AGENDA

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

DIVISION I COMMUNICATIONS AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE

Conference call
Dial-in Number: 1-866-328-4270
Reservation Number: 4116956

August 12, 2009
3 p.m. Eastern time

1. Welcome and opening remarks.

2. Recap of items of significance from the June cabinet meetings and conference calls. Key Items. [Supplement No. 1]

   a. Academic Cabinet. [Supplement No. 2]

   b. Administration Cabinet. [Supplement No. 3]

   c. Amateurism Cabinet. [Supplement No. 4]

   d. Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet. [Supplement No. 5]

      - Definition of Recruitment.

   e. Championships/Sports Management Cabinet. [Supplement No. 6]

   f. Recruiting Cabinet. [Supplement No. 7]

   g. Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

3. Lessons Learned – Best practices shared.

   a. Update regarding request for bylaw review. [Supplement No. 8]

   b. Successful communications strategies and meeting structure.

4. Brief updates from the other Division I leadership bodies.

   a. Board of Directors. [Supplement No. 9]

b. Leadership Council. [Supplement No. 10]

c. Legislative Council. [Supplement No. 11]

5. News from the staff.

a. Collaboration zones – pilot program.

b. Leadership succession planning.

c. Authority of the chair.

d. Reminders regarding objectives in reviewing legislative proposals. [Supplement No. 12]

e. Student-Athlete Advisory Committee members. [Supplement No. 13]

f. Meeting materials.

g. Meeting schedule. [Supplement No. 14]

h. Plans for the 2010 NCAA Convention.

i. Affiliate update.

6. Other business.

7. Proposed future call dates.

8. Adjournment.

# # # #

KEY ITEMS FROM JUNE CABINET MEETINGS

ACADEMIC CABINET.

1. **Nontraditional Courses for Initial Eligibility (NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet Priority Topic).** The cabinet sponsored legislation to specify that nontraditional courses may be used to satisfy NCAA core-course requirements, provided the instructor and student have regular and ongoing access to and interaction with one another for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student throughout the duration of the course, and further, that the course uses a system that permits review and validation of the student's coursework (e.g., exams, papers, assignments) and a defined normative timeline for completion of the course. Additional efforts were approved to clarify the use of credit by examination and repeat courses to meet initial-eligibility requirements and to clarify the types of documentation that will be considered in the review of nontraditional courses as part of the prospective student-athlete review process. Each of these actions are incremental steps to promote integrity within the initial-eligibility process and to help the NCAA academic and membership affairs and NCAA Eligibility Center staffs evaluate the academic records of prospective student-athletes and providers of nontraditional coursework.

2. **Review of Initial-Eligibility Standards.** As part of its legislated duty to manage and monitor eligibility standards, the cabinet began a review of the division's initial-eligibility requirements by drafting goals and principles to guide its future work on this issue. The cabinet welcomes membership feedback regarding these draft items and will continue its review during its September meeting.

ADMINISTRATION CABINET.

1. **Annual Review/Advancement of Provisional/Reclassifying Members.** The cabinet reviewed the progress of all 18 institutions currently in the process of reclassifying their sports programs to Division I active status. Specifically, the group reviewed the annual reports and updated strategic plans for all reclassifying and provisional members and focused on whether such institutions were meeting all applicable legislative requirements and were responsive to feedback provided to the institution the previous year by the former Division I Management Council Membership Subcommittee. The cabinet agreed to recommend to the Leadership Council that Kennesaw State University, New Jersey Institute of Technology, North Florida University and Utah Valley University, all institutions in their final year of the reclassifying or provisional membership process, be elected to active Division I status. Further, the cabinet recommended to the Leadership

Council that University of Central Arkansas [women's soccer and baseball], Florida Gulf Coast University [women's volleyball and baseball], Presbyterian University [softball and men's tennis], University of South Carolina, Upstate [softball and men's soccer] and Western Kentucky University [FCS to FBS] be elected to active Division I multidivisional membership status in the identified sports. Each institution is completing its final year of the multidivisional reclassification process in the applicable sport.

2. **Committee appointment process**. The cabinet is continuing to look for ways to enhance the committee appointment process and is focused on ensuring that all 31 multisport conferences are fairly represented in the appointment process and that the cabinet is well positioned to identify the best nominees for specific committee vacancies. Accordingly, the cabinet is recommending outreach to the multisport conferences, including a conference call between the cabinet chair and conference office personnel, to ensure the conferences have a thorough understanding of the appointment processes.

3. **Division I governance assessment.** While the new Division I governance structure is still in its first year of operation, the cabinet, with the help of the NCAA research staff, is in the preliminary stages of seeking to develop an assessment plan to determine if the new structure is achieving its stated goals and objectives. Plans call for the assessment to include: roster tracking, test cases whereby policy issues are tracked through the governance process, exit surveys to those serving in the structure, interviews with those in leadership positions and yearly reports from staff liaisons.

4. **Cost- saving measures**. During its September meeting, the cabinet's first agenda item will be to conduct a review of NCAA bylaws that fall under its purview to seek to identify possible legislative changes that could ultimately result in cost savings for member institutions.

AMATEURISM CABINET.

1. **Proposals Sponsored for the 2009-10 Legislative Cycle.** The cabinet sponsored three legislative proposals for the 2009-10 legislative cycle, including:

   a. A proposal to change the definition of a professional athletics team to permit an individual prior to initial, full-time collegiate enrollment to engage in outside competition with a professional athletics team without jeopardizing intercollegiate eligibility, provided the individual does not receive more than actual and necessary expenses to compete on the team. The cabinet noted that as part of the

recommendation, the competitive equity issues related to participation in organized competition would be addressed as follows:

(1) In sports other than tennis, swimming and diving and women's volleyball, a prospective student-athlete who does not initially enroll full-time in a collegiate institution within one year (or the next opportunity to enroll after one year has elapsed) following the high school graduation date of the prospective student-athlete's class and participates in organized events after the one-year period shall be charged with a season of intercollegiate competition for each year of participation and shall fulfill an academic year in residence on matriculation at the certifying institution before being eligible to represent the institution in intercollegiate competition.

(2) In tennis, a prospective student-athlete who does not initially enroll full-time in a collegiate institution within six months (or the next opportunity to enroll after the six-month period has expired) following the high school graduation date of the prospective student-athlete's class and participates in organized events after the six-month period shall be charged with a season of intercollegiate competition for each year of participation and shall fulfill an academic year in residence for each year of participation on matriculation at the certifying institution before being eligible to represent the institution in intercollegiate competition.

b. A proposal that would specify that in men's ice hockey, a prospective or enrolled student-athlete may accept actual and necessary travel, and room and board expenses from a professional sports organization that is a member of the National Hockey League (NHL) in order to attend the NHL Scouting Combine, regardless of the duration of the combine.

c. A proposal that would specify that an institution's president or chancellor may designate an institutional staff member(s) to assist student-athletes in making arrangements for securing disabling-injury insurance.

2. Commercial Activity in Division I Intercollegiate Athletics. The cabinet engaged in a detailed review of the final report of the Task Force on Commercial Activity in Intercollegiate Athletics. The cabinet stressed the need for the legislative changes to strike the appropriate balance between the necessity of commercial involvement in intercollegiate athletics and the principles of amateurism. The cabinet will continue its discussion of the legislative concepts in the report at its September meeting, at which time it may make specific legislative recommendations to the Leadership Council.

CHAMPIONSHIPS/SPORTS MANAGEMENT CABINET.

1. **Bylaw and Practices Review.** The cabinet considered the charge outlined by the Division I Board of Directors related to the identification of bylaws and practices that could be modified to provide financial relief to the membership. Cabinet members were encouraged to think about potential changes to Division I Bylaws 17 and 31 that might result in cost savings. Cabinet members agreed to submit potential changes to the NCAA staff on or prior to July 31, 2009, for discussion at the September 2009 meeting. The Cabinet's Administrative Committee agreed to compile the suggestions and lead the discussion at the September meeting.

2. **Sand Volleyball Playing and Practice Season.** The cabinet engaged in a lengthy discussion regarding a proposed sand volleyball playing and practice season model and contest limits for sports sponsorship. After reviewing information submitted by the American Volleyball Coaches Association, the cabinet agreed to delay action on this item. In the interim, the Administrative Committee will request that cabinet members provide the committee feedback frame additional discussion at the cabinet's September meeting.

3. **Report of the NCAA Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct.** At the request of the NCAA Executive Committee, the cabinet reviewed the current NCAA policy precluding the hosting of championship events in metropolitan areas where sports wagering occurs. It was noted that the current policy does not distinguish between predetermined and nonpredetermined championship sites. Consistent with the recommendation from the Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct Committee, the cabinet agreed to recommend that the relevant geographical area be changed from "metropolitan" to "state." Unlike the Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct Committee; however, the cabinet agreed to recommend modifying the current policy so that it would be permissible for a state that permits sports wagering to host a championship, provided the hosting sites are not predetermined.

AWARDS, BENEFITS, EXPENSES AND FINANCIAL AID CABINET.

1. **Review of Current Financial Aid Model.** The Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet continued its review of the financial aid items prioritized during its February 2009 meeting. Specifically, the following topics were prioritized for further study: (1) countable aid versus noncountable aid (e.g., government grants, institutional merit aid, state grants); (2) examination of issues related to determining counter status; (3)

head count versus equivalency designations; and (4) team financial aid limits. During its June meeting, videoconferences with financial aid officers from nine Division I institutions representing all three subdivisions were conducted to obtain additional feedback related to the financial aid items prioritized by the cabinet. Based on this feedback, the cabinet identified two themes to help guide the cabinet in its review and formulation of recommendations:

a. Legislative recommendations resulting from the cabinet's review should prioritize the well-being of student-athletes over other factors (e.g., competitive equity); and

b. The current financial aid legislation is perceived as unduly burdensome and at times prevents financial aid administrators from exercising professional judgment as would be done for non-student-athletes.

In addition, the cabinet directed the staff to develop a spectrum of models demonstrating how potential changes to NCAA rules would impact team limitations if specific types of financial aid (e.g., Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant, institutional merit and need-based aid, state grants, outside aid) were exempted. The staff will prepare the models for review by the cabinet during its September 2009 meeting.

2. Maximum Equivalency Limits – Sand Volleyball. The cabinet sponsored legislation for the 2009-10 legislative cycle related to team financial aid limits in the sport of sand volleyball. Specifically, the legislation sponsored by the cabinet specifies team limits in the sport of sand volleyball as follows:

a. For institutions that sponsor both sand and indoor volleyball teams, there shall be an annual limit of six equivalencies and an annual limit of 14 on the total number of counters in the sport of sand volleyball.

The implementation of the equivalencies will occur as follows:

Effective 2010-11.....three equivalencies
Effective 2011-12.....four equivalencies
Effective 2012-13.....five equivalencies
Effective 2013-14 and thereafter .....six equivalencies; and

b. For institutions that sponsor sand volleyball only, there shall be an annual limit of eight equivalencies and an annual limit of 14 on the total number of counters in the sport of sand volleyball.

RECRUITING AND ATHLETICS PERSONNEL ISSUES CABINET.

1. **Proposals Sponsored for the 2009-10 Cycle**. The Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet sponsored 10 legislative proposals for the membership's consideration for the 2009-10 legislative cycle. One proposal is being forwarded to the NCAA Division I Legislative Council for consideration as emergency or noncontroversial.

2. **Coaching Limits and Athletics Personnel Issues**. The cabinet examined the feedback received from the membership and other constituent groups to the April 2009 coaching limits and athletics personnel discussion document and, as detailed in other sections of this report: affirmed current legislation regarding countable coaches and volunteer coaches; sponsored legislation regarding student assistant coaches, noncoaching staff with sport-specific responsibilities and managers; and agreed to further study the positions of graduate assistant coaches and noncoaching staff with sport-specific responsibilities.

3. **Recruiting Materials**. The cabinet examined current legislation regarding institutional letterhead, printed media guides and audio/video materials. It sponsored legislation to set forth restrictions on institutional letterhead to curb the increasingly elaborate design of materials being called letterhead. It supported a concept to eliminate the provision of printed media guides for recruiting purposes, but declined to sponsor legislation at this time noting some conferences have already indicated the intent to sponsor legislation in this regard. Finally, the cabinet sponsored legislation to deregulate the current restrictions on audio/video materials.

4. **Bylaw and Practices Review**. At the direction of the Division I Board of Directors, the cabinet engaged in an examination of Division I Bylaws 11 and 13 and created an initial list of possible bylaws and policy changes that could potentially be modified to provide financial and operational relief to the membership. The cabinet noted, however, further examination and discussion would be needed prior to moving any towards legislative proposals. Further, the cabinet noted the principle of the Board's charge was also considered in some of the proposals sponsored by the cabinet for the upcoming cycle.

REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISON I ACADEMIC CABINET
JUNE 29-30, 2009, MEETING

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. Legislative Items.

- None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- None.

***KEY ITEMS*.**

1. Nontraditional Courses for Initial Eligibility (NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet Priority Topic). The cabinet sponsored legislation to specify that nontraditional courses may be used to satisfy NCAA core-course requirements, provided the instructor and student have regular and ongoing access to and interaction with one another for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student throughout the duration of the course, and further, that the course uses a system that permits review and validation of the student's coursework (e.g., exams, papers, assignments) and a defined normative timeline for completion of the course. Additional efforts were approved to clarify the use of credit by examination and repeat courses to meet initial-eligibility requirements and to clarify the types of documentation that will be considered in the review of nontraditional courses as part of the prospective student-athlete review process. Each of these actions are incremental steps to promote integrity within the initial-eligibility process and to help the NCAA academic and membership affairs and NCAA Eligibility Center staffs evaluate the academic records of prospective student-athletes and providers of nontraditional coursework.

2. Review of Initial-Eligibility Standards. As part of its legislated duty to manage and monitor eligibility standards, the cabinet began a review of the division's initial-eligibility requirements by drafting goals and principles to guide its future work on this issue (See Page No. 5). The cabinet welcomes membership feedback regarding these draft items and will continue its review during its September meeting.

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

1. Legislative Informational Items.

a. NCAA Bylaw 14.3.1.2.2 – Eligibility – Freshman Academic Requirements – Eligibility for Financial Aid, Practice and Competition – Core-Curriculum Requirements – Nontraditional Courses. The cabinet sponsored legislation to

amend the current nontraditional legislation to specify that nontraditional courses may be used to satisfy NCAA core-course requirements, provided the instructor and student have regular and ongoing access to and interaction with one another for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student throughout the duration of the course; further, provided the course uses a system that permits review and validation of the student's coursework (e.g., exams, papers, assignments) and a defined normative timeline for completion of the course. Current legislation permits the use of nontraditional courses (courses taught via the Internet, distance-learning, independent-study, individualized-instruction, correspondence and other similar means) to be used to satisfy NCAA core-course requirements. This legislation was adopted in 2000 in an attempt to keep up with trends in educational technology and to streamline initial-eligibility standards. While the original intent of the legislation was to allow individuals to take advantage of increased flexibility in learning opportunities without compromising the intent of the core-curriculum legislation, it is important to clarify that there is an expectation that nontraditional courses should include interaction between the instructor and the student throughout the duration of the course. Based on feedback from the NCAA Student Records Review Committee and NCAA High School Records Committee, these legislative changes are intended to help ensure that acceptable nontraditional courses provide opportunities for students to demonstrate their work was completed in a manner consistent with the intent and design of the course curriculum. The ultimate goal of this legislation is to ensure that prospective student-athletes are prepared for college-level coursework; therefore, it is of utmost importance to ensure that individuals are enrolled in quality courses that satisfy the intent of the Association's core-curriculum requirements.

b. **Waivers Initially Considered by the Academic Cabinet.** The cabinet amended the proposal it sponsored in February to specify that the NCAA Division I Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee and the NCAA Division I Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee shall have authority to review waivers that are currently considered initially by the Academic Cabinet. The cabinet considered several types of waivers in which the waiver authority is provided directly to the cabinet with no review by the staff or a waiver committee. The cabinet agreed that, in general, all waivers should have some appeal opportunity available, which can be achieved by allowing for staff to initially review the waivers and by providing appellate jurisdiction to the appropriate waiver committees. Therefore, the cabinet amended the proposal to specify that the following waivers should be initially reviewed by the staff, with an appellate opportunity to the Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee:

(1) Waivers of full-time enrollment for practice and competition, including waivers involving nontraditional academic calendars, student-athlete participation in specified international events and student-athletes with education-impacting disabilities;

(2) Fourth season of competition waivers for nonqualifiers who have not completed 80 percent of their designated degree programs at the beginning of their fifth academic years following initial, full-time collegiate enrollment; and

(3) Determinations regarding the nature of two-year college degree programs.

Further, the cabinet amended the proposal to specify that the following waivers should be initially reviewed by the staff, with an appellate opportunity to the Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee:

- Early admissions program waivers;

The cabinet also asked staff to explore the possibility of providing additional authority to the staff to make decisions on initial-eligibility waivers involving education-impacting disabilities. Currently, the staff's authority to approve such waivers is limited. Expanding the staff's authority would allow the Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee to serve in an appellate role, rather than as the first level of review for such waivers.

2. Nonlegislative Informational Items.

a. Nontraditional Courses Used to Meet Initial-Eligibility Requirements (Academic Cabinet Priority Topic). The cabinet began its review of nontraditional courses used to satisfy initial-eligibility requirements. In light of rapid growth and evolution within the online educational environment, the cabinet's review is intended to ensure current legislation and policies are consistent with the academic goals and purposes of the Association. The cabinet noted some issues that have been identified by the Student Records Review Committee, High School Review Committee and Eligibility Center staff as potential concerns with some nontraditional high school courses, including:

(1) Lack of interaction between instructor and student-athlete throughout the course, including when access is limited to the grading of assignments or exams;

(2) The completion of courses in a condensed timeframe (e.g., five hours, two days, one week), shorter than the guidelines published by the course provider;

(3) Completion of a large number of courses in a short timeframe (e.g., seven core courses in six weeks), often involving sequential coursework taken out of the normal progression;

(4) Repeated courses that are abbreviated or substantially different from the original course;

(5) Courses that do not yield work that can be reviewed; and

(6) Courses that lack a qualified instructor.

In addition to sponsoring the proposal regarding nontraditional courses used for initial-eligibility purposes (See Page No. 2), the cabinet requested that staff consider issuing an interpretation and/or educational column to clarify that credit earned only by examination may not be used for initial-eligibility purposes and that repeated courses must be substantially comparable, qualitatively and quantitatively, to the previously completed course in order to be used for initial-eligibility purposes. This will provide greater clarification and direction to the staff and membership regarding when a course may be considered a repeated course and also will help ensure that repeated courses provide a similar educational experience to the original course.

The cabinet also approved revisions to the Student Records Review Committee policies and procedures to clarify the types of documentation that will be considered in the prospective student-athlete review process. Specifically, the committee may consider evidence supporting the prospective student-athlete's academic record, including coursework completed by the prospective student-athlete; course syllabus; timeline for completion of the course; documentation of the specific content; course instruction methodology; instructor/student interaction; and student assessment(s). Amending the committee's policies facilitates greater scrutiny of the coursework by permitting the staff and committee to consider elements such as pacing and time to complete the course, as well as the use of a learning management system to monitor student progress.

b. **Nontraditional Courses used to meet Progress-Toward-Degree Requirements (Academic Cabinet Priority Topic).** The cabinet reviewed comments and concerns related to NCAA Proposal No. 2008-32-B, which was defeated by the NCAA Division I Legislative Council in April. The cabinet noted that, given the increasing prevalence of nontraditional course delivery within higher education and the expressed interest of the NCAA Division I Board of Directors, the use of nontraditional courses remains a priority topic for the cabinet and it will continue its work on the issue over the next academic year, with the goal of sponsoring legislation for the 2010-11 cycle.

c. **Review of Initial-Eligibility Requirements.** As part of its legislated duty to manage and monitor eligibility standards, the cabinet initiated an examination of the division's initial-eligibility requirements. As it began its review, the cabinet noted the Board of Directors' charge during the most recent revision of initial-eligibility rules was to maximize student-athlete graduation rates while minimizing disparate impact on minority and low-income students. The cabinet examined data indicating

the average academic profile of prospective student-athletes and the percentage of prospective student-athletes meeting initial-eligibility requirements have remained relatively consistent since the extended sliding scale was implemented in 2003. The cabinet also noted that a more normal distribution of standardized test scores has resulted since the extended sliding scale was adopted, eliminating the concentrated "ledge" within the distribution that previously represented prospective student-athletes earning the minimum required test scores (e.g., 820 SAT).

NCAA research consistently has shown that identification of eventual college graduates using high school academic information is best achieved with a formula based on high school grades in core academic courses in combination with ACT-SAT scores (e.g., a sliding scale model). In comparison to other methods for combining academic variables (e.g., conjunctive rules like Proposition 48), the sliding scale has been shown to minimize negative impacts on eventual minority graduates. Further, the cabinet noted that projections from NCAA data indicate that graduation rates would likely increase with an upward shift in the coordinates of the initial-eligibility sliding scale (i.e., requiring a higher grade-point average for a given test score than on the existing scale), but that the increases probably would be relatively modest. Also, such changes might result in substantial increases in adverse impact on ethnic minority student-athletes and in false negative identifications (declaring as ineligible students who likely would have graduated from college).

To offer direction to its review of Division I initial-eligibility standards, the cabinet drafted the following proposed goals for any future initial-eligibility requirements:

(1) Initial-eligibility standards should help ensure first-year student-athlete academic success, as defined by meeting NCAA progress-toward-degree eligibility standards and/or by increasing likelihood of graduation (i.e., increased likelihood after first year compared to likelihood based solely on high school preparation);

(2) Initial-eligibility standards should preserve institutional responsibility for admissions decisions, possibly including consideration of aggregate risk evaluations; and

(3) Initial-eligibility standards should encourage prospective student-athletes to balance their self-identities as students and athletes.

To further guide its review of initial-eligibility requirements, the cabinet developed the following draft principles:

(1) Initial-eligibility standards should strive to maximize first-year college academic success, putting student-athletes on track to graduate in a reasonable timeframe and minimizing false negatives and adverse impact on minority and low-income prospective student-athletes;

(2) NCAA initial-eligibility standards should represent minimally acceptable standards, with continued reliance on member institutions to make admissions decisions that are most appropriate for determining academic success locally;

(3) Review of the initial-eligibility standards should include consideration of the most recent NCAA academic data, changing secondary school standards (e.g., No Child Left Behind) and the national secondary school environment (e.g., increasing enrollment in nontraditional courses);

(4) Initial-eligibility standards should be simple and nationally applicable to ensure prospective student-athletes and high schools can readily understand any potential changes and that such changes can be applied for students throughout the United States (as well as international prospective student-athletes);

(5) Any changes should be able to be implemented with relatively minimal increased chance for operational error and little to no increased bureaucracy for member institutions and high schools;

(6) New requirements should not create or expand opportunities for misrepresentation of prospective student-athletes' academic abilities or credentials;

(7) Consideration should be given to prospective student-athletes' abilities and opportunities to meet increased standards when considering implementation time lines for new or increased requirements; and

(8) Waiver decisions under any initial-eligibility standard should be made through processes employing data-driven analysis in addition to mitigation.

The cabinet is seeking feedback from conferences and other governance entities in the establishment of these goals and priorities and also will solicit comments from various constituent groups and associations (e.g., faculty, coaches and academic support organizations) as it continues its discussion and review of potential initial-eligibility models in the coming academic year.

d. Impact of the Progress-Toward-Degree Requirements on Student-Athlete Degree Selection (Academic Cabinet Priority Topic). The cabinet conducted an initial discussion to identify topics for review when discussing the impact of NCAA progress-toward-degree requirements on student-athlete degree selection. Specifically, the cabinet noted complications in minor declarations and changes of degree programs; restricted degree program options for transfer student-athletes; and, the direct and often indirect influences of faculty, coaches, advisors and peers on individual student-athlete degree declarations. The cabinet will continue to examine these issues in the coming year and will engage in conversations with representatives from N4A and NACADA to inform its review.

e. **Academic Research and Data Collection.** The cabinet directed the staff to prioritize efforts to develop a unique NCAA identification number that will help to link student-athlete academic records and to improve data matching and tracking academic outcomes in the future. The cabinet also noted the need to balance the value of such information with the security of protected and sensitive student-athlete data and encouraged the staff to be responsive to these concerns in its related programming efforts.

f. **Student-Athlete Academic Performance Report.** The cabinet received its annual report regarding student-athlete academic performance and observed substantial increases in the average NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) overall and in some sports, especially in baseball, men's basketball and football. The cabinet also noted that while women's basketball continues to perform at an acceptable level overall, there are some trends that warrant monitoring, including declining eligibility rates and increasing numbers of student-athletes departing institutions while academically ineligible (i.e., "0/2" in the APR). The cabinet expressed support for efforts to address the academic performance of women's basketball student-athletes and welcomes involvement in such activities.

g. **Waiver Process for Data Submission Requirements in NCAA Bylaws 14.3.1.1.1.2, 14.5.4.7.2 and 14.5.6.6.2.** The cabinet authorized the Eligibility Center to process waivers of the information submission requirements for early academic qualifiers, 2-4 and 4-2-4 transfers outlined in Bylaws 14.3.1.1.1.2, 14.5.4.7.2 and 14.5.6.6.2. Further, the cabinet specified that a flexible approach should be taken by the Eligibility Center staff when extenuating circumstances preclude an institution or student-athlete from submitting the required information. Eventually, the waiver process will be part of a Web-based system currently under development for many types of waivers, which will allow for a simple process for the membership. In the interim, the Eligibility Center staff will receive the waiver requests via e-mail, note the reasons preventing submission of required information (for future review by the cabinet), make a determination, and electronically communicate the decision to the institution. Additional information on the waiver process will be forthcoming from the Eligibility Center staff. Finally, the cabinet will receive annual reports regarding the number of waivers requested and approved for each requirement, as well as a summary of mitigation cited in the cases.

h. **Academic Performance of Student-Athletes Receiving the Waivers.** The cabinet reviewed academic performance outcomes of student-athletes who previously requested waivers of NCAA initial-eligibility, progress-toward-degree and/or transfer requirements and directed the staff to further review outcomes of student-athletes who are granted waivers and later become academically ineligible to determine if any trends emerge that would inform the review of future waivers.

i. **Academic Waiver Application Forms for 2009-2010.** The cabinet approved the 2009-10 initial-eligibility waiver and progress-toward-degree waiver application forms and policies and procedures. In a change for 2009-10, academic recovery plans now will be required for all progress-toward-degree waivers, rather than required only when requested by staff. The cabinet also directed the staff to include the NCAA identification number as a required element of initial-eligibility waivers, progress-toward-degree waivers and NCAA Division I Legislative Council Subcommittee for Legislative Relief application forms once the number is fully implemented for all student-athletes. In the interim the staff should require waiver applicants to submit the student identification number matching the student-athlete's entry in the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP) (e.g., Social Security number, campus identification number, Eligibility Center identification number). For student-athletes not included in the APR cohort, institutions may submit the identification number used on campus.

j. **Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Citing Academic or Disciplinary Suspension**. The cabinet reviewed progress-toward-degree waiver case precedent involving academic or disciplinary suspension or dismissal as mitigation for the student-athlete's academic deficiency(ies). As with all waivers, the staff considers the size of the deficiency(ies), the student-athlete's overall academic record, the likelihood of graduation within five years of full-time enrollment, the academic recovery plan and evidence of compelling mitigation that contributed to the deficiency(ies) in its review of progress-toward degree waivers involving suspension or dismissal. The cabinet directed the staff to continue to review such cases in a manner consistent with precedent and noted that academic and disciplinary suspensions should be considered as one of many factors in the waiver process. As a result, in some instances it may be appropriate to approve a waiver when mitigation circumstances are outside the control of the student-athlete.

k. **Review of Guidelines and Process for Transfer Appeals.** The cabinet noted that many transfer waiver requests involve significant academic considerations (e.g., transferable credit hours, academic eligibility at the previous institution), but that other waivers involve competitive equity and other nonacademic elements. To pursue examination of transfer appeals policies, the cabinet agreed to appoint two members to work with representatives of the Subcommittee for Legislative Relief to identify the best avenue and guidelines to review appeals of decisions on requests to waive the division's transfer residence requirement, including consideration of academic performance.

l. **Student Records Review Committee Policies and Procedures.** The cabinet approved revisions to the Student Records Review Committee Policies and Procedures to clearly define the staff and committee's authority during the prospective student-athlete review process, to clarify the documentation necessary to validate an individual's academic credentials, and to permit the staff and committee

to reconsider the certification of a prospective student-athlete when information is obtained subsequent to the certification that indicates the certification was based on fraudulent information or activity. These updates will be incorporated into the committee's policies and procedures document and will be posted on the NCAA Web site.

m. **NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group Report.** The cabinet reviewed the April 2009 Report of the Basketball Academic Enhancement Group. Specifically, the cabinet noted a slight increase in permissible hours of athletically related activities under the preseason practice recommendation, as well as the potential impact on academic support personnel if the summer school recommendation is adopted. Further, the cabinet discussed whether the report, in total, recommends strong enough actions to result in meaningful academic improvement among men's basketball student-athletes. Finally, the cabinet noted it expects to have an opportunity to formally review and comment on the group's final report during the cabinet's September meeting.

n. **NCAA Division I Football Academic Working Group Status Report.** The cabinet reviewed the April 2009 Football Academic Working Group Status Report and specifically noted that football student-athletes, particularly first-year student-athletes, lose a significant number of APR eligibility points during the competitive season. The cabinet generally supported the recommendation to require football student-athletes to complete eligibility requirements in the fall term in order to avoid ineligibility for the first two contests of the following season. The cabinet views this recommendation as an appropriate response to the decreased rates of eligibility demonstrated by football student-athletes overall, but especially among freshmen. Further, the cabinet expressed preliminary opposition to any avenue by which a student-athlete could reduce the two-game suspension and preferred that situations involving mitigation or extenuating circumstances be addressed appropriately through the progress-toward-degree waiver process. In addition, the cabinet is interested in further studying the impact of athletic time demands on football student-athletes as a means of identifying additional strategies to improve academic performance.

o. **Division I Membership Requirements.** The cabinet noted the NCAA Division I Leadership Council's interest in development academic criteria for Division I member institutions and anticipates a formal request for feedback later this year.

p. **Review of Bylaws and Practices for Cost Efficiencies.** The cabinet reviewed several possible concepts identified to provide cost savings to the membership and determined that most would provide little direct financial relief and possibly could jeopardize the Association's principles of sound academic standards and competitive equity. The cabinet also noted that a significant portion of institutional expenditures related to academics and eligibility are for academic support resources and, therefore, are difficult to address via legislative or policy changes.

q. Term of Cabinet Chair. The cabinet extended the term of its chair, Carolyn Callahan, Faculty Athletics Representative at the University of Virginia, through the 2009-10 academic year.

Committee Chair: Carolyn Callahan, University of Virginia, Atlantic Coast Conference
Cabinet Liaisons: Matt Burgemeister, Academic and Membership Affairs
Julie Cromer, Academic and Membership Affairs
Diane Dickman, Academic and Membership Affairs

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
DIVISION I ADMINISTRATION CABINET

The NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet submits this report from its June 30, 2009, in-person meeting in Indianapolis, Indiana.

***KEY ITEMS*.**

1. **Annual Review/Advancement of Provisional/Reclassifying Members.** The cabinet reviewed the progress of all 18 institutions currently in the process of reclassifying their sports programs to Division I active status. Specifically, the group reviewed the annual reports and updated strategic plans for all reclassifying and provisional members and focused on whether such institutions were meeting all applicable legislative requirements and were responsive to feedback provided to the institution the previous year by the former Division I Management Council Membership Subcommittee. The cabinet agreed to recommend to the Leadership Council that Kennesaw State University, New Jersey Institute of Technology, North Florida University and Utah Valley University, all institutions in their final year of the reclassifying or provisional membership process, be elected to active Division I status. Further, the cabinet recommends to the Leadership Council that University of Central Arkansas [women's soccer and baseball], Florida Gulf Coast University [women's volleyball and baseball], Presbyterian University [softball and men's tennis], University of South Carolina, Upstate [softball and men's soccer] and Western Kentucky University [FCS to FBS] be elected to active Division I multidivisional membership status in the identified sports. Each institution is completing its final year of the multidivisional reclassification process in the applicable sport.

2. **Committee appointment process**. The cabinet is continuing to look for ways to enhance the committee appointment process and is focused on ensuring that all 31 multisport conferences are fairly represented in the appointment process and that the cabinet is well positioned to identify the best nominees for specific committee vacancies. Accordingly, the cabinet is recommending outreach to the multisport conferences, including a conference call between the cabinet chair and conference office personnel, to ensure the conferences have a thorough understanding of the appointment processes and support best practices.

3. **Division I governance assessment.** While the new Division I governance structure is still in its first year of operation, the cabinet, with the help of the NCAA research staff, is in the preliminary stages of seeking to develop an assessment plan to determine if the new structure is achieving its stated goals and objectives. Plans call for the assessment to include: roster tracking, test cases whereby policy issues are tracked through the governance process, exit surveys to those serving in the structure, interviews with those in leadership positions and yearly reports from staff liaisons.

4. **Cost- saving measures**. During its September meeting, the cabinet's first agenda item will be to conduct a review of NCAA bylaws that fall under its purview to seek to identify possible legislative changes that could ultimately result in cost savings for member institutions.

***ACTION ITEM*.**

1. **Legislative Items**.

- None.

2. **Nonlegislative Items.**

- Annual Review/Advancement of Provisional/Reclassifying Members. The cabinet reviewed the progress of all 18 institutions currently in the process of reclassifying their sports programs to Division I active status. Specifically, the group reviewed the annual reports and updated strategic plans for all reclassifying and provisional members and focused on whether such institutions were meeting all applicable legislative requirements and were responsive to feedback provided to the institution the previous year by the former Division I Management Council Membership Subcommittee. The cabinet agreed to recommend to the Leadership Council that Kennesaw State University, New Jersey Institute of Technology, North Florida University and Utah Valley University, all institutions in their final year of the reclassifying or provisional membership process, be elected to active Division I status. Further, the cabinet recommends to the Leadership Council that University of Central Arkansas [women's soccer and baseball], Florida Gulf Coast University [women's volleyball and baseball], Presbyterian University [softball and men's tennis], University of South Carolina, Upstate [softball and men's soccer] and Western Kentucky University [FCS to FBS] be elected to active Division I multidivisional membership status in the identified sports. Each institution is completing its final year of the multidivisional reclassification process in the applicable sport.

***INFORMATION ITEMS*.**

1. **Governance Updates.**

a. Reports of the Administration Cabinet. The cabinet received the report of the February 13 - 14, 2009, Administration Cabinet meeting and approved the interim actions of the Administrative Committee of the Administration Cabinet.

b. Governance Reports. In keeping with Division I's efforts to enhance the level of governance communication and develop a more coordinated governance agenda, the cabinet received status reports from the Communications and Coordination Committee, the Board of Directors, the Leadership Council, the Legislative Council and the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. [Note: During the discussion of governance reports, the cabinet again noted the importance of effective communication to the overall success of the new governance structure and the need for all materials to be available on the NCAA Website in a form that is not password protected. Members also suggested that all supplements be included in one PDF file for easier review by both cabinet members and the membership.]

2. Cost savings bylaw review. The cabinet was informed that the Division I Board of Directors asked the councils and cabinets to think creatively about possible changes to bylaws under its purview that could provide financial relief to member institutions. Given its jurisdiction, the Administration Cabinet members received a copy of bylaws pertaining to governance, committee selections and the membership process and were asked to review these bylaws with an eye towards suggesting possible legislative amendments that could result in cost savings. Once the supporting technology is in place, the members will be asked to share their thoughts and ideas over the course of this summer. Cabinet members were instructed to come to the September meeting prepared to further explore potential cost saving ideas as it was suggested that this item be the first topic discussed at that meeting.

3. Issues pertaining to Division I membership.

a. Update on the Leadership Council's discussions regarding membership issues. The cabinet received an update on the Leadership Council's efforts-to-date to develop new Division I membership standards and discuss how the cabinet could be of assistance to the Council's efforts. Based on its experience with the current membership process, the cabinet agreed to forward to the Leadership Council some common concerns identified among institutions currently moving through the reclassification or provisional membership process that may be of assistance to the Council as it continues its discussion of Division I membership requirements. Such concerns included: poor academic performance rates, the financial aid budget [sources of funding predominantly being student fees or institutional funds outside the athletics department], the role of conferences as gatekeepers, staffing responsibilities [a lack of full-time staff members, full-time staff members performing

multiple administrative tasks], compliance/monitoring rules violations, low attendance numbers [marketing strategies] and commitment to diversity.

b. Annual Review/Advancement of Provisional/Reclassifying Members – Review of Updated Strategic Plans and Annual Reports. The cabinet reviewed the progress of all 18 institutions currently in the process of reclassifying the sports programs to Division I active status. Specifically, the group reviewed the annual reports and updated strategic plans for all reclassifying and provisional members and focused on whether such institutions were meeting all applicable legislative requirements and were responsive to feedback provided to the institution the previous year by the former Division I Management Council Membership Subcommittee. The cabinet advanced the following institutions to the next year of the membership reclassification process**:**

(1) Provisional Membership [New members].

- Houston Baptist University – Year Two

(2) Reclassifying Membership [Division II to Division I].

- Year Four

  California State University, Bakersfield
  University of Central Arkansas

- Year Three

  Florida Gulf Coast University
  University of South Carolina, Upstate
  Presbyterian University

- Year Two

  Bryant University
  North Dakota University
  Seattle University
  South Dakota University
  Southern Illinois, Edwardsville University

(3) Multidivisional Membership [Division II to Division I in one men's and or one women's sport other than football and basketball].

- Year Two

  Bryant University [men's lacrosse and women's field hockey]
  Seattle University [men's and women's soccer]
  South Dakota University [men's and women's outdoor track and field]
  Southern Illinois, Edwardsville University [men's soccer and softball]

(4) Deferrals.

The cabinet deferred any decision to advance North Carolina Central University and Winston Salem State University until such time as it has the opportunity to review additional requested information.

c. Recommended modification to current practices regarding the reclassification or provisional membership process. Given the cabinet's concern about the quality of some of the strategic plans presented by transitioning members, the cabinet agreed that all future submissions of institutional updated strategic plans should be approved and signed by the institution's president or chancellor. Further, the cabinet approved a motion to direct the staff to provide to the Committee on Athletics Certification all cabinet feedback letters provided to each institution to assist the committee in addressing potential concerns related to any of the certification operating principles**.**

d. Waiver of Minimum Women's Sports Sponsorship Requirements – Bylaw 20.9.4.2-Virginia Military Institute. The cabinet used its authority pursuant to Bylaw 20.9.4.2 to approve a waiver of the minimum women sports sponsorship requirements for Virginia Military Institute for the 2009-10 academic year.

4. Committee Appointments.

a. Debrief from February meeting. The cabinet reviewed information compiled after its February meeting regarding the number of nominations and the distribution of appointments by conferences. The cabinet discussed the fact that while numbers cannot tell the whole story and it is too early in the process to draw any conclusions, the cabinet must continue to monitor the appointment process to ensure it is fair to all 31 multisport conferences. The cabinet further discussed the need to ensure all conferences have a thorough understanding of the nomination and committee selection processes so that the conferences put their best candidates forward for the current committee openings. The cabinet recommended that a conference call be arranged between the Administration Cabinet chair and the appropriate personnel from the conference offices to discuss the nomination and appointment processes and to share some suggested practices. The cabinet also recommended that at its

September meeting, each cabinet member be assigned one of the 10 conferences currently not represented on the cabinet with the idea of the assigned cabinet members becoming more familiar with the nominees of the non-represented conferences.

b. Review of nominating form. The cabinet again discussed the importance of ensuring that individuals interested in being appointed to committees are required to provide a specific statement explaining why their interests and qualifications make them well suited for the committee. The cabinet suggested renaming the current qualification section of the nomination form the "Statement of Interests and Qualifications." The cabinet also suggested moving that section earlier in the form and asked the staff to work with its computer programming support to remove the requirement that the multisport conferences must include information in that section prior to being able to forward the nomination form to interested candidates. The cabinet reiterated the point that it does not want to make the nomination process more labor intensive for the conferences, but it does want to ensure it is easier to identify the most qualified candidates for the committees.

c. Update on efforts to enhance the level of diversity serving in the governance structure. The cabinet was reminded that the issue of enhancing the gender, racial, ethnic and positional diversity within the governance structure is a priority for the leadership bodies in Division I and the cabinet should play a part in seeking to identify creative strategies to bring about improvement. The cabinet was additionally informed that the Faculty Athletic Representative community has expressed a keen interest in seeing the number of faculty serving throughout the whole of the Division I structure increased.

d. Committee nominations. The cabinet approved appointments to Division I and Association-wide committees. A list of the appointments and reappointments is attached. (Attachment) [Note: In making appointments, the cabinet modified its previous process to consider the complete slate of nominees as submitted from the conferences to ensure every legislatively qualified nominee was considered.]

5. Update and conversation regarding the development of a governance assessment tool. The cabinet received an update from the NCAA research staff regarding plans to conduct an assessment of the new Division I governance structure. As part of this update, the cabinet was informed that the assessment will involve a multitude of measures including: roster tracking, test cases whereby policy issues are tracked through the governance process, exit surveys, interviews with those in leadership positions and yearly reports from staff liaisons. During its September meeting, the cabinet will be provided an opportunity to

both discuss the timeline for the assessment process and provide supporting details regarding the development of the necessary surveys and interview scripts.

6. **Life and Work Balance Initiative.** The cabinet received an update on the NCAA's work-life balance initiative and learned more about the various resources available to help member institutions explore ways to develop more supportive environments. The cabinet was reminded that the NCAA Executive Committee asked each division to explore the development of additional policies and possible legislative changes that could enhance the overall level of balance. The cabinet members discussed the fact that while it is easy to conceptually support efforts to enhance work-life balance in a culture that focuses so much on competition, it is often difficult to see meaningful changes unless such changes are mandated. The cabinet began sharing preliminary ideas on the topic with the plan to have a more in-depth discussion during its September meeting.

Cabinet chair:	*Rob Halvaks, Big West Conference*
Cabinet liaisons:	*Beth DeBauche, governance*
	Steve Mallonee, academic and membership affairs
	Delise O'Meally, membership and governance
	Dave Schnase, academic and membership affairs
	Sharon Tufano, governance

REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I AMATEURISM CABINET
JUNE 22-23, 2009, MEETING

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. Legislative Items.

- None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- None.

***KEY ITEMS*.**

1. Proposals Sponsored for the 2009-10 Legislative Cycle. The cabinet sponsored three legislative proposals for the 2009-10 legislative cycle, including a proposal to change the definition of a professional athletics team and the criteria for determining a season of competition. [See Informational Items 1-a, -b and -c below.]

2. Commercial Activity in Division I Intercollegiate Athletics. The cabinet engaged in a detailed review of the final report of the Task Force on Commercial Activity in Intercollegiate Athletics. The cabinet stressed the need for the legislative changes to strike the appropriate balance between the necessity of commercial involvement in intercollegiate athletics and the principles of amateurism. The cabinet will continue its discussion of the legislative concepts in the report at its September meeting, at which time it may make specific legislative recommendations to the Leadership Council.

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

1. Legislative Informational Items.

a. NCAA Bylaw 12.02.4 (Professional Athletics Team).

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet agreed to sponsor legislation for the 2009-10 legislative cycle to permit an individual prior to initial, full-time collegiate enrollment to engage in outside competition with a professional athletics team without jeopardizing intercollegiate eligibility, provided the individual does not receive more than actual and necessary expenses to compete on the team.

The cabinet noted that as part of the recommendation, the competitive equity issues related to participation in organized competition would be addressed as follows:

(a) In sports other than tennis, swimming and diving and women's volleyball, a prospective student-athlete who does not initially enroll full-time in a collegiate institution within one year (or the next opportunity to enroll after one year has elapsed) following the high school graduation date of the prospective student-athlete's class and participates in organized events after the one-year period shall be charged with a season of intercollegiate competition for each year of participation and shall fulfill an academic year in residence on matriculation at the certifying institution before being eligible to represent the institution in intercollegiate competition.

(b) In tennis, a prospective student-athlete who does not initially enroll full-time in a collegiate institution within six months (or the next opportunity to enroll after the six-month period has expired) following the high school graduation date of the prospective student-athlete's class and participates in organized events after the six-month period shall be charged with a season of intercollegiate competition for each year of participation <u>and</u> shall fulfill an academic year in residence for each year of participation on matriculation at the certifying institution before being eligible to represent the institution in intercollegiate competition.

(2) <u>Effective Date</u>. August 1, 2010.

(3) <u>Rationale</u>. The cabinet agreed that prior to initial collegiate enrollment it is more equitable to determine a prospective student-athlete's eligibility based on the specific circumstances of the prospective student-athlete (as opposed to the prospective student-athlete and any of his or her teammates). Under this approach, a prospective student-athlete would also be permitted to sign a contract with a professional sports team, provided the terms of the contract do not allow for the receipt of more than actual and necessary expenses. With this possible legislative change, an institution would no longer be required to determine whether or not a team is considered professional. Instead, an institution would focus its review on an individual's specific circumstances and eligibility would be assessed for the individual using the threshold of receipt of more than actual and necessary expenses from the sports team.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. Potential cost savings as a result of no longer dedicating resources to determine whether any of a prospective student-athlete's teammates received more than actual and necessary expenses.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

b. Amateurism – Involvement with Professional Teams – Tryout After Enrollment - Men's Ice Hockey.

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet agreed to sponsor legislation for the 2009-10 legislative cycle to specify that in men's ice hockey, a prospective or enrolled student-athlete may accept actual and necessary travel, and room and board expenses from a professional sports organization that is a member of the National Hockey League (NHL) in order to attend the NHL Scouting Combine, regardless of the duration of the combine.

(2) Effective Date. Immediate.

(3) Rationale. This proposal provides the same benefit to men's ice hockey prospective and enrolled student-athletes that currently is provided in the sport of basketball. Currently, men's ice hockey prospective and enrolled student-athletes must limit their tryout activities to a 48-hour period to avoid jeopardizing their eligibility if they receive any expenses for the tryout from a professional sports organization. As a result, individuals taking part in the combine (which does not include any on-ice activities) have attempted to conduct as many interviews as possible during the 48-hour time period, during which medical screenings and a physical fitness evaluation also take place. This compression of activities can be detrimental to the performance of the participants during an activity that can have significant consequences on their future career.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. Expanded opportunities for men's ice hockey student-athletes to tryout with professional teams.

c. Amateurism – Amateur Status – Exception for Insurance against Disabling Injury Insurance and Awards, Benefits and Expenses for Enrolled Student-Athletes – Benefits, Gifts and Services – Disabling-Injury Insurance.

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet agreed to sponsor legislation for the 2009-10 legislative cycle to specify that an institution's president or chancellor

may designate an institutional staff member(s) to assist student-athletes in making arrangements for securing disabling-injury insurance.

(2) Effective Date. Immediate.

(3) Rationale. Currently, there appears to be a growing trend within the agent and financial advisor community to arrange disability insurance policies and loans for student-athletes for purposes of recruiting. The cabinet believes that allowing institutional staff members to assist student-athletes with these arrangements would eliminate improper third-party involvement and also alleviate the pressures on student-athletes to seek out this assistance from third parties. It would continue to be impermissible for a representative of athletics interest to provide such assistance.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. Minimal.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. Potential significant impact on alleviating pressures on student-athletes to seek out assistance from third parties (e.g., agents) in order to secure loans to purchase disabling-injury insurance.

2. Nonlegislative Informational Items.

a. Commercial Activity in Division I Intercollegiate Athletics. The cabinet engaged in a detailed review of the final report of the Task Force on Commercial Activity in Intercollegiate Athletics. The Leadership Council requested the cabinet review the Statement of Principles in order to make recommendations regarding the necessary implementation details relative to the principles pertaining to the amateurism rules. The cabinet stressed the need for the legislative changes to strike the appropriate balance between the necessity of commercial involvement in intercollegiate athletics and the principles of amateurism. The cabinet identified several issues for further discussion at its September meeting and requested that staff provide examples of various new media concepts involving the use of student-athletes' images or names in order to facilitate the discussion.

b. Bylaw and Practices Review. At the request of the Board of Directors, the cabinet engaged in a review of Bylaw 12. The cabinet agreed to continue its examination of the legislation at its September meeting to identify bylaws that could be modified in order to provide possible financial relief to institutions. The cabinet also requested staff solicit the assistance of the National Association of Athletics Compliance (NAAC) for suggestions as to possible legislative change(s).

c. **Guiding Principles.** The cabinet engaged in a discussion regarding its guiding principles and priorities to be used when considering legislative proposals or other amateurism issues. [Attachment A.]

d. **Eligibility Center Report.** The Eligibility Center staff provided an overview of data related to the amateurism certification process (e.g., most penalized sports, bylaws most frequently violated and sports most frequently involved). The cabinet also received an update on the Expense Valuation Pilot Program and reaffirmed that the US Census Bureau Web site is the most appropriate source for expense valuation determinations. The Eligibility Center announced that a new registration Web site will be launched June 29, 2009, at www.eligibiltycenter.org. The cabinet also approved the updated NCAA Divisions I and II Amateurism Certification Process Policies and Procedures. The cabinet also engaged in a discussion regarding the challenges faced by the Eligibility Center staff with prospects who are not truthful during the certification process and requested that this be a future cabinet discussion item.

Cabinet Chair: *Mike Rogers, Baylor University, Big 12 Conference*
Staff Liaison(s): *Rachel Newman Baker, Agent, Gambling and Amateurism Activities*
Angie Cretors, Agent, Gambling and Amateurism Activities
Geoff Silver, Academic and Membership Affairs

Attachment A

GUIDING PRINCIPLES
FOR THE AMATEURISM CABINET

1. Student-athletes shall be an integral part of the student-body and their participation should be motivated primarily by education and by the physical, mental and social benefits to be derived.

2. Ensure that legislation reinforces that student participation in intercollegiate athletics is an avocation, and student-athletes should be protected from exploitation.

3. Minimize missed class time; maximize time spent pursuing educational opportunities

4. All commercial activities shall support intercollegiate athletics and be consistent with the values of higher education.

5. Ensure legislation is written in a simple, clear and enforceable manner.

6. Consider the amount of time legislation has been in effect before supporting a legislative change.

7. Consider the impact of proposals on institutional, conference, NCAA and Eligibility Center resources and staff members.

8. Ensure feedback has been solicited from stakeholders.

9. Consider if sport-specific legislation is warranted or if proposed legislation can/should be expanded to other sports.

10. Examine potential unintended consequences when reviewing legislation.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association
June 26, 2009 RNB:esb

REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I AWARDS, BENEFITS, EXPENSES AND FINANCIAL AID CABINET
JUNE 10-11, 2009, MEETING

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. Legislative Items.

- None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- None.

***KEY ITEMS*.**

1. Review of Current Financial Aid Model. The NCAA Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet continued its review of the financial aid items prioritized during its February 2009 meeting. Specifically, the following topics were prioritized for further study: (1) countable aid versus noncountable aid (e.g., government grants, institutional merit aid, state grants); (2) examination of issues related to determining counter status; (3) head count versus equivalency designations; and (4) team financial aid limits. During its June meeting, videoconferences with financial aid officers from nine Division I institutions representing all three subdivisions were conducted to obtain additional feedback related to the financial aid items prioritized by the cabinet. Based on this feedback, the cabinet identified two themes to help guide the cabinet in its review and formulation of recommendations:

a. Legislative recommendations resulting from the cabinet's review should prioritize the well-being of student-athletes over other factors (e.g., competitive equity); and

b. The current financial aid legislation is perceived as unduly burdensome and at times prevents financial aid administrators from exercising professional judgment as would be done for non-student-athletes.

In addition, the cabinet directed the staff to develop a spectrum of models demonstrating how potential changes to NCAA rules would impact team limitations if specific types of financial aid (e.g., Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant, institutional merit and need-based aid, state grants, outside aid) were exempted. The staff will prepare the models for review by the cabinet during its September 2009 meeting.

2. Maximum Equivalency Limits – Sand Volleyball. The cabinet sponsored legislation for the 2009-10 legislative cycle related to team financial aid limits in the sport of sand volleyball. [See Informational Item No. 1-a below.]

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

1. Legislative Informational Items.

a. NCAA Bylaw 15.5.3.1.2 (Maximum Equivalency Limits – Women's Sports – Sand Volleyball).

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet agreed to sponsor legislation for the 2009-10 legislative cycle to specify team limits in the sport of sand volleyball as follows:

(a) For institutions that sponsor both sand and indoor volleyball teams, there shall be an annual limit of six equivalencies and an annual limit of 14 on the total number of counters in the sport of sand volleyball. The implementation of the equivalencies will occur as follows:

Effective 2010-11.....three equivalencies
Effective 2011-12.....four equivalencies
Effective 2012-13.....five equivalencies
Effective 2013-14 and thereafter .....six equivalencies; and

(b) For institutions that sponsor sand volleyball only, there shall be an annual limit of eight equivalencies and an annual limit of 14 on the total number of counters in the sport of sand volleyball.

(2) Effective Date. August 1, 2010.

(3) Rationale. Limiting the equivalencies to six among 14 total counters is appropriate based on the anticipated playing rules, which would permit five two-person sand volleyball units to compete as a team in competition. It is anticipated that during the sport's emergence, there will be a high number of cross-over student-athletes who participate in both indoor and sand volleyball and limiting the total number of counters will assist in maintaining competitive balance. Based on the information provided to the NCAA Committee on Women's Athletics related to the current sand

volleyball participation numbers, these financial aid limits provide appropriate financial aid opportunities as the sport develops as an NCAA sport. Further, eight equivalencies for sand volleyball is appropriate for institutions that do not sponsor indoor volleyball because the same concerns regarding the number of student-athletes who participate in both sports do not exist at those institutions. Finally, it should be noted that the current application of multisport participant legislation would remain. In other words, any counter in the sport of sand volleyball who also practices or competes in indoor volleyball shall be a counter in indoor volleyball.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. Dependent on institutional decisions whether to sponsor an identified emerging sport for women. Emerging sports for women may be used to meet sports sponsorship requirements; in Divisions I and II, the minimum membership financial aid requirements; and in Division I, for revenue distribution purposes.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. Dependent on institutional sponsorship.

b. Review Definition of Recruited Prospective Student-Athlete (Bylaw 13.02.12.1). The cabinet expressed concerns that the current definition of a recruited prospective student-athlete may detrimentally impact an individual's ability to accept financial aid. For example, a prospective student-athlete who receives as few as two telephone calls from institutional coaches but is not issued a National Letter of Intent (NLI) or a written offer of financial aid (and does not participate in any other activities in Bylaw 13.02.12.1) is considered recruited based on the NCAA definition. Thus, certain financial aid (e.g., outside aid with athletics as a major criterion) the prospective student-athlete is eligible to receive may become countable toward team financial aid limits. Conversely, a prospective student-athlete who receives only one phone call but receives 10 e-mails per week is not recruited, by definition, provided the prospective student-athlete is not issued an NLI or written offer of financial aid or participate in any other activities in Bylaw 13.02.12.1. Given the current recruiting culture and methods, the cabinet requested feedback from the NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet to determine whether the current definition remains appropriate as this cabinet continues its review of rules related to determining counter status.

c. Referral from the NCAA Division I Legislative Review and Interpretations Committee – Calculation of Equivalencies for Lump Sum Financial Aid Awards. During its January 28 and February 18, 2009, teleconferences, the NCAA Division I Legislative Review and Interpretations Committee requested

feedback from the cabinet on a January 21, 2009, staff interpretation related to lump sum awards. Some members of the cabinet expressed a concern that an institution that does not have institutional policies that require awards to be paid in a specific order may gain an advantage based on the flexibility provided in the staff's interpretation; however, the cabinet voted to support the staff's interpretation.

d. **Policies and Practices Task Force – One-Year Period of Award Legislation (Bylaw 15.3.3.1).** The cabinet discussed the merits of current NCAA legislation limiting athletically related financial aid to a maximum of one year. During the discussion the cabinet noted its initial desire to maintain the one-year limit because this allows institutional autonomy to provide the most deserving student-athletes athletics financial aid and ensures the best product available to the general public. Further, members of the cabinet believe that athletics financial aid is a "merit" award and an annual review of whether an individual meets the standards of a merit award is the appropriate way to ensure that the most deserving student-athletes receive that award each year. The cabinet also discussed the option of moving to multiyear athletically related financial aid agreements in exchange for a commitment from the student-athlete to participate at the institution for the same number of years. The cabinet agreed to continue its discussion during its September 2009 meeting.

e. **Additional Financial Aid Items Submitted by Cabinet Members.** The cabinet discussed three items submitted by one of its members related to three different financial aid legislative issues. The cabinet member requested individual cabinet members e-mail feedback on the legislative concepts to him no later than June 20.

f. **Directive to Review Division I Bylaws.** Due to time constraints, the cabinet did not engage in a full discussion of this item; however, each cabinet member received information highlighting potential areas for review, and will engage in a full discussion at its September 2009 meeting.

2. **Nonlegislative Informational Items.**

a. **Outreach to Financial Aid Community.** During its February 2009 meeting, the cabinet directed the staff to draft a plan for outreach (e.g., communication, education) to the financial aid community. The cabinet reviewed and approved the plan drafted by the staff and agreed to update the plan as necessary in the future. The cabinet will continue to receive updates on the staff's progress with these initiatives during future meetings. [Attachment]

b. Best Practices for Conducting Financial Aid Hearing Opportunities. During its February 2009 meeting, the cabinet requested that the staff finalize a comprehensive best practices document related to the application of the financial aid hearing opportunity legislation and renewal/nonrenewal process. The cabinet reviewed and approved the best practices document drafted by the staff. This resource will be made available to the Division I membership on the NCAA Web site.

Committee Chair: M. Grace Calhoun, Indiana University, Bloomington, Big Ten Conference
Staff Liaisons: Brad Hostetter, Academic and Membership Affairs
Vanessa Fuchs, Academic and Membership Affairs
Kris Richardson, Academic and Membership Affairs

ATTACHMENT

Plan for Outreach to Financial Aid Community

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

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

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

REPORT OF THE
NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
DIVISION I CHAMPIONSHIPS/SPORTS MANAGEMENT CABINET

Teleconference
June 25, 2009

REPORT OF THE
NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
DIVISION I CHAMPIONSHIPS/SPORTS MANAGEMENT CABINET

Teleconference June 25, 2009

Participants:

David Blank, Elon University
Sherri Booker, Atlantic Sun Conference
Greg Burke, Northwestern State University
Dwight Datcher, Howard University
Susan Delaney-Scheetz, Pennsylvania State University
Connie Dillon, University of Oklahoma
Jim Fiore, Stony Brook University
Tom Hickman, Winthrop University
Monique Holland, Alabama State University
Christine Hoyles, Pacific-10 Conference
Myndee Larsen, The Summit League
Patrick Lyons, Iona College
Erin McDermott, Princeton University
Jane Miller, University of Virginia
Marilyn Moniz-Kaho'ohanohano, University of Hawaii, Manoa
Daniel Neault, student-athlete from the University of the Pacific
Bruce Rasmussen, Creighton University
Nance Reed, Towson University
Judy Rose, University of North Carolina, Charlotte
Jeff Schemmel, San Diego State University
Jim Schmidt, University of Illinois, Chicago
Rosemary A. Shea, College of Holy Cross
Paula Smith, University of California, Irvine
Jeffrey Stapleton, Monmouth University
Mike Thomas, University of Cincinnati
Keith Tribble, University of Central Florida
Rick Villarreal, University of North Texas
Bradley K. Walker, Ohio Valley Conference
Larry Williams, University of Portland
Steve Brown, NCAA
Joni Comstock, NCAA
Beth DeBauche, NCAA
Brad Hostetter, NCAA
Carol Reep, NCAA
Dave Schnase, NCAA

Joan Cronan, University of Tennessee, Knoxville; Jim Fallis, Northern Arizona University; and Mack Rhoades, University of Akron, were not able to participate in the teleconference. Debbie Corum, Southeastern Conference, participated as an alternate for Joan Cronan; Jeff Pritsker, Northern Arizona University, participated as an alternate for Jim Fallis; and Jon Steinbrecher, Mid-American Conference participated as an alternate for Mack Rhoades.

Jim Isch, NCAA, participated in a portion of the meeting.

REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I CHAMPIONSHIPS/SPORTS MANAGEMENT CABINET

The NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet submits this report from its June 25, 2009, teleconference.

***KEY ISSUES/ISSUES OF SIGNIFICANCE*.**

1. **Bylaw and Practices Review.** The cabinet considered the charge outlined by the NCAA Division I Board of Directors related to the identification of bylaws and practices that could be modified to provide financial relief to the membership. Cabinet members were encouraged to think about potential changes to NCAA rules in NCAA Division I Bylaws 17 and 31 that might result in cost savings. Cabinet members agreed to submit potential changes to the NCAA staff on or prior to July 31, 2009, for discussion at the September 2009 meeting. The NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet Administrative Committee agreed to compile the suggestions and lead the discussion at the September meeting.

2. **Sand Volleyball Playing and Practice Season.** The cabinet engaged in a lengthy discussion regarding a proposed sand volleyball playing and practice season model and contest limits for sports sponsorship. After reviewing information submitted by the American Volleyball Coaches Association, the cabinet agreed to delay action on this item. In the interim, the Administrative Committee will request that cabinet members provide the committee feedback over the summer to frame additional discussion at the cabinet's September meeting.

3. **Report of the NCAA Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct.** At the request of the NCAA Executive Committee, the cabinet reviewed the current NCAA policy precluding the hosting of championship events in metropolitan areas where sports wagering occurs. It was noted that the current policy does not distinguish between predetermined and nonpredetermined championship sites. Consistent with the recommendation from the Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct Committee, the cabinet agreed to recommend that the relevant geographical area be changed from "metropolitan" to "state." Unlike the Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct Committee; however, the cabinet agreed to recommend modifying the current policy so that it would be permissible for a state that permits sports wagering to host a championship, provided the hosting sites are not predetermined.

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

1. **Legislative Informational Items.**

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

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet agreed to sponsor legislation for the 2009-10 legislative cycle to amend NCAA Bylaw 14.1.8.1.6-(a) to permit a former student-athlete to participate in organized practice sessions (while either not enrolled or enrolled part time) at an institution other than the institution he or she attended as an undergraduate and/or graduate student, provided the former student-athlete has graduated and has no eligibility remaining.

(2) Effective Date. August 1, 2010.

(3) Rationale. Current legislation permits an individual (current or former student-athletes) to participate, through the approval of a waiver, in organized practice sessions (while either not enrolled or enrolled part time) provided the individual does so at the institution he or she previously attended or currently attends as an undergraduate or graduate student. The NCAA Olympic Sports Liaison Committee supports the U.S. Olympic Committee (USOC) and national governing bodies' (NGBs) efforts to enhance opportunities for elite athletes to improve their chances of making USA Olympic teams and, in the long term, compete for Olympic medals. Allowing former student-athletes who have graduated and who have no eligibility remaining the opportunity to train with coaches (e.g., the Olympic team coach in that sport) during organized practice sessions at an institution other than where the former student-athlete previously attended or currently attends as an undergraduate or graduate student improves the chances for these former student-athletes to make Olympic teams and earn Olympic medals.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. Allowing current student-athletes to practice against former student-athletes may enhance the chances for the current student-athletes to improve. Further, allowing former student-athletes to participate in an institution's organized practice sessions and train under the supervision of coaches (e.g., current Olympic coach) at institutions other than where the former student-athlete attended as an undergraduate or graduate student may enhance the opportunities for former student-athletes to qualify for national teams and compete internationally.

b. Bylaw 14.1.8.1.6-(g) Eligibility -- Practice Requirement -- Minimum Full-Time Enrollment Waiver.

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet agreed to sponsor legislation for the 2009-10 legislative cycle to amend Bylaw 14.1.8.1.6-(g) to permit a former student-athlete who has either exhausted his or her eligibility or who has completed a degree, to participate in an institution's organized practice sessions for a period of time that would allow the former student-athlete to compete in two consecutive Olympic games (rather than one) following the former student-athlete's exhaustion of eligibility or completion of a degree.

(2) Effective Date. August 1, 2010.

(3) Rationale. The current rule stipulates that in the case of a former student-athlete who has either exhausted his or her eligibility or who has completed a degree, the former student-athlete is limited to participating in an institution's organized practice sessions for no more than five years. The original intent of this rule was to allow a former student-athlete the opportunity to continue practicing with an institution's team in organized practice sessions for a five-year period to enhance his or her chances of qualifying for the next Olympic games following the former student-athlete's completion of a degree or exhaustion of eligibility. However, the average age of the Olympic athlete has increased significantly in the past 15 years. As a result, the cabinet and OSLC are supportive of allowing former student-athletes the opportunity to train for Olympic games beyond the current five-year window. This change would allow a former student-athlete to spend additional years participating in an institution's organized practice sessions but limit that participation to the time period that encompasses two Olympic opportunities. Doing so may increase the former student-athlete's opportunity to make Olympic teams and earn Olympic medals.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. Allowing current student-athletes to practice against former student-athletes may enhance the chances for the current student-athletes to improve. Further, allowing former student-athletes to participate in an institution's organized practice sessions and train under the supervision of coaches (e.g., current Olympic coach) at institutions other than where the former student-athlete attended as an undergraduate

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

[NOTE: Due to technical difficulties, the staff was unable to clarify questions related to this recommendation during the conference call. It should be noted that, in the case of former student-athletes, this waiver only applies to individual sports and rowing and may not be used by individuals in team sports (e.g., basketball). Further, in order for a conference office to approve such a waiver, it must receive documentation that the USOC or NGB has recommended the individual athlete's participation. Finally, while there is not a specified number of years that limit the participation outlined in this recommendation, the time frame is limited to a timeframe that encompasses two Olympic opportunities for the individual.]

c. Bylaw 13.14.3 – Recruiting – Definition of Recruiting Services.

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet agreed to sponsor legislation for the 2009-10 legislative cycle to amend Bylaw 13.14.3 to specify that institutions are permitted to subscribe to published recruiting and video services, provided the service meets the following minimum guidelines. The service must:

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

(b) Make public all applicable rates;

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

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

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

(2) Effective Date. Immediate.

(3) Rationale. Current NCAA rules only require a recruiting or scouting service to be regularly published and available at the same fee rate for all subscribers. There has been a proliferation of these services, particularly in the sport of men's basketball, that do not provide information consistent with the original intent of the legislation. Many of the operators of the

recruiting or scouting services are tied directly to teams or events involving highly skilled prospective student-athletes and concerns have been expressed that the service is used as leverage in the recruiting process. In some instances, the service merely provides demographical information that is available from other sources or in other instances, no information that would assist the men's basketball coaches in the evaluation of talent. Many coaches are convinced that unless the staff subscribes to these recruiting or scouting services, the staff will be disadvantaged in attempts to recruit prospects linked with the recruiting-service operator. The cabinet acknowledged the value that can be derived from recruiting or scouting services and this proposal reflects the intent of the original legislation by establishing minimal guidelines that must be satisfied in order for institutions to subscribe to such a service.

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

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

d. Bylaw 13.1.2.2 –- Recruiting -- Observation of Prospective Men's Basketball Student-Athletes by Noncoaching Athletics Department Staff Members with Basketball Responsibilities.

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet agreed to sponsor legislation for the 2009-10 legislative cycle to amend Bylaw 13.1.2.2 to specify that it is not permissible for noncoaching athletics department staff members with responsibilities in the sport of men's basketball to attend an off-campus athletics event (e.g., high school contest, sports camp) unless the staff member is an immediate family member of one of the participants in the activity. The staff member's attendance to observe activities involving a participant who is an immediate family member must meet the following conditions:

(a) Attendance shall not be for evaluation purposes;

(b) The staff member shall not have direct contact with any prospective men's basketball student-athlete participating in the activity; and

(c) The staff member shall not act as an institutional recruiter (e.g., by reporting back to the institution's coaching staff about the performance of a prospective men's basketball student-athlete, by speaking to a prospective men's basketball student-athlete's parents or coach).

(2) Effective Date. Immediate.

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

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

e. Bylaw 13.1.8.8.1-(b)-(1) Recruiting -– Contacts and Evaluations -– Basketball Evaluations -– Women's Basketball – Nonscholastic Evaluations During Academic Year -– National Standardized Testing Weekends

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet agreed to sponsor legislation for the 2009-10 legislative cycle to amend Bylaw 13.1.8.8.1-(b)-(1) to specify that, in the sport of women's basketball, evaluations during the fall and spring nonscholastic weekends shall not occur on any weekends during

which the PSAT, SAT, PLAN or ACT national standardized tests are administered.

(2) Effective Date. August 1, 2010.

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

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

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

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet agreed to sponsor legislation for the 2009-10 legislative cycle to amend Bylaw 13.1.8.8.1-(b)-(1) to prohibit, in women's basketball, evaluations at noninstitutional nonorganized events (e.g., pick-up games, open gyms) during the summer evaluation period.

(2) Effective Date. Immediate.

(3) Rationale. There has been an escalation in the number of impermissibly arranged activities disguised as open gym or pick-up games during the summer evaluation period. These activities subject coaches to potential rules violations and can create an environment in which contact between NCAA coaches and outside influences occur. During the summer evaluation period, evaluations will be limited to institutional basketball camps and noninstitutional organized events (e.g., camps, leagues,

(4) tournaments and festivals) that are certified through the basketball certification process. The WBCA supports and has requested this legislative change to the women's basketball recruiting model.

(5) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(6) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

g. Bylaw 13.12.1.1.2 – Recruiting – FCS Football - Summer Camps.

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet agreed to sponsor legislation for the 2009-10 legislative cycle to amend Bylaw 13.12.1.1.2 to permit Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) football coaches to conduct and be employed at institutional or noninstitutional football camps anytime during the months of June, July and August.

(2) Effective Date. Immediate.

(3) Rationale. The current legislation limiting institutional camps and working private camps to two 15-day periods in June and July is unnecessarily restrictive for FCS coaches. The issues (e.g., feeling pressure to work several camps in the summer, significant time away from campus and family) surrounding the adoption of legislation limiting the camp periods more directly impact FBS coaches than FCS coaches and more flexibility in scheduling and working at summer camps for FCS coaches is needed.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student Athlete Impact. None.

h. Bylaw 13.1.8.9.4 -– Recruiting -– FCS Football - Evaluations at Nonscholastic Events.

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet agreed to sponsor legislation for the 2009-10 legislative cycle to amend Bylaw 13.1.8.9.4 to permit FCS football coaches to evaluate prospective student-athletes at nonscholastic events (e.g., high school all-star games).

(2) Effective Date. August 1, 2010.

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

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

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. Potential for more efficient use of institutional recruiting expenses.

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

2. Nonlegislative Informational Items.

a. Approval of Report from February 17-18, 2009, Cabinet Meeting. The report from the cabinet's February 17-18, 2009, in-person meeting was approved as previously distributed.

b. Cabinet Policies and Operating Procedures. It was noted that the Conflict of Interest Policy in the cabinet's policies and operating procedures manual has been revised.

[Note: Appendixes P, Academic Performance Program, and Q, Budget Timeline, were added.]

c. National Office Cost Reduction Efforts. Jim Isch, Senior Vice President of Administration and CFO, provided an overview of the national office's cost reduction efforts. It was noted that the National Office's cost savings will reach $5 million rather than the original $4.5 million. The savings will come from the

national office operating budget without impacting the current level of service to the membership. Moneys saved by this initiative will be redistributed to the membership in accordance with the normal supplemental revenue distribution process. The cabinet will spend a significant amount of time during its September 2009 meeting discussing ways to further decrease institutional costs.

d. Reports of Sports and Sport Issues Committees.

- NCAA Division I Football Issues Committee: In addition to the two legislative recommendations sponsored by the cabinet (See Items 1-g and 1-h above), it considered two other legislative recommendations from the Football Issues Committee related to the FCS limit on the number of preseason practice participants and FCS coaches having recruiting contact prior to a prospect's competition. FCS members of the cabinet noted that, during these trying economic times, it is not appropriate to consider adding more preseason practice participants and the motion to discuss the recommendation related to contact with prospects prior to competition failed due to a lack of a second.

e. Championships Travel Update.

The championships staff presented a brief update on the actual travel cost results for championships travel through the completion of the winter championships season. Through the winter season, championships travel costs have declined by 21.2 percent over the previous year, a significant reduction compared to increases during the last three years. It appears that raising the fly/drive mileage threshold approved for the 2008-09 academic year, a greater awareness of travel expenses by all concerned, slackened demand and lower fuel costs have assisted in achieving this result. It was also noted that commercial flights have been reduced by 30 percent, and though the number of charter flights are about the same, they are also down by approximately $5 million or 27.3 percent.

It was noted that a summary of matters related to the travel cost management efforts (including spring championships) will be presented at the next cabinet meeting and that the issue of maintaining the fly/drive mileage as approved for the 2008-09 championships season will be developed for consideration.

f. Committee Chair Appointments. The cabinet took the following action related to committees:

(1) Football Issues Committee. The cabinet appointed Nick Carparelli, of the Big East Conference, as chair of the Football Issues Committee effective September 1, 2009.

(2) NCAA Men's Gymnastics Committee. The cabinet appointed Robb Dunn, Associate Director of Athletics at the U.S. Naval Academy, as chair of the Men's Gymnastics Committee.

(3) NCAA Men's and Women's Rifle Committee. The cabinet appointed Newt Engle, Head Rifle Coach at the University of Akron, as chair of the Men's and Women's Rifle Committee.

g. Automatic Qualification. The cabinet awarded automatic qualification as follows:

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

h. Championships Site Selections. The cabinet approved the following recommendations related to championships site selections.

(1) NCAA Division I Men's Golf Committee. That Alpharetta, Georgia, be designated as a site for the regional competition of the 2010 NCAA Division I Men's Golf Championships with Georgia Institute of Technology serving as host for the competition to be conducted at Capital City Club; that Notre Dame, Indiana, be designated as a site for the regional competition of the 2010 NCAA Division I Men's Golf Championships with the University of Notre Dame serving as host for the competition to be conducted at The Warren Golf Course; that San Diego, California, be designated as a site for the regional competition of the 2010 NCAA Division I Men's Golf Championships with the San Diego State University serving as host for the competition to be conducted at Carlton Oaks Golf Course; that College Station, Texas, be designated as a site for the regional competition of the 2010 NCAA Division I Men's Golf Championships with Texas A&M University serving as host for the competition to be conducted at Traditions Club; that Bremerton, Washington, be designated as a site for the regional competition of the 2010 NCAA Division I Men's Golf Championships with University of Washington serving as host for the competition to be conducted at Golf Mountain Golf Club; that New Haven, Connecticut, be designated as a site for the regional competition of the 2010 NCAA Division I Men's Golf

Championships with Yale University serving as host for the competition to be conducted at The Yale University Golf Course.

For 2011 that Tucson, Arizona, be designated as a site for the regional competition of the 2011 NCAA Division I Men's Golf Championships with the University of Arizona serving as host for the competition to be conducted at the Omni Tucson National Resort; that Erie, Colorado, be designated as a site for the regional competition of the 2011 NCAA Division I Men's Golf Championships with the University of Colorado serving as host for the competition to be conducted at the Colorado National Golf Club; that Ocala, Florida, be designated as a site for the regional competition of the 2011 NCAA Division I Men's Golf Championships with the University of Florida serving as host for the competition to be conducted at Golden Ocala Golf Club; that Zionsville, Indiana, be designated as a site for the regional competition of the 2011 NCAA Division I Men's Golf Championships with Indiana University serving as host for the competition to be conducted at the Wolf Run Golf Club; that Rancho Santa Fe, California, be designated as a site for the regional competition of the 2011 NCAA Division I Men's Golf Championships with the University of San Diego serving as host for the competition to be conducted at The Farms Golf Course; that Blacksburg, Virginia, be designated as a site for the regional competition of the 2011 NCAA Division I Men's Golf Championships with Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University serving as host for the competition to be conducted at the Pete Dye River Course.

(2) Men's and Women's Rifle. That Fort Worth, Texas, be designated as the site for the 2010 National Collegiate Men's and Women's Rifle Championships. Texas Christian University will serve as the host for the competition to be conducted at Daniel-Meyer Coliseum.

(3) NCAA Division I Women's Lacrosse. That Towson University serves as the host institution for the 2010 NCAA Division I Women's Lacrosse Championship.

Committee Chair: Jeff Schemmel, San Diego State University
Staff Liaisons: Joni B. Comstock, Championships
David W. Schnase, Academic and Membership Affairs

REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I RECRUITING AND ATHLETICS
PERSONNEL ISSUES CABINET
JUNE 8-9, 2009, MEETING

KEY ITEMS.

1. **Proposals Sponsored for the 2009-10 Cycle**. The NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet sponsored 10 legislative proposals for the membership's consideration for the 2009-10 legislative cycle. One proposal is being forwarded to the NCAA Division I Legislative Council for consideration as emergency or noncontroversial.

2. **Coaching Limits and Athletics Personnel Issues.** The cabinet examined the feedback received from the membership and other constituent groups to the April 2009 coaching limits and athletics personnel discussion document and, as detailed in other sections of this report: affirmed current legislation regarding countable coaches and volunteer coaches; sponsored legislation regarding student assistant coaches, noncoaching staff with sport-specific responsibilities and managers; and agreed to further study the positions of graduate assistant coaches and noncoaching staff with sport-specific responsibilities.

3. **Recruiting Materials.** The cabinet examined current legislation regarding institutional letterhead, printed media guides and audio/video materials. It sponsored legislation to set forth restrictions on institutional letterhead to curb the increasingly elaborate design of materials being called letterhead. It supported a concept to eliminate the provision of printed media guides for recruiting purposes, but declined to sponsor legislation at this time noting some conferences have already indicated the intent to sponsor legislation in this regard. Finally, the cabinet sponsored legislation to deregulate the current restrictions on audio/video materials.

4. **Bylaw and Practices Review.** At the direction of the NCAA Division I Board of Directors, the cabinet engaged in an examination of NCAA Division I Bylaws 11 and 13 and created an initial list of possible bylaws and policy changes that could potentially be modified to provide financial and operational relief to the membership. The cabinet noted, however, further examination and discussion would be needed prior to moving any towards legislative proposals. Further, the cabinet noted the principle of the Board's charge was also considered in some of the proposals sponsored by the cabinet for the upcoming cycle.

LEGISLATIVE ITEMS.

1. **Emergency or Noncontroversial Item.**

- **Administrative Regulations - Recruiting Calendars - Women's Volleyball - Evaluation Period in Conjunction With the Championship.**

  (1) Recommendation. The cabinet agreed to sponsor and request the Legislative Council adopt as emergency or noncontroversial legislation to permit evaluations in women's volleyball to occur at one single-day event conducted Thursday, Friday, Saturday or Sunday of the NCAA Division I Women's Volleyball Championship, provided the event occurs within a 30-mile radius of the championship site.

  (2) Effective Date. Immediate.

  (3) Rationale. This proposal does not substantially modify existing legislation that was adopted last year with NCAA Division I Proposal No. 2007-5, rather it simply expands the window of time during which events may be held from one day to four days. After experiencing the first year of the legislation, it was clear that limiting the opening to one day reduced the flexibility necessary to accommodate the events in conjunction with other activities surrounding the championship. The cabinet noted that the estimated impact to recruiting and recruiting budgets continues to be minimal as the American Volleyball Coaches Association convention is held in conjunction with the championship, so many coaches are already in the locale of the championship, even if their teams are not participants. The cabinet also noted this exception is similar to the exception that exists in women's basketball and is limited to a single day event and that all coaches from the same institution would be required to attend the same event. Finally, the cabinet notes this proposal was initiated and supported by the American Volleyball Coaches Association.

  (4) Estimated Budget Impact. Minimal.

  (5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

2. Other Legislative Items.

a. Athletics Personnel - Definitions and Applications - Student Assistant Coaches.

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet sponsored a proposal to permit any student-athlete to serve as a student assistant coach at the institution at

which the student-athlete most recently participated in intercollegiate athletics, provided the student-athlete is currently enrolled at the institution as a full-time undergraduate student and forfeits any remaining athletics eligibility. Further, to specify that the number of student assistant coaches be limited in each sport consistent with the limit of countable coaches permitted in each sport.

(2) Effective Date. August 1, 2010.

(3) Rationale. Based on the cabinet's examination of the current coaching limits and athletics personnel legislative model and the feedback received from the membership and other constituent groups to the April 2009 coaching limits and athletics personnel discussion document, the cabinet agreed to modify certain criteria required to be designated as a student assistant coach. This proposal will expand opportunities for student-athletes to gain coaching experience while enrolled as a full-time undergraduate student by eliminating the requirement that the student-athlete must have exhausted his or her eligibility or be injured to the point that he or she cannot practice or compete ever again. Any concern that institutions would gain a competitive advantage by this expansion is addressed with the condition that student assistant coaches would forfeit any remaining eligibility. Further, permitting former student-athletes to serve as student assistant coaches outside of their five-year eligibility period at the institution where they most recently participated may encourage student-athletes who departed their institution prior to graduating to return and finish their baccalaureate degrees and allow institutions to earn additional NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate points. Finally, the cabinet believes limits on the number of student assistant coaches is appropriate to provide additional coaching opportunities while being mindful of any competitive equity concerns that may arise if no limit was set with the expansion of individuals who are now eligible for these positions.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. Minimal, dependent on number of student assistant coaches used by an institution.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. Expanded opportunities to be designated a student assistant coach prior to graduation.

b. Athletics Personnel - Noncoaching Staff With Sport-Specific Responsibilities.

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet sponsored a proposal to permit noncoaching staff with sport-specific responsibilities to participate in organized activities involving only the coaching staff or administrative duties (e.g., attend meetings involving coaching activities, analyze video of the institution's or an opponent's team, track statistics during practice or games) at any time. Further, to specify that these individuals are prohibited from participating in instructional activities with student-athletes and engaging off-campus recruiting activities.

(2) Effective Date. Immediate.

(3) Rationale. Based on the cabinet's examination of the current coaching limits and athletics personnel legislative model and the feedback received from the membership and other constituent groups to the April 2009 coaching limits and athletics personnel discussion document, the cabinet noted the confusion and inconsistent application of current legislation governing noncoaching activities such as attendance at coaches meetings and analyzing video of the institution's team or opponents. The cabinet agreed participation in these activities does not result in a significant advantage to warrant all of the current restrictions on noncoaching activities. The cabinet believes this proposal establishes a reasonable and practical standard by which to define the duties of noncoaching staff with sport-specific responsibilities while retaining the restrictions that these individuals may not participate in instructional activities with student-athletes, engage in off-campus recruiting activities, be identified as coaches or participate with or observe student-athletes in nonorganized voluntary athletically related activities. Furthermore, the involvement of these individuals in practice or game activities (e.g., throw bounce passes, retrieve balls, throw batting practice, signal plays), even if at the direction of a coaching staff member, would be considered instructional activities and would not be permitted. It would be permissible for these individuals to attend practice and competition, to be in the team bench or sideline area and perform administrative duties (e.g., track statistics, run clock, take notes for coaching staff), provided they are not involved in instructional activities with student-athletes. Finally, the creation of a separate definition for this position will be helpful in outlining and distinguishing their duties from other positions in the legislation.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. Minimal.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

c. Athletics Personnel - Managers.

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet sponsored a proposal to establish a definition for managers to specify that a manager: (1) must be enrolled as a full-time, degree-seeking undergraduate or graduate student at the institution; (2) shall not be involved in any off-campus recruiting or perform any recruiting coordination functions; (3) must perform traditional managerial duties; (4) may perform limited duties during practice or competition involving student-athletes on a regular basis, but may not provide instruction to student-athletes or participate in countable athletically related activities; and (5) in baseball, forfeits any remaining athletics eligibility in that sport.

(2) Effective Date. August 1, 2010.

(3) Rationale. Based on the cabinet's examination of the current coaching limits and athletics personnel legislative model and the feedback received from the membership and other constituent groups to the April 2009 coaching limits and athletics personnel discussion document, the cabinet noted there is no specific definition of managers in current legislation and that many of the regulations are found in interpretations. Further, the cabinet agreed with a majority of the feedback received that managers should be limited to individuals who are enrolled as full-time undergraduate or graduate students since these positions are intended to support the coaching staff and team in a limited manner rather than provide a development opportunity for others with prior professional experience (e.g., college coach, high school coach). The cabinet believes these individuals are more appropriately considered and subject to the restrictions on noncoaching staff with sport-specific responsibilities. Under this proposal, there is no time limit on when a student could serve as a manager provided they are enrolled full time at the time they serve as a manager and there is no limit on the number of managers a team could designate. Further, managers could participate in limited duties (e.g., throw bounce passes, retrieve balls, throw batting practice) during practice or competition involving student-athletes on a regular basis to clarify that the nature of the duties are limited rather than the frequency in which they are performed. Additionally, managers in baseball would forfeit any remaining eligibility in baseball as soon as they serve as a manager. This condition is designed to address the potential abuse for tryouts given the roster limit in baseball and the concern of stockpiling student-athletes. Finally, the creation of a separate definition for this position will be

helpful in outlining and distinguishing their duties from other positions in the legislation.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. Minimal.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

d. Athletics Personnel - Limitations on the Number of Coaches and Off-Campus Recruiters - Sand Volleyball.

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet sponsored a proposal that specifies the coaching limitations in the sport of sand volleyball as follows: (1) two head or assistant coaches for institutions that sponsor only sand volleyball; and (2) four head or assistant coaches for institutions that sponsor women's volleyball and sand volleyball. Further, to specify that there shall be a limit of two on the number of off-campus recruiters for institutions that sponsor only sand volleyball and for institutions that sponsor both women's volleyball and sand volleyball.

(2) Effective Date. August 1, 2010.

(3) Rationale. This proposal reflects an increase of one to the current women's volleyball countable coach maximum limitations if an institution sponsors both women's volleyball and sand volleyball. Due to an overlap in the women's volleyball and sand volleyball championship and nonchampionship segments, the cabinet believes this increase is necessary to allow coaches to have an appropriate work/life balance and to provide an opportunity for sand volleyball student-athletes who do not participate in women's volleyball to train with their coach(es) during the fall nonchampionship segment. Further, the cabinet believes a maximum limit of two coaches for institutions sponsoring only sand volleyball is appropriate to coach and manage the anticipated squad size of 10 to 14 student-athletes. Finally, the cabinet notes the input and examination of this issue by the American Volleyball Coaches Association in developing and recommending this proposal.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. Costs associated with hiring additional countable coaches.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None

e. Recruiting - Limitations on Number of Evaluations - Evaluation Days - Women's Volleyball and Sand Volleyball.

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet sponsored a proposal that specifies a limit of 100 evaluation days for recruiting purposes (measured August 1 through July 31) for institutions that sponsor both women's volleyball and sand volleyball and for institutions that sponsor only sand volleyball.

(2) Effective Date. August 1, 2010.

(3) Rationale. This proposal will permit institutions that sponsor women's volleyball and sand volleyball an additional 20 evaluation days. It is expected that in the initial years of sponsorship, a predominant number of sand volleyball participants will also be women's volleyball participants. Due to the limited opportunities to evaluate prospective student-athletes competing in sand volleyball events currently, it is reasonable to expect that the evaluations for sand volleyball student-athletes will be conducted during women's volleyball competition. The cabinet recognized these same challenges will be faced by institutions that sponsor only sand volleyball and believes a limit of 100 evaluation days is also appropriate for these institutions, rather than an unlimited number as suggested by the American Volleyball Coaches Association. Further, the cabinet noted that the number of permissible evaluation days should remain at 80 for institutions that sponsor only women's volleyball.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. Additional costs associated with increase in number of permissible evaluation days for institutions that sponsor sand volleyball.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

f. Athletics Personnel - Limitations on the Number of Countable Coaches and Off-Campus Recruiters - Women's Volleyball. Recruiting - Evaluation Days - Women's Volleyball.

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet sponsored a proposal for women's volleyball to specify that a countable coach (head or assistant) who is involved (e.g., coaching, consulting, representing) with a local sports club on a paid or unpaid basis at any time must be counted as one of the two permissible off-campus recruiters at any one time. Further, to specify that an institution must count each day towards the institution's limit of 80

evaluation days when the coach is involved in coaching (directly or indirectly) the local sports club in competition.

(2) Effective Date. August 1, 2010.

(3) Rationale. This proposal would place further restrictions on women's volleyball coaches' involvement with local sports clubs. Many volleyball coaches feel compelled to be involved with local sports clubs for the benefit of developing relationships with prospective student-athletes that may assist the institution during the recruiting process. The cabinet noted the interest in teaching the game to younger players has become a secondary priority compared to the possible recruiting advantages gained by coaches' involvement with a local sports club. While permitting women's volleyball coaches to remain involved with local sports clubs, the proposal will help to ensure coaches' involvement with club volleyball programs is not an attempt to evade current recruiting regulations. Participation with club teams during practice would continue to not count towards an institution's limit of 80 evaluation days, unless during a quiet period, and it remains impermissible for coaches to be involved with club teams in competition during a quiet period. Additionally, the cabinet noted this proposal would not impact coaches' involvement with local sports clubs comprised of nonprospect-aged participants. Finally, the cabinet notes this proposal was initiated and supported by a majority of Division I coaches of the American Volleyball Coaches Association.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

g. Recruiting - Camps and Clinics - Women's Volleyball.

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet sponsored a proposal to prohibit women's volleyball coaches from being employed (paid or unpaid) with off-campus institutional camps or clinics and noninstitutional camps or clinics held at any location during a quiet period.

(2) Effective Date. August 1, 2010.

(3) Rationale. This proposal would restrict women's volleyball coaches involvement in these types of camps or clinics which have been used as an effective means of gaining exposure to a prospective student-athlete or group of prospective student-athletes at a time when off-campus

recruitment is otherwise not permitted. Institutions could continue to host institutional camps or clinics on its own campus during this time. The cabinet also noted that similar legislation restricting coaches' involvement in institutional and noninstitutional camps or clinics exists in men's basketball and football. Finally, the cabinet notes this proposal was initiated and supported by the American Volleyball Coaches Association.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

h. Recruiting Materials - Audio/Video Materials.

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet sponsored a proposal to permit an institution to show or provide audio/video materials to prospective student-athletes, provided the audio/video materials are not created for a recruiting purpose. Further, to specify that computer recruiting presentations may include audio/video materials not created for a recruiting purpose.

(2) Effective Date. Immediate.

(3) Rationale. This is an effort to deregulate legislation related to audio/video materials based on the advancements of technology. Prior to the technological capabilities that exist today, the current restrictions on audio/video were necessary to maintain equity and minimize cost. However, nearly all institutional Web sites now contain some form of video content (e.g., interviews, press conferences, competition highlights, live or archived contests, facility tours) due to the ease of use and minimal costs associated with recording, producing, posting, sharing and accessing video. Further, much of today's online video content posted on institutional Web sites is not being created solely for a recruiting purpose and is considered general information in content and access, thereby not subjecting it to recruiting legislation. There should not be a substantial increase in the amount of audio/video being produced since most institutions are already producing audio/video that satisfies this proposal. As a result, deregulation in this area is appropriate while still prohibiting institutions from creating audio/video for a recruiting purpose which is the same standard used to regulate attachments to general correspondence. Finally, institutions could still create computer recruiting presentations under this proposal, but would now be permitted to include permissible

audio/video content in their presentations, provided the audio/video was not created for a recruiting purpose.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. Minimal.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

i. Recruiting Materials - General Correspondence - Institutional Letterhead.

(1) Recommendation. The cabinet sponsored a proposal to specify that general correspondence may only be sent to prospective student-athletes, their parents or legal guardians, their coaches or any other individual responsible for teaching or directing any activity in which a prospective student-athlete is involved on institutional letterhead that satisfies all of the following conditions: (1) cannot exceed eight and one-half by 11 inches; (2) only one piece of letterhead may be sent per mailing; (3) no restrictions on design or content on one side; (4) must be blank on the other side except for text (typed or handwritten) used to communicate a message to the recipient and any other handwritten information; and (5) additional pages to the one piece of letterhead must be on white paper with black ink.

(2) Effective Date. August 1, 2010.

(3) Rationale. Given the recent regulations adopted governing institutional note cards and postcards, there has been increased concern regarding institutional letterhead which was deregulated in 1993 with no restrictions on design, content or size. Specifically, institutional letterhead appearing to resemble advertisements, mini posters and press releases that change on a weekly basis rather than traditional letters or letterhead has raised similar concerns that led to the adoption of Proposal No. 2006-39 which placed limitations on institutional note cards. Similarly, prior to adoption of Proposal No. 2006-39, there were no restrictions on size, design or content of note cards and the lack of limitations led to the creation of items that no longer resembled traditional note cards as intended. The rationale statement expressed the membership's concern and frustration with the "no limits" evolution of note cards by noting the shift to more elaborate items and the creation of a consistent standard to ensure equity and minimize any associated cost. It is under these same circumstances that the cabinet has attempted to address institutional letterhead in a slightly different manner by still affording institutions creative flexibility in its design, but limiting that flexibility to one side of the letterhead. However,

institutions must still adhere to any institutional policies on letterhead that may exist (e.g., must include mailing address, Web site address). Further, the regulations on attachments to general correspondence remain. The cabinet believes this flexibility, coupled with the other restrictions on size and the remaining content, strikes an appropriate balance in this area.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. Potential reduction for those institutions currently printing two-sided letterhead.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Bylaw and Practices Review**. At the request of the Board of Directors, the cabinet engaged in a review of Bylaws 11 and 13 and created an initial list of possible bylaws and policy changes that could potentially be modified to provide financial and operational relief to the membership. It is important to note each of these items will require further examination to develop specific recommendations prior to adoption. Further, they are not listed in priority order.

a. **Bylaw 11:**

- Eliminate live, in-person scouting for all sports.
- Reduce the number of coaches who can recruit off campus at any one time.

b. **Bylaw 13:**

- Deregulate communication with prospective student-athletes (e.g., telephone calls, text messages, electronic mail, “do not call list”).
- Eliminate the mailing of all printed recruiting materials.
- Eliminate the use of express mail for delivery of the National Letter of Intent (e.g., send via electronic mail or regular mail).
- Limit the number of official visits for all sports.
- Reduce the number of official visits per prospective student-athlete.

- Limit the expenses associated with official visits (e.g., lodging, meals, entertainment).
- Prohibit official visits for prospective student-athletes who have already signed an NLI.
- Limit the number of subscriptions to recruiting or scouting services.
- Create recruiting calendars for all sports.
- Shorten the July evaluation period for basketball.

Further, the cabinet noted the following actions or positions taken during its meeting that also fall under the Board's charge: (1) sponsored a proposal to restrict institutional letterhead; (2) supported efforts to eliminate printed media guides for recruiting purposes; (3) sponsored a proposal to establish a limit of 100 evaluation days for institutions sponsoring sand volleyball; (4) sponsored a proposal to limit the number of student assistant coaches; (5) sponsored a proposal to specify that managers must be full-time students; (6) continued examination of graduate assistant coaches and noncoaching staff with sport-specific responsibilities; and (7) identified the examination of communication methods in the recruiting process as a priority item during the upcoming year. Finally, the cabinet also noted two other areas outside of its jurisdiction that should be considered, including the elimination of foreign tours and the examination of current five-year clock and season-of-competition legislation.

2. **Priority Item - Coaching Limits and Athletics Personnel.** Based on the cabinet's examination of the current coaching limits and athletics personnel legislative model and the feedback received from the membership and other constituent groups to the April 2009 coaching limits and athletics personnel discussion document, the cabinet engaged in discussion of the following:

a. **Countable Coaches**. The cabinet agreed to maintain the current number of countable coaches in all sports. The cabinet noted the current number of countable coaches is appropriate for several reasons. The current limit maintains competitive equity among all Division I institutions and, specifically, there is the same opportunity for success among all institutions resulting in better competition across the division. Also, the cabinet believes the current limits help preserve the quality of skill and competition expected by administrators, coaches, student-athletes and fans at the Division I level. Finally, the cabinet noted the current limits provide student-athletes with an appropriate level of instruction and

supervision necessary to achieve a high level of competition at all Division I institutions.

b. **Volunteer Coaches**. The cabinet agreed to maintain the current legislation regarding volunteer coaches. The cabinet noted a volunteer coach is often used to enhance the student-athletes' experience. Additionally, the cabinet noted the current legislation enables institutions to provide opportunities for community members to be involved with the intercollegiate athletics program along with an avenue for former student-athletes to reconnect with their sport. Finally, the cabinet noted that individuals who often serve as volunteer coaches provide unique expertise that can help enrich the student-athlete experience that is distinctly different than what a head or assistant coach may be able to provide.

c. **Graduate Assistant Coaches**. The cabinet agreed to continue its discussion relative to graduate assistant coaches at its next meeting in an effort to better assess the implications of the current and suggested legislative changes.

d. **Noncoaching Staff with Sport-Specific Responsibilities**. The cabinet engaged in a broad discussion of several issues related to noncoaching staff with sport-specific responsibilities. In addition to the legislative proposal the cabinet sponsored regarding the duties of these individuals, the cabinet agreed to further explore issues related to the number, role and specific duties of these individuals at the campus level and will seek specific feedback from coaches associations to inform the cabinet's next discussion. The intent of this request is to better understand the appropriate number of personnel (coaches and noncoaching staff) needed to effectively manage and lead a Division I intercollegiate athletics sports program to determine what, if any, limits are warranted.

3. **Printed Media Guides**. The cabinet discussed printed media guides and the recent trend of institutions and conferences announcing their intent to eliminate or reduce the number of printed media guides. A representative of the College Sports Information Directors of America group was present to discuss the organization's "pro/con" document that outlined several points to consider relative to printed media guides and the reduction or elimination of printed versions of these publications. The cabinet noted a shift in expenses from printed media guides to Web site development is an issue that institutions should carefully monitor as the cost savings may be less than anticipated. However, the cabinet noted the increased use of technology by interested parties, including the media, fans and prospective student-athletes, to receive information may result in a more efficient and effective mechanism of delivery to a broader audience than printed materials

can provide, particularly when institutions are already investing resources in Web site development. Further, it was noted that some conferences have indicated the intent to sponsor legislation to eliminate the provision of printed media guides to prospective student-athletes or possibly eliminate the printing of all media guides. Accordingly, the cabinet expressed its support of the concept to eliminate the provision of printed media guides for recruiting purposes, but declined to sponsor legislation at this time.

4. **Recreational Activities Legislation**. The cabinet continued their review and discussion regarding the recreational activities legislation as requested by the Legislative Council and considered potential legislative changes, including whether regulations should be added for all or specific sports. After much discussion, the cabinet agreed that no change to the legislation is necessary at this time. While the cabinet noted some recent examples of prospective student-athletes participating in recreational activities that have been observed by the general public and potential publicity issues associated with these activities, they agreed that these few examples did not represent widespread abuse to warrant additional regulations in this area. Further, the cabinet agreed to monitor the issue of recreational activities and revisit this issue, if necessary, in the future.

5. **Communication Strategies**. The cabinet continued its review of communication strategies among conference members and at the institutional level. It appears an increasing number of cabinet members are working with their conference office staff to help disseminate and receive information prior and subsequent to cabinet meetings. Further, it appears most conferences used the discussion document on coaching limits and athletics personnel as an opportunity to engage during spring conference meetings. At the campus level, cabinet members shared how they communicate relevant information with their staff, coaches and student-athletes. Each cabinet member was encouraged to emphasize communication with student-athletes in the coming year, particularly at the campus and conference level. The NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is also engaged in providing information and soliciting feedback from the student-athlete population through its various forms of communication, including new media such as Facebook and Twitter.

6. **Future Agenda Items**. The cabinet identified communication methods in the recruiting process as a future priority item for the upcoming year along with a broad examination of early recruitment. Further, the cabinet will continue to monitor the use of technology in the recruiting process.

Cabinet Chair: ***Petrina Long, University of California, Los Angeles, Pacific-10 Conference***
Staff Liaison(s): ***Jeremiah Carter, Academic and Membership Affairs***
Amy Huchthausen, Academic and Membership Affairs
Charnele Kemper, Academic and Membership Affairs
Jackie Thurnes, Enforcement Services

MEMORANDUM

May 4, 2009

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

FROM: Beth DeBauche, staff liaison.

SUBJECT: Bylaw and Practices Review.

1. <u>Charge</u>.

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

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

2. <u>Illustrations</u>.

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

3. Timeline.

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

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

A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association
Division I Board of Directors

NCAA National Office — August 6, 2009
Indianapolis, Indiana — 8 a.m. – 3 p.m.

1. Opening remarks.

2. Minutes of the April 30, 2009, Board of Directors meeting. [Supplement No. 1] [**Anticipated Action Item]**

3. Report of the Division I Presidential Advisory Group August 3, 2009, teleconference. [Supplement No. 2 – An addendum will be distributed at the meeting.] [No action anticipated.]

4. NCAA report. [No action anticipated.]

5. News regarding a men's basketball enforcement initiative. [No action anticipated.]

6. Update regarding the new NABC communications plan. [Supplement No. 3] [No action anticipated.]

7. Final report and recommendations of the Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group. [Supplement No. 4 will be provided at a later date.] **[Anticipated Action Item – Referral into the governance structure.]**

8. Report from the Committee on Academic Performance. [Supplement No. 5]

    a. Update regarding APR portfolio, including the committee's perspective on adding chancellor or president and director of athletics to the APR Portfolio.

    b. Request to sponsor legislative changes to Bylaw 23. **[Anticipated action Item.]**

    c. Preliminary review by the Academic Cabinet and the Committee on Academic Performance of current Initial Eligibility Standards.

d. Discussion regarding the current Occasion Three and Four Penalties appeals process.

9. Division I Governance Structure Update.

a. Report of the Division I Governance Substructure. [Supplement No. 6] [No action anticipated.]

b. Report from the May 6 and 11, 2009, Division I Leadership Council teleconferences. [Supplement No. 7] [No action anticipated.]

c. Report of the July 30, 2009, Division I Legislative Council. [Supplement No. 8. An addendum will be distributed in advance of the meeting.]

- Override request regarding Proposal Nos. 2008-46 Playing and Practice Seasons -- Baseball -- Preseason Practice and First Contest -- Championship Segment and 2008-59 Division Membership -- Definitions and Applications -- Emerging Sports for Women -- Sand Volleyball. **[Action Possible.]**

10. Division I Committee on Infractions.

a. Request to sponsor legislation. [Supplement No. 9] **[Anticipated Action Item.]**

b. Committee appointment. [Supplement No. 10] **[Anticipated Action Item.]**

11. AFCA/NCAA Respect Weekend. [Supplement No. 11] [No action anticipated.]

12. Report of the April 30, 2009, meeting of the NCAA Executive Committee. [Supplement No. 12] [No action anticipated – for information only.]

13 Litigation update. [Supplement No. 13 will be distributed at the meeting.] [No action anticipated.]

14. Governmental relations report. [Supplement No. 14] [No action anticipated – for information only.]

15. Other business.

16. Future meeting dates.

    a. January 16, 2010, NCAA Convention, Atlanta, Georgia.

    b. April 29, 2010, National Office, Indianapolis, Indiana

    c. August 12, 2010, National Office, Indianapolis, Indiana

    d. October 28, 2010, National Office, Indianapolis, Indiana

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

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

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

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

17. Adjournment.

Report Division I Leadership Council
May 6 and 11, 2009, Conference Calls

May 6, Call Participants:

Jeff Altier, Stetson University
Matt Baysinger, Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
Janet Cone, University of North Carolina-Asheville
Tom Douple, Summit League
Peg Bradley-Doppes, University of Denver
Rich Ensor, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference
Peter Fields, Montana State University, Bozeman
Chet Gladchuk, U.S. Naval Academy
Alan Hauser, Appalachian State University
R.C. Johnson, University of Memphis
Kathy Jones, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
John Marinatto, Big East Conference
Charles McClelland, Texas Southern University
Jim Miller, University of Richmond
Jeff Orleans, Ivy League
John Ritscdorff, Marist College
Charles Wellford, University of Maryland
Bobby Williams, Sam Houston State University
David Berst, NCAA
Beth DeBauche, NCAA
Kevin Lennon, NCAA
Steve Mallonee, NCAA

May 11, Call Participants:

McKinley Boston, New Mexico State University
Rob Halvaks, Big West Conference
Paul Kowalczyk, Colorado State University
Jon LeCrone, Horizon League
Susan Lipnickey, Miami University (Ohio)
Lisa Love, Arizona State University
Patrick Nero, America East Conference
Greg Sankey, Southeast Conference
Brenda Weare, Northeast Conference
Mark Wilson, Tennessee Technological University
David Berst, NCAA
Beth DeBauche, NCAA
Kevin Lennon, NCAA
Steve Mallonee, NCAA

1. **Role of the Leadership Council.** The Leadership Council was informed that as a follow-up to its discussion at its last meeting regarding how best for the Council to serve its leadership advisory role, the Leadership Council chair asked the Board for its thoughts and direction. It was reported that the Board appeared to appreciate the Council's desire to maintain their national and global perspectives on issues as free from parochial political pressures and to understand that issues are different and may require different strategies, yet as a general matter the Board indicated it would appreciate receiving advice, counsel and recommendations from the Leadership Council after being fully developed and vetted by the substructure and membership. It was noted that based on this feedback, the Leadership Council's preliminary views regarding Division I membership standards would be shared with the Division I membership in advance of a report going to the Board of Directors.

2. **Ongoing discussion regarding the level of diversity in the Division I governance structure.** The Leadership Council was informed that the Board at its most recent meeting reconfirmed its charge to the Leadership Council to examine the level of diversity serving in the governance structure, including positional diversity. In reconfirming its charge, the Board noted the importance of ensuring the faculty voice is adequately heard throughout the structure and asked the Leadership Council to thoroughly examine the structure, provide an analysis as to where the faculty voice is most needed and where it might currently be missing. Additionally, the Leadership Council should provide recommendations designed to address the situation with supporting rationale.

   In response, individual Leadership Council members noted that issues of representation are complex and the former Governance Subcommittee spent a great deal of time with this issue. Members noted it is important that all voices be heard and voices of some groups should not be heard at the expense of others. Therefore, as the Leadership Council seeks to address this important and difficult issue, it must seek to find an appropriate sense of balance.

3. **It was noted that the next in-person meeting of the Leadership Council has been scheduled in Indianapolis on October 6, 2009. Sleeping rooms will be reserved for October 5 and the meeting will occur from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. on October 6.** It is expected that appropriate governance and membership groups will provide comments regarding the proposed membership criteria in advance of this meeting for the consideration of the council.

   - **Proposed Division I Membership Criteria.** The Leadership Council reviewed the document entitled Proposed Division I Membership Criteria. Comments of members are included below along with the proposed membership criteria in the color red.

(Note: The preamble of the document, background information and assumptions are excluded from this report due to their length.)

Recommendations: The Council requests that appropriate governance structure groups and conferences be asked to provide feedback concerning these preliminary recommendations. The Leadership Council will consider all comments received and determine its final recommendations to the Board of Directors during its next in-person meeting in October.

(1) Potential new members of Division I should be required to enter the division through the five-year "reclassification" process described in Bylaw 20.5.1, but only after presenting a bona fide offer of membership in a Division I multisport, voting conference.

[Note: The sponsoring conference can provide appropriate guidance and counsel, assist with scheduling, monitor student-athlete well being and enhance accountability during the process. It should also be noted that the reclassification process applies only to moving from Division II to I and will need to be reformatted to provide for appropriate benchmarks in a five-year process. Communication with Division II is necessary to avoid unintended consequences for that division. Requiring conference sponsorship and prior membership in Division II is intended to promote the long-term stability of the Association.] (This "Note" regarding the role of a conference and the requirement to enter from Division II only should be part of the text of No. 1.)

It is important for conferences to discuss the potential relationship between conferences and its prospective member so that expectations are clear and to ensure the relationship is beneficial to not only the institution but to the overall membership process.

There should be a check list to assist conferences and transitioning institutions in ensuring that institutions are meeting their appropriate benchmarks. More thought should be given to the timing of when various benchmarks should occur.

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

If the conferences are appropriately assisting with the membership process does it matter where an institution comes from? Does requiring an institution to

come from Division II send the correct message and does it serve the intended purpose of ensuring institutions are appropriately preparing for Division I?

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

(3) A substantial Division I application fee should be required before entering the "reclassification" process, which should be commensurate with the estimated value of services and benefits made available through Division I membership.

This requirement must be data-driven.

It must be made clear what part of the fee off-sets administrative and educational expenses and what part equates to the value of benefits and Division I brand.

Should this payment be viewed as a cost or expense off-set rather than a fee? It should be emphasized that conferences may require separate fees.

[There is a limited amount of resources, benefits and good will associated with Division I membership. The Leadership Council discussed a $1,000,000 application fee, but concluded that a specific calculation and data were needed before arriving at the appropriate figure. In addition, it was noted that upon election to Division I membership, the application fee should be deposited in an NCAA student-athlete scholarship program or among Student Athlete Opportunity Funds and should not be returned to the institution or provided to the sponsoring conference. In the event the institution withdraws from the reclassification process, the application fee would be returned to the institution, less any expenditure for educational costs related to the membership process. It should also be noted that conferences may require separate fees for joining the conference.]

(4) Upon beginning the "reclassification" process, the institution must meet Division I sports sponsorship requirements and consideration should be given to increasing the minimum to as much as a 75 percent of the grants-in-aid maximums in the conference sponsored sports in which the institution will participate. In addition, the alternative means of satisfying this requisite now set forth in Bylaw 20.9.1.2-(b) (c) and (d) should be modified to correlate to the increased minimum.

[This 75 percent minimum is an increase from the 50 percent now required for Division I institutions and the current membership shall be required to meet this minimum within a reasonable period following adoption of this legislation. Data should be reviewed regarding the actual level of grants now in place and the number or sports sponsored among Division I members. Bylaw 20.9.1.2.1 would be retained.] (The substance of this note should be moved to the regular text of the document.)

The Council wants to see data to have a better appreciation regarding what Division I members are currently providing in this area.

Given the importance of this issue it would be helpful to engage the conferences in a conversation regarding this topic to help ensure the percentage is appropriate. Also, would such minimums be appropriate in sports "designated" by the conference?

There needs to be a flexible approach available to institutions to ensure they can meet the standard reflective of the fact the membership includes both public and private schools.

What is the impact on revenue sharing?

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

[The Leadership Council also discussed requiring a four-year average APR of .925 or higher for each sponsored sport, but believes a demonstrated commitment to academics should be required.]

The Committee on Academic Performance and the Academic Cabinet should provide assistance in identifying the appropriate academic standard.

(6) NCAA certification should be required earlier in the "reclassification" period, possibly in year two.

[There should be an expectation that the sponsoring conference will assist the institution in this process and that special attention should be given to rules compliance, academic support services, recruiting, coaches, team travel and facilities. A compliance review should be required before final approval as a Division I member.]

The Committee on Athletics Certification should be involved in developing the recommended standards and timeline. Meeting standards early in the process and then demonstrating the ability to sustain such standards is important.

The review process must make it clear that this is an evolutionary process so that there is no confusion that receiving positive marks during the certification process does not necessarily equate to Division I membership.

More discussion should occur regarding the timing of the process and what elements should be included.

(7) A multisport conference must establish voting privileges in the Division I governance structure through legislation that names the conference among those set forth in applicable sections of Constitution 4 related to the structure and voting rations for member of the Board of Directors, Legislative and Leadership Councils and the five cabinets.

[Note: This is the current requirement in Division I. Current conferences should evaluate Constitution 3.3.3.2 regarding the formulation of Division I playing conferences.]

Items 7, 9 and 10 are related. It is important that the conferences are involved as part of this discussion and that they consider whether the definition of a multisport conference should be modified.

(8) Institutions participating in the current multi-divisional practice that permits a Division II or III institution to participate in one men's and one women's sport in Division I, except in football or men's or women's basketball should be permitted to continue that practice. Consider requiring standards for future entrants such as multisport conference affiliation, compliance reviews, defined financial aid requirements and application fees. No change is recommended for participation in national collegiate championships.

More information is needed regarding how this process currently works. Once more information is gathered, it would be appropriate to limit the practice.

In some sports access from a multi-divisional standpoint or from a single-sport conference may be appropriate, perhaps based off a percentage of sponsorship.

What is the impact of this item on FCS conferences?

(9) Multisport, voting conferences shall receive preference in awarding Automatic Qualification (AQ) for Division I championships. Further, no more than 32 AQs may be awarded for any championship, and at least 50 percent of the field must be preserved for "at large" selections.

(10) Division I conferences should evaluate current requirements for "core" and "continuity" for automatic qualification, which in turn will assist in determining whether those provisions remain valid if the membership requirements above are enacted.

Are "core" and "continuity" requirements needed if there is a meaningful definition of a multisport conference in the manual?

(11) New members of Division I should qualify immediately for revenue distributions related to academic enhancement and the Special Assistance/Student-Athlete Opportunity Fund. Remaining allocations and Division I distributions should be computed based upon actual members of the division at the time applicable revenue contracts are signed. Each sponsoring conference would be free to share its revenues from Division I distributions among its members as it deems appropriate.

[Note: This is a change in that the sponsoring conference will determine whether, and the manner by which, new members share in the Sports Sponsorship, Grants-in-Aid and Basketball Fund distributions.]

(12) The Football Championship Subdivision Issues and governance committees should be asked to evaluate minimum criteria for designation in that subdivision, as well as opportunities for postseason competition for member conferences.

More work is needed regarding this issue. It should be referred to FCS conferences and to both the FCS Issues and Governance Committees for comment.

(13) The role of the Administration Cabinet should be reviewed related to management of the reclassification process while working in coordination with *sponsoring conferences.*

With the added coordination with conferences in providing guidance and assistance to potential new members, some administrative functions

performed now by the Administrative Cabinet could be transferred to the conference office.

(14) Constitution 3.2.3.1 should be amended to provide that the vote to approve an institution for Division I membership upon recommendation of the Administration cabinet shall be taken by the Board of Directors, rather than the Leadership Council.

This may be noncontroversial legislation.

WHAT TO EXPECT WITH REGARD TO THE STATUS OF PROPOSAL NOS. 2008-46 AND 2008-59.

1. Override requests on Proposal Nos. 2008-46 and 2008-59.

Division I has received override requests on two proposals that were adopted by the Legislative Council during the 2008-09 legislative cycle. Specifically, Division I received 56 override requests from the membership with regard to Proposal No. 2008-46 Playing and Practice Seasons -- Baseball -- Preseason Practice and First Contest -- Championship Segment. This proposal specifies that in baseball, an institution shall not begin practicing before the Friday that is three weeks prior to the first permissible contest date and shall not play its first contest prior to the Friday in February that is 14 weeks before the Friday immediately preceding Memorial Day. Simply put, it calls for a change from the current 13 week season to a 14 week season.

Division I has also received 63 override requests regarding Proposal No. 2008-59 Division Membership -- Definitions and Applications -- Emerging Sports for Women -- Sand Volleyball. This proposal adds sand volleyball as an emerging sport for women.

2. What do these override requests mean?

Upon receipt of at least 30 override requests from the membership, the Legislative Council or the Board of Directors shall review its previous legislative action.

3. July 30, 2009, Legislative conference call.

Since the Legislative Council was the governance body within the Division I structure that adopted both proposals, subject to acceptance by the Board of Directors, the Legislative Council will be asked to review its previous legislative actions. Accordingly, the Legislative Council will conduct a teleconference on July 30 for this purpose.

During this teleconference, the Legislative Council may:

a. Accept the membership's override requests by defeating either (or both) of the previously adopted proposals;

b. Uphold its earlier decision to adopt either Proposal No. 2008-46 or Proposal No. 2008-59, or both; or

b. Develop alternative approaches to the concepts addressed in Proposal Nos. 2008-46 and 2008-59, but it should be noted that option is not likely given the nature of the proposals being reviewed.

[Note: The Legislative Council's action will not be considered final until after the conclusion of the August 6, 2009, Board of Directors meeting to ensure the Board has an opportunity to provide proper legislative oversight.]

4. <u>August 6, 2009, Division I Board of Directors Meeting</u>.

At its August meeting, the Board will receive a report from the Legislative Council's July 30 teleconference. Upon receipt of that report, the Board of Directors will have a number of options. The Board may:

a. Accept the Legislative Council's actions with regard to Proposal Nos. 2008-46 and 2008-59, in which case no further action will be needed by the Board;

b. Take a different, independent action from the Legislative Council, in which case the Board's action will be the binding action in response to the override requests; or

c. Develop an alternative approach regarding either of the legislative proposals (or both). Any alternative approach adopted by the Board would result in the new proposal(s) entering into another override period.

5. <u>2010 NCAA Convention</u>.

If the Division I Legislative Council or Board of Directors decide to uphold the earlier adoption of Proposal Nos. 2008-46 and 2008-59, the override request(s) will be considered by the membership at the 2010 NCAA Convention.

If a Convention proceeding is required, at least a five-eighths majority vote of active members present, including conference members in the governance structure, shall be required to override the previous legislative action. The vote will be based on the principle of one institution, one vote. The vote will be taken by roll call.

An override of the legislative action by vote of the membership shall be effective upon adjournment of the Division I Business Session where the vote would occur.

Proposal Review Instructions for Cabinets and Committees.

From July 15 through 5 p.m. Eastern time, Tuesday, October 27, modifications pertinent to proposals listed in the 2009-10 Division I Publication of Proposed Legislation (POPL) may be suggested by any conference or cabinet. Such modifications may either increase or decrease the scope of the proposal, provided they are germane to the original concept. Alternative proposals to legislation that appear in the POPL may also be submitted during this time period. The following describes the modification process:

Proposals Forwarded to your Cabinet or Committee. The cabinet should review each proposal assigned to it, make a recommendation and/or forward the recommendation to the Legislative Council. In formulating a position/recommendation for each proposal, three options are available:

Option 1: Support with no suggested modification.

Option 2: Oppose and do not suggest any modification.

Option 3: Oppose and suggest a modification to the proposal. As part of this option, a cabinet should indicate whether it wishes to sponsor an alternative proposal if the sponsor does not choose to modify its proposal as suggested. **If no such indication is provided, an alternative proposal will not be sponsored.**

Language for Cabinet Reports.
Cabinets will include their positions (and any suggested modifications and indication of possible sponsorship of an alternative proposal) and any rationale in their reports to the Legislative Council.

Cabinets should use the following language, which corresponds to the options specified above, in the recommendation section(s) of the committee's legislative action item(s), in their reports to the Legislative Council:

Language for Option 1: "The cabinet supports Proposal No. 2009-XX, which would <insert language from intent statement here>." <Include rationale for position here>.

Language for Option 2: "The cabinet opposes Proposal No. 2009-XX, which would <insert language from intent statement here>." <Include rationale for position here>.

Language for Option 3: "The cabinet opposes Proposal No. 2009-XX, which would <insert language from intent statement here>. The cabinet recommends that the sponsor modify Proposal No. 2009-XX to specify that…<describe modification>. The cabinet would support the proposal if modified." *If the cabinet does not wish to sponsor an alternative proposal, simply include the cabinet's rationale for its position. If the cabinet wishes to sponsor an alternative*

proposal and if the sponsor does not modify its proposal, use the following language: "Further, in the event the sponsor does not support the suggested modification, the cabinet shall sponsor an alternative proposal." <Include rationale for position here>.

Proposals recommended by a cabinet. The original sponsors of legislative proposals may modify proposals during the sponsor modification period. The cabinet that made the original recommendation should review the resultant proposals to ensure the legislation reflects what was intended or to recommend modifications. Any recommendations for modifications must be included in your reports to the Legislative Council.

Feedback from coaches associations or other constituent groups on various proposals. If your cabinet receives feedback on other proposals that are not listed for its review, please forward that feedback to the liaisons of the appropriate cabinet or committee. For example, if the Women's Basketball Coaches Association provides feedback to the Women's Basketball Issues Committee on a recruiting proposal that affects all sports, that feedback should be forwarded to the liaisons to the Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet.

NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Cabinet Representatives

Academic Cabinet
Jarrett Newby
East Carolina University
Conference USA
Mailing and Permanent Address:
700 Willow Street
Greenville, North Carolina 27858
Phone: 607-206-9000
E-mail: jarrettnewby@gmail.com

Administration Cabinet
Catharine Marosszeky
Kent State University
Mid-American Conference
Mailing Address:
586 Perry Street
Kent, Ohio 44240
Permanent Address:
22 Davis Road
Aurora, Ontario Canada L4G2B6
Phone: 303-931-8633
E-mail: Catharine.marosszeky@gmail.com

Amateurism Cabinet
Matthew Goff
James Madison University
Colonial Athletic Conference
Mailing Address:
520 Davis Mill Drive
Harrisonburg, Virginia 22801
Permanent Address:
4816 Twinbrook Road
Fairfax, Virginia 22032
Phone: 703-909-6716
E-mail: mattgoff31@gmail.com

Awards , Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet

Ann Morrison
California State University, Sacramento
Big Sky Conference
Mailing and Permanent Address:
2609 Stingray Court
Sacrament, California 95826
Phone: 650-921-7574
E-mail: annekmorrison@gmail.com

Championships/Sports Management Cabinet

Danielle Neault
University of the Pacific
Big West Conference
Mailing Address:
MacCaffrey Center Apartments #32
3601 Pacific Avenue
Stockton, California 95211
Permanent Address:
13261 Norcorft Road
San Diego, California 92130
Phone: 858-481-8353
Fax: 858-259-6733
Cell: 858-395-6379
E-mail: danielleneault@gmail.com

Recruiting Cabinet

Audrey Beth Piotrowski
Cleveland State University
Horizon League
Mailing and Permanent Address:
2367 Augustine Drive
Parma, Ohio 44134
Phone: 440-668-8103
E-mail: audreypiotrowski03@gmail.com

DIVISION I MEETING SCHEDULE

Governance Group	Sleeping Rooms	Dates	Meeting Location
Board of Directors	Hyatt	August 6-7, 2009	Indianapolis, IN
Championship Cabinet	Marriott	September 15-16, 2009	Indianapolis, IN
Academic Cabinet	Westin	September 14–15, 2009	Indianapolis, IN
Awards/Benefits/FA Cabinet	Westin	September 17-18, 2009	Indianapolis, IN
Administration Cabinet	Hyatt	September 16-17, 2009	Indianapolis, IN
Recruiting Cabinet	Westin	September 21 – 22, 2009	Indianapolis, IN
Amateurism Cabinet	Westin	September 24-25, 2009	Indianapolis, IN
Leadership Council	Westin	October 6, 2009	Indianapolis, IN
Legislative Council	Westin	October 19 – 20, 2009	Indianapolis, IN
Presidential Advisory Group	Westin	October 28, 2009	Indianapolis, IN
Board of Directors	Westin	October 29, 2009	Indianapolis, IN
Presidential Advisory Group	Conference call	January 11, 2010	3 pm (Eastern)
Legislative Council	TBD	January 13 – 14, 2010	Atlanta, GA
Leadership Council	TBD	January 14, 2010	Atlanta, GA
Board of Directors	TBD	January 16, 2010	Atlanta, GA
Academic Cabinet	Westin	February 1 – 2, 2010	Indianapolis, IN
Recruiting Cabinet	Westin	February 3 – 4, 2010	Indianapolis, IN
Administration Cabinet	Westin	February 9-10, 2010	Indianapolis, IN
Championships Cabinet	Westin	February 16 – 17, 2010	Indianapolis, IN
Awards/Benefits/FA Cabinet	Westin	February 23 – 24, 2010	Indianapolis, IN
Amateurism Cabinet	Marriott	February 25 – 26, 2010	Indianapolis, IN
Leadership Council		March, 2010	Indianapolis, IN
Legislative Council	Westin	April 12, 2010	Indianapolis, IN
Board of Directors	Westin	April 29, 2010	Indianapolis, IN
Administration Cabinet	Westin	June 30 – July 1, 2010	Indianapolis, IN
Presidential Advisory Group	Conference call	August 9, 2010	3 pm (Eastern)
Board of Directors		August 12, 2010	Indianapolis, IN

Championships Cabinet	Westin	Sept. 14 – 15, 2010	Indianapolis, IN
Leadership Council		October, 2010	Indianapolis, IN
Legislative Council	Westin	October 18 – 19, 2010	Indianapolis, IN
Presidential Advisory Group	Westin	October 27, 2010	Indianapolis, IN
Board of Directors	Westin	October 28, 2010	Indianapolis, IN
Board of Directors		August 11, 2011	Indianapolis, IN

NOTE: More dates will be identified shortly.

REPORT OF
THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
DIVISION I COMMUNICATIONS AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE
CONFERENCE CALL

Participants: August 12, 2009

Matt Baysinger, Big Twelve Conference – (SAAC)
Grace Calhoun, Indiana University – (Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet)
Carolyn Callahan, University of Virginia – (Academic Cabinet)
Joseph D'Antonio, Big East Conference – (Legislative Council)
Rob Halvaks, Big West Conference – (Administration Cabinet)
Petrina Long, UCLA – (Recruiting/Athletics Personnel Cabinet)
Mike Rogers, Baylor University – (Amateurism Cabinet)
Jeff Schemmel, San Diego State University – (Championships/Sports Management Cabinet)
Beth DeBauche, NCAA – recording secretary

Damon Evans, chair of the Leadership Council was unable to participate on the call.

NCAA staff: David Berst, Matt Burgemeister, Jeremiah Carter, Julie Cromer, Diane Dickman, Kelly Groddy, Lynn Holzman, Michelle Hosick, Brad Hostetter, Kevin Lennon, Steve Mallonee, Pat McConney, Delise O'Meally, Dave Schnase, Maricela Shukie, Geoff Silver, Mark Tschaggeny, and Sharon Tufano also participated on the call.

The conference call was called to order at 2:05 p.m. by the staff liaison Beth DeBauche.

1. Welcome and opening remarks. The committee was reminded that this call marks the one year anniversary for both the committee and the new Division I governance structure. It was noted that it has been a productive first year.

2. Recap of items of significance from the June cabinet meetings and conference calls. The cabinet chairs shared meeting highlights as follows:

   a. Academic Cabinet.

   (1) Review of Initial-Eligibility Standards. As part of its legislated duty to manage and monitor eligibility standards, the Academic Cabinet began a review of the division's initial-eligibility requirements by drafting goals and principles to guide its future work on this issue. The cabinet welcomes feedback from other cabinets regarding these draft items and will continue its review during its September meeting.

   (2) Nontraditional Courses for Initial Eligibility. The cabinet sponsored legislation to specify that nontraditional courses may be used to satisfy NCAA core-

course requirements, provided the instructor and student have regular and ongoing interaction for purposes of teaching and evaluation throughout the duration of the course, the course uses a system that permits review and validation of the student's coursework, and the course has a defined timeline for completion. The cabinet will continue to examine the issue of nontraditional courses, though it is not sponsoring additional legislation in this legislative cycle.

(3) Explanation of "Academic Impact". The cabinet asked that the Legislative Council consider a policy revision that would require an explanation of the academic impact to accompany every legislative proposal. A variety of comments were offered by committee members including that such a reference may best be addressed in the rationale statement.

(4) Bylaw and Practices Review. The cabinet reviewed several possible concepts identified to provide cost savings to the membership and determined that most would provide little direct financial relief and possibly could jeopardize the Association's principles of sound academic standards and competitive equity. The cabinet also noted that a significant portion of institutional expenditures related to academics and eligibility are for academic support resources and are difficult to address via legislative or policy changes.

b. Administration Cabinet.

(1) Annual Review/Advancement of Provisional/Reclassifying Members. The cabinet reviewed the progress of 18 institutions currently in the process of reclassifying their sports programs to Division I active status. During its review, the cabinet identified consistent areas of concern regarding reclassifying institutions, including: poor academic performance rates, funding coming primarily from student fees or institutional funds outside the athletics department, financial aid budgets, athletics department staff having both coaching and administrative roles, and compliance and monitoring issues.

(2) Committee Appointments. The cabinet continued to look for ways to enhance the committee appointment process in order to ensure that all 31 multisport conferences are fairly represented, and that the cabinet is well positioned to identify the best nominees for specific committee vacancies.

(3) Governance Assessment Tool. The cabinet is working with the NCAA research staff to develop an assessment tool to determine if the new governance structure is achieving its stated goals and objectives. Members of the Communications and Coordination Committee will be asked to participate in this effort.

c. Amateurism Cabinet.

(1) Commercial Activity in Division I Intercollegiate Athletics. The cabinet reviewed the final report of the Task Force on Commercial Activity in Intercollegiate Athletics and identified several issues for further discussion at its September meeting. It is anticipated that the cabinet will review examples of various new media concepts involving the use of student-athletes' images or names in order to facilitate the discussion.

(2) Bylaw and Practices Review. At the request of the Board of Directors, the cabinet reviewed Bylaw 12 for areas of possible cost savings and agreed to continue its examination of the legislation at its September meeting. The cabinet also solicited the assistance of the National Association of Athletics Compliance (NAAC) for suggestions as to possible legislative change(s).

d. Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet.

(1) Review of Current Financial Aid Model. The cabinet continued its review of the current financial aid model and concluded that the financial aid rules are too complicated, and that the expansive federal and state regulation causes many financial aid professionals to feel overregulated. The cabinet formulated three hypothetical financial aid models representing a moderate change, a significant change, and a radical change to the current model. These models will be discussed further during the September meeting and broader membership feedback will be sought in the fall.

(2) Maximum Equivalency Limits – Sand Volleyball. The cabinet sponsored legislation for the 2009-10 legislative cycle related to team financial aid limits in the sport of sand volleyball.

(3) One-year Award Period. The cabinet engaged in a discussion of the current one-year period for athletics-based financial aid awards, including whether a multi-year award would be an acceptable option. The cabinet will discuss this issue further at its September meeting.

(4) Letter of Intent Limits. The cabinet is looking into which conferences have limits on the number of Letters of Intent that may be signed by prospective student-athletes in a specific sport each year. The cabinet is exploring the question of whether conferences and institutions should regulate this area or whether there should be a national standard. The cabinet will address this issue further at its September meeting.

e. Championships/Sports Management Cabinet.

(1) Championships Budget Issues. The cabinet is analyzing what the championships budget might be in the future and is drafting a letter to be sent to all sports committees requesting that each committee prioritize their budgets and run a budget analysis with five and ten percent budget decreases and increases. The sports committees will be asked to return the results of this budget exercise to the Championships/Sports Management Cabinet by the cabinet's winter meeting.

(2) Bylaw and Practices Review. The cabinet members were encouraged to think about potential changes to Bylaws 17 and 31 that might result in cost savings for the membership. The cabinet has received quality responses and plans further discussion at its September meeting.

(3) Sand Volleyball Playing and Practice Season. The cabinet discussed a proposed sand volleyball playing and practice season model and contest limitations but agreed to delay action on these items until the Legislative Council considered the membership's override request on Proposal No. 2008-59.

f. Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Cabinet.

(1) Sponsored Proposals. The cabinet sponsored 10 legislative proposals in the 2009-10 legislative cycle, including legislation regarding student assistant coaches, non-coaching staff with sport-specific responsibilities and managers.

(2) Coaching Limits and Athletics Personnel Issues. The cabinet affirmed current legislation regarding countable coaches and volunteer coaches, and agreed to further study the positions of graduate assistant coaches and non-coaching staff with sport-specific responsibilities.

(3) Recruiting Materials. The cabinet examined current legislation regarding institutional letterhead, printed media guides and audio/video materials. It sponsored legislation to set forth restrictions on institutional letterhead. The cabinet also sponsored legislation to deregulate the current restrictions on audio/video materials. The committee is considering whether the current technology being utilized for recruitment purposes has surpassed the current legislation regarding recruitment practices.

(4) Definition of Recruitment. Upon request of the Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet, the Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Cabinet will work to further define the word "recruitment" at its September meeting.

(5) Bylaw and Practices Review. At the direction of the Board of Directors, the cabinet engaged in an examination of Bylaws 11 and 13 and created an initial list of possible amendments and policy changes that could provide financial and operational relief to the membership. The cabinet noted that further examination and discussion would be needed prior to any actions being taken.

g. Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

(1) Commercial Activity in Intercollegiate Athletics. SAAC reviewed the report of the Task Force on Commercial Activity in Intercollegiate Athletics and sought to identify which principles would benefit from student-athlete feedback. The SAAC is preparing information to assist student-athletes in understanding the report.

(2) Bylaw and Practices Review. The SAAC identified areas of potential cost savings that would have a minimal impact on the student-athlete experience.

(3) Findings of the Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group. The SAAC received the report of the Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group. The SAAC took no formal position on the report and will seek feedback from men's basketball student-athletes before doing so.

3. Lessons Learned – Best practices shared.

a. Update regarding request for bylaw review. The committee members were reminded to make the review of bylaws to identify potential cost savings a priority for their September cabinet agendas. This timeframe is based on the fact the staff is planning to forward a listing of cabinet-developed amendments to the councils in October. In October, the councils will be asked to develop a prioritized list of possible legislative amendments. This list will be presented to the Board at its October meeting for possible legislative sponsorship in the 2009-10 cycle. Given the legislative deadline, cabinet work not completed in September will have to be brought forward for the 2010-11 legislative cycle.

b. Successful communications strategies and meeting structure. The committee members shared practices that worked well during their meetings as follows:

(1) Recruiting Cabinet. The Recruiting Cabinet reported success with engaging its members in small group discussions regarding potential cost savings measures. The chair noted this meeting format appears to result in a higher level of dialogue and camaraderie among the members.

(2) Academic Cabinet. The Academic Cabinet indicated having success in enhancing the level of dialogue by using a small group discussion format as well. The cabinet also reported that it is continuing its practice of conducting a conference call in advance of its meeting to review governance reports and address preliminary matters. Additionally, the chair shared that she was pleased with how well the video conferencing worked, as a number of staff members joined the meeting using that method.

(3) Championships/Sports Management Cabinet. The cabinet chair noted that despite some technological difficulties, he was generally pleased with the cabinet's June conference call and mentioned that he anticipates the cabinet will try to meet via conference call in the future as their agenda allows.

(4) Amateurism Cabinet. The chair shared that he asked the cabinet members to put cell phones and handheld devices away during the meetings with the understanding he will provide the group with a scheduled break that allows for ample time to contact their offices and homes. The chair reported that the members have responded positively to this practice.

4. Brief updates from the other Division I leadership bodies.

a. Board of Directors. The committee heard that during the August Board of Directors meeting, the Board chair listed issues he views as important to the division's agenda. This list, which is set forth below, reflects much of the ongoing work of the cabinets:

(1) The need to address issues associated with the nontraditional delivery of courses relative to the eligibility of student-athletes.

(2) The impact of Division I initial-eligibility standards and the impact of those standards on academic support personnel.

(3) The proliferation of noncoaching personnel and the impact on competitive equity.

(4) The need to assess whether the Division's academic reform efforts are having the desired impact.

(5) The need to promote intercollegiate athletics in a way that promotes a healthy balance between fiscal responsibility and athletic success in an effort to assist member institutions in making decisions that are consistent with their values.

It was reported that the staff tries to keep the Board informed regarding developments from the governance substructure.

b. Leadership Council. The committee was informed that the Leadership Council's next meeting is scheduled for October 6. During that meeting, the council is expected to continue developing suggested new Division I membership standards. Additionally, the Leadership Council will seek to identify ways to enhance the level of diversity serving in the Division I governance structure. Both of these conversations are important to the Division I agenda and have potential to involve the cabinets.

c. Legislative Council. The committee learned that during a July 30 conference call, the Legislative Council sustained its prior actions in adopting Proposal No. 2008-46 Playing and Practice Seasons – Baseball – Preseason Practice and First Contest – Championship Segment and Proposal No. 2008-59 Division I Membership – Definitions and Applications – Emerging Sports for Women – Sand Volleyball, both of which were subject to override requests from the membership. Subsequently, the Board supported the Legislative Council's determination. Therefore, the matter will be considered by the Division I membership during the 2010 NCAA Convention.

Additionally, the Legislative Council chair informed the group that proposals in the 2009-10 legislative cycle will be published on August 15. He encouraged the chairs to make sure their cabinets provide detailed and constructive comments to help in the development of good legislation.

5. Collaboration zone – pilot program. The committee members were informed that the governance staff is currently working with the national office's IT staff to develop a Collaboration Zone for all the Division I councils and cabinets. This zone, which will provide separate tabs for each governance group, will allow for not only the posting of materials but for a chat room feature. The Amateurism Cabinet has agreed to serve as the pilot group for this project. A tab is also currently being created for the Communications and Coordination Committee so the chairs will have the ability to experiment with the functionality. The members were reminded that this zone is not intended to replace the general posting of information for the membership on the NCAA's Website. The chairs did not offer any objections to the 31 multisport conferences being granted access to the Division I governance.

6. Leadership succession planning. The staff noted that under the current chair rotation schedule, all chairs are scheduled to rotate in April 2010. This complete turnover of the members of the Communications and Coordination Committee will present a problem as much of the history of this group could be lost. Possible solutions that have been identified to address this transitional problem included seeking legislative relief to allow a few of the chairs to serve in their leadership role for an additional year to help stagger terms and allow additional cabinet/council members to participate on Communications and Coordination Committee conference calls. One of the challenges associated with allowing others to participate on the calls is the fact the slate of chairs must reflect the gender, ethnic, positional and subdivisional diversity of Division I. This challenge demands the cabinets and councils work together to identify a slate of chairs. Accordingly, the staff suggested the chairs determine whether they would like to serve for one more year in that role and start to identify a few representatives to serve as a possible successor. The chairs should come to the 2010 Convention meeting prepared with the names of some possible replacements so that the committee can start developing a diverse slate for the Board's consideration.

7. Authority of the chair. The committee members were briefly reminded that unless their cabinet or council took specific action to provide authority to the chair to act on behalf of the cabinet or council between meetings, the chair is not empowered to do so.

8. Reminders regarding objectives in reviewing legislative proposals. The chairs were again reminded that the September cabinet meetings play an important role in the legislative review. The chairs and staff liaisons were encouraged to provide enough detail in their reports so the legislative comments are instructive to the Legislative Council. The chairs and liaisons were asked to review Supplement No. 12, which provides instructions for the cabinets' review of proposals.

9. Student-Athlete Advisory Committee members. The committee members were informed that the Division I SAAC has selected new representatives to the cabinets to replace vacating members. These new SAAC representatives have been through a service training session and are eager to serve. The list of contact information for the SAAC members was provided to the chairs. The chairs were encouraged to actively seek to engage their SAAC representative in both meetings and social activities.

10. Meeting materials. The chairs generally reported that their members appear supportive of the national office's "green"/cost savings measure that has resulted in meeting materials being posted online. The chairs noted there appears to be a mix between members

who print off materials and those that bring their laptops to the meetings. It was suggested that the staff review supplements online in advance of meetings to ensure documents are easily readable on laptops. Further, it was noted that some cabinet members have asked that all meeting supplements be posted to the Website as one document for easier review.

11. Meeting schedule. The committee was provided the composite Division I governance meeting schedule as a point of information. Staff liaisons were encouraged to share this information broadly.

12. Plans for the 2010 NCAA Convention. The chairs expressed an interest in again attending the NCAA Convention. The staff noted that the chairs can anticipate participating in the Joint Councils/SAAC and Joint Councils/Board functions. Further, the chairs should plan to participate in programming during the Division I Issues Forum and in a meeting of the Communications and Coordination Committee. The chairs should plan on being in attendance in Atlanta on January 14-15, 2009.

13. Affiliate update. The committee briefly discussed the importance of sharing information regarding the work of their cabinets and councils with outside affiliate groups to ensure such groups are current with Division I issues. Given the governance staff's relationships with affiliate groups and its efforts to coordinate the priorities on the Division I agenda, the chairs were encouraged to let the staff know if their cabinets or councils have initiatives they want to highlight. As part of this conversation, a few of the chairs noted how helpful it was to attend one of the student-athlete leadership conferences to gain a better understanding of the student-athletes' perspective on issues. The staff agreed to provide the committee with information on the next Division I Student-Athlete Leadership Conference so that they could possibly attend.

14. Proposed future call dates. The Communications and Coordination Committee members asked that the staff check with them after the September series of cabinet meetings to determine whether their next conference call should be scheduled before the October Legislative Council meeting or after the October Board of Directors meeting.

15. Adjournment. The call was adjourned at 3:35 p.m. EDT.

# # # # #