AGENDA

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

DIVISION I COMMUNICATIONS AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE

Conference call — November 30, 2011
Dial-in Number: 1-888-363-4734 — 11 a.m. Eastern time
Access Code: 2518317

1. Welcome and opening remarks.

2. Report of the NCAA Division I Communications and Coordination Committee August 16, 2011, conference call. [Supplement No. 1]

3. Key items from the September cabinet meetings and conference calls. [Supplement No. 2]

4. Guiding principles for the Division I Amateurism Cabinet. [Supplement No. 3]

5. Update on Presidential Retreat Initiatives. [Supplement No. 4]

6. Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Update.

7. Other business.

8. Adjournment.

REPORT OF
THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
DIVISION I COMMUNICATIONS AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE (CCC)
AUGUST 16, 2011, CONFERENCE CALL

1. **Report of the Committee's April 19, 2011, Conference Call.** The committee approved the report of its April 19, 2011, conference call.

2. **Presidential Retreat.** The committee was informed of the following working groups that were established to advance the goals identified during the Presidential Retreat:

   a. A group that will review NCAA rules and athletics practices (e.g., personnel, travel, recruitment) to determine what institutional and NCAA resource efficiencies that can be achieved.

   b. A group that will work to identify areas where greater flexibility can be employed on a conference-by-conference basis to use resources in support of student-athlete well-being, particularly the value of grants-in-aid and multi-year scholarship commitments.

   c. A group that will review the NCAA Division I Manual to reduce the volume of unenforceable and inconsequential rules that fail to support the Association's core principles and place an emphasis on the most strategically important matters. This group also is charged with developing filters that ensure new legislation aligns and addresses the Association's core principles and values.

   d. A group that will develop a multi-level violation reporting and penalty structure that will focus on primarily those infractions that clearly violate NCAA enduring values. The group also will consider the level and severity of penalties associated with the most egregious violations.

   It was also noted that the Division I Committee on Academic Performance (CAP) and the Division I Academic Cabinet continue to move forward with their recommendations related to initial-eligibility and two-year college transfer regulations, as well as a new Academic Performance Rate (APR) benchmark and penalty structure.

3. **Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Update**. Scott Krapf, chair of the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC), reported on SAAC's recent meeting and noted that the Division I SAAC has had ongoing discussions regarding the following:

- Creation of a Student-Athlete Voice Team to better ensure that the student-athlete voice is heard;
- A division-wide community service project;
- Continued communication regarding a men's basketball recruiting model, and
- The Capitol One Cup and how it may be better structured.

Communications and Coordination Committee chair: Mike Alden, University of Missouri
Staff Liaison: Jacqueline Campbell, Division I governance

Key Items from the September Division I Cabinet Meetings

1. **Academic Cabinet.**

   a. **Review of NCAA Division I Academic Eligibility Requirements for Prospective Student-Athletes.** The NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet discussed possible changes to the initial-eligibility requirements and forwarded recommended increased standards to the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance for their review.

   b. **Review of Two-Year College Legislation.** The cabinet reviewed legislation it sponsored regarding two-year college transfer requirements and proposed that the implementation timeline be accelerated by one year

2. **Administration Cabinet.**

   a. **Division I Online Override Voting Process**. The cabinet approved the new online override voting process and timeline for implementation this fall.

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

   c. **Review of Legislation**. The cabinet took positions on legislative proposals referred from the 2011-12 Division I legislative cycle.

3. **Amateurism Cabinet.**

   a. **National Professional Sports Counseling Panel and National Agent Registration Program**. The cabinet continued its comprehensive review of agent activities and other issues that impact elite student-athletes. The cabinet emphasized the importance of providing adequate education about these issues to student-athletes. The cabinet supports the concept of creating a national sports counseling panel that will serve a two-prong purpose: 1) to advise institutions on how to best educate and serve as a resource to elite student-athletes considering a potential professional career, and 2) to advise student-athletes in all sports about their prospects of playing professionally, in addition to other issues that arise in athletes' transition from the collegiate to professional ranks.

   b. **National Agent Registration Program**. The cabinet supported the concept of a national agent registration program. The cabinet believes such a program would provide institutions information about agents that would otherwise be unavailable. The cabinet also recognized the value that such a program could provide to the NCAA enforcement staff.

c. **Definition of Amateurism and Guiding Principles for the Amateurism Cabinet**. The cabinet reviewed the definition of "amateurism," in addition to the guiding principles of the Cabinet, and decided to update the principles to reflect the realities of today's collegiate model. The cabinet also discussed the criticism that the organization has received as it relates to the fundamental principle of amateurism and wants to strategize effective ways to communicate the principle moving forward.

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

a. **Examination of Maximum Grant-in-Aid Limitations/Equivalency versus Head Count Designations.** The cabinet reviewed information that included an overview of statistical data provided by the NCAA research staff related to Division I current participation numbers, current trends in awarding financial aid and models indicating possible pressure on scholarship limits. The cabinet also reviewed feedback from campuses and conferences on whether current designations (head count or equivalency) and team financial aid limits are appropriate. After reviewing the feedback and information provided by the NCAA research staff, the cabinet agreed that the topic warrants additional consideration. However, the cabinet decided to revisit the topic at its February 2012 meeting so it would have the benefit of knowing what changes to financial aid were supported by the NCAA Division I Board of Directors.

b. **Review of Equivalency Computation Method.** The cabinet reviewed the current equivalency computations legislation in Division I, including feedback cabinet members received from their campuses and conferences on suggestions for calculating equivalencies. The cabinet remains supportive of NCAA Proposal No. 2011-76 and agreed not to pursue other alternative equivalency computation methods at this time.

c. **Departure/Return Expense Restrictions – Women's Golf.** The cabinet discussed a proposed exception to the departure/return expense legislation for women's golf. The cabinet reviewed current departure/return legislation and agreed to solicit feedback from member conferences and institutions to determine whether changes are necessary. The cabinet also noted that this issue may be affected by the potential outcomes of the Presidential Retreat initiatives. The cabinet will review the information at its February meeting.

d. **Room and Board – Unlimited Meal Plans.** The cabinet discussed unlimited meal plans and current room and board legislation. The cabinet agreed to propose legislation to allow an institution to provide a student-athlete who eats in institutional facilities financial aid that includes a board allowance that consists of the maximum board plan available to all students at the institution. Further, if the maximum board

plan available to all students at the institution represents less than three meals per day, to provide a board allowance that includes three meals per day.

5. Championships/Sports Management Cabinet.

a. Review of 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Budget Recommendations. The cabinet reviewed budget recommendations from the entities that report to the cabinet. A majority of the recommendations related to student-athlete participation opportunities, officials fees/expenses, travel party/squad size, per diems and game operations. The cabinet viewed the proposals with the following three lenses: 1) "Must haves." These initiatives are necessary due to legislative or policy changes or are otherwise necessary for the appropriate operation of the relevant championship; 2) "Important but not necessary." These initiatives would have a significant positive impact on the student-athlete experience or would have a significant positive financial impact on the Association and or its member institutions; and 3) "Fund if possible." Initiatives in this category should be funded, but only after initiatives in the first two categories are funded. After the cabinet took a position on each recommendation, it prioritized those recommendations that received cabinet approval. Of the 27 recommendations that were approved, the cabinet agreed that eight initiatives should receive priority for funding. The cabinet noted that the results show that, for this budget cycle, the cabinet placed significant value on student-athlete participation opportunities. In addition, the cabinet agreed that the budget exercise will provide a good foundation for future discussions related to the cabinet's priorities and funding philosophy.

b. Track and Field Regionals. The cabinet continued its discussion related to track and field regionals. To assist in its discussion, the cabinet requested and received informational reports from NCAA staff on NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) trends in Division I cross country and track and field and on the initial findings from the NCAA Goals Study on the experiences of current Division I track and field student-athletes.

After much discussion, the cabinet agreed to retain the current regional model.

6. Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet.

a. Review of Proposals Sponsored by and Forwarded to the Cabinet from the 2011-12 Cycle. The cabinet reviewed 34 legislative proposals related to recruiting and athletics personnel that will be considered by the Division I membership in the 2011-12 legislative cycle. As a result of its review of the proposals it sponsored in June, the cabinet also modified three proposals and withdrew one from the legislative cycle.

b. **Priority Item – Consideration of Proposals Related to Limitations on the Number of Noncoaching Staff Members.** The cabinet continued its discussion related to a request from the NCAA Division I Legislative Council to explore potential revisions or alternatives to pending proposals, which would establish limits on noncoaching staff with responsibilities related to football and basketball. The cabinet believes that NCAA Division I Proposal Nos. 2010-16-C, 2010-16-C-1, 2010-18-C, 2010-18-C-1, 2010-20-C and 2010-C-1 appropriately address competitive equity and financial resource issues. Although there may be challenges related to implementation of the proposals, if the membership focuses on the intent of the legislation and uses established processes for necessary interpretations or clarifications, the benefits realized will outweigh any burden related to monitoring and enforcement. The cabinet noted that the proposals were sponsored with delayed effective dates, which was intended to allow time for education and to address implementation issues. The cabinet reaffirmed its support for the amendments it sponsored (Proposal Nos. 2010-16-C-1, 2010-18-C-1 and 2010-20-C-1), as currently constituted and for the adoption of the base proposals (Proposal Nos. 2010-16-C, 2010-18-C and 2010-20-C) as they would be amended. In addition, as noted in its review of Proposal No. 2011-22, the cabinet expressed support for the concept of a limit on the number of individuals in the bench area during men's basketball competition.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES
FOR THE NCAA DIVISION I 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 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.

Post-Presidential Retreat Updates
October 28, 2011

Committee on Academic Performance (CAP)

Presentation to Board: October 2011
Chair: Walter Harrison, President
University of Hartford

Vice Chair: Roderick McDavis, President
Ohio University

Direct questions and feedback to staff contacts:
Kevin Lennon, klennon@ncaa.org
Bernard Franklin, bfranklin@ncaa.org

Group Met
OCT 24-25

Group Presented to Board
OCT 26-27

DEVELOPMENTS

The Division I Board of Directors voted October 27 to adopt legislation implementing recommendations to improve the academic success of student-athletes. The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance, and the Division I Academic Cabinet, created a package of proposals aimed at improving academic success. The package of proposals includes increased initial-eligibility standards, increased two-year college transfer standards, an increase of the penalty benchmark to 930, and amending the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program to establish an academic standard of 930 for participation in the postseason. The approved measures are outlined below.

APPROVED PROPOSAL

1. **Initial-Eligibility Standards:** The Board supported increased initial-eligibility measures that create more rigorous academic standards for competition than for practice and receipt of athletically related financial aid. Setting a higher standard for competition during the first year of enrollment allows student-athletes who are likely to be academically successful to compete during their first year of enrollment. Student-athletes who need more time to acclimate to college life in order to ensure academic success will be provided an academic redshirt year without the pressure of competition. The specifics of the recommendations are below.

    a. **Athletically Related Financial Aid and Practice:** The Board approved a model that creates a higher academic standard for incoming freshman to compete than to receive athletically related financial aid and practice, creating an academic redshirt year. Student-athletes who achieve the current minimum initial-eligibility standard on the test score-grade point average sliding scale

with at least a minimum 2.0 core-course GPA will continue to be eligible for athletically related financial aid during the first year of enrollment and practice during the first regular academic term of enrollment. Student-athletes can earn the opportunity to practice in the second term by passing nine semester or eight quarter hours.

b. **Competition During First Year of Enrollment:** The Board approved an increase to the standard for immediate access to competition to a 2.3 GPA and an increased sliding scale. Incoming student-athletes will need to earn a grade-point/test score average that is set at approximately one-half standard deviation below the national student body mean. This represents an increase from the current one standard deviation below the national student mean. The new sliding scale requires a high school core grade-point average to be approximately 0.5 grade-point average units higher for a given test score compared to the current qualifier standard. For example, an SAT score of 1,000 requires a 2.5 high school core-course GPA for competition compared to the 2.0 currently needed.

c. **Core Course Requirements:** The Board approved the committee's recommendation to require prospects to successfully complete 10 of the 16 total required core courses before the start of their senior year in high school. Seven of the 10 successfully completed courses must be in English, math and science.

d. **Effective Date:** For students first entering college full time August 1, 2015, or after.

2. **Two-Year College Transfer Student-Athletes:** The Board supports the increased standards for two-year college transfers put forward by the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet. Specifically, based on data related to the lack of academic success of two-year college transfers, the proposals recommended increased transfer standards for two-year college transfers.

a. **Increased Standards:** The Board approved increasing the transferable grade-point average from 2.0 to 2.5; limiting the number of physical education activity courses to a total of two; and for non-qualifiers, requiring the completion of a core curriculum (six credits of English, three credits of math and three credits of science).

b. **Year of Academic Readiness:** This proposal remains in the 2011-12 legislative cycle and will be voted on for the first time at the NCAA Convention in January 2012. The year of readiness provides an opportunity for academically underprepared student-athletes to gain the academic preparation needed to be successful. It allows student-athletes enrolled at a two-year institution to sit out of competition during the initial year of enrollment without starting the five-year clock for purposes of eligibility and progress toward degree.

c. **Effective Date:** For student-athletes initially enrolling at a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2012 (no student-athlete currently enrolled in a two-year collegiate institution will be impacted).

3. **Access to Championships and Division I Academic Performance Program Penalty Structure:** The committee presented recommendations on the implementation schedule for the Board's directive to include a postseason academic access standard of a 930 Academic Progress Rate (APR), which correlates to an approximate 50 percent Graduation Success Rate (GSR). The Board

approved the implementation schedule for the postseason eligibility standard, as well as a new APR penalty structure.

a. **Access to Postseason:** The Board established a 930 APR as a minimum academic standard to participate in Division I postseason competition. This includes a mission filter only in the first year a team fails to meet the benchmark and an improvement filter in the second year and beyond. There will be a transition time period of three years for access to the postseason.

b. **Penalty Structure:** The Board approved the committee's recommended three-level penalty structure. First-level penalties include practice penalties (e.g. four hours/one day of practice per week in-season, resulting in 16 hours per week rather than 20 and five days per week rather than six, to be replaced with academic activities). The second level adds out-of-season practice restrictions (four hours per week), cancellation of nontraditional season or spring football and for sports without a nontraditional season, a 10 percent reduction in contests and length of season. The third level comprises a menu of options including financial penalties, restricted NCAA membership, coaching suspensions for a designated number of contests and/or recruiting, restricted access to practice for incoming student-athletes that fall below pre-determined academic standards and multi-year postseason competition bans. Teams will be subject to level three penalties until APR improves.

c. **Filters / Waivers:** A mission filter (e.g. schools in the bottom 15 percent of resources and with a 50 percent GSR receive relief from the penalty) for postseason competition exists only in the first year a team fails to meet the benchmark. All other teams below 930 would be ineligible for postseason competition. An improvement filter (e.g. teams must have an average APR of 950 over the two most recent years to demonstrate meaningful improvement) only applies the second time and beyond that a team is subject to postseason ineligibility, and applies to level two and three penalties only. The waiver threshold in level one will be very rigorous, with approval for only those teams with truly extraordinary circumstances. Lastly, filters are applied automatically, while waivers require staff review.

d. **Conference Policies:** All conference offices must adopt a policy regarding teams that do not meet championship academic access standards with respect to automatic qualification for postseason and revenue distribution. This requirement allows conferences to develop their own policies, and only requires that a written policy exist.

e. **Effective Date:** The new postseason eligibility structure will take effect in the 2012-13 academic year, with a two-year implementation window before the benchmark moves from 900 to 930. For access to postseason competition in 2012-13 and 2013-14, teams must achieve a 900 multi-year APR or a 930 average over the two most recent years to be eligible. For 2014-15, access to postseason competition requires a 930 average over four years or a 940 over the two most recent years.

Postseason Competition Year	Multiyear APR for Postseason Eligibility	Two Most Recent Years Average APR for Postseason Eligibility
2011-12	Current penalty structure and benchmarks apply.	N/A
2012-13	Four-Year APR of 900 OR	Two most recent years average at or above 930

2013-14	Four-Year APR of 900 OR	Two most recent years average at or above 930
2014-15	Four-Year APR of 930 OR	Two most recent years average at or above 940
2015-16 and beyond	Four-Year APR of 930	N/A

Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group

Presentation to Board: October 2011
Chair: Graham Spanier, President,
Pennsylvania State University

Vice Chair: Sidney McPhee, President,
Middle Tennessee State University

Direct questions and feedback to staff contact:
David Berst, dberst@ncaa.org

Group Met
OCT 4

Group Presented to Board
OCT 26-27

DEVELOPMENTS

The Division I Board of Directors voted on October 27 to adopt legislation implementing the recommendations of the Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group. The approved measures are outlined below. The legislation implementing these recommendations is effective August 1, 2012.

APPROVED PROPOSAL

1. <u>Cost of Attendance (COA)</u>.

a. Permit a Division I student-athlete who has received institutional financial aid equal to the value of a full grant in aid (i.e. tuition and fees, room and board and required course-related books), to receive additional athletically related financial aid up to the value of the institution's "cost of attendance", or up to $2,000, whichever is less. The Board decided not to revisit this amount for three years.

(1) The additional "miscellaneous expense" amount is to be indexed annually to the consumer price index. Further, Student Athlete Opportunity Funds may be used at the institution's discretion toward these miscellaneous expenses, as is currently permitted.

(2) A Pell Grant will not be included in the NCAA financial aid calculation and will be considered an exempted government grant for purposes of applying NCAA regulations.

(3) Only athletically related aid will be counted toward team limits in equivalency sports. All non-athletically related financial aid now will be excluded, which will permit student-athletes to receive additional sources of financial aid without affecting team financial aid limits. The "miscellaneous expense allowance" would be applicable once the total of athletics and other permissible aid exceeds the value of a full grant.

(4) Because this legislation is permissive in nature, conferences are encouraged to consider common application of this legislation among its members and sports.

b. As a best practice, all student-athletes should submit a Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA).

2. <u>Multiyear Grants in Aid</u>.

a. Period of award.

(1) Maintain, subject to existing exceptions, the requirement that the period of award for athletics aid may be not less than one academic year.

(2) Permit athletics aid, up to the permissible limits, to be awarded for a period beyond the minimum of one academic year, up to the date the student-athlete exhausts eligibility to compete in all sports.

(3) Maintain only non-athletically related conditions in athletics aid agreements regarding cancellation or reduction of aid during the period of its award.

b. Changing awarded amounts.

(1) Maintain current restrictions and processes on reducing or canceling athletics aid during the period of the award.

(2) Permit institutions discretion to increase athletics aid during the period of its award.

(3) Maintain current requirements for hearing opportunities related to reducing or canceling aid during the period of the award.

c. Minimum equivalency values.

(1) Require institutions to award not less than 10 percent of an equivalency to each student-athlete who receives institutional financial aid based in any degree on athletics ability, regardless of other sources of financial aid. [Note: Institutions currently are required in baseball to award a minimum 0.25 equivalency award but the Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet is developing a "block grant" system. The Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group agreed that a .10 minimum may be appropriate for all sports, but the group will consider the alternative minimum cabinet model and report a final recommendation to the Board for action in January or April 2012.]

d. Eligibility for financial aid – former student-athletes.

(1) Eliminate financial aid eligibility restrictions (five years of aid within a six-year period) to permit institutions to provide athletics aid to former student-athletes who remain at, or return to, the institution to complete their baccalaureate degree requirements.

EXISTING INFORMATION

Bylaw 16 "Extra Benefits".

The Well-Being Working Group supports six staff deregulation recommendations and referred them to the Rules Working Group for further consideration. The topics to be addressed include: incidental expense waivers; nutrition; expenses to receive recognized awards; medical and insurance expenses; missed class time waivers, and "entertainment" of family and friends of student-athletes.

FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the issues below, and expressed the desire to revisit these issues as early as their January 2012 meeting.

Early Enrollment.

The working group agreed that the practice of early graduation and enrollment in college should receive increased scrutiny to ensure that only qualified students are permitted to engage in the practice. The timing and sequencing of core courses and disproportionate levels of credits earned in a compressed period should disqualify student-athletes from practice and competition until following the normal high school graduation dates of such individuals. Therefore, the working group supports the Academic Cabinet, the NCAA Eligibility Center and the Committee on Academic Performance in the quest to address these issues. The group is concerned that premature high school graduation for the principal purpose of participating in spring practice for fall sports has both led to academic abuses and otherwise is not in the best interests of NCAA student-athletes.

Initial Eligibility.

The working group supports the Committee on Academic Performance's preliminary views regarding an increase in the GPA and test score requirements to attain full eligibility as a freshman. The group also supports consideration of a category of student-athletes who may qualify for financial aid and practice, but not competition in their initial year in residence.

Resource Allocation Working Group

Presentation to Board: January 2012
Chair: Michael Adams, President,
University of Georgia

Vice Chair: Ann Millner, President
Weber State University

Direct questions and feedback to staff contact:
Kathleen McNeely, kmcneely@ncaa.org

Group Teleconference
OCT 11

Next Teleconference
NOV 4

DEVELOPMENTS

The Resource Allocation Working briefed the Division I Board of Directors at its October 27 meeting on its progress to date, outlined below. The working group will convene next on November 4.

EXISTING INFORMATION

The Resource Allocation Workgroup held a teleconference on October 11 to review draft recommendations regarding foreign travel, non-championship segment competition, reductions in competition in all sports and reductions in scholarships. The working group:

1. Reaffirmed the vote in favor of elimination of nonchampionship segment competition. The sports with nonchampionship segment competition are cross country, field hockey, soccer, softball, lacrosse and men's volleyball.

2. Voted in favor of a 10 percent reduction in regular-season competition for all sports. However, if the elimination of non-championship segment competition is passed by the Division I Board, credit would be given for non-championship reductions.

3. Reaffirmed the unanimous vote to recommend eliminating all foreign travel.

4. Voted in favor of a reduction of:

    a. FBS football scholarships from 85 to 80.

    b. FCS football scholarships from 63 to 60.

    c. Men's basketball scholarships from 13 to 12.

    d. Women's basketball scholarships from 15 to 13. These scholarships will be reapportioned to other women's sports.

    e. In addition, the work group requests that the Committee on Academic Performance (CAP) consider incentives that would allow institutions above a certain APR score to maintain

FBS football scholarships at 85, FCS scholarships at 63 (with 85 overall counters), men's basketball scholarships at 13 and women's scholarships at 15.

5. Agreed in concept to a reduction in non-coaching staff within programs. The next work group meeting will consider options recommended by Division 1A Athletic Directors' Association, NCAA legislation that is on the agenda for the Division 1 Board and additional staff ideas. The work group also indicated interest in incorporating language related to non-coaching staff that serve the athletics department "in any capacity".

6. The work group also expressed interest in reviewing the current legislation regarding the minimum number of sports mandated for Division I membership. The discussion will include both increases and decreases to the minimum number.

7. Finally, the group agreed to revisit the recommendations before finalizing to ensure each proposal aligns with the values and outcomes agreed upon by work group members at its initial meeting.

Collegiate Model – Rules Working Group

Presentation to Board: April 2012
Chair: James Barker, President
Clemson University

Vice Chair: Steadman Upham, President
University of Tulsa

Direct questions and feedback to staff contact:
Kevin Lennon, klennon@ncaa.org

Group Met
OCT 11

Next Meeting
DEC 13

DEVELOPMENTS

The Collegiate Model – Rules Working Group briefed the Division I Board of Directors at its October 27 meeting on its progress to date. The working group also requested and received endorsement from the Board for a resolution that summarizes the concepts and direction for the working group as they do their part to transform intercollegiate athletics, driven by principle-based outcomes. The working group will meet next on December 13.

EXISTING INFORMATION

The NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model - Rules convened in Indianapolis Tuesday, October 11. The following provides a summary of the pertinent discussion related to the meeting and action taken by the group.

The group:

1. Reviewed feedback provided by membership in response to a 2011 NCAA Presidential Retreat Response Questionnaire.

2. Acknowledged the need to change the regulatory culture in meaningful ways that, in conjunction with an enhanced enforcement structure, will better support the collegiate model by placing appropriate emphasis on the most significant regulations.

3. Recognized the challenges inherent to our current regulatory culture, including the creation of a number of rules that are nationally insignificant, difficult to enforce and do not clearly enhance the academic and athletics success of student-athletes.

4. Discussed the importance of amending the NCAA Division I Manual to reduce the volume of unenforceable and inconsequential rules that fail to support our enduring values.

5. Supported a new approach to the regulatory aspect of intercollegiate athletics that will ensure legislation aligns with and addresses our enduring values.

    a. Decided, in support of this new approach, to:

        (1) Establish principle-based outcomes that will apply to each operating bylaw, promote the fundamental constitutional principle of each operating bylaw and serve as the basis for legislation of national significance that merits inclusion in the Manual;

        (2) Redefine "competitive equity" in terms of fairness to member institutions and student-athletes;

        (3) Identify an appropriate penalty structure that reinforces the need to adhere to established principles; and

        (4) Increase shared responsibility for rules compliance among those who participate in, lead and administer intercollegiate athletics at the campus, conference and national levels, and coaches.

6. Develop a filtering process to evaluate future proposals to ensure that such legislation is consequential, readily enforceable, promotes our enduring values and further identified principle-based outcomes.

7. Agreed concurrent NCAA Division I Board of Directors support for the concepts and direction outlined by the working group is critical to advancing a new approach to the regulatory approach.

8. Encouraged staff to reach out to membership constituents to gather feedback on concepts identified by the working group.

9. Agreed to review specific principle-based outcomes and operational bylaws at its December 2011 meeting.

10. Presentation to Board – April 2012.

Collegiate Model – Enforcement Working Group

Presentation to Board: Beginning January 2012
Chair: Edward Ray, President
Oregon State University

Vice Chair: Nancy Zimpher, Chancellor
State University of New York

Direct questions and feedback to staff contact:
Julie Roe Lach, jroe@ncaa.org

Group Teleconferenced
OCT 10 and 24

Next Teleconference
NOV 2

DEVELOPMENTS

The Collegiate Model – Enforcement Working Group briefed the Division I Board of Directors at its October 27 meeting on its progress to date and timeline for action items, outlined below. The Working Group will meet next on November 2.

EXISTING INFORMATION

The working group conducted its third conference call October 10. During this call, the group revisited the guiding principles for action, reviewed the history of the current violation and penalty structure and associated processes used to resolve cases and identified advantages and disadvantages of the current system that should be considered when developing the new structure.

The October 10 call focused on the concept of a multi-level violation structure and the group began discussion of a proposed new violation structure consisting of four levels of violations, including defining each level, identifying the types of violations that would fall into each level, citing examples, and examining the process for disposition of each level of violation.

Finally, the group reviewed the bylaws and history related to show-cause requirements and the impact of show-cause orders that have been imposed on coaches and other at-risk individuals.

The work of this group in proposing a multi-level violation structure, a new penalty structure, and re-establishing a sense of shared responsibility shall be undertaken pursuant to the Association's core purpose of governing competition in a fair, safe, equitable and sportsmanlike manner, and integrating intercollegiate athletics into higher education so that the educational experience of the student-athlete is paramount. The Association's enduring values of student-athlete success, the collegiate model, amateurism as a student model and competitive equity should drive the implementation of the new structures.

During the working group's October 24 call, there was continued discussion and refinement of the multi-level violation structure. The working group also engaged in discussion related to different process models. The group intends to begin examining the penalty structure on its November 2 call.

The working group's timeline contemplates the following:

November

- Consider a proposed penalty structure during the group's November calls.

December

- In-person meeting to finalize violation/penalty structures.
- Work on shared responsibility - defining roles of all parties.
- Work on enforcement process - staff approach to investigations (inclusive of procedural review); Committee on Infractions process for handling cases (written review, hearing, other options); Committee on Infractions/Infractions Appeals Committee composition.

January 2012

- Present initial concepts to the Division I Board of Directors.

April 2012

- Present final concepts to the Division I Board of Directors.

August 2012

- Propose necessary legislative changes to the Board.

In addition, the group shall rely on the following guiding principles:

- **The Principle of Fairness**. Any new violation and penalty structure must be fair to all parties involved in the process and consider the interests of all member institutions that uphold integrity through rules compliance. Appropriate weight should be given to fair process considerations for those culpable for violations or otherwise involved, and potential legal implications. The severity of penalties must have a direct correlation with the significance of the violations, and both need to coincide with the significance of violations as identified by the membership and staff, as well as the NCAA enduring values.

- **The Principle of Accountability**. The new violation and penalty structures should be designed to hold those institutions, coaches, administrators and student-athletes who violate the rules accountable for their conduct, both at the individual and institutional levels. In addition, both the NCAA staff and membership (coaches, administrators, institutions and conferences) must be held accountable for the fairness of the process and must understand the shared responsibility of accountability to the intercollegiate model, regardless of the direct impact on those involved in violations.

- **Principle of Process Integrity**. Any new structures must be designed to ensure effectiveness and efficiency in the process and its results. The new structures must be easily understood, legitimate, timely, respecting of confidentiality while transparent with process, and sufficiently workable to establish clear and strict guidelines and boundaries.

###

REPORT OF
THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
DIVISION I COMMUNICATIONS AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE (CCC)
NOVEMBER 30, 2011, CONFERENCE CALL

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

- None.

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

1. **Report of the Committee's August 16, 2011, Conference Call.** The committee approved the report of its August 16, 2011, conference call.

2. **Key Items from the September 2011, Division I Cabinet and October Legislative Council Meetings.** The committee received a report of the key items from the September 2011, cabinet and October Legislative Council meetings.

   a. **Administration Cabinet** – During its September meeting, the cabinet reviewed and approved the new online override voting process, which is modeled after the voting session process that occurred during the Division I Business Session at the annual NCAA Convention. The process will allow for a discussion period consistent with the one that occurred prior to the vote on the Convention floor. All active Division I and affiliate members of the Association (e.g., coaches associations) will have the opportunity to participate in the discussion period, as they did when the vote was conducted in person. The discussion period will be followed by the voting period, in which only active Division I members may participate. The online voting process is being used for the first time this fall as Division I conducts an override vote on Proposal No. 2009-100-A.

   b. **Legislative Council**. During its October meeting, the Legislative Council reviewed proposals in the 2011-12 legislative cycle through three key lenses developed by the Rules Working Group: (1) Is the rule meaningful and of consequence…is it an issue that merits a national regulation or can it simply be addressed by institutions/conferences/coaches associations? Is it really necessary? (2) Is the rule enforceable.. does it present significant challenges either in monitoring compliance as well as proving violations?, and (3) Does the rule support the success of the student-athlete, academically and/or athletically? When developing its initial position on the proposals in the 2011-12 legislative cycle, the Legislative Council indicated an intent to table a number of the proposals that did not appear to meet the test of the three lenses.

3. **Guiding Principles.** Mark Hollis, chair of the Amateurism Cabinet, reported that during discussions at its September meeting, the Amateurism Cabinet noted that a number of the guiding principles established by that cabinet could, and probably should, apply to all Division I cabinets. It was noted that the work of several of the Presidential Retreat Working Groups involve developing principles that align with the Association's enduring values. It was the sense of the group that once the working groups complete their work, the cabinets can reevaluate their guiding principles to ensure they are consistent and align with the enduring values of the Association.

4. **Update on NCAA Presidential Retreat Initiatives.** The committee received an update on actions taken by the Board of Directors during its October meeting, as well as a report regarding plans for the working groups going forward and the involvement of the Division I cabinets and councils.

   a. **Actions Taken by the Board of Directors.**

      (1) **NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance**.

         (a) **Initial-Eligibility Standards.** The Board adopted legislation that would increase initial-eligibility requirements, resulting in more rigorous academic standards for competition than for practice and receipt of athletically related financial aid. The Board approved an increase to the standard for immediate access to competition to a 2.300 grade-point average and an increased sliding scale. Incoming student-athletes will need to earn a test score/grade-point average that is set at approximately one-half standard deviation below the national student body mean. Student-athletes who achieve the current minimum initial-eligibility standard on the test score/grade-point average sliding scale, with at least a minimum 2.000 core course grade-point average, will continue to be eligible for athletically related financial aid during the first year of enrollment and practice during the first regular academic term of enrollment. Student-athletes can earn the opportunity to practice in the second term by passing nine-semester or eight-quarter hours. The Board approved a reqirement that prospects successfully complete 10 of the 16 total required core courses before the start of their senior year in high school. Seven of the 10 successfully completed courses must be in English, math and science. These new requirements are effective for students first entering college full time August 1, 2015, or after.

(b) Two-Year College Transfer Requirements. The Board adopted legislation to increase the transferable grade-point average from 2.000 to 2.500; limit the number of physical education activity courses to a total of two; and for nonqualifiers, requiring the completion of a core curriculum (six credits of English, three credits of math and three credits of science). The enhanced two-year college transfer requirements will be effective for student-athletes initially enrolling at a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2012; no student-athlete currently enrolled in a two-year collegiate institution will be impacted. The Board took no action on the proposal related to the Year of Academic Readiness and agreed to leave it in the 2011-12 legislative cycle to be voted on at the January 2012 meeting of the NCAA Division I Legislative Council.

(c) Access to Championships and APP Penalty Structure. The Board approved the implementation schedule for the postseason eligibility standard, as well as a new APR three-level penalty structure. The Board established a 930 APR as a minimum academic standard to participate in Division I postseason competition. This includes a mission filter only in the first year a team fails to meet the benchmark and an improvement filter in the second year and beyond. There will be a transition time period of three years for access to the postseason. The Board also specified that all conferences must adopt a policy regarding teams that do not meet championship academic access standards with respect to automatic qualification for postseason and revenue distribution. The new postseason eligibility structure will take effect in the 2012-13 academic year, with a two-year implementation window before the benchmark moves from 900 to 930.

(2) Student-Athlete Well Being Working Group.

(a) Cost of Attendance. The Board adopted legislation that would permit a Division I student-athlete who has received institutional financial aid equal to the value of a full grant-in-aid (i.e., tuition and fees, room and board and required course-realted books) to receive additional athletically related financial aid up to the value of the institution's "cost of attendance," or up to $2,000, whichever is less. The Board decided not to revisit this amount for three years.

(b) Multiyear Grant-in-Aid. The Board adopted legislation that would permit athletics aid, up to the permissible limits, to be awarded for a period beyond the minimum of one academic year, up to the date the student-athlete exhausts eligibility to compete in all sports.

(c) Team Financial Aid Limits. The Board adopted legislation to provide that only athletically-related aid will be counted toward team limits in equivalency sports.

(d) Eligibility for Aid: Former Student-Athletes. The Board adopted legislation, effective immediately, to eliminate financial aid eligibility restrictions (five years of aid within a six-year period) to permit institutions to provide athletics aid to former student-athletes who remain at, or return to, the institution to complete their baccalaureate degree requirements.

(3) Rules Working Group. The Board endorsed a resolution that summarizes the concepts and direction outlined by the working group as they move forward with their evaluation of the rules.

b. Plans Moving Forward. The committee was informed that the Rules Working Group has developed a communication plan that includes conducting feedback gathering sessions (e.g., teleconferences) with various constituent groups. Following the initial outreach, the working group will focus on gathering feedback on specific principles and or proposals, particularly any that are generated from the group's December meeting. The working group plans to use the February cabinet meetings as an opportunity to gather additional comments on principles/proposals developed specific to bylaws for which the cabinets have oversight responsibility.

5. Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Update. Katie Willett, staff liaison to the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC), reported on the committee's November 18-20, 2011, meeting in Indianapolis. It was noted that along with the regular review of legislative proposals, the Division I SAAC discussed the following:

- Text messaging and other forms of communication used in the recruiting process;
- A division-wide community service project; and
- An initiative aimed at creating an increased awareness of SAAC and how to better insert the voice of student-athletes at all levels of governance activity (i.e., campus, conference, national).

Committee Chair: Michael Alden, University of Missouri
Staff Liaison: Jacqueline Campbell, Division I Governance

Division I Communication and Coordination Committee November 30, 2011, Teleconference	
ATTENDEES	ABSENTEES
Mike Alden, University of Missouri, Leadership Council	William Chaves, Eastern Washington University, Administration Cabinet
Sarah Bobert, Marquette University – Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet	Scott Krapf, Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Ivy League, Legislative Council	
Herman Holt, University of North Carolina, Asheville, Academic Cabinet	
Mark Hollis, Michigan State University, Amateurism Cabinet	
Ian McCaw, Baylor University, Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet	
Judy Rose, University of North Carolina, Charlotte, Championships/Sports Management Cabinet	
Jacqueline Campbell, NCAA, recording secretary	
Other NCAA staff members who participated on the teleconference: David Berst, Diane Dickman, Angie Cretors, Michelle Hosick, Kevin Lennon, Steve Mallonee, Jarrett Newby, Binh Nguyen, Jobrina Perez, Carol Reep, Kris Richardson, Jennifer Roe, Alex Smith, Sharon Tufano, Katie Willett, Marcus Wilson and Leeland Zeller.	