AGENDA

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

DIVISION I COMMUNICATIONS AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE

Conference call — April 19, 2011
Dial-in Number: 1-888-450-5996 — 1 p.m. Eastern time
Reservation Number: 825003

1. Welcome and opening remarks.

2. Report of the Communications and Coordination Committee November 30, 2010, conference call. [Supplement No. 1]

3. Key items from the January, February and April cabinet/council meetings. [Supplement No. 2]

4. Key items for discussion on the Division I agenda.

   a. Academics – Review of Two-Year College Transfers Academic Requirements. [Supplement No. 3A] (Carolyn Callahan will report on the Academic Cabinet's work)

   b. Men's Basketball Recruiting. [Supplement No. 3B] (Mike Alden will report on the Leadership Council's work.)

   c. Agents. [Supplement No. 3C] (Mike Rogers will report on the Amateurism Cabinet's work.)

5. Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee update.

6. Other business.

7. Proposed future call dates.

8. Adjournment.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association
April 8, 2011 JGC:pam

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

Participants: November 30, 2010

Sarah Bobert, Marquette University – Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet
Carolyn Callahan, University of Virginia – Academic Cabinet
Nick Fulton, Big Ten Conference – Division I Student-Advisory Committee
Petrina Long, University of California, Los Angeles – Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet
Shane Lyons, Atlantic Coast Conference –Legislative Council
Mike Rogers, Baylor University – Amateurism Cabinet
Judy Rose, University of North Carolina, Charlotte – Championships/Sports Management Cabinet
Jacqueline Campbell, NCAA – recording secretary

Rob Halvaks, Big West Conference – Administration Cabinet, was unable to participate on the call.

NCAA staff: David Berst, Amanda Conklin, Angie Cretors, Jennifer Daniels, Diane Dickman, Lynn Holzman, Michelle Hosick, Charnelle Kemper, Binh Nguyen, Carol Reep, Alex Smith and Leeland Zeller also participated on the call.

The conference call was called to order at 2:04 p.m. by Jacqueline Campbell. All were present as noted above.

1. **Report of the Committee's August 26, 2010, Conference Call.** The committee approved the report of the August 26, 2010, conference call.

2. **Key Items from the September/October Division I Governance Meetings.** The cabinet received a report of the key items from the September/October cabinet, council and Board of Directors meetings.

3. **Key Items on the Division I Agenda.** The committee received the following information regarding key items on the Division I agenda:

   a. Men's Basketball Recruiting. During its October 28 meeting, the Board of Directors received a request from the Collegiate Commissioners Association (CCA) to sponsor

legislation that would eliminate the summer evaluation period in men's basketball beginning with the summer of 2011. The Board did not support the immediate elimination of summer recruiting, rather it noted its intent to sponsor such legislation in the 2011-12 legislative cycle and, in the meantime, assigned the Leadership Council, along with appropriate stakeholders, the responsibility to evaluate and create a new comprehensive recruiting model for men's basketball. It was noted that while the Leadership Council is charged with creating a new recruiting model, input would be sought from various stakeholders, including the Recruiting Cabinet.

b. Agents. The Leadership Council and the Amateurism Cabinet are engaged in discussions regarding agents and the manner by which they enter the lives of prospective and enrolled student-athletes, and how they influence the decisions student-athletes ultimately make regarding professional career opportunities. It is anticipated that the Leadership Council will be expected to submit recommendations to the Board of Directors that will lead to a better process to ensure that individuals make an informed decision when considering a career in professional athletics.

c. Academics. The Academic Cabinet continues its discussion of possible changes to the initial-eligibility and 2-4 transfer requirements. The cabinet recommends no changes to the initial-eligibility standards at this time, but it has developed concepts for changes to the 2-4 transfer requirements that it is circulating for membership and two-year college input. The committee was informed that although the cabinet recommends no changes to the initial-eligibility standards at this time, there are a number of presidents in the membership that support enhancing initial-eligibility requirements.

d. Individual Financial Aid Limit. The staff noted that there has been some discussion amongst several Division I conferences regarding the possibility of changing the individual financial aid limit from a full grant-in-aid to the cost of attendance. Some have suggested that individual financial aid limits need not be the same for all student-athletes. The Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet will discuss the individual financial aid limit in the upcoming year.

e. Division I Distribution and Academic Component. The committee was informed that there is a task force comprised of presidents and commissioners discussing the revenue distribution plan and whether there should be changes based on the new Turner/CBS media contract, specifically whether an academic component should be added.

4. **Discussion of Ways to Enhance the Committee's Function**. The committee discussed ways to enhance communication between Division I governance bodies and how this committee could assist in the coordination and management of the Division I agenda.

5. **Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Update**. Nick Fulton, chair of the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC), reported on the committee's November meeting and noted that the Division I SAAC spent considerable time taking positions on a number of proposals in the 2010-11 legislative cycle.

6. **Proposed Future Call Dates.** The staff noted that the next call of the committee would follow the February cabinet meetings and precede the April Leadership Council meeting. Calendars will be sent to committee members to determine availability.

7. **Adjournment.** The call was adjourned at 2:48 p.m.

Key Items from the January, February and April 2011 NCAA Division I Cabinet and Council Meetings

1. **Academic Cabinet**. The Academic Cabinet continued its discussion of possible changes to the two-year college transfer academic requirements. Based on membership and two-year college feedback regarding the draft package of concepts, the cabinet refined the concepts for additional input. The cabinet continues to present the modified draft concepts as a package for feedback in preparation for developing legislative proposals for the 2011-12 legislative cycle during its June 2011 meeting. The package strives to balance principles of increased academic success, simplicity of administration, access to higher education and opportunity for those prospective student-athletes who are academically underprepared while taking into account the full breadth of feedback from the membership and two-year college community.

2. **Administration Cabinet**.

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

   b. **Proposal No. 2010-100 - The Membership Reclassification Process.** The cabinet received an overview of the application of the new membership reclassification process and engaged in a discussion regarding the role of the cabinet and the conferences in the new process. The cabinet noted that inasmuch as conference membership is a prerequisite for any prospective Division I institution to begin Year One of the reclassification process, conferences who have extended such offers of membership should have increased involvement in shepherding the reclassifying member through the entire process, including assistance with the preparation and completion of its annual report and strategic plan. It was noted that the legislation continues to provide the cabinet oversight responsibility for monitoring each institution's progress through the reclassification process. In that regard, the group agreed that it should continue to adhere to its current philosophy of reviewing all annual reports and strategic plans, providing constructive feedback to institutions and moving those institutions to the next year of the process who have satisfied all applicable legislative requirements and demonstrated sufficient progress that merit advancement.

3. **Amateurism Cabinet**.

   a. **Amendments to the Legislative Proposal to Revise the Regulations Related to the Use of a Student-Athlete's Name or Likeness in Promotional Activities**. The

cabinet agreed to sponsor three amendments-to-amendments to Proposal No. 2010-26 related to the use of a student-athlete's name or likeness in promotions, advertisements and media activities.

b. **Agent/Advisor Discussion**. The cabinet continued its comprehensive review of the agent/advisor issue. Specifically, the cabinet focused on: (1) Broadening the current definition of an agent; (2) Creating a national registration program, and (3) Creating a national sports counseling panel.

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

a. **Examination of Maximum Grant-In-Aid Limitations/Equivalency Versus Head Count Designations**. The cabinet reviewed a summary of statistical data provided by the NCAA research staff related to the ratio of available grants-in-aid to participants, award distribution across head count and equivalency sports, and median dollar amounts received by student-athletes. After reviewing this information, the cabinet discussed potential financial aid models that may be feasible in future options for the membership (e.g., hybrid model currently used in sports like baseball ice hockey). The cabinet noted that additional feedback from the membership is necessary prior to recommending any modification of the current maximum grant-in-aid limitations or alteration of a sport's designation as a head count or equivalency sport. The cabinet asked staff to collect additional statistical information, including information related to unduplicated head counts by institution and by gender, and to research and to develop potential alternative financial aid models. During its June meeting, the cabinet will review information gathered and consider how amending financial aid legislation may impact Title IX and participation levels.

b. **Review of Frequently Requested Legislative Waivers Associated With NCAA Bylaw 16**. The cabinet reviewed and discussed frequently-requested legislative relief waivers associated with Bylaw 16. Following the review, the cabinet agreed to sponsor legislation for the 2011-12 legislative cycle to expand the current legislation to permit an institution to pay transportation, housing and meal expenses for any student-athlete to be present in situations in which a student-athlete suffers a life-threatening injury or illness, or, in the event of a student-athlete's death, to provide these expenses in conjunction with funeral arrangements. The cabinet also agreed to sponsor legislation to eliminate the prohibition against an institution providing the

proceeds of fundraising conducted for student-athletes (or their immediate family) under extreme circumstances directly to beneficiaries. Finally, the cabinet directed the staff to solicit feedback from the Collegiate Commissioners Association Compliance Administrators, Faculty Athletics Representatives and the National Association for Athletics Compliance, on issues related to departure/return expense restrictions legislation (Bylaw 16.8.1.2.1). Specifically, the cabinet is seeking feedback regarding the length of time (e.g., 60 hours before the start of the actual competition, a certain number of nights away from campus) that is appropriate for providing departure and return expenses and, when a waiver of this legislation is needed, the appropriate body (conference, institution or national office) to consider such waivers. The cabinet will review this feedback at its June meeting.

5. Championships/Sports Management Cabinet.

a. NCAA Division I Men's and Women's Soccer Committee – Joint Championship. The cabinet was informed that the Men's and Women's Soccer Committees have agreed that it is not in the best interest of the sport to combine the NCAA Division I Men's and Women's Soccer Championships. Furthermore, it was noted that the Women's Soccer Committee is discussing standardizing the date formula for the Women's College Cup, and will submit a recommendation to the cabinet for its June meeting.

b. Men's and Women's Water Polo and Men's Volleyball – Automatic Qualification. The cabinet agreed to request that the Division I Legislative Council adopt noncontroversial legislation that would exempt the three sports above from the requirement that 50 percent of the championship bracket be reserved for at-large bids. Further, the cabinet requested that each sports committee confirm how it would administer its championship if the proposal is adopted. The cabinet noted that any request for bracket expansion would need to be submitted during the cabinet's September 2011 meeting when it considers all budget requests.

6. Leadership Council.

a. Olympic Sports Liaison Committee (OSLC)/National Governing Body (NGB) Working Group Recommendations. The Leadership Council received a report from the Council's subcommittee on Olympic sports regarding its review of the

OSLC/NGB working group's recommendations related to endangered sports and sports that face challenges to their growth. The subcommittee recommended that the NCAA national office assign to a senior leader the responsibility for creating collaborative strategies to prioritize and sustain Olympics sports within the collegiate structure. The subcommittee noted that designating a senior staff member with specific duties relative to Olympic sports would assist with the growth of Olympic sports at the collegiate level while at the same time acknowledging the importance of college sports to the success of the United States Olympic efforts. The Leadership Council unanimously agreed to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the subcommittee's recommendations.

b. Men's Basketball Recruiting. The Leadership Council received presentations regarding men's basketball recruiting from two panels of current and former Division I head men's basketball coaches, several individuals involved with nonscholastic event operations, the executive director of the NABC, two Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) members and the chairs of the two Leadership Council men's basketball recruiting subcommittees. Themes/concepts shared with the Council include:

- Providing opportunities for earlier access to prospects, their coaches and parents/legal guardians (e.g., telephone calls, official visits).
- Increasing opportunities for more direct access to prospects, their coaches and/or parents/legal guardians during academic year evaluation periods.
- Providing greater opportunities for greater access to prospects, while maintaining the 130 recruiting days that currently exists.
- Establishing some objective measure of academic readiness/preparedness that must be satisfied before an institution may expend recruiting funds to provide an official visit to a prospect.
- Modifying the current official visit legislation in order to minimize the need for unofficial visits.
- Consider allowing on-campus evaluations ("tryouts") during official visits.
- Shortening the July evaluation period, provided that evaluation days are added to April.
- Consider eliminating the text messaging restrictions.
- Consider eliminating the terms contact and evaluations, and use recruiting opportunities.
- Student-athlete well-being should be emphasized when making decisions regarding changes to the men's basketball recruiting model.

- The recruiting process should include parents as much as possible.
- Consider modifying the event certification requirements in order to address some of the concerns regarding nonscholastic events.

7. Legislative Council.

a. Legislation. The Legislative Council reviewed the proposals in the 2010-11 legislative cycle and adopted 63 proposals, defeated 25 proposals and sent out for comment 29 proposals.

b. Report from the Legislative Review and Interpretations Committee.

(1) The Legislative Council used its authority pursuant to Constitution 5.4.1.1 to modify a previously approved official interpretation [Reference: 12/3/092, Item No. 3] and issue the following official interpretation:

Alumna or Alumnus Participating in Occasional Practice Session with Former Institution's Team. (I) The Legislative Council determined that it is permissible for an alumna or alumnus of an institution (e.g., former student-athlete) to participate in an occasional practice session with a member institution's intercollegiate athletics team, provided the institution does not publicize the participation of the former student-athlete in the practice session.

[References: NCAA Division I Bylaws 14.1.6.1 (requirement for practice), 17.01.9 (outside competition) and 17.02.10 (outside team) and an official interpretation (12/3/92, Item No. 1), which has been archived]

(2) The Legislative Council did not approve the committee's minute from the September 16, 2010, teleconference (No. 12). The Legislative Council issued the following interpretation:

Prospective Student-Athlete Observing Practices and Meetings. (I) The Legislative Council determined that the legislation that prohibits a coaching staff member from engaging in practice activities with a prospective student-athlete does not preclude a prospective student-athlete from only observing an institution's on-field or on-court practice sessions (including those sessions that

are closed to the general public), regardless of whether he or she has signed a National Letter of Intent or a written offer of admission or financial aid, or has submitted a financial deposit to the institution in response to the institution's offer of admission. The Council determined that a prospective student-athlete may not observe off-field or off-court practice sessions (e.g., meetings, film review) that are closed to the general public if he or she has signed a National Letter of Intent or a written offer of admission or financial aid, or has submitted a financial deposit to the institution in response to the institution's offer of admission.

[References: NCAA Division I Bylaw 13.1.5.9 (prohibited practice activities) and an official interpretation (9/17/10, Item No. 1), which has been archived]

8. Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet.

a. **Amendments to Legislative Proposals to Limit the Number of Noncoaching Staff in Basketball and Football**. The cabinet sponsored three amendments-to-amendments related to establishing limits on the number of noncoaching staff members for basketball, bowl subdivision football and championship subdivision football (NCAA Proposal Nos. 2010-16-C, 2010-18-C and 2010-20C)

b. **Review of 2010-11 Cycle Proposal Forwarded to the Membership for Review and Comment**. The cabinet reviewed and took positions on recruiting and athletics personnel proposals that remain in the 2010-11 legislative cycle and were sponsored or modified by other NCAA governance entities or conferences after the cabinet's initial review of legislation in September 2010. In January, the proposals were forwarded by the Legislative Council to the membership for review and comment, and will be voted on by the Legislative Council at its April meeting.

c. **Priority Item – Continuing Examination of Recruiting Models**. The cabinet continued its extensive examination of recruiting models. The cabinet reviewed feedback submitted by sport specific groups and coaches associations regarding the development of recruiting calendars and establishing recruiting-person days or evaluation days in all sports for which such provisions currently do not apply. Also, the cabinet discussed possible modification of current legislation pertaining to contacts and evaluations, electronic transmissions, official visits and tryouts.

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

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

www.ncaa.org

MEMORANDUM

March 2, 2011

TO: NCAA Division I Conference Commissioners;

NCAA Division I Collegiate Commissioners Association Compliance Administrators;

Faculty Athletics Representative Association;

1A Faculty Athletics Representatives;

National Academic Advising Association;

National Association for Athletics Compliance;

National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics; and

Select Coaches' Associations.

FROM: Carolyn Callahan, chair
NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet.

SUBJECT: NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet: Seeking Feedback on Two-Year College Transfer Concepts.

As part of continuing academic reform efforts, the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet continued its review of two-year college transfer academic requirements during its February 2011, meeting. Based on data regarding the differences in academic profiles of two-year transfers and their nontransfer counterparts, the Academic Cabinet developed draft concepts for membership and two-year community feedback during its September 2010, meeting. The cabinet received significant feedback regarding the draft concepts. Based on feedback, the cabinet has modified the concepts and provided greater clarity in application. The cabinet again seeks input from the NCAA membership and the two-year community regarding the amended concepts with the goal of developing legislative proposals for formal NCAA membership consideration in the 2011-12 legislative cycle.

The package of concepts includes enhanced academic standards for both qualifiers and nonqualifiers, as well as the establishment of a year of academic readiness. Together, the components of the package develop minimum standards that reflect the academic preparation needed to succeed academically at a

Division I institution. The package also provides opportunities for student-athletes, who are academically underprepared when enrolling at a two-year college, sufficient time to meet 2-4 transfer requirements.

Enclosed is a summary overview of the draft concepts developed by the cabinet. The cabinet again seeks feedback regarding the amended concepts. Please forward additional comments to Diane Dickman (ddickman@ncaa.org) or Jennifer Strawley (jstrawley@ncaa.org) at the NCAA not later than June 1, 2011. In addition, if you would like NCAA staff to attend your spring conference meetings to review the concepts and gather input from your constituents, please contact Diane or Jennifer.

Thank you again for your time in reviewing the concepts.

JFS/CC:alg

Enclosure

NCAA Division I Academic Eligibility Requirements for Two-Year College Transfers

Goals and Principles.

In its review of 2-4 transfer regulations, the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet adopted the following goals:

Establishment of 2-4 transfer requirements that:

1. Lead to enhanced first-year academic success at the four-year institution.

2. Improve academic success and graduation of 2-4 college transfer student-athletes at four-year institutions and have these outcomes more closely mirror nontransfer student-athletes.

3. Provide greater opportunity for academically underprepared student-athletes to gain the academic skills and preparation necessary to be academically successful and graduate from a four-year institution.

Key Research Findings.

1. Two-year college transfers leave college ineligible at higher rates than any other group of student-athletes, in particular after exhausting athletics eligibility.

2. Although two-year college transfer graduation rates have trended up in the last decade, they still lag behind those student-athletes who enter an NCAA Division I institution directly from high school.

3. Transfer students from two-year colleges earn academic progress rates that are significantly lower than those for transfers from four-year colleges or nontransfers.

4. Grade-point average at the two-year institution is the strongest predictor of first-year academic success at the four-year college. Aggregate ineligibility rates among two-year college transfers decrease significantly as a function of increased two-year college grade-point average. In particular, student-athletes transferring from a two-year college with low grade-point averages are much more likely to experience academic difficulties at the four-year school than any other group of students.

5. The number of physical education activity courses taken at the two-year college has a significant and independent negative relationship with four-year college success. Controlling for other factors such as grades earned, students with fewer physical education activity credits tend to perform better academically at four-year institutions.

6. Student-athletes who transfer with more academic courses taken at the two-year institution (particularly in math, science and English) perform better at four-year institutions.

Draft Concepts.

Qualifiers: Note that per current NCAA regulations, student-athletes who are qualifiers are eligible for practice and financial aid upon transfer. Thus, the following apply only to competition during their initial year of enrollment at the Division I institution.

1. Increase the transferable grade-point-average requirement from 2.000 to 2.250.

2. Expand to all sports the current men's basketball limitation of two credit hours of physical education activity courses that may be used to fulfill the transferable degree credit and grade-point-average requirements. An exception would be provided for a physical education degree program or a degree program in education that requires physical education activity courses.

3. All other 2-4 transfer regulations for qualifiers would remain in effect. This includes the student spending at least one full-time term at the two-year college and completing an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours of transferable degree credit per term.

4. The proposed changes (increased grade-point average and the limit on physical education activity courses) would also apply to 4-2-4 transfers.

Nonqualifiers: Nonqualifiers are ineligible for competition, practice and financial aid unless they meet two-year college transfer requirements.

1. Increase the transferrable grade-point-average requirement from 2.000 to 2.250 for competition purposes only. Although data clearly support the importance of an increased grade-point-average requirement, to continue to provide access to higher education for student-athletes who do not meet the increased grade-point average, athletics aid and practice may be provided for student-athletes who achieve the current 2.000 transferable grade-point average and meet all other requirements noted in Nos. 2 through 5 below.

2. Expand to all sports the current men's basketball limitation of two hours of physical education activity courses that may be used to fulfill the transferable degree credit and grade-point-average requirements. An exception would be provided for a physical education degree program or a degree program in education that requires physical education activity courses.

3. Require completion of transferable core credits at the two-year institution as follows: three semester/four quarters of math, three semester/four quarter hours of science and six semester/ eight quarters of English. This adds three semester/four quarter credits of science to the current core requirement.

4. All other current requirements would remain in effect (e.g., earn Associate of Arts degree or equivalent academic two-year degree, 48 semester/72 quarters of transferable credits, minimum of three semesters/four quarters at two-year college, progress-toward-degree requirements, etc.).

5. An increase to the grade-point average, the limit of physical education activity courses and the inclusion of a core curriculum would also apply to 4-2-4 transfers. The core curriculum requirements may be earned at any previous two- or four-year institution.

Year of Academic Readiness for Student-Athletes at Two-Year Institution.

Central to the package is a concept that would target prospective student-athletes who are significantly academically underprepared by permitting an academic year in residence during the student's first year at the two-year college in order to remediate academic deficiencies. Members of the two-year college community have indicated that, for some student-athletes, it is extremely difficult to successfully complete the courses needed to meet NCAA transfer requirements in two years. This will only be enhanced by increased academic standards for two-year transfers. In addition, student-athletes who need significant remediation, or courses taught below those transferable to an NCAA institution, are sometimes attending two-year colleges part time for a semester or two in order not to trigger the start of their five-year NCAA "clock."

The draft concept of a year of academic readiness would provide additional time at the two-year college for student-athletes to become academically prepared for enrollment at a Division I institution. With the increased academic standards outlined above, the year of academic readiness would provide an option for two-year college students who may benefit from remedial courses and other opportunities to gain the academic skills needed to succeed and graduate from a four-year institution.

The general principles of the year of academic readiness are as follows:

1. The year of academic readiness must occur at the two-year college(s). No competition would be permitted during the year of academic readiness; however, student-athletes could practice and receive athletically related financial aid.

2. The year of academic readiness must be used during the student-athlete's initial year of collegiate enrollment, whenever that occurs.

3. Student-athletes would be required to register with the NCAA Eligibility Center and be certified as a nonqualifier in order to use the year of academic readiness.

4. The NCAA Eligibility Center would track student-athletes who use the year of academic readiness. Student-athletes and two-year colleges would be required to notify the NCAA Eligibility Center, during the initial year of enrollment at the two-year institution, of the

decision to use the year of academic readiness. Use of the year of academic readiness would be noted on Institutional Request List.

5. Students-athletes who elect to use the year of academic readiness must attend the two-year college(s) full time for a minimum of five full-time semesters/seven quarters prior to transferring to a Division I institution.

6. The year of academic readiness and minimum of five semesters or seven quarters of enrollment at the two-year college may occur at multiple two-year colleges.

7. The five semester or seven quarters of enrollment at the two-year college must be consecutive. Existing exceptions would remain in place (e.g., armed services, Peace Corps, official religious mission).

8. The start of the five-year NCAA eligibility "clock" would be delayed during the first year of enrollment at the two-year institution for purposes of the five-year period of eligibility and progress toward degree.

9. Student-athletes would have a maximum of two seasons of competition remaining upon enrolling at a Division I institution. Extenuating circumstances (e.g., injury) may be considered in the waiver process.

10. The year of academic readiness would not be considered a denied participation opportunity for purposes of a five-year clock extension request.

11. Student-athletes would be provided the opportunity to receive six years of athletically related financial aid within a seven-year period.

12. First year of academic enrollment for purposes of the recruiting contact legislation does not include the year of academic readiness. Therefore, on or off campus in-person recruiting contact (including unofficial and official visits) may not occur until after the second year of enrollment. Evaluation/phone calls remain available per current bylaws.

13. Current NCAA regulations (e.g., amateurism rules) related to time between high school graduation and initial full-time enrollment at the two-year institution would remain in place.

Effective Date.

The Academic Cabinet recommends that the aforementioned changes to the two-year college transfer legislation be effective for student-athletes initially enrolling full time at a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2013. The Academic Cabinet noted this effective date provides sufficient time to conduct educational outreach and provide appropriate notice.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
DIVISION I LEADERSHIP COUNCIL
APRIL 4, 2011, MEETING

- ***ACTION ITEMS*.**

Olympic Sports Liaison Committee (OSLC)/National Governing Bodies (NGB) Working Group Recommendations. The Leadership Council received a report from the Council's subcommittee on Olympic sports regarding its review of the OSLC/NGB working group's recommendations related to endangered sports and sports that face challenges to their growth. The subcommittee recommended that the NCAA national office assign to a senior leader the responsibility for creating collaborative strategies to prioritize and sustain Olympics sports within the collegiate structure. The subcommittee noted that designating a senior staff member with specific duties relative to Olympic sports would assist with the growth of Olympic sports at the collegiate level while at the same time acknowledging the importance of college sports to the success of the United States Olympic efforts. The Leadership Council unanimously agreed to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the subcommittee's recommendations. [See Supplement No. 1]

- ***INFORMATION ITEMS*.**

1. **Discussion of Men's Basketball Recruiting Model.** The Leadership Council received presentations regarding men's basketball recruiting from two panels of current and former Division I head men's basketball coaches (i.e., Jim Boeheim, Syracuse University; Paul Hewitt, Georgia Tech University; Ron Hunter, Georgia State University; Jeff Jones, American University, and Phil Martelli, Saint Joseph's University), several individuals involved with nonscholastic event operations (Criss Beyers, assistant athletics director at Bloomington High School South, and Rob Kennedy, president of Hoop Group), Jim Haney, the executive director of the NABC, and comments from two Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) members (Scott Krapf, chair, C.J. Williams, men's basketball student-athlete). Among themes/concepts that were shared with the Leadership Council:

   - Coaches should have earlier contact with prospective student-athletes and their parents (e.g., earlier phone calls, earlier contact with prospects at their high schools).
   - The NCAA should consider permitting official paid visits and on-campus evaluations during a prospect's junior year of high school.
   - Coaches would support shortening the July evaluation period if they are provided additional days to evaluate in April.
   - The NCAA should consider eliminating the text messaging restrictions.
   - Coaches would be supportive of relaxing the rules related to telephone calls, possibly allowing calls earlier and then progressively more often (e.g., start in sophomore year with limited calls, more calls in junior year and unlimited calls during senior year).

- The NCAA should consider eliminating the terms contacts and evaluations, and use recruiting opportunities.
- "Third parties" are a reality in the current recruiting environment. NCAA rules need to allow coaches to enter the recruiting process earlier.
- The NCAA should consider modifying its event certification requirements in order to address some of the concerns regarding nonscholastic events.
- All parties report that coaches and prospects are exhausted by the last week in July.
- Student-athlete well-being should be emphasized when making decisions regarding changes to the men's basketball recruiting model.

2. **Report from the Leadership Council Men's Basketball Recruiting Subcommittees.** Morgan Burke and Robin Harris, chairs of the two subcommittees, reported the following factors/concepts as critical in the analysis of access to prospects and a more effective use of recruiting time and resources:

   - Providing opportunities for earlier access to prospects, their coaches and parents/legal guardians.
   - Increasing opportunities for more direct access to prospects, their coaches and/or parents/legal guardians during academic year evaluation periods.
   - Providing greater opportunities for greater access to prospects, while maintaining the 130 recruiting days that currently exists.
   - Establishing some objective measure of academic readiness/preparedness that must be satisfied before an institution may expend recruiting funds to provide an official visit to a prospect.
   - Modifying the current official visit legislation in order to minimize the need for unofficial visits.

   The recruiting subcommittees will continue their discussions of men's basketball recruiting in the upcoming months. The Leadership Council will meet again in July or early August to review the work of both subcommittees with the goal of developing recommendations regarding a new recruiting model to forward to the Board of Directors in October.

3. **Report from Division I and Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) Commissioners and Head Men's Basketball Coaches.** The Leadership Council received a report of recent discussions of men's basketball recruiting by Division I and FCS commissioners and a head men's basketball coach from each of those conferences. The following concepts resulted from those discussions:

   - There should be more and earlier communication in the recruiting process.
   - The rules regarding communication should be simplified.
   - The recruiting process should include parents as much as possible.

- There should be a spring evaluation period.
- The July evaluation period is very valuable
- High school evaluations should be structured to allow coaches to gather as much information as possible about prospects.
- Should consider allowing tryouts during official visits.

4. Men's Basketball Recruiting Model Alternatives. The Leadership Council received a document outlining men's basketball alternative recruiting models that was developed by conference office administrators with NCAA rules compliance and basketball backgrounds from the Atlantic Coast, Big Ten, Big East, Big 12, Pac-10 and Southeastern Conferences (see Attachment). While the document has not been discussed with the presidents/chancellors of the six conferences, it was offered to the Leadership Council for consideration in its discussions of men's basketball recruiting models.

5. Status Report from the Subcommittee on Agent Issues. Rachel Newman, NCAA director of agent, gambling and amateurism activities, noted that the Amateurism Cabinet discussed agent issues during its February meeting and will continue those discussions in June. The subcommittee plans to begin work this summer and will assess whether sport specific legislation is viable.

6. Report from the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Division I SAAC Chair Scott Krapf presented a report of the committee's recent meeting and priorities for the upcoming year.

7. Future Meetings.

a. July, 2011, TBD.

b. October, 2011, TBD.

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

The National Collegiate Athletic Association
April 7, 2011 SDB/JGC:vlm

Leadership Council Attendance
April 4, 2011, Meeting

Leadership Council members in attendance:
Michael Alden, University of Missouri, Columbia, Big Twelve Conference, chair
Jeffrey Altier, Stetson University, Atlantic Sun Conference
Sandy Barbour, University of California, Berkeley, Pacific-10 Conference
Kathleen Batterson, Colonial Athletic Association (alternate)
Karl Benson, Western Athletic Conference (alternate)
Peg Bradley-Doppes, University of Denver, Sun Belt Conference
Morgan Burke, Purdue University, Big Ten Conference
Janet Cone, University of North Carolina, Asheville, Big South Conference
Joseph D'Antonio, Big East Conference (alternate for portion of meeting)
Tom Douple, Summit League
Peter Fields, Montana State University-Bozeman, Big Sky Conference
Chet Gladchuk, U.S. Naval Academy, Patriot League
Robin Harris, Ivy League
Alan Hauser, Appalachian State University, Southern Conference
R.C. Johnson, University of Memphis, Conference USA
Cynthia K. Jones, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Missouri Valley Conference
Lynn King, University of the Pacific, Big West Conference
Paul Kowalczyk, Colorado State University, Mountain West Conference
Scott Krapf, Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
Jonathan (Jon) LeCrone, Horizon League
Susan Cross Lipnickey, Miami University, Mid-American Conference
John Marinatto, Big East Conference
Charles McClelland, Texas Southern University, Southwestern Athletic Conference
Clyde McCoy, University of Miami, Atlantic Coast Conference
John McCutcheon, University of Massachusetts, Atlantic 10 Conference
Noreen Morris, Northeast Conference
Patrick Nero, America East Conference
John Ritschdorff, Marist College, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference
Greg Sankey, Southeastern Conference (alternate)
Dennis Thomas, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference
Bobby Williams, Sam Houston State University, Southland Conference
Mark Wilson, Tennessee Technological University, Ohio Valley Conference
Jamie Zaninovich, West Coast Conference (alternate)

NCAA primary staff liaisons in attendance:
S. David Berst, NCAA
Jacqueline Campbell, NCAA, recording secretary
Kevin Lennon, NCAA

Leadership Council members not in attendance:, McKinley Boston, Jr., New Mexico State University, Western Athletic Conference; Joan Cronan, University of Tennessee, Southeastern Conference, and; Jack Hayes, Hofstra University, Colonial Athletic Association

Guests:
Criss Beyers, assistant athletics director, Bloomington High School South
Jim Boeheim, head men's basketball coach, Syracuse University
Jim Haney, executive director, National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC)
Paul Hewitt, former head men's basketball coach, Georgia Tech University
Ron Hunter, head men's basketball coach, Georgia State University
Tom Izzo, head men's basketball coach, Michigan State University
Jeff Jones, head men's basketball coach, American University
Rob Kennedy, president, Hoop Group
Shane Lyons, chair, Division I Legislative Council
Phil Martelli, head men's basketball coach, Saint Joseph's University

NCAA staff members in attendance: Mark Emmert, Bernard Franklin, Ken Hubert, LuAnn Humphrey, Jim Isch, Kevin Lennon, Steve Mallonee, Kayla McCulley, Rachel Newman, Stacey Osburn, Tom Paskus, Donald Remy and Wallace Renfro were also present during portions of the meeting.

Men's Basketball Recruiting Model Alternatives

Background

For more than two decades there have been several attempts to change the structure of the NCAA Division I men's basketball recruiting model. These efforts centered on a perceived need to develop a more educationally sound and healthier environment for the recruitment of prospective student-athletes. Despite numerous reform attempts, the current recruiting structure continues to be filled with challenges. In general, legislative change over the years resulted in the empowerment of third-party influences while contact between NCAA Division I coaches, prospects, and their parents/guardians became increasingly more limited.

In September 2010, a strong majority of conference commissioners voted to recommend to the NCAA Division I Board of Directors that the summer recruiting evaluation period conducted around non-scholastic club basketball tournaments be eliminated. The Board responded by not supporting the immediate elimination of summer recruiting, but noted its intent to sponsor such legislation in the 2011-12 legislative cycle. In the meantime, the Board assigned to the Leadership Council, along with appropriate stakeholders, the responsibility to evaluate and create a new comprehensive recruiting model for men's basketball. The Board also suggested that the Legislative Council not take action on proposals in the 2010-11 legislative cycle that impact the recruiting calendar in men's basketball. Resolution of this issue is expected by August 2011.

A group of conference office administrators with NCAA rules compliance and basketball backgrounds from the Atlantic Coast Conference, Big Ten Conference, Big East Conference, Big 12 Conference, Pac-10 Conference, and Southeastern Conference convened to review the history of NCAA regulation in this area and to review and discuss issues and alternatives related to it. The discussions were held at the direction of the commissioners of the six conferences. The results of the discussions were not vetted with the presidents and chancellors of the conferences and is not being advanced as a proposal of the Group of Six Conferences.

Objectives and consensus

The group focused on developing concepts for change to the current men's basketball recruiting model that would support the following objectives:

1. Empower coaches, prospects, and parents to make the best informed decision in the recruiting process with less reliance on third parties.
2. Allow coaches along with prospects and their parents to better know each other through the recruiting process.
3. Simplify the regulatory burden for athletics departments.
4. Recognize the modern reality of technology and communication.

5. Create a more flexible recruiting structure with increased emphasis on campus access.

Consensus formed around the following components of a package that could be put into place effective with a prospect's junior year of high school to meet these objectives:

- Permit contact with prospects beginning April 15 of the junior year of high school.
- Permit official visits to begin April 15 of the junior year of high school.
- Permit institutions to provide travel expenses for a prospect's parents/legal guardians during official visits.
- Deregulate bylaws to permit institutions and prospects to communicate more frequently using any method (text messaging, phone, email, etc.).
- Explore initiating limited tryouts during official visits using rules that compare to current Division II regulations.

In addition, the group supports Proposal 2010-58-C, but recommends it be referred to the Leadership Council for its review of men's basketball recruiting.

A pair of recruiting calendar alternatives

Two differing approaches emerged related to the specifics of the recruiting calendar and evaluations at non-scholastic events.

Five of the six conferences (ACC, Big East, Big Ten, Big 12, Pac-10) reached general consensus around changes to the recruiting calendar (labeled as Alternative 1, below) that reduces the summer evaluation period while also reinstating a brief evaluation period for non-scholastic events held during two weekends in April.

The SEC offered an alternative (labeled as Alternative 2, below) which focuses the months of April and May on contact rather than evaluation while reducing and eventually eliminating summer evaluations of non-scholastic events.

Alternative 1

Alternative 1 acknowledges that past attempts to regulate the role and influence of the non-scholastic basketball environment in the recruiting process have been largely ineffective. Attempts to change the culture surrounding non-scholastic basketball by limiting coaches' attendance at events has had no effect, and elimination of summer recruiting might produce a similar outcome. Further, some broad opportunity to evaluate at non-scholastic events was needed for all Division I members—not only during the summer, but also in April.

Alternative 1 features the following changes to the recruiting calendar:

- An April evaluation period for certified non-scholastic events would be held on Saturday-Sunday for two weeks beginning two weekends after the Final Four. If those two weekends conflict with SAT/ACT national testing dates, evaluations would be permitted during an alternate weekend in April or May.

- Summer evaluations at certified non-scholastic events would be reduced from 20 days to a 9-day period during the last three weekends (Friday-Sunday) in July.

Limiting the summer evaluation period to weekends would allow coaches to remain on-campus with their team members during the week, an important consideration in the event Proposal 2010-58-C is adopted, providing greater opportunities for summer interaction between coaches and student-athletes.

Elimination of some of the certification requirements for non-scholastic events that have proven to be difficult to verify or enforce would be included in this alternative.

Alternative 1 also features exploring the establishment of a pilot program of evaluation camps held in April and during the summer.

Some of the parameters for these camps (number of camps, number of participants, sites, costs, management, format, college coaches' involvement, etc.) are to be determined. These camps could be modeled on the format used for the NBA Pre-Draft Camp or USA Basketball U16 national team development camp. USA Basketball, through its executive director, expressed strong interest in working on this project (sample structure documents are attached).

Alternative 2

Proponents of Alternative 2 do not believe that reducing the summer evaluation period by several days and adding evaluation opportunities in April effectively changes the status quo—as the overwhelming majority of the commissioners and the NCAA Board of Directors preferred.

Thus, Alternative 2's spring recruiting philosophy is intended to move away from evaluation of athletics skill to in-person recruiting contact with prospects and their family members.

Like Alternative 1, Alternative 2 features earlier contact with prospects (starting in April of the junior year of high school). Both alternatives would permit one contact on the high school campus with a high school junior. Alternative 2 would also allow two contacts at the prospect's home in April and May.

As for the summer, the long-term goal of Alternative 2 is to eliminate evaluations at non-scholastic events, shifting evaluations from non-scholastic events to the evaluation camp model outlined in Alternative 1.

In the near term, Alternative 2 proposes:

- A 9-day period during the last three weekends (Friday-Sunday) in July during which evaluations at certified non-scholastic events may occur. This 9-day period is identical to that proposed in Alternative 1, but it would only exist for a three-year period while the transition to evaluation camps occurs.

- An additional requirement that all certified non-scholastic events include both an evaluation session and a skill-instruction component for all participants.

kw/mm
3/31/2011

Proposed alternatives to basketball recruiting model

Feature	Current	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
Official visits			
Starting point	Senior year of high school	April 15 of junior year of high school	
Travel expenses	Prospect	Prospect and two parents/legal guardians	
Off-campus contact starting point	July 1 after junior year of high school	April 15 of junior year (one contact at PSA's high school)	April 15 of junior year (two contacts at PSA's home, one contact at PSA's high school in months of April and May)
On-campus tryouts	Prohibited	Explore initiating tryouts with the following parameters: • Starting point: April 15 of the junior year of high school • During official visit only • Pre-tryout physical required • Up to 2 hours • May including testing and competition with team; only PSAs and S-As may participate • Tryouts must be closed and unpublicized	
		• On-campus or normal practice/competition site	• Most frequently used on-campus practice site
Communications with PSAs			
Types	Phone, email, fax only	The forms of communication would not be regulated	
Phone call frequency	• June 15 of sophomore year through July 31 of junior year of high school: 1 per month • August 1 prior to senior year of high school: Unlimited during contact period; two per week otherwise • JC and four-year PSAs: One call per week	Starting point: August 1 prior to the junior year of high school The frequency of phone calls would not be regulated	

mm—3/28/2011

Feature	Current	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
Recruiting calendar evaluations			
April and May	No evaluations permitted at non-scholastic events	• Permit evaluations at certified non-scholastic events on two weekends (Saturday-Sunday) in late April. Dates would change if conflicts with national testing dates for SAT/ ACT occur. • Modify certification requirements for non-scholastic events • Explore creation of evaluation camps as a pilot program. To be determined: - Site(s) - Numbers and ages of PSAs - Format - Management - Coaches ability to work camps - Cost	• No evaluations permitted in April. Focus of spring recruiting would be on contact.
July	Evaluations permitted at certified non-scholastic events during two 10-day evaluation periods	• Permit evaluations at certified non-scholastic events during a 9-day evaluation period consisting of the last three Fridays-Saturdays-Sundays • Modify certification requirements for non-scholastic events	• Permit evaluations at certified non-scholastic events during a 9-day evaluation period consisting of the last three Fridays-Saturdays-Sundays for a three-year period as a transition to evaluation camps • Modify certification requirements for non-scholastic events to require both an evaluation session and a skill instruction session
		• Explore creation of evaluation camps as a pilot program. To be determined: - Site(s) - Numbers and ages of PSAs - Format - Management - Coaches ability to work camps - Cost	

Illustration of Alternative Evaluation Model in NCAA Division I Men's Basketball and Related Issues

USAB to stage evaluation camps on two-weekends in April (or early May) and three weekends in July.

Invitation-based camps targeting collegiate prospects in the rising Junior and Senior high school classes. Expected participation of 1,000 student-athletes evenly divided between the two class levels (500 rising juniors and 500 rising seniors). Participating camp instructors/coaches and student-athletes would be selected by USAB or other partner organizations. Could include NCAA Division I college coaches with representation balanced so that all institutions have the opportunity to participate.

All expenses of participants would be paid, including travel. NCAA and conferences would underwrite it. No sponsorship or commercial involvement associated with the camps (clean venue concept) to avoid potential turf battles and conflict of interest issues.

Sites would be in proximity to major airport hubs, geographically balanced. Also consider using campus facilities to house athletes and conduct camps. Anticipate five sites with approximately 200 student-athletes assigned to each site.

Camp format would be similar to USAB U16 national team development camp.

Primary focus is basketball but also a limited opportunity for educational and rules messaging.

Camps would be operated as an alternative to other evaluation events but coaches could still participate in evaluation at certified events not part of the camp structure as long as they occur in the permissible evaluation window (two April and three July weekends).

USA BASKETBALL
2011 NATIONAL TEAM TRIALS SCHEDULE
(U16 FIBA Americas Championship)
May 26-30, 2011

U.S. Olympic Training Center-Colorado Springs, CO

SCHEDULE

Wednesday, May 25 Arrival of Lead Clinician, Coaching Staff and Support Staff

Thursday, May 26 Arrival of Athletes and Selection Committee

12:00-4:00p Registration - Sports Center 2

SKILLS TRAINING SESSION 1 (Sports Center 2) - closed
4:30-5:00p Orientation (parents and athletes)
5:00-6:30p Group 1 - Individual Skills Clinics/Position Work
Group 2 - Maximum Performance Session – West Wing
6:30-8:00p Group 2 - Individual Skills Clinics/Position Work
Group 1 - Maximum Performance Session – West Wing

Friday, May 27 **SKILLS TRAINING SESSION 2 (Sports Center 2) - closed**
8:30-10:00a Group 1 - Individual Skills Clinics/Position Work
Group 2 - USADA Information Session – West Wing
10:00-11:30a Group 2 - Individual Skills Clinics/Position Work
Group 1 - USADA Information Session – West Wing

SKILLS TRAINING SESSION 3 (Sports Center 2) - closed
1:00-2:30p Group 1 - Individual Skills Clinics/Position Work
Group 2 - Recruiting Information Session – West Wing
2:30-4:00p Group 2 - Individual Skills Clinics/Position Work
Group 1 - Recruiting Information Session – West Wing

TRIALS SESSION 1 (Sports Center 2)
5:00-6:30p Group 1 - Team Offense & Defense/Scrimmages
Group 2 - Parent Recruiting Session – West Wing
6:30-8:00p Group 2 - Team Offense & Defense/Scrimmages
Group 1 - Parent Recruiting Session – West Wing

Saturday, May 28 **TRIALS SESSION 2 (Sports Center 2)**

	8:30-10:00a	Group 1 - Position Work/Scrimmages
	10:00-11:30a	Group 2 - Position Work/Scrimmages
	TRIALS SESSION 3 (Sports Center 2)	
	1:00-2:30p	Group 1 - Position Work/Scrimmages
	2:30-4:00p	Group 2 - Position Work/Scrimmages
	TRIALS SESSION 4 (Sports Center 2)	
	5:00-6:30p	Group 1 - Position Work/Scrimmages
	6:30-8:00p	Group 2 - Position Work/Scrimmages
Sunday, May 29	**TRIALS SESSION 5 (Sports Center 2)**	
	9:00-9:15a	Stretching/Shooting
	9:15-10:45a	Scrimmages
	TRIALS SESSION 6 (Sports Center 2)	
	1:45-2:00p	Stretching/Shooting
	2:00-3:30p	Scrimmages
	TRIALS SESSION 7 (Sports Center 2)	
	5:45-6:00p	Stretching/Shooting
	6:00-7:30p	Scrimmages
Monday, May 30	**TEAM SESSION (Sports Center 2) - closed**	
	8:30 am	Announcement of U16 National Team
	9:30-11:00a	Team Meeting/Practice
	pm	Departure of Athletes, Coaches and Committee Members

REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I LEADERSHIP COUNCIL
FOCUS ON ACCESS AND SUCCESS WORKING GROUP
APRIL 4, 2011

The NCAA Division I Leadership Council Focus on Access and Success Working Group (ASWG) was asked to evaluate the current Division I men's basketball recruiting model and make recommendations relating to the appropriate access for college coaches to currently enrolled student-athletes, prospective student-athlete and parents. It should be noted that from the outset the consensus of the ASWG was that the state of the current men's basketball environment necessitates increased opportunities for the coaches to have increased access to the athletes and parents. The following is a summary of the group's specific discussions and recommendations.

1. **Access to Enrolled Student-Athletes**. The ASWG believes that coaches' access to currently enrolled men's basketball student-athletes should be increased to help address the current graduation rates, the alarming rate of transfers (estimated at forty percent) and the need to provide alternative modes of skill development during the summer months for the student-athletes. The ASWG concluded that the current model for access to enrolled student-athletes during the academic year was sufficient and appropriate and therefore, the group focused on ways to increase access to enrolled student-athletes during the summer months.

   In terms of access during the summer, the ASWG reviewed the provisions of NCAA Division I Proposal No. 2010-58-C, which mandates summer academic preparation and college acclimatization and that is currently pending NCAA Board of Directors action in April 2011. The ASWG strongly supported the athletics development activities portion of the proposal, which would permit weight training, conditioning and skill-related instruction during an eight-week period in the summer. With regard to the specific academic preparation and acclimatization requirements, the ASWG voiced support for the overarching concepts of the proposal and believed the proposal was a step in the right direction but noted the following concerns that should be addressed:

   - There was concern regarding the likelihood of academic success for those student-athletes in need of remediation and the potential "double-jeopardy" posed by requiring the student-athletes to pass a specific number of hours during summer school (three hours for incoming freshman and six hours for enrolled student-athletes). The working group discussed many facets of the hours requirement:

     - While noting the double-jeopardy consideration, there was also concern that only requiring a minimal number of hours to be passed may effectuate little in terms of strengthening academic requirements.

     - For those incoming freshman coming from high schools with terms that run late into June, requiring a significant number of credits would be a lot to accomplish in one term.

     - For continuing student-athletes, a six credit hour requirement is excessive. Some of the student-athletes may not be able to get courses in their major during the summer which puts schools in a situation where institutions are paying for classes that are not needed.

- Student-athletes must pass 18 credit hours applicable towards a degree every academic year. If they are required to take six credit hours every summer - with the expectation that the courses are substantive and moving the student-athlete towards graduation – some (most likely fifth -year seniors) may not have enough degree-applicable hours available their final year.

- There was concern about the significant costs that would be incurred by institutions as a result of the mandated summer school provisions. In addition to increased costs, there was discussion about the potential lack of resources in terms of academic support for some institutions during the summer months.

- The proposal currently links enrollment in the summer term to the ability to conduct athletics development activity and there is an eight-week maximum allowed for those activities. Many institutions have summer terms that span less than eight weeks or in some instances, student-athletes need more than one term of summer school.

- By allowing eight weeks of athletics development activity, there was concern that student-athletes may ultimately be required to be on campus the entire summer without the opportunity to have a break to return home.

- For those enrolled student-athletes who are not required to attend summer school based on satisfactory academic performance, those student-athletes may feel compelled to attend summer school simply because the majority of their teammates are attending and working out together.

2. **Access to Prospective Student-Athletes**. The ASWG determined that the following factors are critical in the analysis of access to prospects:

   - Earlier access is preferred;

   - College coaches need to be empowered to provide increased opportunities for access in order to compete with third parties;

   - Opportunities for college coaches to make contacts with prospects in the high school setting should be increased; and

   - Because third-party handlers attempt to curry favor from college coaches by paying for prospects and their families to make unofficial visits, the current official visit legislation needs modification in order to minimize the need for unofficial visits.

   The following chart summarizes the ASWG discussions relating to access to prospects:

Feature	Current	ASWG Proposed
Official visits		
Starting point	Senior year of high school.	• Junior year of high school (April or earlier).
Travel expenses	Prospect	• Prospect and at least one parent. Must define "parent."
Miscellaneous		• Extend the duration of visits to provide more opportunity for on-campus interaction.
Off-campus contact starting point	July 1 after junior year of high school.	• Junior year at PSA's high school (April or earlier).
On-campus tryouts	Prohibited	• On campus "evaluations" of prospects permitted in conjunction with OV. Do not use term "tryout." • Would necessitate an increase in access currently permitted to student-athletes or should not count against current limits. • Consider ways to minimize missed HS class time but permit full collegiate experience. • Closed/unpublicized. • Number of evaluations should be limited in some way.
Communication with PSAs		
Types	Phone, e-mail, fax only.	• Unregulated
Phone call frequency	• June 15 of sophomore year through July 31 of junior year of high school: 1 per month. • August 1 prior to senior year of high school: Unlimited during contact period; two per week otherwise. • 2-year institutions and four-year PSAs: One call per week	• Unregulated • Must establish talking points to emphasize need for deregulation and address concerns of SAAC.

Feature	Current	Proposed
Recruiting calendar evaluations		
April	No evaluations permitted at nonscholastic events.	• Permit evaluations at regionalized, nonscholastic skill instruction camps on two weekends (Saturday-Sunday) that would have to be certified by the NCAA. Dates would change if conflicts with national testing dates for SAT/ACT occur. In order to accommodate enhanced evaluation opportunities, a minimum amount of time during camp could be dedicated to actual competition but the emphasis must be on skill instruction. • An alternative model for April could include regionalized high school team camps that would have to be certified by the NCAA. • If legally permissible, a specific requirement for NCAA certification would be that event operators must make accessible all data and information pertaining to prospective student-athletes. • Any model needs to attempt to shorten the current nonscholastic season (March to July). For example, allow for the prospective student-athletes to have a break between the high school season and the nonscholastic season.
July	Evaluations permitted at certified nonscholastic events during two 10-day evaluation periods.	• Permit evaluations at nonscholastic events during an evaluation period. Number of days and specific periods to be determined but less than currently permitted. Consider ensuring some type of break during period. • If legally permissible, a specific requirement for NCAA certification would be that event operators must make accessible all data and information pertaining to prospective student-athletes.

NCAA Division I Leadership Council Men's Basketball Recruiting Subcommittee
Notes from March 22 Teleconference

1. Noted the subcommittee's focus was to examine the current men's recruiting culture and look for ways:

    - to meet the needs of both prospects and Division I coaches through appropriate and efficient access; and

    - to reduce off-campus recruiting travel for coaches.

2. Agreed that the subcommittee should also be cognizant that there are specific issues of importance to the various stakeholders in men's basketball:

    - Minimization of the negative outside influences;
    - Promotion of cost-efficient recruiting;
    - Prioritization of student-athlete (and coach) well-being; and
    - Maximization of opportunities for access by coaches to prospective student-athletes.

3. Also noted the importance of receiving men's basketball coaches input throughout this review process.

4. Identified the following concepts for more detailed discussion on its March 28 teleconference.

    - Reduce the July evaluation period (noted the last week generally is counterproductive to the recruiting process for both prospects and coaches).
    - Permit additional opportunities to observe prospects during the April contact period (perhaps during weekends in certified nonscholastic events).
    - Deregulate modes of communication, such as telephone calls and text messages.
    - Explore a tryout model to permit prospects to engage in activities during official visits with current student-athletes in the presence of coaching staff members.
    - Permit official visits during the junior year once the playing season has concluded.
    - Look for more effective uses of time in the recruiting process.
    - Permit greater involvement of the high school coaches/personnel and prospects' parents, including contact with the prospect at the high school during visits that occur during the evaluation period.
    - Permitting institutions greater flexibility in using off-campus recruiting opportunities (remove distinction between contacts and evaluations).
    - Permit institutions to pay for a prospect's parents to accompany the prospect on an official visit.

5. R.C. Johnson volunteered to represent the subcommittee at the NABC head coaches meeting Friday morning, April 1 in Houston at the site of the Final Four.

NCAA Division I Leadership Council Men's Basketball Recruiting Subcommittee
Notes from March 28 Teleconference

1. Noted that the final document developed by the NCAA Division I Leadership Council should emphasize clearly the goals and objectives of any proposed recommendations. Such goals/objectives include :

    - Providing increased opportunities for prospects to obtain relevant information so as to make more sound recruiting choices; thus, reducing the likelihood of transfer after collegiate enrollment.

    - Providing Division I basketball coaches increased opportunities to make more sound recruiting decisions consistent with missions of the coaches' institution.

    - Increasing the influence of Division I basketball coaches as well as the scholastic influences [as opposed to the non-scholastic influences] in the recruiting process.

    - Establishing a more effective and cost-efficient recruiting process.

2. Continued discussion regarding the previously identified concepts related to the charge of the subcommittee with increased focus on more effective use of recruiting time and resources. Among the concepts discussed included:

    - Providing greater opportunities for more direct access to prospects, while maintaining the 130 recruiting days that currently exist in men's basketball.

    - Increasing opportunities for more direct access with the prospect, the prospect's coach and/or parents/legal guardians during academic year evaluation periods.

    - Establishing some objective measure of academic readiness/preparedness that must be satisfied before an institution may expend recruiting funds to provide an official visit to a prospect.

3. Noted that there are distinct differences in the recruiting budgets in the approximately 125 programs that generally sign a Top 150 prospect and the approximately 225 programs that sign the remaining 850 plus prospects. Agreed that such differences must be considered when developing fair and equitable recommendations.

4. Developed a preliminary chart of possible options reflecting the previously identified concepts consistent with the subcommittee's charge. [See Attachment]

Basketball Recruiting Model Possible Options

Activity	Current	Possible Options
Official visits		
Starting point	Senior year of high school	• April 15 of junior year of high school • The first weekend after the Division I Men's Basketball Championship game of the junior year of high school • Establish benchmark academic requirements (e.g. grade-point average, core courses, standardized scholastic aptitude test on file) necessary to provide official visit. • Other?
Travel expenses	Prospect	• Prospect and one parent (or legal guardian) • Prospect and two parents (or legal guardians) • Other?
Initial Off-campus contact	July 1 after junior year of high school	• April of junior year (one contact at prospect's high school) [Note: The contact would be included in the limitations on the permissible number of contacts and/or recruiting opportunities, subject to potential changes in those areas] • Other?
Off-campus contact in conjunction with evalution	Prohibited during evaluation period	• Permit contact at the prospect's educational institution (except on the day of competition), provided scholastic authorities, parents/legal guardians are present and the prospect does not miss class. • Permit contact at the prospect's educational institution, provided scholastic authorities, parents/legal guardians are present and the prospect does not miss class; allow contact on the day of competition either after the competition has concluded or several hours in advance of the competition.

Activity	Current	Possible Options	

		• Provide greater flexibility to use recruiting opportunities, while maintaining the 130 recruiting days.
		  • Eliminate limitations on permissible number of contacts, while maintaining limits on recruiting opportunities per prospect;
		  • Eliminate contact and evaluation periods (other than dead periods), while maintaining limits on number of recruiting opportunities per prospect.
		• Other?	

On-campus tryouts	Prohibited in Division I Permitted in Division II **Division II** On-campus or normal practice/ competition site One tryout per PSA per institution Must be high school senior or older Typically after completion of season Pre-tryout physical Up to 2 hours May include testing and competition with team	One tryout permitted beginning April 15 (or the first weekend after the Division I men's basketball championship game) of the junior year of high school. Limitations to be determined:	
		NABC (Based on recommendations made in 2004) On-campus 6 tryouts per PSA 18 tryouts per institution Between first day of senior year classes and early NLI period, tryout may only occur during an official visit Following the season, tryout may occur during official or unofficial visit No missed class time for tryout Up to 2 hours Tryouts must be closed and unpublicized. Only PSAs and SAs may participate	**Additional Considerations** • Establishing limits on the number tryouts during unofficial visits. • Restricting tryouts on unofficial visits to April of the prospect's senior year in high school.

Activity	Current	Possible Options
Communication with PSAs		
Phone call/text messaging frequency	• June 15 of sophomore year through July 31 of junior year of high school: 1call per month/unlimited e-mail/no text messages. • August 1 prior to senior year of high school: Unlimited during contact period; two calls per week otherwise/unlimited e-mail/no text messages. • JC and four-year PSAs: One call per week/unlimited e-mail/no text messages.	• No limitations on phone calls/text messages after June 15 following sophomore year in high school • Other?
Recruiting calendar evaluations		

April	No evaluations permitted at non-scholastic events.	• Permit evaluations at certified non-scholastic events on two weekends (Saturday-Sunday) in late April. Dates would change if conflicts with national testing dates for SAT/ACT occur.
		• Increase recruiting-person days to be offset with a decrease in July evaluation period.
		• Create evaluation camps as either a pilot or full-blown program. To be determined:
		  • Site(s)
		  • Numbers and ages of PSAs
		  • Format
		  • Management (NCAA, USA Basketball, iHoops)
		  • Coaches ability to work camps
		  • Cost
		• Other?

Activity	Current	Possible Options

July	Evaluations permitted at certified non-scholastic events during two 10-day evaluation periods.	• Evaluations permitted at certified non-scholastic events during a 9-day evaluation period consisting of the last three Fridays-Saturdays-Sundays.
		• Establish one 10-day evaluation period and eliminate the last week in July.
		• Establish two five-day or two seven - day evaluation periods with an intervening dead period and eliminate the last week in July.
		• Modify certification requirements for non-scholastic events.
		• Create evaluation camps as either a pilot or full-blown program. To be determined:
		  • Site(s)
		  • Numbers and ages of PSAs
		  • Format
		  • Management (NCAA, USA Basketball, iHoops)
		  • Coaches ability to work camps
		  • Cost
		• Other?

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

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

www.ncaa.org

MEMORANDUM

February 3, 2011

To: NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet.

From: Rachel Newman Baker
NCAA Director of Agent, Gambling and Amateurism Activities.

SUBJECT: Definition of an Agent, Agent Contact Calendar (Football) and National Agent Registration Program.

The purpose of this memo is to outline three concepts for consideration by the cabinet:

1. Definition of an agent;
2. Agent Contact Calendar; and
3. National Agent Registration Program.

The first concept, redefining the definition of an agent, would broaden the current definition to include outside third parties who have been inserting themselves into student-athletes' lives and creating problems. The second concept, Agent Contact Calendar, would create legislated, permissible windows of agent contact with student-athletes with remaining eligibility. Finally, a national agent registration program would serve as a resource for institutions and allow agents contact with student-athletes based on the calendar. The concepts could be packaged together so that only agents that participate in the national registration program would have access via the contact calendar.

1. Definition of an Agent.

Outside third parties are actively recruiting and soliciting student-athletes and because they do not negotiate contracts with professional teams, they do not always trigger NCAA agent legislation. These individuals attach themselves to the student-athletes early in order to establish trust and build a relationship that will pay off when the student-athlete turns professional. Historically no one has had jurisdiction over their behavior so there is no accountability from the NCAA, professional leagues, professional players' associations, or state government agencies. The below proposed definition would cause these individuals to trigger the NCAA definition of an agent.

Definition of an agent: "Any person (including, but not limited to, a contract advisor, financial planner, marketing representative, runner, or any individual who is employed or associated with that person) who 1) represents directly or indirectly, any individual in the marketing of his/her athletics ability or reputation or, 2) seeks to represent or gain financially."

2. Agent Contact Calendar (Football).

The below agent contact calendar is built specific to the sport of football and utilizes three factors in its consideration: 1) length and timing of the college football playing and practice season; 2) time of heaviest contact between agents and football student-athletes; and 3) types of communication.

This calendar oversees the contact and non-contact periods that govern communications between football student-athletes and agents, takes into account the NFLPA junior rule, and only applies to seniors and draft-eligible juniors. Agents cannot have contact with first- or second-year players.

Contact is defined as any in-person meetings, phone calls, text messages, direct mail, social networking communication or any other forms of electronic communication.

WINTER CLASSES

Time Period: End of regular season to beginning of spring football.

- Unlimited contact for draft eligible student-athletes after the end of regular season until the beginning of spring football.
- Student-athletes with remaining eligibility must inform the institution of any in-person meetings prior to the meetings and provide the institution with the agent's contact information.
- Student-athletes receiving any type of communication (i.e., phone calls, text messages, direct mail or any other form of electronic communication) from an agent must inform the institution and provide the agent's contact information after the first initial contact.

SPRING FOOTBALL

Time Period: Beginning of spring football practice until the end of the spring football game.

- In-person contact is prohibited during this period.
- Contact by telephone calls, text messages, mail, e-mail, social networking and other forms of electronic communication shall be unrestricted.
- Student-athletes receiving any type of communication from an agent must inform the institution and provide the agent's contact information after the first initial contact.

- At the institution's discretion an agent forum can be held following the spring football game to allow student-athletes to meet and interview agents.

SPRING CLASSES

Time Period: End of spring football to the end of spring classes.

- Contact by telephone, text message, direct mail, e-mail and other forms of electronic communication shall be unrestricted. Student-athletes receiving any type of communication from an agent must inform the institution and provide the agent's contact information after the first initial contact.
- In-person contact shall be limited to one day during the week and unlimited during the weekends. The institution will determine the day during the week to allow agents on campus to conduct meetings with student-athletes.
- The student-athlete must inform the institution prior to any in-person weekend meetings.

SUMMER CLASSES

Time Period: End of spring classes to beginning of fall camp.

- Unlimited contact between student-athletes and agents.
- Student-athletes must inform the institution prior to any scheduled in-person meetings.
- Student-athletes receiving any type of communication from an agent must inform the institution and provide the agent's contact information after the first initial contact.

FALL CAMP

Time Period: Beginning of fall camp to end of fall camp.

- Contact by telephone, text, e-mail, mail, and other forms of electronic communication shall be limited to one day during the week and unlimited on the weekends.
- Student-athletes receiving any type of communication from an agent must inform the institution and provide the agent's contact information after the first initial contact.
- In-person contact is not permissible during fall camp. However, institutions can schedule agent days during fall camp for agents to present information to student-athletes.

REGULAR SEASON

Time Period: Period including week prior to first game through last regular season game.

- In-person contact shall be limited to one day a week. The institution will determine the day during the week to allow agents on campus to conduct meetings with student-athletes.
- All other contact shall be unlimited.

- Student-athletes receiving any type of communication from an agent must inform the institution and provide the agent's contact information after the first initial contact.

3. National Agent Registration Program

The primary purpose of this program would be to establish a program that can assist student-athletes and member institutions in education about agents/advisors for future professional careers. The national office would register all agents/advisors that wish to represent student-athlete's in their future professional athletics careers and could share pertinent information with member institutions.

The benefits of a national agent registration program would include:

a. A secure web-based system that would be easy for individuals to register;

b. The web-based system would create one central database to serve all member institutions with information about agents. Currently member institutions often have their own agent registration program in place but many do not have any registration programs and are unfamiliar with the agents. Player Association certification programs and state and federal law requirements would still apply;

c. Allow for a sharing of information with institutions, student-athletes, and parents through a secured, online website that would include, but not be limited to contact information, employee names/contact information, head shots, disciplinary actions taken against them, etc.;

d. Provide access to NCAA student-athletes via the recruiting contact calendar to those agents that register with the national program;

e. Allow for a direct link to interviewing agents that may be involved in an institutional or NCAA investigation. For example, a condition of registration could include availing oneself to interviews and providing documents when requested; and

f. Direct education on NCAA rules can be provided to individuals that register.

RNB:esb

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

Participants: April 19, 2011

Mike Alden, University of Missouri – Leadership Council
Sarah Bobert, Marquette University – Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet
Carolyn Callahan, University of Virginia – Academic Cabinet
Rob Halvaks, Big West Conference – Administration Cabinet
Scott Krapf – Division I Student-Advisory Committee
Shane Lyons, Atlantic Coast Conference –Legislative Council
Mike Rogers, Baylor University – Amateurism Cabinet
Judy Rose, University of North Carolina, Charlotte – Championships/Sports Management Cabinet
Jacqueline Campbell, NCAA – recording secretary

Petrina Long, University of California, Los Angeles – Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet, was unable to participate on the call.

NCAA staff: David Berst, Shauna Cobb, Angie Cretors, Jennifer Daniels, Lynn Holzman, Michelle Hosick, Kayla McCulley, Rachel Newman, Jobrina Perez, Carol Reep, Kris Richardson, Alex Smith, Jennifer Strawley, Sharon Tufano, Katie Willet and Leeland Zeller also participated on the call.

The conference call was called to order at 1:02 p.m. by Jacqueline Campbell. All were present as noted above.

1. **Report of the Committee's November 30, 2010, Conference Call.** The committee approved the report of its November 30, 2010, conference call.

2. **Key Items from the February/March/April Division I Governance Meetings.** The committee received a report of the key items from the February/March/April cabinet and council meetings.

   a. **Legislative Council** – The committee received the following information regarding actions of the Legislative Council during its April 11-12, 2011, meeting:

      (1) Non-Coaching Staff Limitations – The Council tabled three proposals that would have established limits on the number of non-coaching personnel in the sports of football, and men's and women's basketball. The Council agreed that

there should be limits on non-coaching personnel; however, it expressed concern as to whether the proposals, as written, can effectively address the concerns related to the proliferation of non-coaching sport-specific personnel.

(2) Student-Athlete Likeness – The Council tabled Proposal No. 2010-26 as amended by 2010-26-3, which would have modified the legislation related to the use of a student-athlete's name and likeness for promotions and advertisements. The Council will seek membership feedback and will review the proposal again in October.

(3) Board of Directors Resolution – The Council developed several concepts that will be shared with the Board of Directors in response to the April 2010 Board Resolution regarding the Division I legislative cycle. Two concepts that will be shared are: (a) Changing the legislative cycle to a two-year overlapping cycle where specified bylaws will be included in alternate-year cycles, and (b) Increasing the requisite number of requests necessary to call for an override vote from 30 to 75, to suspend legislation from 100 to 125, and for FCS-only issues from 15 to 25.

b. Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet – During its February meeting, the cabinet reviewed financial aid data that would assist with its examination of maximum grant-in-aid limitations, and head count and equivalency sport designations. In June, the cabinet plans to review additional statistical data along with feedback from the membership as it considers how amending financial aid legislation may impact Title IX and participation levels.

3. Key Items on the Division I Agenda. The committee received the following information regarding several key items on the Division I agenda:

a. Academics. During its February meeting, the Academic Cabinet continued its review of possible changes to the 2-4 transfer requirements. The cabinet reviewed feedback regarding its initial draft concepts and modified those concepts to provide greater clarity in application. The cabinet has circulated the modified concepts to the NCAA membership and two-year college community for additional feedback. The committee was informed that the cabinet prefers the recommendations be reviewed as a package, inasmuch as together, the components of the package develop minimum standards that reflect the academic preparation needed to succeed academically at a Division I institution. The package also provides student-athletes, who are academically underprepared when enrolling at a two-year college, sufficient time to meet 2-4

transfer requirements. The cabinet plans to sponsor legislation for membership consideration in the 2011-12 legislative cycle.

b. **Men's Basketball Recruiting**. In January, the Leadership Council began its review of men's basketball recruiting with presentations from representatives of the Black Coaches and Administrators (BCA), Collegiate Commissioner Association (CCA), iHoops, National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC) and National Federation of High Schools (NFHS). Following the January meeting, two subcommittees of the Leadership Council were formed and met via conference call several times in March. The Council was provided a status report during its April 4 meeting in Houston, Texas where the group heard presentations from several current and former Division I head men's basketball coaches, the executive director of the NABC, two non-scholastic event operators and two Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) members. The Council also received feedback from 20 Division I and Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) commissioners and head men's basketball coaches from those conferences, as well as recruiting model alternatives developed by conference office administrators with compliance and men's basketball backgrounds from the Group of Six conferences. Moving forward, the two subcommittees will continue to meet with an expected joint meeting of the two groups in July. The Leadership Council will meet again in July/August and will begin to develop a men's basketball recruiting model for consideration by the Board of Directors during its October meeting. It is anticipated that the Board will sponsor legislation in the 2011-12 legislative cycle that would create a new men's basketball recruiting model.

c. **Agents**. The Amateurism Cabinet continued its discussions regarding agents during its February meeting. The cabinet considered the following concepts:

(1) Definition of an Agent. The cabinet is considering a new definition that would broaden the current definition of an agent and would include outside third parties who have been inserting themselves into the lives of prospective and enrolled student-athletes.

(2) Agent Contact Calendar for the Sport of Football. This calendar would regulate the contact and non-contact periods that govern communications between football student-athletes and agents, taking into account the National Football League Players Association (NFLPA) junior rule. It was noted that there does not appear to be much support for this type of calendar.

(3) National Agent Registration Program. This program would assist student-athletes and member institutions with education regarding agents/advisors as they pursue opportunities for professional sports careers.

4. Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Update. Scott Krapf, chair of the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC), reported on his participation in men's basketball recruiting discussions during the April 4 Leadership Council meeting. He also noted that the Division I SAAC has had ongoing discussions regarding the following:

- Proposal No. 2010-26 related to the use of student-athletes' names and likenesses in promotions and advertisements;
- Ways to better communicate with high-profile men's basketball student-athletes as they seek feedback regarding men's basketball recruiting;
- SAAC awards of excellence;
- A division-wide community service project, and
- The Capitol One Cup and how it may be better structured.

5. Proposed Future Call Dates. The staff noted that the next call of the committee would follow the June cabinet and July/August Leadership Council meetings. Calendars will be sent to committee members to determine availability.

6. Adjournment. The call was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.