

AGENDA

National Collegiate Athletic Association

Division I Communications and Coordination Committee

Conference call

Dial-in Number: 1-888-363-4734

Access Code: 2518317

May 11, 2012

2 p.m. Eastern time

1. Welcome and opening remarks.
2. Report of the NCAA Division I Communications and Coordination Committee November 30, 2011, conference call. (Supplement No. 1)
3. Update on NCAA Presidential Retreat Initiatives. (Supplement No. 2)
4. Rules Working Group Update -- Role of the NCAA Division I Cabinets. (Supplement Nos. 3A, 3B and 3C)
5. Other business.
6. Adjournment.

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

ACTION ITEMS.

- None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Report of the Committee's August 16, 2011, Conference Call.** The committee approved the report of its August 16, 2011, conference call.
2. **Key Items from the September 2011, Division I Cabinet and October Legislative Council Meetings.** The committee received a report of the key items from the September 2011, cabinet and October Legislative Council meetings.
 - a. **Administration Cabinet** – During its September meeting, the cabinet reviewed and approved the new online override voting process, which is modeled after the voting session process that occurred during the Division I Business Session at the annual NCAA Convention. The process will allow for a discussion period consistent with the one that occurred prior to the vote on the Convention floor. All active Division I and affiliate members of the Association (e.g., coaches associations) will have the opportunity to participate in the discussion period, as they did when the vote was conducted in person. The discussion period will be followed by the voting period, in which only active Division I members may participate. The online voting process is being used for the first time this fall as Division I conducts an override vote on Proposal No. 2009-100-A.
 - b. **Legislative Council.** During its October meeting, the Legislative Council reviewed proposals in the 2011-12 legislative cycle through three key lenses developed by the Rules Working Group: (1) Is the rule meaningful and of consequence...is it an issue that merits a national regulation or can it simply be addressed by institutions/conferences/coaches associations? Is it really necessary? (2) Is the rule enforceable.. does it present significant challenges either in monitoring compliance as well as proving violations?, and (3) Does the rule support the success of the student-athlete, academically and/or athletically? When developing its initial position on the proposals in the 2011-12 legislative cycle, the Legislative Council indicated an intent to table a number of the proposals that did not appear to meet the test of the three lenses.

3. **Guiding Principles.** Mark Hollis, chair of the Amateurism Cabinet, reported that during discussions at its September meeting, the Amateurism Cabinet noted that a number of the guiding principles established by that cabinet could, and probably should, apply to all Division I cabinets. It was noted that the work of several of the Presidential Retreat Working Groups involve developing principles that align with the Association's enduring values. It was the sense of the group that once the working groups complete their work, the cabinets can reevaluate their guiding principles to ensure they are consistent and align with the enduring values of the Association.
4. **Update on NCAA Presidential Retreat Initiatives.** The committee received an update on actions taken by the Board of Directors during its October meeting, as well as a report regarding plans for the working groups going forward and the involvement of the Division I cabinets and councils.
 - a. **Actions Taken by the Board of Directors.**
 - (1) **NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance.**
 - (a) **Initial-Eligibility Standards.** The Board adopted legislation that would increase initial-eligibility requirements, resulting in more rigorous academic standards for competition than for practice and receipt of athletically related financial aid. The Board approved an increase to the standard for immediate access to competition to a 2.300 grade-point average and an increased sliding scale. Incoming student-athletes will need to earn a test score/grade-point average that is set at approximately one-half standard deviation below the national student body mean. Student-athletes who achieve the current minimum initial-eligibility standard on the test score/grade-point average sliding scale, with at least a minimum 2.000 core course grade-point average, will continue to be eligible for athletically related financial aid during the first year of enrollment and practice during the first regular academic term of enrollment. Student-athletes can earn the opportunity to practice in the second term by passing nine-semester or eight-quarter hours. The Board approved a requirement that prospects successfully complete 10 of the 16 total required core courses before the start of their senior year in high school. Seven of the 10 successfully completed courses must be in English, math and science. These new requirements are effective for students first entering college full time August 1, 2015, or after.
 - (b) **Two-Year College Transfer Requirements.** The Board adopted legislation to increase the transferable grade-point average from 2.000 to

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

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

(2) **Student-Athlete Well Being Working Group.**

- (a) **Cost of Attendance.** The Board adopted legislation that would permit a Division I student-athlete who has received institutional financial aid equal to the value of a full grant-in-aid (i.e., tuition and fees, room and board and required course-related books) to receive additional athletically related financial aid up to the value of the institution's "cost of attendance," or up to \$2,000, whichever is less. The Board decided not to revisit this amount for three years.
- (b) **Multiyear Grant-in-Aid.** The Board adopted legislation that would permit athletics aid, up to the permissible limits, to be awarded for a period beyond the minimum of one academic year, up to the date the student-athlete exhausts eligibility to compete in all sports.

- (c) **Team Financial Aid Limits.** The Board adopted legislation to provide that only athletically-related aid will be counted toward team limits in equivalency sports.
 - (d) **Eligibility for Aid: Former Student-Athletes.** The Board adopted legislation, effective immediately, to eliminate financial aid eligibility restrictions (five years of aid within a six-year period) to permit institutions to provide athletics aid to former student-athletes who remain at, or return to, the institution to complete their baccalaureate degree requirements.
 - (3) **Rules Working Group.** The Board endorsed a resolution that summarizes the concepts and direction outlined by the working group as they move forward with their evaluation of the rules.
 - b. **Plans Moving Forward.** The committee was informed that the Rules Working Group has developed a communication plan that includes conducting feedback gathering sessions (e.g., teleconferences) with various constituent groups. Following the initial outreach, the working group will focus on gathering feedback on specific principles and or proposals, particularly any that are generated from the group's December meeting. The working group plans to use the February cabinet meetings as an opportunity to gather additional comments on principles/proposals developed specific to bylaws for which the cabinets have oversight responsibility.
5. **Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Update.** Katie Willett, staff liaison to the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC), reported on the committee's November 18-20, 2011, meeting in Indianapolis. It was noted that along with the regular review of legislative proposals, the Division I SAAC discussed the following:
- Text messaging and other forms of communication used in the recruiting process;
 - A division-wide community service project; and
 - An initiative aimed at creating an increased awareness of SAAC and how to better insert the voice of student-athletes at all levels of governance activity (i.e., campus, conference, national).

Committee Chair: Michael Alden, University of Missouri

Staff Liaison: Jacqueline Campbell, Division I Governance

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

I. Division I Reform Efforts Overview

Contact: Amy Dunham at adunham@ncaa.org

- Coming out of an August 2011 retreat, Division I presidents created and charged working groups to affect change in the areas of student-athlete well-being, academics, NCAA bylaws, enforcement/penalties and fiscal sustainability.
- The reform effort is intended to move both thoughtfully and expeditiously. The working groups are listening to membership feedback, and have set up a website to share materials and collect feedback at NCAA.org/workinggroups.
- The working groups are presidentially led and include coaches, athletics directors, faculty, conference representatives, compliance administrators, representatives of affiliate organizations and student-athletes.

Enforcement Working Group

Contact: Laura McNab at lwurtz@ncaa.org

- Purpose: Make the enforcement process more efficient (process cases faster) and more effective (institute strong penalties that are more predictable).
- Current recommendations: a four-level (instead of two) violation structure; more Committee on Infractions (COI) members serving on panels vs. the entire COI hearing every case; a penalty structure with guidelines for imposing core penalties. Membership is requested to visit NCAA.org/workinggroups to review/comment on the recommendations.
- Upcoming timeline: May-June: working group and its liaisons will meet with conferences, affiliated groups and member institutions seeking additional feedback on refined proposals for the Aug. 2012 Board meeting, with a majority of the recommendations having an effective date of Aug. 2013.

Rules Working Group

Contact: Lynn Holzman at lholtzman@ncaa.org or Dave Schnase at dschnase@ncaa.org

- Purpose: To review and amend the DI Manual to reduce unenforceable and inconsequential rules that fail to support NCAA enduring values, and focus on those that are meaningful, enforceable and supportive of student-athlete success.
- The legislative process also will be modified so future rule changes meet this standard as well.
- In March, the working group posted the first series of materials (including concepts on Bylaws 11 (Athletics Personnel), 13 (Recruiting) and 16 (Awards and Benefits)) for membership comment at NCAA.org/workinggroups.
- In May, the second round of materials (Bylaws 12 (Amateurism) & 14 (Eligibility)) was posted. Action plans are being developed for Bylaws 15 (Financial Aid) and 17 (Playing and Practice Seasons).

Resource Allocation Working Group

Contact: Kathleen McNeely at kmcneely@ncaa.org

- The majority of recommendations from the resource allocation group were defeated by the Board of Directors. However, the Championships/Sports Management Cabinet will study appropriate numbers of competitions in each sport and the rules group will address non-coaching personnel limits.

Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group

Contact: David Berst at dberst@ncaa.org

Miscellaneous Expense Allowance

- Purpose: To assist student-athletes in meeting the full cost-of-attendance not covered by the current NCAA financial aid model, which covers tuition, room, board, and required books and fees but not the additional miscellaneous expenses (non-required books, travel, etc.) to attend college. No school is required to offer the benefit.
- The DI Board of Directors is committed to allowing schools to voluntarily enhance the grant-in-aid to cover additional educationally related expenses above the full grant.
- The working group is seeking feedback at NCAA.org/workinggroups on several possible options, including a need-based option or an institutional supplement to its Student Athlete Opportunity Fund. The eventual implementation solution will consider Title IX and applying the legislation in equivalency sports.

Multiyear scholarships

- This provision was adopted by the Board in October. This legislation was part of the override process, but did not receive the requisite override votes to be defeated and remains effective for the 2012-13 year.
- The National Letter of Intent signing periods in 2011-12 have included offers of multi-year grants for 2012-13 and renewals in the summer of 2012 for returning student-athletes may include them as well.
- Allowing schools to award scholarships for more than one year is intended to address student-athlete well-being.
- The conditions for nonrenewal or cancellation of a scholarship are unchanged – an institution may cancel a scholarship for poor academic performance, disciplinary matters, etc. As before, schools may also include specific non-athletic conditions in the scholarship agreement.
- The agreement does not prohibit student-athletes from transferring, subject to existing transfer rules.

II. AcademicsContact: Jennifer Strawley at jstrawley@ncaa.org or Diane Dickman at ddickman@ncaa.org

The DI Board of Directors adopted in October a package of proposals that emphasize the primacy of academics, including a minimum academic expectation for postseason competition, increased initial eligibility standards and increased two-year college transfer requirements.

Academic Progress Rate (APR)

- In August, the DI Board of Directors set the minimum academic standard for postseason participation as a 930 APR, which predicts roughly a 50 percent graduation success rate.
- The new postseason eligibility structure takes effect in the 2012-13 academic year, with a two-year phase-in before the benchmark moves from 900 to 930. For 2012-13 and 2013-14, teams must achieve a 900 multi-year APR or a 930 average for the most recent two years to be eligible for postseason play.
- In 2014-15, teams that don't achieve the 930 benchmark for their four-year APR or at least a 940 average for the most recent two years will be ineligible. In 2015-16, the 930 benchmark for postseason competition participation – and additional penalties – will be implemented fully.
- The APR requirement for postseason participation would be waived only in extraordinary circumstances.

Initial Eligibility

- New initial eligibility standards establish a higher standard for competition in a student-athlete's first year of enrollment based on demonstrated academic success in high school.
- Student-athletes who achieve the current minimum eligibility standard will be eligible for financial aid during the first year of enrollment and practice during the first term.
- To compete as a freshman, incoming student-athletes must achieve a higher GPA and test score combination
- Prospects must earn 10 of the 16 total required core courses before their senior year.
- In order to educate prospective student-athletes on the change, the legislation will take effect no earlier than Aug. 2016.

Two-four transfer rules

- Data show that two-year college transfer student-athletes have difficulties meeting Division I academic expectations. In aggregate, these student-athletes graduate at lower rates and exhibit significantly lower APRs.
- Under new rules that go into effect in August 2012, two-year college transfers must achieve a 2.5 transferrable GPA and transfer only two PE activity courses.
- Student-athletes who don't qualify academically out of high school also will be required to complete a core curriculum of English, math and science courses.
- The "academic year in readiness" concept, which would allow student-athletes to receive aid and practice at the two-year institution (but not compete) while delaying the start of their five-year clock, has been tabled.

III. Athletics CertificationContact: Troy Arthur at tarthur@ncaa.org

- Athletics certification will become the Division I Institutional Performance Program (IPP) in 2013. The new process will be less expensive, less burdensome and provide more practical application for schools.
- The program will use data already submitted to the NCAA from each institution to create an annual report card through which an institution can compare itself with like institutions in the areas of academics, student-athlete experience, fiscal management and inclusion (gender and ethnicity).
- For institutions that are below an identified measurement, resources will be identified to assist. Possible resources include: best practices; an NCAA staff visit; and supplemental funds.

IV. Override processContact: Jackie Campbell at jgcampbell@ncaa.org

- DI conducted its first online override vote in December 2011 with Administration Cabinet oversight.
- The online process mirrors the Convention process: a comment period during which active and affiliate DI members can comment and discuss, followed by a voting period for every active DI institution and conference in good standing.
- To override legislation, 62.5% of the votes cast by eligible institutions and conferences must support an override.
- Like at the Convention, results are not released until the polls are closed.
- The Administration Cabinet will review the timeline, fairness and efficiency of the online process in June 2012 and make appropriate recommendations for changes to the Board of Directors in the fall.

NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model – Rules

**Update from NCAA Division I Board of Directors and
Presidential Advisory Group Joint Meeting
April 2012**

The NCAA Division I Board of Directors and Presidential Advisory Group spent a considerable portion of their agendas discussing key concepts from the NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model – Rules, and were very supportive of your work. Presidents Barker and Upham were able to help lead these discussions with their presidential colleagues.

- Support for national rules governing Division I athletics that are meaningful, enforceable and contribute to students' success.
- Support for redefining competitive equity in terms of fairness of competition. The presidents acknowledged the challenges inherent in this approach, but noted how critical it is in terms of making real change in the regulatory culture.
- Agreement with approach to define the Division I collegiate model through commitments. And, the need to tie bylaws that are more outcome/value-based and less prescriptive to these commitments.
- Agreed that in some instances, development and implementation of institutional policies and procedures may be the most appropriate way to address certain regulatory requirements. Schools will need help in making sure the policies are comprehensive and reflect appropriate values.
- Noted that in a new regulatory environment compliance professionals should focus more attention on issues of most significance in supporting the collegiate model.
- Support for timeline outlined and the measured approach being taken by the Rules Working Group. (Recognition of need to strike a balance with soliciting feedback from membership and governance structure while maintaining momentum for change.)
- Recognized that while there is agreement that the current regulatory culture needs to change, there will be disagreement in the membership on how aggressive these changes need to be, and what specifically needs to change. It will be important for the Rules Working Group to reflect on the commitments and values in recommending appropriate legislative changes to the Board that will make meaningful changes in the regulatory culture.
- Requested materials to help them advance the key principles and ideas with their conference colleagues and campus personnel.



NCAA WORKING GROUP ON COLLEGIATE MODEL - RULES

UPDATE
APRIL 2012



OVERVIEW

- Anticipated timeline.
- Summary of the feedback thus far.
- Examples of a few concepts.
- Key points.
- Successful Outcomes.



TIMELINE

- Spring/Summer/Early Fall-
 - Emphasis on outreach and education plan.
- October 2012 or January 2013-
 - Recommendations.
- August 2013-
 - Effective date of any new proposals.



FEEDBACK

- Commitments are clear and reasonable.
- Competitive equity.
 - Fair competition vs. financial or other natural advantages.
 - Examples - maximum number of contests, maximum number of scholarships and rules that protect the amateur model.



POSSIBLE NEW FRAMEWORK

- Commitments
- Preamble.
- General provisions.
- Operating bylaws.



EXAMPLE NO. 1

BYLAW 13

- Recruiting materials.
 - Deregulate printed recruiting materials either by eliminating the rule entirely or, in the alternative, prohibit sending or providing prospective student-athletes any recruiting materials other than general correspondence.
 - Three alternatives being discussed:
 1. Deregulate completely and permit any and all materials;
 2. Prohibit all recruiting materials; or
 3. Permit only those materials produced for all prospective students by the admissions office.



EXAMPLE NO. 1

BYLAW 13

- Printed recruiting materials.
 - Three alternatives being discussed:
 1. Deregulate completely and permit any and all materials;
 2. Prohibit all recruiting materials; or
 3. Permit only those materials produced for all prospective students by the admissions office.



EXAMPLE NO. 2

BYLAW 16

- Permit any academic support, career counseling or personal development expenses that an institution determines to be reasonable.
 - Institutional autonomy.
 - Individualized approach.
 - Costs?
 - Reasonable?



KEY POINTS

- Core values.
- Membership feedback.
- Deregulation **AND** additional scrutiny.
- Policies and procedures implemented at the local level.
- Institutional autonomy - and shared responsibility.
- Presidential leadership.



SUCCESSFUL OUTCOMES

- Clearer understanding of expectations of appropriate roles, responsibilities and behaviors of everyone involved in intercollegiate athletics.
- NCAA rules will be viewed as value-based, meaningful, enforceable and supportive of the collegiate model of sport.
- NCAA rules to have primary focus on principle-based "outcomes."
- Increased public confidence that rules are important and critical to maintaining the integrity of collegiate sports.



SUCCESSFUL OUTCOMES

- Willful violations of NCAA rules will be viewed as serious and problematic, with appropriate and proportionate penalties to be assessed in as timely a manner as possible.
- Coaches will have greater "ownership" of rules that govern their conduct, and therefore, should be more likely to comply.
- Increase in "shared responsibility" for compliance with rules from all parties.



SUCCESSFUL OUTCOMES

- Reduction in administrative burden on compliance systems with better focus on monitoring and evaluating critical principles and rules.
- Significant reduction in size of rule book.
- System is strengthened so that any future changes to rules are limited to those rules deemed meaningful, supporting student success and enforceable.
- Streamlined and more efficient cabinet/committee structure moving forward.



Questions or Comments?



The image features the NCAA logo in white, bold, italicized capital letters, centered on a blue sphere. The sphere is set against a dark blue background with abstract, lighter blue geometric shapes and lines radiating from the right side, creating a sense of motion and depth.

NCAA®

NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model - Rules
Overview of How Modified Timeline Impacts Existing Governance Structure and Legislative Calendar

The modifications to the NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model - Rules timeline have provided the opportunity for the Rules Working Group to align itself with scheduled governance meetings and the familiar legislative schedule. The following outlines how if the Rules Working Group agrees on recommendations out of a July teleconference, the governance structure and membership's existing legislative review and discussion periods positions the Rules Working Group and NCAA Division I Board of Directors to take action on legislative recommendations in January 2013.

| Time Period and Key Dates | Items of Focus | How Current Governance Meetings and Legislative Calendar Coincides with Rules Working Group Timeline |
|---|--|--|
| May 3 | Rules Working Group teleconference. | |
| May 7 through June 29, 2012. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conference Meetings. Governance Meetings. NCAA Regional Rules Seminars. | Additional outreach on concepts in NCAA Bylaw 11 (athletics personnel), Bylaw 13 (recruiting) and Bylaw 16 (awards, benefits and expenses) that require additional discussion. Outreach with membership to collect feedback on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bylaw 12 (amateurism). Bylaw 14 (eligibility). | June cabinet meetings. Review Rules Working Group legislative concepts and provide feedback. |
| July. | Rules Working Group teleconference. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreement on legislative recommendations for consideration. Key insights on Bylaw 12 (amateurism) and Bylaw 14 (eligibility) and other items sent to the membership for feedback. Finalize plans for Bylaw 15 (financial aid) and Bylaw 17 (playing and practice seasons) reviews after receiving cabinet input. | July 15: Legislation submission deadline for NCAA Division I conference and cabinets. Due to moratorium, no legislative proposals may be submitted for the 2012-13 cycle. |
| July through early August. | | Staff drafts and develops legislative proposals based on Rules Working Group recommendations. |
| <i>August 2, 2012, Board of Directors Meeting.</i> | <i>Progress report; no legislative action anticipated.</i> | |
| August 15. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rules Working Group legislative recommendations in proposal format are made available to governance structure and membership in online publication. Proposals forwarded to cabinets for review and comment. |

| Time Period and Key Dates | Items of Focus | How Current Governance Meetings and Legislative Calendar Coincides with Rules Working Group Timeline |
|---|---|--|
| September through December. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued outreach and communication. Review of legislative proposals. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet review and development of positions on proposals in Bylaw 11 (athletics personnel), Bylaw 12 (amateurism), Bylaw 13 (recruiting), Bylaw 14 (eligibility) and Bylaw 16 (awards, benefits and expenses). Cabinets provide feedback on concepts for Bylaw 15 (financial aid) and Bylaw 17 (playing and practice seasons). Conferences typically meet during this period of time to review and develop positions on legislative proposals in preparation for a January Legislative Council vote. |
| October 15-16 Legislative Council Meeting. | | Review and develop positions on legislative proposals. |
| October Leadership Council Meeting. | Review recommendations and provide input. | |
| <i>October 30 Board of Directors Meeting.</i> | <i>Receive report of Rules Working Group. Possibly endorse recommendations. No legislative action anticipated.</i> | |
| January 15-16, 2013, Legislative Council Meeting. | | Review and develop final positions on legislative proposals to be considered by the Board. |
| January 17, 2013 Leadership Council Meeting. | Review recommendations and provide input. | |
| January 18, 2013, NCAA Convention Division I Business Session. | Opportunity for membership to discuss and debate legislative recommendations in forum setting. | |
| <i>* January 19, 2013, Board of Directors Meeting.</i> | <i>Legislative action anticipated on Rules Working Group recommendations for Commitments and Bylaw 11 (athletics personnel), Bylaw 12 (amateurism), Bylaw 13 (recruiting), Bylaw 14 (eligibility) and Bylaw 16 (awards, benefits and expenses).</i> | |
| <i>TBD Board of Directors Meeting.</i> | <i>Legislative action anticipated on Bylaw 15 (financial aid) and Bylaw 17 (playing and practice seasons).</i> | |

**Fall/winter Rules Working Group meeting to review re-written bylaws and draft legislative proposals related to Bylaw 12 (amateurism) and Bylaw 14 (eligibility).*

**REPORT OF
THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
DIVISION I COMMUNICATIONS AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE (CCC)
MAY 11, 2012, CONFERENCE CALL**

ACTION ITEMS.

- None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Report of the Committee's November 30, 2011, Conference Call.** The committee approved the report of its November 30, 2011, conference call.
2. **Update on NCAA Presidential Retreat Initiatives.** The committee was reminded of the work completed to date by the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance and several of the Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Working Groups (i.e., Student-Athlete Well Being, Resource Allocation, Enforcement). It was noted that the concept of a miscellaneous expense allowance continues to be supported by the NCAA Division I Board of Directors. The Student-Athlete Well-Being Working group has circulated to the membership and various constituent groups three possible options for this type of educational expense allowance. The working group will evaluate the feedback prior to making a final recommendation to the Board of Directors. The Resource Allocation Working Group essentially has completed its work, with the issues of the appropriate number of contests/competition in each sport and noncoaching personnel limitations being referred to the Rules Working Group in its examination of Bylaws 17 (Playing and Practice Seasons) and 11 (Conduct and Employment of Athletics Personnel). The Enforcement Working Group continues its work in creating a multi-level NCAA rules violation structure, an enhanced penalty structure for NCAA rules infractions and re-establishing a sense of shared responsibility among the interested individuals and entities in intercollegiate athletics.
3. **Rules Working Group Update – Roles of the NCAA Division I Cabinets.** The committee was informed of the extended timeline for the work of the Rules Working Group to allow for coordination with all the presidential working groups and extensive education, outreach and consensus-building within the membership. The extended timeline will allow for comprehensive feedback from the Division I cabinets and other governance groups with areas of expertise. As the cabinets meet in June and September, the chairs are reminded to encourage cabinet members to review the proposed commitments and corresponding concepts with the goal of creating rules that are meaningful, enforceable and supportive of student-athlete success. It was noted that the working group plans to present

recommendations to the Board of Directors in October 2012 or January 2013, depending on membership feedback received through the spring and summer.

Committee Chair: Michael Alden, University of Missouri

Staff Liaison: Jacqueline Campbell, Division I Governance

| Division I Communications and Coordination Committee May 11, 2012, Teleconference | |
|---|--|
| ATTENDEES | ABSENTEES |
| William Chaves, Eastern Washington University, Administration Cabinet | Mike Alden, University of Missouri, Leadership Council |
| Sarah Bobert, Marquette University – Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet | Mark Hollis, Michigan State University, Amateurism Cabinet |
| Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Ivy League, Legislative Council | |
| Eugene Daniels, Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee | |
| Herman Holt, University of North Carolina, Asheville, Academic Cabinet | |
| Ian McCaw, Baylor University, Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet | |
| Judy Rose, University of North Carolina, Charlotte, Championships/Sports Management Cabinet | |
| Jacqueline Campbell, NCAA, recording secretary | |
| Other NCAA staff members who participated on the teleconference: Lynn Holzman, Michelle Hosick, Jobrina Perez, Carol Reep, Kris Richardson, Dave Schnase, Alex Smith, Danielle Teetzel, Katie Willett and Leeland Zeller. | |