A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association
Division I Leadership Council

Indianapolis Marriott Downtown — August 2, 2011
Indianapolis, Indiana — 8 a.m. to 3 p.m.

1. Welcome and introductions.

2. Division I Governance Update.

   a. Report of the April 4, 2011, Leadership Council meeting. [Supplement No. 1] [**Anticipated Action Item**]

   b. Reports of the April 11-12, 2011, Legislative Council meeting and the July 14, 2011 teleconference. [Supplement No. 2A] [Supplement No. 2B will be posted subsequent to the July 14 teleconference.]

   c. Report of the April 28, 2011, Board of Directors meeting. [Supplement No. 3]

   d. Key/Action Items from the June Division I cabinet meetings. [Supplement No. 4] [**Anticipated Action Item**]

   e. Update from the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

3. Preview of October agenda item: conference and institutional networks.

4. Transgender Student-Athlete Presentation. [Supplement No. 5] [Karen Morrison, NCAA director of gender inclusion, and Mary Wilfert, NCAA associate director of health and safety to present the information.)

5. Discussion of men's basketball recruiting model. [Supplement Nos. 6A, 6B and 6C] [**Anticipated Action Item**]

6. Discussion of agent activities. [Supplement No. 7]

7. Other items of business.

8. Adjournment.

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. 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

ADDENDUM
SUPPLEMENT NO. 1
DI Leadership Council 08/11

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
Kathleen Batterson, Colonial Athletic Association (alternate)
Karl Benson, Western Athletic Conference (alternate)
Morgan Burke, Purdue University, Big Ten Conference
Sandy Barbour, University of California, Berkeley, Pacific-10 Conference
Peg Bradley-Doppes, University of Denver, Sun Belt 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.

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MEETING APRIL 11-12, 2011

ACTION ITEMS.

- None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. Legislative Actions. A list of the NCAA Division I Legislative Council's legislative actions may be found in Attachment A and detailed voting results may be found in Attachment B.

a. Consideration of Proposals Related to Limitations on the Number of Noncoaching Staff Members. The Legislative Council tabled NCAA Proposal Nos. 2010-16-C, 2010-16-C-1, 2010-16-C-2, 2010-18-C, 2010-18-C-1, 2010-18-C-2, 2010-20-C and 2010-20-C-1 in order to allow for further discussion and potential refinement of the concepts. The Legislative Council requested that the NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet review and discuss potential revisions or alternatives to the current versions of the proposals that may more appropriately address competitive equity and financial resource issues and concerns related to monitoring and enforcement. Possible alternatives include limits on the number of noncoaching staff members who are permitted to attend practices and access to the bench area during competition. It is anticipated that the Legislative Council will consider the proposal again during its October meeting.

b. Consideration of Proposal No. 2010-26 and Amendments. The Council tabled Proposal No. 2010-26, as amended by Proposal No. 2010-26-3, in order to help ensure that the Legislative Council and the membership understand its application as compared to the current legislation. The NCAA staff was directed to develop additional educational material and provide examples of promotional activities that would be impermissible pursuant to current legislation but would be permissible pursuant to Proposal No. 2010-26, as amended. It is anticipated that the Legislative Council will consider the proposal again during its October meeting.

[Note: Per NCAA Constitution 5.3.2.2.4.1, legislation adopted by the Legislative Council shall be subject to possible review by the NCAA Division I Board of Directors at its next meeting. At its discretion, the Board of Directors may ratify, amend or defeat legislation adopted by the Legislative Council. Further, per Constitution 5.3.2.2.4.2, the Board of Directors may resurrect a proposal defeated on final review by the Legislative Council and consider the proposal on its merits. The Board also may amend such a proposal.]

2. Report of the NCAA Division I Legislative Review and Interpretations Committee.

a. Item No. 1 of the minutes of the March 3, 2011, teleconference (No. 4) was rendered moot by the adoption of Proposal Nos. M-2011-1 and M-2011-2.

b. The Legislative Council approved the remaining items (Nos. 2-6) of the minutes of the March 3, 2011, teleconference (No. 4) as distributed.

3. Report of the NCAA Division I Legislative Council Subcommittee for Legislative Relief. (For additional information, see Supplement No. 10 of the Legislative Council meeting materials and the NCAA Division I Legislative Council Subcommittee for Legislative Relief page on the NCAA website.)

- The Legislative Council approved a revision to the subcommittee's policies and procedures to establish a protocol for an appeal teleconference in which an applicant institution is a participant.

4. NCAA Division I Board of Directors Resolution – The Division I Legislative Process. The Legislative Council continued its discussion of the Board of Directors resolution related to the legislative process. As a result of its discussion, the Legislative Council outlined the concepts listed below for review by the Board of Directors. Based on feedback provided by the Board of Directors, the concepts could be further refined and, ultimately, introduced into the 2011-12 legislative cycle for consideration by the membership.

a. Development of a Legislative Process that Consists of Two Overlapping Two-Year Cycles. A legislative process consisting of two overlapping two-year cycles would allow the membership to focus attention on particular issues during each legislative cycle and fully develop comprehensive legislative concepts. A determination would be made regarding which bylaws would be included in each separate two-year cycle.

b. Increase the Requisite Number of Requests to Initiate an Override of the Adoption or Defeat of a Legislative Proposal. The Legislative Council recommends that the number of requests necessary to call for an override increase from 30 to 75 and that the number of requests necessary to suspend a legislative change increase from 100 to 125. For NCAA Football Championship Subdivision specific legislation, the numbers would increase from 15 to 25 and from 40 to 50. While it is important to maintain the opportunity for the membership to override legislation for which there is significant opposition, the current threshold for initiating an override represents less

than 10 percent of the Division I membership. An increase to the number of requests required may encourage more thoughtful review of proposals during the legislative process and enhance the efficiency of the governance process.

5. Election of Chair and Vice Chair. Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, representative of the Ivy League, was elected to serve as chair of the Legislative Council, effective September 1. Greg Sankey, representative of the Southeastern Conference, was elected to serve as vice chair of the Legislative Council, effective September 1.

6. Future Meeting Dates.

a. October 17-18, 2011, Indianapolis.

b. January 11-12, 2012, Indianapolis in conjunction with the NCAA Convention.

Council Chair: *Shane Lyons, Atlantic Coast Conference*
Council Liaisons: *Lynn Holzman, Academic and Membership Affairs*
Steve Mallonee, Academic and Membership Affairs
Binh Nguyen, Academic and Membership Affairs
Leeland Zeller, Academic and Membership Affairs

ATTACHMENT A
SUPPLEMENT NO. 2A
DI Leadership Council 8/11

NCAA Division I Legislative Council April 2011 Legislative Actions

1. Proposals Recommended as Emergency or Noncontroversial Legislation.

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2011-1	AMATEURISM -- EXCEPTION FOR PRIZE MONEY FOR PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES AFTER FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT AT NON-NCAA INSTITUTIONS -- OUTSIDE THE PLAYING SEASON DURING THE SUMMER VACATION PERIOD	NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet	Immediate	To specify that after a prospective student-athlete has enrolled full-time at a non-NCAA institution, he or she may accept prize money based on his or her place finish or performance in an open athletics event (an event that is not invitation only), provided the competition occurs outside his or her institution's declared playing and practice season during the institution's summer vacation period.	Supported as noncontroversial legislation. Adopted.
2011-2	ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION -- ACADEMIC INTEGRITY -- ACADEMIC STANDARDS -- RETENTION RATE OF STUDENT-ATHLETE SUBGROUPS	NCAA Division I Legislative Council (Committee on Athletics Certification)	Immediate; beginning with class four institutions.	To eliminate the requirement that the retention rate of any student-athlete subgroup be analyzed by the institution as part of its self-study.	Supported as noncontroversial legislation. Adopted.
2011-3	ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION -- ACADEMIC INTEGRITY -- ACADEMIC SUPPORT -- APR IMPROVEMENT PLANS	NCAA Division I Legislative Council (Committee on Athletics Certification)	Immediate; beginning with class four institutions.	To eliminate the requirement that an institution must demonstrate implementation of any academic-improvement plans developed in response to a requirement of the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program as part of its self-study.	Supported as noncontroversial legislation. Adopted.

2011-4	EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS -- SELECTION OF TEAMS FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS PARTICIPATION -- AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION -- LIMITATIONS ON AUTOMATIC-QUALIFYING POSITIONS – MEN'S VOLLEYBALL, MEN'S WATER POLO AND WOMEN'S WATER POLO	NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet	August 1, 2011	To exempt men's volleyball, men's water polo and women's water polo from the requirement that 50 percent of the championship field shall be reserved for at-large teams.	Supported as noncontroversial legislation. Adopted.
	ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION -- CONSOLIDATION OF REGULATIONS		Immediate	To move certain sections of NCAA Bylaw 33 to Bylaw 22, as specified; further, to eliminate Bylaw 33.	Not supported as noncontroversial legislation. Recommendation to be considered for sponsorship into the 2011-12 legislative cycle by the NCAA Division I Legislative Council Administrative Committee during its June teleconference.

2. Actions Related to Modifications of Wording.

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
M-2011-1	RECRUITING -- UNOFFICIAL (NONPAID) VISIT -- VISIT IN JULY AFTER COMMITMENT -- MEN'S BASKETBALL	NCAA Division I Legislative Council	Immediate	In men's basketball, to clarify that a prospective student-athlete who has signed a National Letter of Intent (NLI) is permitted to make an unofficial visit during July to the institution with which he has signed the NLI; further; for an institution not using the NLI in a particular sport, or for a prospective student-athlete who is not eligible to sign the NLI (e.g., four-year college transfer), a prospective student-athlete is permitted to make an unofficial visit during July, provided he has signed the institution's written offer of admission or financial aid, or the institution has received a financial deposit from the prospective student-athlete in response to an offer of admission.	Approved.
M-2011-2	RECRUITING -- UNOFFICIAL (NONPAID) VISIT -- VISIT IN JULY AFTER COMMITMENT -- MEN'S BASKETBALL	NCAA Division I Legislative Council	August 1, 2011	In men's basketball, to clarify that a prospective student-athlete may make an unofficial visit during July, provided he has signed a National Letter of Intent or the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid, or the institution receives a financial deposit in response to the institution's offer of admission.	Approved.

3. Actions Related to 2010-11 Legislative Cycle Proposals.

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2009-100-A	RECRUITING -- TRYOUTS -- NONSCHOLASTIC PRACTICE OR COMPETITION AND NONINSTITUTIONAL CAMPS OR CLINICS -- MEN'S BASKETBALL	NCAA Division I Board of Directors	Immediate; a contract signed before October 29, 2009 may be honored.	In men's basketball, to specify that an institution [including any institutional department (e.g., athletics, recreational/intramural)] shall not host, sponsor or conduct a nonscholastic basketball practice or competition in which men's basketball prospective student-athletes participate on its campus or at an off-campus facility regularly used by the institution for practice and/or competition by any of the institution's sport programs; further, to specify that an institution may host basketball-related events that are part of officially recognized state multisport events and that the use of institutional facilities for noninstitutional camps or clinics that include prospect-aged participants shall be limited to the months of June, July and August.	Adopted.

2009-100-B	RECRUITING -- TRYOUTS -- NONSCHOLASTIC PRACTICE OR COMPETITION AND NONINSTITUTIONAL CAMPS OR CLINICS -- MEN'S BASKETBALL -- EXCEPTION FOR LONGSTANDING EVENTS	Horizon League	Immediate; a contract signed before October 29, 2009 may be honored.	In men's basketball, to specify that an institution [including any institutional department (e.g., athletics, recreational/intramural)] shall not host, sponsor or conduct a nonscholastic basketball practice or competition in which men's basketball prospective student-athletes participate on its campus or at an off-campus facility regularly used by the institution for practice and/or competition by any of the institution's sport programs; further, to specify that the use of institutional facilities for noninstitutional camps or clinics that include prospect-aged participants shall be limited to the months of June, July and August and that an institution may host basketball-related events that are part of officially recognized state multisport events and longstanding contests or events, as specified.	Defeated.
2010-16-C	PERSONNEL -- LIMITATIONS ON THE NUMBER AND DUTIES OF COACHES -- NONCOACHING STAFF MEMBERS -- BASKETBALL -- LIMIT OF TWO	NCAA Division I Legislative Council	August 1, 2012	In basketball, to specify that there shall be a limit of two noncoaching staff members (two for men's basketball and two for women's basketball) whose duties include support of the basketball program in any capacity (e.g., director of operations, video coordinator, quality control personnel, director of player development, director of community relations) who may be employed (either on a salaried or a volunteer basis) by the institution; further, to specify that clerical staff and managers and noncoaching institutional staff members whose responsibilities relate to basketball, but who do not directly support the basketball program (e.g., sports information personnel, equipment manager, academic advisor, athletic trainer, marketing staff) are exempt from the limitation on the number of noncoaching staff members.	On initial consideration, adopted, as amended by NCAA Proposal No. 2010-16-C-1. On reconsideration, tabled.

2010-16-C-1	PERSONNEL -- LIMITATIONS ON THE NUMBER AND DUTIES OF COACHES -- NONCOACHING STAFF MEMBERS -- BASKETBALL -- LIMIT OF FOUR -- EXCEPTION FOR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet	August 1, 2012	To amend NCAA Proposal No. 2010-16-C, in basketball, to specify that there shall be a limit of four noncoaching staff members (four for men's basketball and four for women's basketball) whose duties include support of the basketball program in any capacity (e.g., clerical staff, director of operations, video coordinator, quality control personnel, director of player development, director of community relations) who may be employed (either on a salaried or a volunteer basis) by the institution; further to specify that a full-time undergraduate or graduate student at the certifying institution who performs duties in support of the basketball program is exempt from the limitation on the number of noncoaching staff members.	On initial consideration, approved. On reconsideration, tabled.
2010-16-C-2	PERSONNEL -- LIMITATIONS ON THE NUMBER AND DUTIES OF COACHES -- NONCOACHING STAFF MEMBERS -- BASKETBALL -- LIMIT OF TWO -- EXCEPTION FOR VIDEO PERSONNEL WHO ARE FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	Atlantic Coast Conference	August 1, 2012	To amend NCAA Proposal No. 2010-16-C, in basketball, to specify that a videographer who is a full-time undergraduate student at the certifying institution is exempt from the limitation on the number of noncoaching staff members.	Initially rendered moot by the approval of Proposal No. 2010-16-C-1. After reconsideration of Proposal No. 2010-16-C-1, tabled.
2010-17	PERSONNEL -- LIMITATIONS ON THE NUMBER OF COACHES -- FOOTBALL BOWL SUBDIVISION -- FOUR GRADUATE ASSISTANT COACHES	Big East Conference	August 1, 2012	In bowl subdivision football, to increase, from two to four, the limit on graduate assistant coaches.	Adopted.

2010-18-C	PERSONNEL -- LIMITATIONS ON THE NUMBER AND DUTIES OF COACHES -- BOWL SUBDIVISION FOOTBALL -- NONCOACHING STAFF MEMBERS -- LIMIT OF SIX	NCAA Division I Legislative Council	August 1, 2012	In bowl subdivision football, to specify that there shall be a limit of six noncoaching staff members whose duties include support of the football program in any capacity (e.g., director of operations, video coordinator, quality control personnel, director of player development, director of community relations) who may be employed (either on a salaried or a volunteer basis) by the institution; further, to specify that clerical staff and managers and noncoaching institutional staff members whose responsibilities relate to football, but who do not directly support the football program (e.g., sports information personnel, equipment manager, academic advisor, athletic trainer, marketing staff) are exempt from the limitation on the number of noncoaching staff members.	On initial consideration, defeated. On reconsideration, tabled.
2010-18-C-1	PERSONNEL -- LIMITATIONS ON THE NUMBER AND DUTIES OF COACHES -- BOWL SUBDIVISION FOOTBALL -- NONCOACHING STAFF MEMBERS -- LIMIT OF NINE -- EXCEPTION FOR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet	August 1, 2012	To amend NCAA Proposal No. 2010-18-C, in bowl subdivision football, to specify that there shall be a limit of nine noncoaching staff members whose duties include support of the football program in any capacity (e.g., clerical staff, director of operations, video coordinator, quality control personnel, director of player development, director of community relations) who may be employed (either on a salaried or a volunteer basis) by the institution; further to specify that a full-time undergraduate or graduate student at the certifying institution who performs duties in support of the football program is exempt from the limitation on the number of noncoaching staff members.	On initial consideration, defeated. On reconsideration, tabled.

2010-18-C-2	PERSONNEL -- LIMITATIONS ON THE NUMBER AND DUTIES OF COACHES -- BOWL SUBDIVISION FOOTBALL -- NONCOACHING STAFF MEMBERS -- LIMIT OF SIX -- EXCEPTION FOR VIDEO PERSONNEL WHO ARE FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	Atlantic Coast Conference	August 1, 2012	To amend NCAA Proposal No. 2010-18-C, in bowl subdivision football, to specify that a videographer who is a full-time undergraduate student at the certifying institution is exempt from the limitation on the number of noncoaching staff members.	On initial consideration, defeated. On reconsideration, tabled.
2010-20-A	PERSONNEL -- LIMITATIONS ON THE NUMBER AND DUTIES OF COACHES -- NONCOACHING STAFF WITH SPORT-SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES -- CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION FOOTBALL -- LIMIT OF FOUR	NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet	August 1, 2012	In championship subdivision football, to specify that there shall be a limit of four noncoaching staff members whose responsibilities are specific to football and who work directly for the football program who may be employed (either on a salaried or a volunteer basis) by the institution; further to specify that clerical staff and managers who work exclusively for the football program are exempt from the application of this limitation.	Defeated.
2010-20-B	PERSONNEL -- LIMITATIONS ON THE NUMBER AND DUTIES OF COACHES -- NONCOACHING STAFF WITH SPORT-SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES -- CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION FOOTBALL -- LIMIT OF THREE	NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet	August 1, 2012	In championship subdivision football, to specify that there shall be a limit of three noncoaching staff members whose responsibilities are specific to football and who work directly for the football program who may be employed (either on a salaried or a volunteer basis) by the institution; further, to specify that clerical staff, managers and video coordinators who work exclusively for the football program are exempt from the application of this limitation.	Defeated.

2010-20-C	PERSONNEL -- LIMITATIONS ON THE NUMBER AND DUTIES OF COACHES -- CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION FOOTBALL -- NONCOACHING STAFF MEMBERS -- LIMIT OF FOUR	NCAA Division I Legislative Council	August 1, 2012	In championship subdivision football, to specify that there shall be a limit of four noncoaching staff members whose duties include support of the football program in any capacity (e.g., director of operations, video coordinator, quality control personnel, director of player development, director of community relations) who may be employed (either on a salaried or a volunteer basis) by the institution; further, to specify that clerical staff and managers and noncoaching institutional staff members whose responsibilities relate to football, but who do not directly support the football program (e.g., sports information personnel, equipment manager, academic advisor, athletic trainer, marketing staff) are exempt from the limitation on the number of noncoaching staff members.	On initial consideration, adopted. On reconsideration, tabled.
2010-20-C-1	PERSONNEL -- LIMITATIONS ON THE NUMBER AND DUTIES OF COACHES -- CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION FOOTBALL -- NONCOACHING STAFF MEMBERS -- LIMIT OF SIX -- EXCEPTION FOR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet	August 1, 2012	To amend Proposal No. 2010-20-C, in championship subdivision football, to specify that there shall be a limit of six noncoaching staff members whose duties include support of the football program in any capacity (e.g., clerical staff, director of operations, video coordinator, quality control personnel, director of player development, director of community relations) who may be employed (either on a salaried or a volunteer basis) by the institution; further, to specify that a full-time undergraduate or graduate student at the certifying institution who performs duties in support of the football program is exempt from the limitation on the number of noncoaching staff members.	On initial consideration, approved. On reconsideration, tabled.

2010-24	AMATEURISM -- INVOLVEMENT WITH PROFESSIONAL TEAMS -- PROFESSIONAL BASKETBALL DRAFT -- FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE STUDENT-ATHLETE -- MEN'S BASKETBALL	Atlantic Coast Conference	August 1, 2011	In men's basketball, to specify that the date by which a student-athlete must request that his name be removed from a professional league's draft list in order to retain his eligibility shall be the day before the first day of the spring National Letter of Intent signing period for the applicable year.	Adopted.
2010-25	AMATEURISM AND AWARDS, BENEFITS AND EXPENSES -- USE OF AGENTS -- BENEFITS, GIFTS AND SERVICES -- CAREER COUNSELING AND INTERNSHIP/JOB PLACEMENT SERVICES	Big East Conference	Immediate	To permit a student-athlete to use career counseling and internship/job placement services available exclusively to student-athletes, provided the student-athlete is not placed in a position in which the student-athlete uses his or her athletics ability.	Adopted.
2010-26	AMATEURISM -- PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES -- USE OF A STUDENT-ATHLETE'S NAME OR LIKENESS	NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet	August 1, 2011	To revise the regulations related to use of a student-athlete's name or likeness for promotions, advertisements and media activities, as specified.	Tabled, as amended by Proposal No. 2010-26-3.
2010-26-1	AMATEURISM -- PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES -- USE OF A STUDENT-ATHLETE'S NAME OR LIKENESS -- PRIMARY PURPOSE OF COMMERCIAL ADVERTISEMENT	NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet	August 1, 2011	To amend NCAA Proposal No. 2010-26, to specify that primary purpose of a commercial advertisement or promotion that includes the names or likenesses of student-athletes is to publicize the commercial entity's affiliation with the institution, conference or the NCAA.	Defeated.

2010-26-2	AMATEURISM -- PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES -- USE OF A STUDENT-ATHLETE'S NAME OR LIKENESS -- NO COMMERCIAL ADVERTISEMENTS OTHER THAN CONGRATULATORY	NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet	August 1, 2011	To amend NCAA Proposal No. 2010-26, to restrict the use of a student-athlete's name or likeness for commercial promotions or advertisements to congratulatory advertisements, as specified.	Defeated.
2010-26-3	AMATEURISM -- PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES -- USE OF A STUDENT-ATHLETE'S NAME OR LIKENESS -- CO-SPONSORS OF PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES -- CONSOLIDATION OF MEDIA ACTIVITIES	NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet	August 1, 2011	To amend NCAA Proposal No. 2010-26, to restrict the use of a student-athlete's name or likeness for promotions and advertisements, as specified; further, to eliminate the distinction in the application of the media activities legislation between those that occur during the playing season and those that occur outside the playing season.	Approved.

2010-30	RECRUITING -- TELEPHONE CALLS -- TIME PERIOD FOR TELEPHONE CALLS -- SPORTS OTHER THAN FOOTBALL	NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet	August 1, 2011	In sports other than football, to specify that an institution may make one telephone call per month to an individual (or the individual's relatives or legal guardians) on or after June 15 at the conclusion of the individual's sophomore year in high school through July 31 after the individual's junior year in high school, two telephone calls per week beginning August 1 prior to the individual's senior year in high school, and one telephone call per week to a two-year or four-year college prospective student-athlete (or the prospective student-athlete's relatives or legal guardians); further, in sports other than football for which a defined recruiting calendar applies, to specify that during a contact period that occurs on or after August 1 before an individual's senior year in high school, telephone calls may be made at the institution's discretion.	Adopted.
2010-37	RECRUITING -- FOOTBALL EVALUATIONS -- SCHOLASTIC AND NONSCHOLASTIC ACTIVITIES -- OTHER EVALUATION EVENTS ORGANIZED OR SANCTIONED SCHOLASTIC ATHLETICS ASSOCIATION -- CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION FOOTBALL	Northeast Conference	August 1, 2011	In championship subdivision football, to specify that an institutional staff member may attend a recruiting event in which information (e.g., athletics or academic credentials, highlight or combine video) related to prospective student-athletes is presented or otherwise made available, provided the event is organized or sanctioned by the applicable state high school athletics association, state preparatory school association or state or national junior college athletics association.	Tabled.
2010-39	RECRUITING -- RECRUITING MATERIALS -- VIDEO/AUDIO MATERIALS -- METHODS OF DELIVERY TO PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES	The Ivy League	August 1, 2011	To specify that an institution may only provide permissible video or audio material to a prospective student-athlete via an electronic mail attachment or hyperlink.	Adopted.

2010-45	RECRUITING AND PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- TRYOUT EXCEPTIONS AND OUT-OF-SEASON RESTRICTIONS -- RECOGNIZED TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS	The Ivy League	Immediate	To specify that in order for an athletics department staff member or coach to participate in state, regional, national and international training programs involving prospective student-athletes, the staff member must be selected by the applicable governing body and the participants are selected by an authority or a committee of the applicable governing body that is not limited to athletics department staff members affiliated with one institution; further, to specify that Olympic and national team development programs may involve a coach and current student-athletes from the same institution, provided (in addition to existing criteria) a committee or other authority of the national governing body, which is not limited to coaches affiliated with one particular institution, selects the involved participants and the national governing body funds the program.	Adopted, as amended by Proposal No. 2010-45-1.
2010-45-1	RECRUITING AND PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- TRYOUT EXCEPTIONS AND OUT-OF-SEASON RESTRICTIONS -- RECOGNIZED TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS -- FUNDING NOT RESTRICTED TO NATIONAL GOVERNING BODY	The Ivy League	Immediate	To amend NCAA Proposal No. 2010-45, to remove the requirement that the national governing body fund an Olympic or national team development program in order for such a program to include a coach and student-athlete from the same institution.	Approved.

2010-48	RECRUITING -- USE OF RECRUITING FUNDS -- RECRUITING OR SCOUTING SERVICES -- LIST OF PERMISSIBLE RECRUITING SERVICES -- MEN'S BASKETBALL	Southeastern Conference	August 1, 2011	In men's basketball, to specify that the NCAA national office shall publish a list, on a quarterly basis, of men's basketball recruiting or scouting services deemed to meet the required standards for subscription.	Tabled.
2010-51-A	ELIGIBILITY -- GENERAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS -- FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT -- REQUIREMENT FOR COMPETITION -- NONTRADITIONAL COURSES	NCAA Division I Academics Cabinet	August 1, 2011	To specify that enrollment in a nontraditional course (e.g., distance-learning, correspondence, extension, Internet/virtual courses, independent study or any other course or credit that is not earned in a face-to-face classroom environment with regular interaction between the instructor and the student) offered by the certifying institution may be used to satisfy the full-time enrollment requirement for competition, provided specified conditions are met.	Adopted.
2010-51-B	ELIGIBILITY -- GENERAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS -- FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT -- REQUIREMENT FOR COMPETITION -- NONTRADITIONAL COURSES -- UP TO 50 PERCENT OF MINIMUM REQUIREMENT	NCAA Division I Legislative Council	August 1, 2011	To specify that enrollment in a nontraditional course (e.g., distance-learning, correspondence, extension, Internet/virtual courses, independent study or any other course or credit that is not earned in a face-to-face classroom environment with regular interaction between the instructor and the student) offered by the certifying institution may be used to satisfy up to 50 percent of the minimum full-time enrollment requirement for competition, provided specified conditions are met.	Rendered moot by the adoption of Proposal No. 2010-51-A.

2010-52	ELIGIBILITY -- GRADUATE STUDENT/POSTBACCALAUREATE PARTICIPATION -- ONE-TIME TRANSFER EXCEPTION -- NONRENEWAL OF ATHLETICS AID AT PREVIOUS INSTITUTION -- BASEBALL, BASKETBALL, FOOTBALL AND MEN'S ICE HOCKEY	Mountain West Conference	August 1, 2011	In baseball, basketball, football and men's ice hockey, to permit a student-athlete who is enrolled in a graduate or professional school of an institution other than the institution from which he or she previously received a baccalaureate degree to participate in intercollegiate athletics, provided the student-athlete meets the conditions of the one-time transfer exception (other than the sport restrictions), has at least one season of competition remaining and the student-athlete's previous institution did not renew his or her athletically related financial aid for the following academic year.	FBS: Adopted. FCS: Adopted. Division I: Adopted.
2010-58-C	ELIGIBILITY, FINANCIAL AID AND PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- SUMMER ACADEMIC PREPARATION AND COLLEGE ACCLIMATIZATION -- MEN'S BASKETBALL -- NATIONAL SERVICE ACADEMY EXCEPTION	Mountain West Conference	August 1, 2011; effective beginning with the summer 2012.	In men's basketball, to establish a summer academic preparation and college acclimatization model, as specified, including exceptions for national service academies.	Tabled, pending review of the men's basketball recruiting model by the NCAA Division I Leadership Council.

2010-59-A-FCS	ELIGIBILITY -- PROGRESS-TOWARD-DEGREE REQUIREMENTS -- ELIGIBILITY FOR COMPETITION -- FULFILLMENT OF CREDIT HOUR REQUIREMENTS -- FALL TERM ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS FOR FUTURE COMPETITION -- POTENTIAL TO REGAIN ELIGIBILITY FOR TWO CONTESTS -- CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION FOOTBALL	NCAA Division I Board of Directors (Football Academic Working Group)	August 1, 2011	In championship subdivision football, to specify that a student-athlete who does not successfully complete nine-semester hours or eight-quarter hours of academic credit during the fall term and earn the NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) eligibility point for the fall term shall not be eligible to compete in the first four contests against outside competition in the following playing season; further, to specify that the student-athlete may regain eligibility to compete in the third and fourth contests of that season, provided he or she successfully completes at least 27-semester hours or 40-quarter hours of academic credit before the beginning of the next fall term.	Defeated.
2010-59-B-FCS	ELIGIBILITY -- PROGRESS-TOWARD-DEGREE REQUIREMENTS -- ELIGIBILITY FOR COMPETITION -- FULFILLMENT OF CREDIT HOUR REQUIREMENTS -- FALL TERM ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS FOR FUTURE COMPETITION -- POTENTIAL TO REGAIN FULL ELIGIBILITY -- CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION FOOTBALL	Big East Conference	August 1, 2011	In championship subdivision football, to specify that a student-athlete who does not successfully complete nine-semester hours or eight-quarter hours of academic credit during the fall term and earn the NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) eligibility point for the fall term shall not be eligible to compete in the first four contests against outside competition in the following playing season; further, to specify that the student-athlete may regain eligibility to compete in the first four contests against outside competition in the following playing season, provided he or she successfully completes at least 27-semester hours or 40-quarter hours of academic credit before the beginning of the next fall term.	Defeated.

2010-59-C	ELIGIBILITY -- PROGRESS-TOWARD-DEGREE REQUIREMENTS -- ELIGIBILITY FOR COMPETITION -- FULFILLMENT OF CREDIT HOUR REQUIREMENTS -- FALL TERM ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS FOR FUTURE COMPETITION -- ONE-TIME EXCEPTION TO REGAIN FULL ELIGIBILITY -- FOOTBALL	Atlantic Coast Conference	August 1, 2011	In football, to specify that a student-athlete who does not successfully complete nine-semester hours or eight-quarter hours of academic credit during the fall term and earn the Academic Progress Rate eligibility point for the fall term shall not be eligible to compete in the first four contests against outside competition in the following playing season; further, to specify that the student-athlete may regain eligibility to compete in the third and fourth contests of that season, provided he or she successfully completes 27-semester hours or 40-quarter hours of academic credit before the beginning of the next fall term; finally, to specify that one time during a student-athlete's five-year period of eligibility, a student-athlete may regain eligibility to compete in the first four contests against outside competition in the following playing season, provided he or she successfully completes at least 27-semester hours or 40-quarter hours of academic credit before the beginning of the next fall term.	FBS: Adopted. FCS: On initial consideration, defeated. On reconsideration, adopted.
2010-60	ELIGIBILITY -- PROGRESS-TOWARD-DEGREE REQUIREMENTS -- REGULATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRESS TOWARD DEGREE -- NONTRADITIONAL COURSES	NCAA Division I Academics Cabinet	August 1, 2011	To specify that nontraditional courses (e.g., distance-learning, correspondence, extension, Internet/virtual courses, independent study or any other course or credit that is not earned in a face-to-face classroom environment with regular interaction between the instructor and the student) completed at an institution other than the certifying institution, may be used to meet credit-hour and percentage-of-degree requirements, provided specified conditions are met.	Adopted.

2010-82-A-B	AWARDS, BENEFITS AND EXPENSES -- EXPENSES PROVIDED BY THE INSTITUTION FOR PRACTICE AND COMPETITION -- INCIDENTAL EXPENSES AT NCAA CHAMPIONSHIPS, NATIONAL GOVERNING BODY CHAMPIONSHIPS IN EMERGING SPORTS AND LICENSED BOWL GAMES	Southeastern Conference	August 1, 2011	To increase, from $20 to $30, the amount of money that an institution may provide to each member of the squad to cover unitemized incidental expenses during travel and practice for NCAA championship events or national governing body championship events in emerging sports, during a period limited to the maximum number of days of per diem allowed for the involved championship, or, for licensed postseason bowl contests, for a period not to exceed 10 days.	Defeated an amendment to set the amount for unitemized expenses at $35. On initial consideration, defeated an amendment to set the amount for unitemized expenses at $30. On reconsideration, approved an amendment to set the amount for unitemized expenses at $30. Adopted, as amended.

2010-83	AWARDS, BENEFITS AND EXPENSES -- EXPENSES PROVIDED BY THE INSTITUTION FOR PRACTICE AND COMPETITION -- NONPERMISSIBLE -- LODGING IN CONJUNCTION WITH A REGULAR-SEASON HOME CONTEST -- CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION FOOTBALL	NCAA Division I Championships /Sports Management Cabinet	August 1, 2011	In championship subdivision football, to specify that an institution shall not provide lodging (e.g., hotel, motel) to any student-athlete in conjunction with a regular-season home contest.	Adopted.
2010-86	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- GENERAL PLAYING SEASON REGULATIONS -- NO MISSED CLASS TIME IN CONJUNCTION WITH NONCHAMPIONSHIP SEGMENT COMPETITION -- BASEBALL, CROSS COUNTRY, FIELD HOCKEY, LACROSSE, SOCCER AND VOLLEYBALL	NCAA Division I Championships /Sports Management Cabinet	August 1, 2011	In baseball, men's and women's cross country (without indoor or outdoor track and field), field hockey, men's and women's lacrosse, men's and women's soccer, and men's and women's volleyball, to specify that no class time shall be missed in conjunction with competition during the nonchampionship segment, including activities associated with such competition (e.g., travel and other pregame or postgame activities).	Adopted.

2010-87	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- NONCHAMPIONSHIP SEGMENT -- TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS -- CROSS COUNTRY, FIELD HOCKEY, SOCCER, SOFTBALL AND VOLLEYBALL -- HAWAII OR ALASKA EXCEPTION -- ONCE IN FOUR YEARS	Western Athletic Conference	August 1, 2011	In men's and women's cross country (for institutions without indoor or outdoor track and field), field hockey, men's and women's soccer, softball and men's and women's volleyball, to specify that, once every four years, an institution may use any form of transportation for travel to Hawaii or Alaska for nonchampionship segment competition against an active member institution located in Hawaii or Alaska.	Approved an amendment to allow for missed class time in conjunction with the exception. Adopted, as amended.
2010-94	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- MEN'S SOCCER -- FIRST CONTEST OR DATE OF COMPETITION -- 12-WEEK SEASON	Pacific-10 Conference and Atlantic Coast Conference	August 1, 2011	In men's soccer, to specify that an institution shall not play its first contest or engage in its first date of competition (game) with outside competition prior to the Friday prior to the 12th weekend prior to the start of the applicable Division I soccer championship, except that an alumni contest may be played the previous weekend.	Adopted.
2010-108	EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS -- ADMINISTRATION OF NCAA CHAMPIONSHIPS -- SITES AND DATES -- NONREVENUE CHAMPIONSHIPS SITE ASSIGNMENT	Pacific-10 Conference	August 1, 2011	To specify that in championships that do not generate revenue and for which only 25 percent of the bracket is seeded, seeded teams shall have the opportunity to host preliminary rounds and that conference opponents shall be avoided in the first two rounds of the championship.	Section A: Adopted. Section B: Adopted.

2010-110	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS AND RECRUITING -- MANDATORY MEDICAL EXAMINATION -- SICKLE CELL SOLUBILITY TEST -- WRITTEN RELEASE	NCAA Division I Championships /Sports Management Cabinet (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports)	August 1, 2011	To eliminate the opportunity for an individual to decline and sign a written release for the sickle cell solubility test as part of the required medical examination or evaluation for student-athletes who are beginning their initial season of eligibility and students who are trying out for a team must undergo prior to participation in voluntary summer conditioning or voluntary individual workouts pursuant to the safety exception, practice, competition or out-of-season conditioning activities.	Defeated.

Conference -- Voting Delegate	Conference Type	Voting Weight	M-2011-1 and M-2011-2	Package of LRIC Minutes of 3/3/2011 (2-6)	SLR Policies and Procedures	Ratification of Chair and Vice Chair	2011-1 as noncontroversial	2011-1	2011-2 as noncontroversial	2011-2	2011-3 as noncontroversial	2011-3	2011-4 as non-controversial	2011-4	2011- Athletics Certification – Consolidation of Regulations as noncontroversial	2009-100-B	2009-100-A	2010-16-C-1	2010-16-C as amended
America East B. Barrio	DI	1.2	Y				N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	N	N	N	Y	N
Atlantic 10 J. Redmond	DI	1.2	N				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Atlantic Coast S. Lyons	FBS	3	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Atlantic Sun B. Breedlove	DI	1.2	N				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Big 12 L. Ebihara	FBS	3	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Big East J. F. D'Antonio, Jr.	FBS	3	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	N	N	N	N	N
Big Sky J. Gee	FCS	1.2	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Big South M. Eaker*	FCS	1.2																	
Big Ten B. Jaffee	FBS	3	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Big West C. Masner	DI	1.2	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Colonial Athletic K. Batterson	FCS	1.2	Y	APPROVED	APPROVED	APPROVED	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Conference USA R. Philippi	FBS	3	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Horizon League E. Jacobs/S. Jarvis	DI	1.2	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Ivy Group C. Campbell-McGovern	FCS	1.2	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Metro Atlantic Athletic W. Maher	DI	1.2	Y				N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Mid-American J. Bacon	FBS	1.5	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	N	Y	N	Y
Mid-Eastern Athletic S. Stills	FCS	1.2	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	N	N	N	N	Y
Missouri Valley M. Mulvenna	FCS	1.2	N				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Mountain West J. Ruggiero	FBS	1.5	-				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northeast M. Hefferan	FCS	1.2	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Ohio Valley M. Banker	FCS	1.2	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Pacific-10 B. Goode	FBS	3	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
Patriot League P. Muffley	FCS	1.2	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Southeastern G. Sankey	FBS	3	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Southern D. King*	FCS	1.2																	
Southland S. McDonald	FCS	1.2	N				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N
Southwestern Athletic A. Robinson	FCS	1.2	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y	N	N	N	Y
Sun Belt K. Keene	FBS	1.5	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
The Summit League A. Torain	DI	1.2	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
West Coast K. Peters	DI	1.2	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Western Athletic R. Spear	FBS	1.5	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	N	N	N	Y	Y
Pioneer League B. Collier (FCS voting only)	FCS	1																	
Adopt/Yes (Y)			42.3				46.2	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	36.3	34.8	18.6	7.5	27.6	33.9	36
Defeat/No (N)			4.8				2.4	0	0	0	0	0	1.2	0	30	41.1	21	14.7	12.6
Abstain (A)			0				0	0	0	0	0	0	11.1	13.8	0	0	0	0	0
No Vote Cast (-)			1.5				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total			48.6				48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6

***Was unable to attend in-person meeting.**

NCAA Division I Legislative Council
April 11-12, 2011

Conference -- Voting Delegate	Conference Type	Voting Weight	Reconsider 2010-16-C as amended	Reconsider 2010-16-C-1	Table 2010-16-C, 2010-16-C-1 and 2010-16-C-2	2010-18-C-1 FBS	2010-18-C-2 FBS	2010-18-C	Reconsider 2010-18-C, 2010-18-C-1	Table 2010-18-C, 2010-18-C-1 and 2010-18-C-2	2010-17 FBS	Reconsider 2010-17	2010-20-A FCS	2010-20-B FCS	2010-20-C-1 FCS	2010-20-C FCS as amended	Reconsider 2010-20-C and 2010-20-C-1	Table 2010-20-C and 2010-20-C-1	2010-24	2010-25	2010-26-1
America East B. Barrio	DI	1.2	N	N	N														Y	Y	N
Atlantic 10 J. Redmond	DI	1.2	N	N	Y														Y	Y	N
Atlantic Coast S. Lyons	FBS	3	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y							Y	Y	N
Atlantic Sun B. Breedlove	DI	1.2	Y	Y	Y														Y	N	N
Big 12 L. Ebihara	FBS	3	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N							Y	N	N
Big East J. F. D'Antonio, Jr.	FBS	3	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N							N	Y	N
Big Sky J. Gee	FCS	1.2	Y	Y	Y								N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Big South M. Eaker*	FCS	1.2											N	N							
Big Ten B. Jaffee	FBS	3	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y							Y	N	N
Big West C. Masner	DI	1.2	N	Y	Y														Y	Y	N
Colonial Athletic K. Batterson	FCS	1.2	Y	Y	Y								N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-
Conference USA R. Philippi	FBS	3	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N							Y	Y	N
Horizon League E. Jacobs/S. Jarvis	DI	1.2	N	Y	N														Y	N	Y
Ivy Group C. Campbell-McGovern	FCS	1.2	Y	Y	Y								N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Metro Atlantic Athletic W. Maher	DI	1.2	Y	Y	Y														Y	Y	N
Mid-American J. Bacon	FBS	1.5	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y							Y	Y	N
Mid-Eastern Athletic S. Stills	FCS	1.2	Y	Y	Y								N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Missouri Valley M. Mulvenna	FCS	1.2	N	Y	N								N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Mountain West J. Ruggiero	FBS	1.5	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y							Y	Y	Y
Northeast M. Hefferan	FCS	1.2	Y	Y	Y								N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Ohio Valley M. Banker	FCS	1.2	Y	Y	N								N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pacific-10 B. Goode	FBS	3	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y							N	Y	N
Patriot League P. Muffley	FCS	1.2	Y	Y	Y								N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y
Southeastern G. Sankey	FBS	3	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N							Y	Y	N
Southern D. King*	FCS	1.2											N	N							
Southland S. McDonald	FCS	1.2	Y	Y	Y								N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Southwestern Athletic A. Robinson	FCS	1.2	Y	Y	Y								N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Sun Belt K. Keene	FBS	1.5	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N							N	N	N
The Summit League A. Torain	DI	1.2	Y	Y	Y														Y	Y	N
West Coast K. Peters	DI	1.2	Y	Y	Y														N	Y	N
Western Athletic R. Spear	FBS	1.5	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y							Y	N	N
Pioneer League B. Collier (FCS voting only)	FCS	1											N	N							
Adopt/Yes (Y)			41.1	44.7	42.3	10.5	9	7.5	27	27	16.5	13.5	0	0	6	6	10	10	33.9	34.8	5.1
Defeat/No (N)			7.5	3.9	6.3	16.5	18	19.5	0	0	10.5	13.5	13	13	4	4	0	0	13.5	13.8	42.3
Abstain (A)			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.2	0	0
No Vote Cast (-)			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.2
Total			48.6	48.6	48.6	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	13	13	10	10	10	10	48.6	48.6	48.6

***Was unable to attend in-person meeting.**

NCAA Division I Legislative Council
April 11-12, 2011

Conference -- Voting Delegate	Conference Type	Voting Weight	2010-26-2	Table 2010-26 and 2010-26-3	2010-26-3	Table 2010-26 as amended	2010-30	Table 2010-37 FCS	2010-39	2010-45-1	2010-45 as amended	Table 2010-48	2010-51-A	2010-52 FBS	2010-52 FCS	2010-52 Division I	Table 2010-58-C	2010-59-C FBS
America East B. Barrio	DI	1.2	N	N	N	N	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	N			Y	Y	
Atlantic 10 J. Redmond	DI	1.2	N	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	N			Y	Y	
Atlantic Coast S. Lyons	FBS	3	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Atlantic Sun B. Breedlove	DI	1.2	N	N	N	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	N			Y	Y	
Big 12 L. Ebihara	FBS	3	N	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N
Big East J. F. D'Antonio, Jr.	FBS	3	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N
Big Sky J. Gee	FCS	1.2	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	
Big South M. Eaker*	FCS	1.2						Y							Y			
Big Ten B. Jaffee	FBS	3	N	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Big West C. Masner	DI	1.2	N	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	N	
Colonial Athletic K. Batterson	FCS	1.2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	
Conference USA R. Philippi	FBS	3	N	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	N
Horizon League E. Jacobs/S. Jarvis	DI	1.2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	N			Y	Y	
Ivy Group C. Campbell-McGovern	FCS	1.2	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	
Metro Atlantic Athletic W. Maher	DI	1.2	N	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	
Mid-American J. Bacon	FBS	1.5	N	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Mid-Eastern Athletic S. Stills	FCS	1.2	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	
Missouri Valley M. Mulvenna	FCS	1.2	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A		Y	N	Y	
Mountain West J. Ruggiero	FBS	1.5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	A	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Northeast M. Hefferan	FCS	1.2	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	
Ohio Valley M. Banker	FCS	1.2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	
Pacific-10 B. Goode	FBS	3	N	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Patriot League P. Muffley	FCS	1.2	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	
Southeastern G. Sankey	FBS	3	N	Y	Y	N	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		Y	Y	Y
Southern D. King*	FCS	1.2						Y							Y			
Southland S. McDonald	FCS	1.2	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	
Southwestern Athletic A. Robinson	FCS	1.2	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	
Sun Belt K. Keene	FBS	1.5	N	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N
The Summit League A. Torain	DI	1.2	N	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	
West Coast K. Peters	DI	1.2	N	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	N			Y	Y	
Western Athletic R. Spear	FBS	1.5	N	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Pioneer League B. Collier (FCS voting only)	FCS	1						Y							Y			
Adopt/Yes (Y)			6.3	16.2	43.8	42	38.1	13	39	44.1	48.6	47.1	34.8	27	13	47.4	43.2	16.5
Defeat/No (N)			42.3	32.4	4.8	6.6	10.5	0	9.6	3	0	1.5	12.6	0	0	1.2	5.4	10.5
Abstain (A)			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.5	0	0	1.2	0	0	0	0	0
No Vote Cast (-)			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total			48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	13	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	27	13	48.6	48.6	27

***Was unable to attend in-person meeting.**

NCAA Division I Legislative Council
April 11-12, 2011

Conference -- Voting Delegate	Conference Type	Voting Weight	2010-59-A FCS	2010-59-B FCS	2010-59-C FCS	Reconsider 2010-59-C FCS	2010-59-C FCS	2010-60	Amend 2010-82-A-B ($35)	Amend 2010-82-A-B ($30)	Reconsider Amendment to 2010-82-A-B ($30)	Amend 2010-82-A-B ($30)	2010-82-A-B as amended	2010-83 FCS	2010-86	Amend 2010-87	2010-87 as amended	2010-94	2010-108 Section A	2010-108 Section B	2010-110
America East B. Barrio	DI	1.2						N	N	N	N	N	N		Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Atlantic 10 J. Redmond	DI	1.2						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Atlantic Coast S. Lyons	FBS	3						Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Atlantic Sun B. Breedlove	DI	1.2						Y	N	N	N	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Big 12 L. Ebihara	FBS	3						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Big East J. F. D'Antonio, Jr.	FBS	3						N	N	N	N	N	N		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Big Sky J. Gee	FCS	1.2	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	N
Big South M. Eaker*	FCS	1.2	N	N										N							
Big Ten B. Jaffee	FBS	3						Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Big West C. Masner	DI	1.2						Y	N	N	N	N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Colonial Athletic K. Batterson	FCS	1.2	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Conference USA R. Philippi	FBS	3						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A
Horizon League E. Jacobs/S. Jarvis	DI	1.2						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Ivy Group C. Campbell-McGovern	FCS	1.2	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Metro Atlantic Athletic W. Maher	DI	1.2						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mid-American J. Bacon	FBS	1.5						N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Mid-Eastern Athletic S. Stills	FCS	1.2	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Missouri Valley M. Mulvenna	FCS	1.2	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	A
Mountain West J. Ruggiero	FBS	1.5						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northeast M. Hefferan	FCS	1.2	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Ohio Valley M. Banker	FCS	1.2	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	N	Y	Y
Pacific-10 B. Goode	FBS	3						Y	N	N	Y	N	N		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Patriot League P. Muffley	FCS	1.2	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Southeastern G. Sankey	FBS	3						N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	N
Southern D. King*	FCS	1.2	N	N										Y							
Southland S. McDonald	FCS	1.2	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Southwestern Athletic A. Robinson	FCS	1.2	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	-	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y
Sun Belt K. Keene	FBS	1.5						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
The Summit League A. Torain	DI	1.2						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
West Coast K. Peters	DI	1.2						N	N	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Western Athletic R. Spear	FBS	1.5						Y	N	N	N	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Pioneer League B. Collier (FCS voting only)	FCS	1	N	N										Y							
Adopt/Yes (Y)			0	0	5	7	6	37.5	27.9	36.3	40.5	40.2	36.6	8	34.8	42	40.8	32.7	37.8	34.2	20.4
Defeat/No (N)			13	13	5	3	4	11.1	20.7	12.3	8.1	8.4	12	4	9.6	5.4	7.8	8.1	10.8	14.4	24
Abstain (A)			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1.2	0	7.8	0	0	4.2
No Vote Cast (-)			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total			13	13	10	10	10	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	13	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6	48.6

***Was unable to attend in-person meeting.**

REPORT OF THE APRIL 28, 2011, MEETING OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1. **Report of the January 15, 2015, Board of Directors Meeting. The Board approved the report of its January 15, 2011, meeting.** (Unanimous voice vote) [Reference Supplement No. 1.]

2. **Report of the Division I Presidential Advisory Group.** The Board received a report from Ann Millner, chair of the Division I Presidential Advisory Group (PAG), regarding the group's April 27, 2011, meeting. The Board was informed of PAG's views regarding various Board agenda items as they were considered by the Board. [Reference Supplement No. 3.]

   BOARD ACTION: **The Board appointed William Meehan, president of Jacksonville State University, as chair of PAG. President Meehan will replace Ann Millner, whose two-year term as chair of PAG ends at the conclusion of the April 2011 meetings. President Millner will remain on PAG and the Board through the April 2012 meetings**. (Unanimous voice vote.)

3. **President's Report.** NCAA President Mark Emmert reported on the following items:

   a. **NCAA Advertising Policies/Bowl Game Licensing/Conflict of Interest Policies**. President Emmert recommended the Board adopt emergency legislation that would amend Bylaw 18.7.2 to include a "Note" indicating that for a period of up to three years, beginning April 28, 2011, no new postseason football bowl game licenses will be issued by the NCAA Football Bowl Licensing Committee. President Emmert also noted plans to immediately appoint an NCAA Football Bowl Licensing Task Force that will be charged with undertaking a comprehensive examination of the purposes, criteria, process and oversight of the NCAA licensing process for postseason football bowl games. The Task Force will clarify the purposes for NCAA licensing of bowl games and align the criteria and procedures for licensing with those purposes. The result of the examination will be a better defined role, structure and accountability for the NCAA Postseason Licensing Subcommittee, clearer and better understood norms for bowl sponsoring agencies, and a better public understanding of the role of the NCAA in its licensing of bowl games.

      BOARD ACTIONS:

      - **The Board used its emergency authority to adopt legislation to specify that for a maximum three-year period beginning April 28, 2011, no new postseason football bowl game licenses will be issued by the NCAA Football**

Bowl Licensing Committee. [**Effective Date: Immediate.**] (Unanimous voice vote.)

- **The Board approved the charge of the Task Force, noting its expectation for a report at its October 2011 meeting regarding the progress of the Task Force.** (Unanimous voice vote.)

b. **Athletics Certification.** President Emmert shared with the Board recommendations resulting from an extensive review of the Division I athletics certification program.

BOARD ACTIONS:

- **The Board used its emergency authority to adopt legislation, which specifies that no additional active Division I member institutions will enter the athletics certification process through August 1, 2013. Further, the Board charged the Committee on Athletics Certification (CAC) with developing a new, streamlined, technology-driven process, and reporting back to the Board in October 2011 and April 2012 regarding its progress.** (Unanimous voice vote.)

- **The Board determined that all 45 Class 3 institutions must complete the process and submit their self-study reports based on the timeline determined by the CAC. The committee will determine which institutions should be subject to an evaluation visit based on the institution's submitted self-study report. Institutions determined not to need an evaluation visit shall have the option of completing the process with or without that visit. Further, the Board noted that those institutions currently completing the process should be placed at the back of the queue should there continue to be classes of institutions in the newly developed certification process.** (Unanimous voice vote.)

c. **Presidential Retreat.** President Emmert noted his plans to host a presidential retreat on August 9-10, 2011, which will include approximately 50 Division I presidents/chancellors, several Division I commissioners and athletics directors, and the chairs of the Divisions II and III Presidents Councils. Additional information and clarification regarding the retreat will be shared with the participants in the near future.

d. **Joint NCAA/NACUBO Study of Coaches Compensation**. The Board was informed of the NCAA's plans to partner with the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) to conduct a study regarding the governance and oversight of executive level compensation, as well as research

regarding compliance with Internal Revenue Service (IRS) tax policy. The goal of the survey would be to collect data that would assist in the development of best practices, rather than to develop financial mandates.

4. **Report from the Task Force to Clarify Roles of the Committee on Infractions and Infractions Appeals Committee**. The Board received the final report of the Task Force to Clarify the Roles of the Committee on Infractions (COI) and Infractions Appeals Committee (IAC), which included three legislative and several non-legislative recommendations. [Reference Supplement No. 4.]

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved all the recommendations submitted by the task force. (Unanimous voice vote.)

5. **Division I Governance Structure Update**.

a. **Report of the April 4, 2011, Meeting of the Leadership Council**. Mike Alden, chair of the Division I Leadership Council, reported briefly on the April 4, 2011, Leadership Council meeting.

(1) Olympic Sports Liaison Committee/National Governing Bodies (NGB) Working Group Recommendations. The Leadership Council recommended that the Board approve assigning a senior-level NCAA staff member with the responsibility for establishing closer collaboration with the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) with regard to prioritizing and sustaining Olympic sports within the collegiate structure.

BOARD ACTION: **The Board approved the Leadership Council's recommendation.** (Unanimous voice vote.)

(2) Men's Basketball Recruiting Model. The Leadership Council received presentations regarding men's basketball recruiting from representatives of a variety of men's basketball stakeholders. The Leadership Council also heard from its two recruiting subcommittees, several Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) members, Division I and FCS commissioners and head coaches, and a group of administrators from the Group of Six conferences. The Leadership Council will meet again in August to discuss the subcommittees' work and begin to formulate its recommendation regarding a new men's basketball recruiting model for presentation to the Board in October.

(3) Agents. The Leadership Council continued its discussion on agents and will focus on the following concepts as potential ways to address the issues:

(a) Enhanced Education of Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes.

(b) New Definition of Agent.

(c) Agent Contact Calendar.

(d) National Agent Registration Program.

(e) Consideration of sport-specific agent legislation.

b. Report of the April 11-12, 2011, Meeting of the Division I Legislative Council. Shane Lyons, chair of the Division I Legislative Council, reported that the Legislative Council acted on approximately 40 proposals, 20 of which were adopted and eight which were defeated; the remaining proposals were tabled or rendered moot. The following Legislative Council actions were identified for Board discussion:

[Note: In accordance with the Division I legislative process, the Board has the authority to consider any action taken by the Legislative Council, but is not required to do so. Where the Board decided to take action on proposals below, you will see the action indicated in bold type. For those proposals on which it did not act, the Legislative Council's actions stand.]

(1) Adopted Proposals.

(a) **Proposal No. 2009-100-A – Recruiting – Nonscholastic Practice and Competition and Institutional Camps or Clinics – Men's Basketball.** This proposal would prohibit an institution from hosting a nonscholastic practice/competition on its campus that involves men's basketball prospects. The proposal addresses long-standing concerns about competitive recruiting advantages gained as a result of these activities and arrangements between operators and coaches to host such activities.

BOARD ACTION: The Board adopted an amendment to Proposal No. 2009-100-A, which would establish additional exceptions that would permit an institution to host, sponsor or conduct a nonscholastic event that involves men's basketball prospects, provided:

- **The event is open (not classified by age group or level of educational institution) and all men's basketball prospects reside within a 50-mile radius of the institution's campus; or**

- **The event is part of a program that is consistent with the mission of the institution (e.g., state wellness and educational programs) and the athletics department or representatives of its athletics interests are not involved in the conduct, promotion or administration of the activity, or**

- **The event is an ancillary event that is part of a nonathletics program (e.g., Boy Scouts) and is operated outside the institution's athletics program.** (Unanimous voice vote.)

(b) **Proposal No. 2010-17 – Personnel – Limitations on Number of Coaches – Football Bowl Subdivision – Four Graduate Assistant Coaches.** This proposal would increase from two to four the number of graduate assistant coaches in FBS football.

(c) **Proposal No. 2010-24 -- Amateurism -- Involvement With Professional Teams -- Professional Basketball Draft -- Four-Year College Student-Athlete -- Men's Basketball.** This proposal would move the date by which a men's basketball student-athlete must request that his name be removed from the NBA draft to retain his eligibility be moved to the day before the first day of the spring National Letter of Intent (NLI) signing period.

(d) **Proposal No. 2010-51-A -- Eligibility – General Eligibility Requirements – Full-Time Enrollment – Requirement For Competition – Nontraditional Courses**. This proposal would permit the use of nontraditional courses to satisfy the full-time enrollment requirement for competition.

(e) **Proposal No. 2010-59-C -- Eligibility – Progress-Toward-Degree Requirements – Eligibility for Competition -- Fulfillment of Credit Hour Requirements – Fall Term Academic Requirements for Future Competition -- One-Time Exception To Regain Full Eligibility -- Football.** This proposal is an alternative to the Football Academic Working Group's (FAWGs) proposal that would permit a one-time exception to the requirement that a football student-athlete earn nine semester/eight quarter hours in the fall term or lose eligibility for the first four games of the next season with the opportunity to reduce the

ineligibility to two games if the student-athlete earns 27 semester/40 quarter hours before the following fall term.

(f) **Proposal No. 2010-60 -- Eligibility – Progress-Toward-Degree Requirements – Regulations For Administration Of Progress Toward Degree – Nontraditional Courses**. This proposal would permit the use of nontraditional courses completed at an institution other than the certifying institution to be used to satisfy credit-hour and percentage-of-degree requirements.

(2) Defeated Proposals.

- **Proposal No. 2010-110 – Playing and Practice Seasons and Recruiting – Mandatory Medical Examination – Sickle Cell Solubility Test – Written Release**. This proposal would have eliminated the option for student-athletes to decline or opt out of the required sickle cell test that was implemented last fall.

(3) Tabled Proposals.

(a) **Proposal No. 2010-16-C, 2010-16-C-1 and 201-16-C-2 -- Personnel -- Limitations On The Number And Duties Of Coaches -- Noncoaching Staff Members -- Basketball -- Limit Of Two; 2010-18-C, 2010-18-C-1 and 2010-18-C-2 -- Personnel -- Limitations On The Number And Duties Of Coaches -- Bowl Subdivision Football -- Noncoaching Staff Members -- Limit Of Six; and 2010-20-C and 2010-C-1 -- Personnel -- Limitations On The Number And Duties Of Coaches -- Championship Subdivision Football -- Noncoaching Staff Members -- Limit Of Four.** These proposals would establish limits on the number of non-coaching sports-specific staff members in football and basketball.

(b) **Proposal No. 2010-26 as amended by 2010-26-3 -- Amateurism – Promotional Activities – Use of a Student-Athlete's Name or Likeness.** This proposal would revise legislation related to the use of student-athletes' names and likenesses in advertisement and promotions. The Council settled on one of the alternatives for further consideration, but noted that the membership needed additional time and education as to the distinction between the current rule and the proposed change.

(c) **Proposal No. 2010- 48 -- Recruiting -- Use Of Recruiting Funds -- Recruiting Or Scouting Services -- List Of Permissible Recruiting Services -- Men's Basketball.** This proposal would require that the

NCAA national office publish men's basketball scouting services that are deemed to meet the required standards for subscription. Since January, the sponsors of this proposal has been working with the NCAA staff to develop a new proposal that would establish a certification process for scouting services in men's and women's basketball, and football and intend to include it in the 2011-12 legislative cycle.

(d) **Proposal No. 2010-58-C -- Eligibility, Financial Aid And Playing And Practice Seasons -- Summer Academic Preparation And College Acclimatization -- Men's Basketball – National Service Academy Exception.** This proposal would establish a summer academic preparation and college acclimatization model for men's basketball student-athletes, including exceptions for national service academies.

(4) Proposals Previously Tabled By the Board.

(a) **Proposal No. 2010-12 – Legislative Process – Amendment Process – Membership Override of Legislative Changes – Legislative Council or Board of Directors Review – Override Voting**. This proposal would eliminate the requirement that override votes take place at the annual NCAA Convention.

BOARD ACTION: **The Board agreed to take Proposal No. 2010-12 off the table and voted to adopt the proposal.** (Unanimous voice vote.)

(b) **Proposal No. 2010-109-B – Executive Regulations – Administration of NCAA Championships – Restricted Advertising and Sponsorship Activities – Professional Sports Organizations Or Teams – Financial Sponsorship Of NCAA Or Conference Championships**. This proposal would allow professional sports organizations to serve as financial sponsors for conference and NCAA championships. The Board took no further action; therefore, its previous action to table the proposal continues.

(5) Board of Directors Resolution. The Legislative Council continued its discussion of the Board's resolution to review the legislative process and developed two concepts on which it would like feedback from the Board:

(a) Development of a legislative process that consists of two overlapping two-year cycles to allow the membership to focus attention on particular bylaws during each legislative cycle.

(b) Increase the requisite number of requests required to initiate an override of the adoption or defeat of a legislative proposal. The recommendation would be to increase the number required for a call for override vote from 30 to 75 and the number to suspend a proposal from 100 to 125. Further, for FCS specific legislation, the number would increase from 15 to 25 and 40 to 50. FBS currently does not have requisite numbers, but a number similar to FCS should be considered.

6. **Division I Committee on Infractions**. The committee requested the Board approve several bylaw revisions and a committee appointment. [Reference Supplement Nos. 8A and 8B.]

a. **Bylaw 19.5 Revisions.** The committee recommends recodification and restating the penalty provisions of Bylaw 19 to provide clarity and better reflect current practices.

b. **Bylaw 32 Revisions**.

(1) The committee recommended the Board approve revisions to Bylaws 32.1.1 (Confidentiality) and 32.8.8.3 (Imposition of Penalties).

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the recommended revisions to Bylaw Nos. 19.5, 32.1.1 and 32.8.8.3. (Unanimous voice vote.)

(2) The committee recommended the Board approve a revision to Bylaw 32.3.8 (Limited Immunity).

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the recommended revision to Bylaws 32.3.8. (Unanimous voice vote.)

c. **Committee Appointment**. The Board appointed Chris Griffin (Foley & Lardner, Tampa, Florida) to the Division I Committee on Infractions as appeal coordinator. (Unanimous Voice Vote.)

7. **Administration Cabinet Recommendation**. The Administration Cabinet recommended that the Board use its authority pursuant to Bylaw 21.7.2 to add the Division I Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee to the list of committees in Bylaw 27.2.1 that are accepted from the requirement that no subdivision shall have more than 50 percent representation on any committee.

BOARD ACTION: The Board voted to approve the cabinet's recommendation. (Unanimous voice vote.)

8. Governance Transitional Issues.

a. Appointment of new Members to the Board of Directors. The Board unanimously approved the following new Board members whose terms begin following the Board's April 2011 meeting:

- David Hopkins, president, Wright State University, Horizon League.
- Harris Pastides, president, University of South Carolina, Columbia, Southeastern Conference
- David Skorton, president, Cornell University, Ivy League.
- Timothy White, chancellor, University of California, Riverside, Big West Conference.

b. Appointments to the NCAA Executive Committee. The Board unanimously approved the appointment of the following Board members to the Executive Committee whose terms begin following the Board's April 2011 meeting:

- William Beauchamp, president, University of Portland, West Coast Conference.
- William Meehan, president, Jacksonville State University, Ohio Valley Conference.

c. Appointments of FCS and Division I Members to the Cabinets and Councils. The Board reviewed the slate of nominees for councils and cabinets submitted by the FCS and Division I conferences. It was noted that the Presidential Advisory Group recommended approval of the slate as conforming to the intention of enhancing positional diversity on the bodies, but also recognizing the practical problems reported by the affected conferences in attempting to satisfy the complex matrix of expectations regarding gender, ethnic and positional diversity for each of the eight bodies in question. It is expected that the conferences will continue to work to enhance diversity through 2012 when all 20 conferences will have completed a rotation of positions on all councils and cabinets.

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the FCS and Division I 2011 slate of cabinet and council nominees. (Unanimous voice vote.)

9. **Expression of Appreciation**. The Board thanked departing Board members Charles Bantz, president, IUPUI, Summit League, Greg Dell'Omo, president, Robert Morris University, Northeastern Conference; Kevin Mullen, president, Sienna College, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference, and Lee Todd, president, University of Kentucky, Southeastern Conference, for their service to Division I.

10. **Future Meeting Dates**.

a. August 9-10, 2011, Presidential Retreat, Indianapolis, Indiana.

b. August 11, 2011, Indianapolis, Indiana.

c. October 27, 2011, Indianapolis, Indiana.

d. January 14, 2012, in conjunction with the NCAA Convention, Indianapolis, Indiana

Board of Directors chair: Judy Genshaft, University of South Florida
Staff Liaisons: S. David Berst, Division I governance
Jacqueline Campbell, Division I governance

Key/Action Items from the June Division I Cabinet Meetings

1. Academic Cabinet.

a. Review of NCAA Division I Academic Eligibility Requirements for Two-Year College Transfers. The NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet continued its discussion of possible changes to two-year college transfer academic requirements. Based on membership and two-year college feedback regarding the most recent draft package of concepts, the cabinet refined the concepts and sponsored legislative proposals for the 2011-12 legislative cycle. Specifically, the cabinet sponsored three separate proposals in this area; increased academic standards, a year of academic preparedness and a new waiver structure.

b. Review of NCAA Division I Initial-Eligibility Requirements. The cabinet discussed potential changes to initial-eligibility requirements. The cabinet considered a spectrum of potential changes. Specifically, the cabinet explored increases to the current initial-eligibility model including an increase to the minimum core grade-point average. In addition, the cabinet considered the development of alternative initial-eligibility models.

2. Administration Cabinet.

a. **Annual Review/Advancement of Provisional/Reclassifying Members.** The cabinet reviewed the progress of all 10 institutions currently in the process of reclassifying their sports programs to Division I active status. Specifically, the group reviewed the annual reports and updated strategic plans for all reclassifying and provisional members and focused on whether such institutions were meeting all applicable legislative requirements and were responsive to feedback provided to the institution the previous year by the cabinet. The cabinet agreed to recommend to the Division I Board of Directors that Florida Gulf Coast University, Houston Baptist University, University of North Carolina Central and University of South Carolina, Upstate, be elected to active Division I membership status.

b. **Multidivisional Reclassification – Opposite Gender -- NCAA Bylaw 20.4.1.2**. The cabinet engaged in a thorough discussion regarding the application of new Proposal No. 2010-100 and the elimination of multidivisional reclassification and recommended that the Division I Leadership Council consider sponsoring legislation to permit current non-Division I institutions with a sport (other than football and basketball) classified in Division I for only one gender to seek reclassification of one Division I sport of the opposite gender. The cabinet directed the staff to develop information outlining potential issues that merit discussion related to this topic.

3. Amateurism Cabinet.

a. Earmarked Expenses for Prospective Student-Athletes in Individual Sports. The NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet is proposing legislation to permit an individual, prior to collegiate enrollment, who is participating in an individual sport, to accept expenses for athletics participation from outside sources (not otherwise permitted by the NCAA) provided the funds are not provided by an agent or an institution.

b. Agent Activities. The cabinet continued its comprehensive review of agent activities. The concepts discussed included an evaluation of the use of agents for prospective student-athletes participating in nonopt-in draft sports, implementing an agent registration program and the creation of a national professional sports counseling program. In addition, the cabinet is proposing legislation to expand the definition of an agent.

c. Prize Money for Tennis Prospective Student-Athletes. The cabinet is proposing legislation to permit tennis prospective student-athletes to accept prize money not to exceed $10,000 per calendar year. Further, to specify that once the individual has reached the $10,000 limit, he or she may receive additional prize money on a per event basis, provided such prize money does not exceed his or her actual and necessary expenses for participation in the event.

d. Sponsorship of Legislation. The cabinet agreed to sponsor several proposals for the 2011-12 legislative cycle including the following:

- **Definition of an Agent.** This proposal would modify the definition of an agent to include any individual who directly or indirectly represents or attempts to represent a prospective student-athlete or student-athlete in the marketing of his or her athletics ability or reputation for financial gain; or seeks to obtain any type of financial gain or benefit from securing a prospective student-athlete's enrollment at an institution or a student-athlete's potential earnings as a professional athlete. This definition may include, but is not limited to, a certified contract advisor, financial advisor, marketing representative, brand manager or anyone who is employed or associated with such persons.

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

a. Examination of Maximum Grant-in-Aid Limitations/Equivalency versus Head Count Designations. The NCAA Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet reviewed information that included an overview of statistical data provided by the NCAA research staff related to Division I current participation

numbers, current trends in awarding aid and total number of student-athletes participating who do not receive athletics aid. The cabinet also examined concepts that could affect administration of team financial aid limits. Following the review, the cabinet agreed its members will solicit feedback from their campuses and conferences on whether current designations (head count or equivalency) and team financial aid limits are appropriate. The cabinet members will also engage their campuses and conferences in discussions on methods for calculating equivalencies, including methods that would not use actual and average figures the way they currently are used. Additionally, the cabinet charged the staff with collecting additional statistical information, including information related to participation numbers based on race/ethnicity, numbers of student-athletes who participate without receiving athletics aid and high school participation numbers. The cabinet will review the information and feedback at its September meeting.

b. Review of Equivalency Computation Method. The cabinet reviewed and discussed altering the permissible method for equivalency computations (NCAA Division I Bylaw 15.5.3.2) to a method similar to the method used in Division II. The cabinet reviewed information on the current equivalency computations legislation in Division I and Division II, including information submitted by a cabinet member. The cabinet agreed to sponsor legislation for the 2011-12 legislative cycle to permit an institution to use either the actual or average amount received by a student-athlete as the numerator and either the actual or average amount of the full grant-in-aid value in the denominator when calculating equivalencies.

c. Identification of Future Agenda Items and Determination of Priorities. The cabinet identified the following priorities for review, noting that data collection may be necessary to fully examine these issues:

(1) Examination of maximum grant-in-aid limitations.

(2) Educational outreach to financial aid administrators.

(a) Team; and

(b) Equivalency versus head count designations.

(3) Methods for calculating equivalency computations.

(4) Time period for providing expenses using the departure/return expense legislation.

5. Championships/Sports Management Cabinet

a. Track and Field. The cabinet reviewed and preliminarily discussed a letter from the Big 12 Council of Faculty Athletics Representatives requesting that the cabinet at its September meeting vote on whether to eliminate track and field regionals. The cabinet also reviewed information from the NCAA GOALS study and a letter from the United States Track and Field and Cross Country Coaches Association and agreed to continue discussion on the topic during the September 2011 meeting.

b. NCAA Division I Women's Soccer Committee.

(1) Date Standardization. The cabinet approved a recommendation that, effective with the 2012 championship, the date formula for the Women's College Cup be standardized so that the Women's College Cup will occur the first weekend in December, and if December 1 is a Saturday that will count as the first weekend with competition taking place on Friday and Sunday. The NCAA Division I Women's Soccer Committee believes that the championship should occur at the same time each year and a week prior to the Men's College Cup.

(2) Championship Format. The cabinet approved a recommendation that the 1-1-2-2 championship format approved in June, 2010 be changed to a 1-2-1-2 format, effective with the 2011 championship.

6. Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet.

a. Continuing Examination of the Recruiting Model. The NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet continued its comprehensive examination of recruiting models in the areas of contacts, evaluations, electronic transmissions, telephone calls and official visits. The cabinet reviewed feedback received from conferences, coaches associations and roundtables conducted at the recent regional rules seminars. Based on the feedback received, the cabinet agreed to sponsor legislative proposals related to electronic transmissions (e.g., text messages) and evaluations. In addition, 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. Based on the feedback, the cabinet sponsored proposals to establish recruiting calendars for men's and women's fencing, field hockey, men's ice hockey, women's gymnastics and wrestling. The cabinet noted a lack of consensus in the membership regarding concepts that would permit earlier contacts and official visits and the NCAA Division I Leadership Council's current review of men's basketball recruiting issues. Therefore, the cabinet agreed to defer additional discussion of these concepts until after the review of the men's basketball recruiting issues is complete and the membership has reacted to the

resultant model. During the upcoming year, the cabinet will explore potential concepts to deregulate and simplify recruiting rules.

b. Discussion on Limits on Noncoaching Staff with Sport Specific Responsibilities. The cabinet discussed a request from the NCAA Division I Legislative Council to explore potential revisions or alternatives to the current proposals regarding limits on noncoaching staff with sport specific responsibilities. Specifically, the cabinet discussed whether the current proposals appropriately addressed competitive equity and financial resource issues and concerns related to monitoring and enforcement. The cabinet noted that restricting the activities of noncoaching staff members (e.g., attending practice, sitting on the bench during contests) has the potential for unintended consequences, such as eliminating a noncoaching staff member's access to the coaching staff for administrative or student-athlete welfare purposes. In addition, such restrictions may limit a noncoaching staff member's ability to gain professional development. The cabinet noted that previous feedback received from the membership favored the limits identified in the current proposals. Based on feedback from the NCAA enforcement staff, the cabinet believes that the current legislation regarding limitations on number and duties of coaches is enforceable and may be sufficiently monitored. The cabinet will continue to review feedback from the membership and explore options related to this topic at its September meeting.

c. Sponsorship of Recruiting Legislation. The cabinet agreed to sponsor a number of proposals for the 2011-12 legislative cycle including the following:

(1) **Recruiting – Recruiting Materials – Electronic Transmissions.** This proposal would permit all forms of electronically transmitted correspondence (e.g., electronic mail, text messaging, Instant Messenger) to be sent to an individual (or his or her parents or legal guardians), provided the correspondence is sent directly to the individual (or his or her parents or legal guardians) and is private between only the sender and recipient. Further, the proposal would permit an institution to begin sending recruiting materials, including electronic transmissions, to a prospective student-athlete on the date that is consistent with the date on which the institution may begin to make telephone calls to an individual in the particular sport (e.g., June 15 at the conclusion of the prospective student-athlete's sophomore year in high school for men's basketball and men's ice hockey, July 1 following the completion of the junior year in high school for most other sports).

(2) **Recruiting – Telephone Calls.** This proposal would eliminate the limitations on the numbers and frequency of telephone calls to prospective student-athletes, once the permissible date on which institutions may begin calling prospective student-athletes is reached.

ATTACHMENT A
SUPPLEMENT NO. 4
DI Leadership Council 8/11

Multidivisional Reclassification - Opposite Gender
(Discussion Document)

With the adoption of Proposal No.2010-100, Division I culminated a three-year review process of current membership standards and agreed to implement newly developed standards, effective August 1, 2011. One of the new standards set forth in the proposal is the elimination of any further multidivisional reclassification. Previously, Division II and III members, in sports other than football and basketball, were permitted to classify a single men's and a single women's sport in Division I. Proposal 2010-100 continued to allow Division II and III members with a sport currently classified in Division I to sponsor that sport at the Division I level. After the adoption of the legislation, there has been discussion regarding the impact of the new legislation on Division II and III institutions that currently have a sport in only one gender classified in Division I. For example, a Division II or III institution may conduct men's ice hockey at the Division I level, but may not have any women's sport classified at the Division I level.

During its June 29, 2011, meeting, the Division I Administration Cabinet engaged in a thorough discussion of the matter and recommended that the Division I Leadership Council consider sponsoring legislation to permit current Division II and III institutions with a sport (other than football and basketball) classified in Division I for only one gender to seek reclassification of one Division I sport of the opposite gender. The cabinet directed the staff to develop information outlining potential issues that merit discussion related to this topic.

Currently, there are a total of 28 Division II and Division III institutions that sponsor a single sport in Division I for only one gender. Of the 28, 24 of those institutions sponsor only a men's sport and four institutions sponsor only a women's sport. In addition, 12 of those institutions (11 of which are in Division II) sponsor only the sport of men's ice hockey. It is worth noting that the Division I women's ice hockey championship is conducted as a National Collegiate Championship and thus Division I and Division II institutions currently have the same championship access opportunity in women's ice hockey.

The following are a list of issues that merit consideration during the discussion of this issue:

1. What is the appropriate application fee if the Division I membership reinstates multidivisional reclassification for this limited set of institutions? Should the old fee be re-established or should there be an increase in the application fee?

2. Should the reclassification process be identical to the previous process (i.e., two years) or should a different process be established?

3. Should the institution be able to reclassify any one sport (other than football/basketball) of the opposite gender?

4. Should an institution be allowed to reclassify a sport from the opposite gender only if it can demonstrate there were plans to do so at the time the moratorium was implemented?

5. Should there be a limited period of time in which an institution can seek reclassification of a sport program of the opposite gender?

6. Should the sport program be required to be a member of a Division I conference (likely a single sport conference)?

ATTACHMENT B
SUPPLEMENT NO. 4
DI Leadership Council 8/11

Division II Institutions Sponsoring a Division I Men's Sport

Dallas Baptist University	Baseball
Le Moyne College	Baseball
New York Institute of Technology	Baseball
University of Alabama in Huntsville	Men's Ice Hockey
University of Alaska Fairbanks	Men's Ice Hockey
American International College	Men's Ice Hockey
Bentley University	Men's Ice Hockey
Ferris State University	Men's Ice Hockey
Lake Superior State University	Men's Ice Hockey
University of Massachusetts Lowell	Men's Ice Hockey
Merrimack College	Men's Ice Hockey
Michigan Technological University	Men's Ice Hockey
University of Nebraska Omaha	Men's Ice Hockey
Northern Michigan University	Men's Ice Hockey
Bellarmine University	Men's Lacrosse
Adelphi University	Men's Soccer
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	Men's Wrestling
Clarion University of Pennsylvania	Men's Wrestling
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania	Men's Wrestling
Millersville University of Pennsylvania	Men's Wrestling

Division II Institutions Sponsoring a Division I Women's Sport

West Chester University of Pennsylvania	Field Hockey
Wayne State University (Michigan)	Women's Ice Hockey
Francis Marion University	Women's Soccer

Division III Institutions Sponsoring a Division I Men's Sport

Rochester Institute of Technology	Men's Ice Hockey
Hobart College	Men's Lacrosse
Rutgers, The State Univ. of New Jersey, Newark	Men's Volleyball
Franklin & Marshall College	Men's Wrestling

Division III Institutions Sponsoring a Division I Women's Sport

Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Women's Rowing

R·I·T

Rochester Institute of Technology

Office of the President
George Eastman Building
2 Lomb Memorial Drive
Rochester, New York 14623-5604
585-475-2394 Fax 585-475-5700

June 1, 2011

Robert L. Halvaks
Chair, NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet
c/o Ms. Jackie Campbell
Director of Division I Governance
NCAA
P.O. Box 6222
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6222

Dear Mr. Halvaks:

I am the President of the Rochester Institute of Technology ("RIT"), and I write to encourage the NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet to take whatever action is necessary at its June meeting to permit an NCAA Division III member institution with a sport classified in Division I for one gender to sponsor a Division I sport for the other gender. Specifically, RIT, which has sponsored men's ice hockey in Division I for several years, seeks the opportunity to offer Division I women's ice hockey. The adoption of Division I Proposal No. 2010-100 currently precludes that opportunity.

In August 2007, when the Division I Board of Directors decided to impose a moratorium on new applications for Division I membership, it also opted to suspend the opportunity to begin the multidivisional classification process. At that time, RIT had plans to reclassify its women's ice hockey program to Division I but had not yet instituted formal action to do so. It understood the Division I membership's desire to fully evaluate the means by which an institution moved into the division, and it waited patiently for the moratorium to be lifted. RIT did not anticipate that the "moratorium" on multidivisional classification would effectively become permanent and preclude its women's ice hockey program from joining the men's in Division I.

The rationale for the legislative change stated that it was "designed to better prepare prospective new members for a move to Division I" and that the new structure would "ensure that reclassifying members are committed to the Division I philosophy and operating principles." RIT, with its men's hockey program already in Division I for the past six years, is not a "new member" and is well aware of the philosophy and commitment necessary to compete in the division. Further, the rationale for the proposal indicated that the legislation would "increase the likelihood that such institutions will operate successful, competitive programs at the Division I level." The men's hockey program demonstrated its ability to be successful in the division by reaching the "Frozen Four" in the spring of 2010.

In RIT's view, the new approach established by Division I to help provide for smooth transitions to Division I should not be applicable to an institution that already has a sport in

Division I. The proposal and the membership's adoption of it seemingly recognizes that fact by protecting those sports programs that are already classified in Division I by the 2010-11 academic year from the ban on multidivisional classification. What the legislation fails to take into account is that such institutions, already committed to Division I in one sport, might have plans to provide a similar opportunity to the gender not currently participating in Division I. It appears appropriate to provide such an institution the opportunity to make the choice to include an additional sport in its commitment to Division I.

When RIT became aware that Proposal No. 2010-100 was pending, it attempted to express its concerns to the Division I governance structure. However, as a Division III member, it had no official voice, and certainly no vote, in regard to changes in Division I rules in which it had a vital interest. RIT was informed that the Division I Leadership Council, which had put the proposal forward through the sponsorship of the Board of Directors, considered the question in its October 2010 meeting but did not modify the proposal. Further, it was indicated that no Division I conference that was eligible to submit legislative amendments chose to sponsor a change in the proposal to address RIT's concerns.

These reports are not surprising in light of the fact that there is no one on the Leadership Council (nor is there a Division I conference) that has a vested interest in the issue. However, it is understood that among the Administration Cabinet's duties are the oversight of the management of the Division I governance structure and the administration of the "legislation and policies and procedures related to Division I membership." Accordingly, RIT asks that in the furtherance of these duties the Cabinet address the concerns of non-Division I members that have a sport for only one gender classified in Division I by finding a means to accommodate a sport for the other gender within the Division I structure. RIT believes the impact on Division I of making such an accommodation would be minimal in light of the limited numbers of involved institutions and all such institutions have already understood the necessary commitment to operate one sport in Division I for a period of time.

A primary concern in this matter relates to gender equity. RIT finds it untenable to permit only its men's ice hockey program to be involved in the Division I student-athlete experience while its women's ice hockey team is not. It has been RIT's intent from the time its men began competing in Division I to reclassify its women's program. RIT was moving forward with that plan when the moratorium was put in place. Currently, it finds itself in a situation over which it has no control that prohibits it from extending the same opportunities to its men's and women's ice hockey student-athletes.

It appears that the Division I Administration Cabinet is the body in the division's governance structure that has the ability to begin the steps necessary to provide reasonable relief to RIT and other similarly situated institutions. Accordingly, RIT asks that the Cabinet give this matter serious consideration, recognize the untenable position in which some institutions find

themselves as a result of Proposal No. 2010-100 and take action to remedy the situation. Your help would be greatly appreciated. If there is any additional information that would assist the Cabinet in its thoughtful review of this matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,

William W. Destler, Ph.D.
President

NCAA and Transgender Student-Athlete Participation.

The NCAA currently does not have a published policy or interpretation to assist the membership with questions about fair and equitable participation by student-athletes who identify as transgender, i.e., a psychological and social identification as a man or a woman that differs from the person's sex at birth. A person who was born female and transitions to male is termed trans-male. A person who was born male and transitions to female is termed trans-female.

In consultation with medical and research experts who have advised both the Olympic committee and others working with transgender athletes, the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports and the Committee on Women's Athletics support the following to provide direction regarding the participation of a transgender student-athlete:

- *A [trans-male] student-athlete who has received a medical exception for treatment with testosterone for diagnosed Gender Identity Disorder (GID), for the purposes of NCAA competition may compete on a men's team, but is no longer eligible to compete on a women's team without changing that team status to a mixed team.*

- *A [trans-female] student-athlete being treated with testosterone suppression medication for GID, for the purposes of NCAA competition may continue to compete on a men's team but may not compete on a women's team without changing it to a mixed team status until completing one calendar year of testosterone suppression treatment.*

- *It is the responsibility of the NCAA institution to submit the request for a medical exception for testosterone treatment prior to the student-athlete competing while undergoing treatment. In the case of testosterone suppression, the institution must submit written documentation of the year of treatment and ongoing monitoring of testosterone suppression.*

- *For the purpose of NCAA competition, cases of GID treatment being interrupted will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.*

In addition to addressing policy, the above committees and NCAA staff have developed a resource handbook and a video to help the membership with full understanding of the issues. The Executive Committee will provide a final review and approval to establish the above policy for the membership at its August 2011 meeting.

NCAA and Participation of Transgender Student-Athletes

Karen Morrison, Office of Inclusion
Mary Wilfert, Health and Safety

NCAA Executive Committee Framework for NCAA Inclusion *[Adopted April 2010]*

As a core value, the NCAA believes in and is committed to diversity, inclusion and gender equity among its student-athletes, coaches and administrators.

We seek to establish and maintain an inclusive culture that fosters equitable participation for student-athletes and career opportunities for coaches and administrators from diverse backgrounds.

Diversity and inclusion improve the learning environment for all student-athletes and enhance excellence within the Association.

The Office of Inclusion will provide or enable programming and education, which sustains foundations of a diverse and inclusive culture across dimensions of diversity including, but not limited to

age, race, sex, class, national origin, creed, educational background, disability, gender expression, geographical location, income, marital status, parental status, sexual orientation and work experiences.

NCAA® Office of Inclusion

Why prepare?

- Increasing number of transgender youth and college students.
- Transgender students may face bullying, isolation.
- College and university diversity mission statements and non-discrimination policies.
- States, localities and schools are adding gender identity & expression to non-discrimination policies and laws.
- Sports participation can be accommodated fairly.
- National Office > 40+ inquiries and faces potential test case

Gender Definitions

- **Transgender** – a) umbrella term for anyone whose identity falls outside stereotypical gender norms; b) more narrowly, those whose gender identity does not match their assigned birth gender.
- **Sex** – male, female, intersexual (the body).
- **Gender** – boy/girl; man/woman; trans (heart/mind).
- **Gender identity** – inner psychological concept of self as M, F, both or neither; individual begins to identify with psychological gender between the ages 18 mos. & 3 years.
- **Gender expression** – how we “perform” our gender.
- **Gender nonconforming/gender variant** – one whose behaviors/interests fall outside of what is stereotypical for their assigned gender. Not necessarily transgender.

More Definitions

Three distinct and separate constructs related to an individual's sexual being:

- **Transgender** – *Psychological and social* identification as a man or a woman that differs from the person's sex at birth.
- **Sexual orientation** – who we are attracted to romantically/erotically – lesbian, gay, bisexual, or "heteroflexible."
- **Intersex** conditions (differences of sex development)– individuals born with physically mixed or atypical bodies with respect to sexual characteristics, i.e. chromosomes, internal reproductive organs, and genitalia. May not be visible and individuals may not be aware of the condition. Estimate one in 2,000 births.

Awareness: Transitioning

- Process by which transgender individual lives consistently, and presents with his or her “true” gender identity.
- Can occur in three ways:
  - Social transition – changes in clothing, hairstyle, name, pronouns.
  - Hormonal transition – medicines such as hormone “blockers,” or estrogen or testosterone
  - Surgery – body modified by adding or removing gender-related physical traits, i.e. breast removal or genital reconstructive surgery (not required; most transgender people do not do it).

Recent Efforts

- NCAA National Office efforts
  - Currently – No policy; no interpretations. Use government id-guidance
  - Ongoing discussion of NCAA staff and Representatives from membership bodies
  - Governance body discussions
- 2010 Transgender Think Tank Report: On the Team: Equal Opportunity for Transgender Student-Athletes/WSF and NCLR.
- Coverage in Chronicle of Higher Education, Inside Higher Ed., NY Times, ESPN…

Think Tank Report

- Explains TSA participation issues, including medical research, legal implications, competitive equity…
- Proposes model policy to address competitive equity concerns for the collegiate athlete, relying on feedback regarding NCAA policy on medications and team gender characterization.

NCAA Association Challenges

- Need to address at the Association-Wide level
- Student-Athlete Well-Being vs. competitive equity
- Medical and Legal Concerns
  - o Banned drugs
  - o State anti-discrimination laws
  - o Confidentiality
- Mixed Team Participation
- Research -- what do we know?

What is needed?

- **Transgender Awareness** – Leaders, coaches, faculty, staff, students, parents, alumni; media relations staff

- **Policies** – Preferably uniform national policies

- **Preparation** of athletic programs for basic accommodations, i.e. pronouns, dress codes, bathrooms, changing areas, hotel rooms, including confidential notification of competing schools.

Best Practice- Guiding Principles

- Access to educational resources and training
- Equal opportunity, inclusion, non-discrimination
- Preservation of integrity of women’s sports
- Use of sound medical & scientific knowledge
- Policies practical, fair, available, & enforced
- Clear appeals process
- Privacy interests of all athletes preserved
- Comply with state and federal laws

NCAA Educational Resource

- Resource Document
- Dr. Crane video class
- Workshop PowerPoint and facilitator notes

  Will include: Definition of terms; student-athlete well-being & accommodation, education, policy and media best practice recommendations; NCAA rule implications

- Timeline:

  October 2010 - Commission Educational Resource

  March l, 2011 - Staff review final draft of Educational Resource

  April 2011 - Present Education Resource to PC, EC, update on progress

  Summer 2011 - Electronic roll out of Educational Resource to the membership

NCAA rules-impact…CSMAS & CWA Support

- *A [trans-male] student-athlete who has received a **medical exception for treatment with testosterone** for diagnosed Gender Identity Disorder (GID), for purposes of NCAA competition may compete on a men's team, but is no longer eligible to compete on a women's team without changing that team status to a mixed team.*

- *A [trans-female] student-athlete being **treated with testosterone suppression medication** for GID, for the purposes of NCAA competition may continue to compete on a men's team but may not compete on a women's team without changing it to a mixed team status until completing one calendar year of testosterone suppression treatment.*

Governance trails

2010 –

- Women's Athletics
- Minority Opportunities & Interests
- Competitive Safeguards & Medical Aspects of Sport
- Division III Conf Commissioners Assoc.
- D-II & III SAAC
- D-III President's Council
- All division joint SAAC

2011 –

- D-II Management Council/President's Council
- Executive Committee Subcommittee on Gender & Diversity
- Executive Committee – April
- Divisional Cabinets - summer
- Executive Committee decision – August
- Resources distributed; Educational campaign begins

Resources

- Karen Morrison, Director of Gender Inclusion
  kmorrison@ncaa.org
- Mary Wilfert, Associate Director, Health & Safety
  mwilfert@ncaa.org
- www.ncaa.org/gender_equity Select LGBT Resources or

  Home ► Governance► Office of Inclusion ► Gender Equity

NCAA® Office of Inclusion

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I LEADERSHIP COUNCIL FOCUS ON ACCESS AND SUCCESS WORKING GROUP JULY 12, 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 Recommendations
Official visits		
Starting point	Senior year of high school.	• Starting the weekend after the Men's Basketball Championship of the junior year thru the senior year of high school. • Consideration should be given to whether OV during the summer months provide a sufficient "collegiate experience."
Travel expenses	Prospect	• Prospect and two parents/legal guardians. 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.	• Starting during junior year in high school at PSA's high school only during: o September contact period. o April contact period.
On-campus tryouts	Prohibited	• Based on all of the proposed recruiting model changes, the ASWG does not believe that any changes should be implemented regarding on-campus tryouts.
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	• Incorporate permissible text messaging into phone call legislation restrictions. • Permit phone and text communication starting June 15 prior to junior year in high school – 1 call. • Keep July communication restrictions. • After August 1 prior to junior year in high school – unlimited communication. • Must establish talking points to emphasize need for deregulation and address concerns of SAAC.
Recruiting calendar evaluations		
April	No evaluations permitted at nonscholastic events.	• Permit evaluations at certified nonscholastic events on two weekends (Saturday-Sunday). • Neither weekend can fall on ACT/SAT testing dates. • Events must be subject to NCAA certification program.
July	Evaluations permitted at certified nonscholastic events during two 10-day evaluation periods.	• Permit evaluations at nonscholastic events during a total of 12 days in July. o The 12 days would consist of three four day periods that run from Thursday at 5 pm to Sunday at 5 pm.

NCAA Division I Leadership Council Men's Basketball Recruiting Subcommittee
Notes from May 5, 2011, Teleconference.

1. Finalized the subcommittee's "Big Picture" concepts for consideration by the full NCAA Division I Leadership Council [See Attachments A and B].

2. Noted that the subcommittee had completed its charge and that it was appropriate to share this subcommittee's concepts with conferences for appropriate feedback, with the understanding that there is another Leadership Council Recruiting Subcommittee also reviewing the issue and potentially developing other concepts and recommendations; agreed that an additional teleconference with the other subcommittee may be beneficial prior to the Council's August 2 in-person meeting.

3. As to future steps in the Council's review, noted that once the Leadership Council reached consensus on concepts/recommendations at its August meeting, the details should be completed for the Council to review at its October meeting prior to forwarding them to the NCAA Division I Board of Directors later in October for consideration to be placed in the 2011-12 legislative cycle.

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 academic benchmark requirements (e.g. grade-point average, standardized test on file) necessary to provide official visit.
Travel expenses	Prospect	• Prospect and one parent (or legal guardian) • Prospect and two parents (or legal guardians)
Initial Off-campus contact	July 1 after junior year of high school	• April of junior year (one contact at PSA'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]
Off-campus contact in conjunction with evalution	Prohibited during evaluation period	• Permit contact at the prospect's educational institution (except during the time period when classes are in session and during the day of competition), provided scholastic authorities or parents and /or legal guardians are present. • Permit contact at the prospect's educational institution (except during the time period classes are in session), provided scholastic authorities or parents and /or legal guardians are present; allow contact on the day of competition either after the competition has concluded or several hours in advance of the competition. • Provide greater flexibility to use recruiting opportunities; eliminate limitations on permissible number of contacts, while maintaining limits on recruiting opportunities; eliminate contact and evaluation periods (other than dead periods) while maintaining 130 recruiting-person days.

Activity	Current	Possible Options	
On-campus staged evaluations (OCE) (formerly known as tryouts)	Prohibited	One OCE permitted beginning April 15 of the junior year of high school. Limitations to be determined:	
		Division II Model On-campus or normal practice/ competition site One OCE per PSA per institution Must be high school senior or older Typically after completion of season Pre-OCE physical Up to 2 hours May include testing and competition with team	**NABC (Based on recommendations made in 2004)** On-campus 6 OCEs per PSA 18 OCEs per institution Between first permissible date for official visit and beginning of early NLI period, OCE may only occur during an official visit Following the senior season, OCE may occur during official or unofficial visit. No missed class time for OCE. Up to 2 hours OCEs must be closed and unpublicized. Only PSAs and S-As may participate.

Activity	Current	Possible Options
Communication with PSAs		
Types	Phone, e-mail, fax only	Any, including text
Phone call/text messaging frequency	• June 15 of sophomore year through July 31 of junior year of high school: 1 call per month/unlimited e-mail. • August 1 prior to senior year of high school: Unlimited during contact period; two calls per week otherwise/unlimited e-mail. • JC and four-year PSAs: One call per week/unlimited e-mail	• No limitations after June 15 following sophomore year in high school
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 occur as a result of national testing dates for SAT/ACT or due to the observance of Easter.
		• 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

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 three Fridays-Saturdays-Sundays.
		• Establish one 10 day or 14 day period and eliminate the last week in July.
		• Establish two five-day or two seven-day periods with an intervening dead period and eliminate the last week in July.
		• Establish a limit of 30 recruiting-person days during a TBD evaluation period.
		• 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

The National Collegiate Athletic Association
May 9, 2011 SAM:lmb

Recruiting Model - "Big Picture" Concepts

1. **Greater/earlier access, increased communication and information gathering – empowering coaches, prospects and parents to make more informed recruiting decisions.**

   - Allow for earlier off-campus, in-person contacts with junior prospects [discussion should focus on the permissible time frame for such contacts and how early during the junior year such contacts may occur]; no contacts should be allowed immediately after any competition as they could be problematic and place undue pressure on the prospect due to the volume of coaches trying to engage in such activity.

   - Evaluation of certified nonscholastic events during April contact period [possibly establish May evaluation period] -- two weekends, Saturday and Sunday only; noted that permissible weekends should not conflict with national standardized testing date or the observance of Easter.

   - Official visits during spring of junior year (after April dead period); establish benchmark academic requirements.

   - On-campus evaluations ("tryouts") during official visits and, for senior prospects only, during unofficial visits.

   - Allow payment of travel expenses for prospect's parents/legal guardian during official visits (applicable number of parents/legal guardians to be determined).

2. **Summer recruiting/July evaluation period.**

   - Reduction needed [specific reduction to be determined…possible options include:

     a. Nine days/three weekends of three days each;

     b. Two five-day/seven-day periods;

     c. One ten-day/14-day period; or

     d. 30 recruiting-person days during a "to be determined" evaluation period.

3. **More efficient/effective use of recruiting opportunities.**

   - Seven recruiting opportunities per prospect; remove separate numerical limits for contacts and evaluations.

- Allow contact with prospects during any high school visit (regardless of contact/evaluation period) – apply to seniors and juniors [more discussion needed on whether to extend to sophomores or freshmen, possibly limiting the interaction to an introduction in the presence of a high school coach/authority]; request feedback from the National Federation of State High School Association and the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

- Must address concerns regarding significant number of coaches visiting certain prospects on a given day or at the same time (e.g., after a practice, competition).

4. Simplification of recruiting rules and regulatory burden/ recognition of modern reality of technology.

- Consideration of a more flexible recruiting calendar to allow each institution to allocate recruiting resources as it deems appropriate; maintain 130 recruiting person days and appropriate dead periods, but leave the remainder the of the year open.

- Deregulation of phone calls/maintain an initial start date.

- Deregulation of text messages/maintain an initial start date.

Request feedback from the DI Recruiting and Personnel Issues Cabinet and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee on the issue of flexible recruiting calendars and deregulation of phone calls/text messages.

5. Moratorium on changes to men's recruiting calendar/model for designated period of time, unless recommendations approved by NCAA Division I Leadership Council and NCAA Division I Board of Directors.

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

SUPPLEMENT NO. 7
DI Leadership Council 8/11

MEMORANDUM

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

June 9, 2011

TO: NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet and Leadership Council.

FROM: Internal Working Group on Agent Legislation.

SUBJECT: Potential Legislative Recommendation Regarding the Use of Agents and Advisors Prior to Enrollment.

In early 2010, at the request of the NCAA Executive Committee, an NCAA national office internal group was assembled to conduct a review of NCAA legislation. Included in that group were senior administrators along with representatives from academic and membership affairs (AMA); agent, gambling and amateurism activities (AGA); amateurism certification process (ACP); and the office of legal affairs (OLA). The group discussed the current state and historical interpretations of the legislation, as well as the possible negative and positive influences of agent involvement in the lives and career decisions of prospective and enrolled student-athletes. Additionally, the group discussed potential legislative options, ranging from the most restrictive (absolute agent prohibition) to the most liberal (the allowance of agent representation across all sports). In between those two extremes were discussions regarding other potential options that varied by individual status (prospective, as opposed to enrolled student-athletes) and/or sport and draft type.

As a result of this internal review, the working group is seeking feedback from the cabinet and the/Leadership Council on the following recommendations:

1. Proposed legislation that would allow prospective student-athletes (PSA) (pre-enrollment) in certain sports to use advisors/agents in direct negotiations with professional clubs to market ability and negotiate contracts. This would benefit the PSA by allowing them to gain as much information as possible in order to make an informed decision regarding entering a draft. No recommended changes for currently enrolled student-athletes (post-enrollment).

2. Not removing the restrictions relating to the provision of material benefits by agents at any time (pre- or post-enrollment).

This proposed legislative option would only be available in sports with nonopt-in drafts that allow players to be drafted out of high school (e.g., baseball, hockey and soccer).

Potential consequences of model.

Allowing high school and junior college PSAs to be represented would provide access to all sources of information relating to the decision regarding professional pursuits. This legislative option allows PSAs the benefit of agent involvement in direct negotiations with professional teams. While the legislation currently in place allows for the review of contracts and advice to be given to PSAs in all sports, the line has been drawn at the point of actual negotiations with the professional team as being impermissible. Under this proposal, discussions with the professional team regarding club interest, draft status, possible financial terms and other considerations relating to the PSA would be permissible.

Experiences in the sport of baseball show that there are different tiers of advisor/agents that operate in the environment. It is our understanding that, unless the financial terms are extremely high, top-tier agents will generally advise PSAs to attend college thereby increasing their chances of making it to the sport's top professional league. Lower tier agents who are attempting to gain a foothold or desire to gain financially from the amateur draft may use their influence to direct PSAs down the professional route with little regard for the PSAs best interests. For this reason and others, agent/advisors are not always the best or reliable source of information. Further, permissible agent representation would lead to an increase in the number of relationships (total number of represented student-athletes versus those who now use advisors although it is important to note that most advisors are in fact agents), thus leading to greater agent involvement with student-athletes. Finally, recruiting rules would need to be reviewed and potentially modified given the contact that agent/advisors would likely have with NCAA coaches regarding their clients.

The rule change will create efficiencies in the amateurism certification process in that resources previously spent on determining whether direct contact between a PSA's advisor and a professional team occurred will no longer be necessary. Instead, the ACP staff can focus on whether any material benefits were provided to the PSA by the agent/advisor. Currently, it is well known that many recruited PSAs in the sports of baseball and men's ice hockey already use the services of an advisor. Not all of those PSAs, however, disclose that information during the certification process. Accordingly, those PSAs who are forthcoming during the certification process potentially subjecting them to amateurism penalty, would be largely eliminated.

Potential concerns.

1. Erosion of historical amateurism principles for PSAs.

   It is important to note that Principle 2.9 does not refer to the amateurism status of PSAs, only that of student-athletes:

"Principle 2.9: Amateurism. **Student-athletes** shall be amateurs in an intercollegiate sport, and their participation should be motivated primarily by education and by the physical, mental and social benefits to be derived. **Student participation in intercollegiate athletics** is an avocation, and **student-athletes** should be protected from exploitation by professional and commercial enterprises."

Additionally, from a practical perspective, there seems to be very little disagreement that both PSAs and student-athletes need to be better prepared to make more informed decisions. The disagreement often comes with who is best positioned to provide these student-athletes with the best advice.

2. Sport specific legislation.

Making changes to the current legislation in specific sports could result in individual PSAs in sports not impacted asserting that they should be afforded the same opportunity to be "well-informed" regarding professional opportunities.

3. Potential coaches' perspective.

Since this option would not change the legislation as it pertains to student-athletes, the potential negative concerns regarding distractions during the season may still exist. Specifically, it is unrealistic to think that any relationship formed prior to the individual's enrollment would be completely absolved. In addition, although advice can be sought from an advisor in the sport of baseball, student-athletes and parents would still need to communicate with clubs in order to gather information. Coaches may also be concerned regarding the influence of agents, some of whose financial interest in having players sign rather than attend college may inappropriately influence their advice. This likely would only be a factor for high-level draft picks that are more likely to have large signing bonuses or PSAs with unscrupulous agents attempting to make money off the amateur draft. It would also lead to an increase in represented PSAs and thus, regardless of whether the model included a requirement that the agency relationship end once the individual becomes a student-athlete, "cessation requirement", it could lead to more agent involvement during the recruiting process and a student-athlete's subsequent collegiate career. The cessation requirement if strenuously enforced and strictly followed by student-athletes and agents might also influence more agents to direct PSAs to professionalize them.

It would be important to note that if a PSA is permitted to have an agent and that agent is involved in the recruiting process, the institution would be required to monitor the activity of the agent and coaching staff to verify that the agent is not acting as an impermissible recruiter on behalf of the institution. Furthermore, if a PSA is required to cease any interaction or involvement with his/her former agent once becoming a student-athlete, an

institution would need to monitor the interaction between the student-athlete and the agent in order to avoid potential institutional culpability.

It is important to note that the American Baseball Coaches Association and the NCAA Baseball Issues Committee have recommended that the NCAA permit PSAs in that sport to employ advisors/agents to meet with professional teams. The National Basketball Coaches Association and American Football Coaches Association have historically been opposed to any deregulation with agents; however, due to the way that the NBA and NFL drafts are currently structured, this would more than likely not affect men's basketball and football PSAs.

4. Even with the cessation requirement, this model would likely increase agent influence for previously represented student-athletes. While the goal is to increase the opportunity for prospective student-athletes and student-athletes to gain valuable information to make decisions regarding the future career in professional sports, it does open the door for individuals that are only trying to gain financially to direct or advise a PSA or his/her family to sign a professional contract. As evidenced by baseball and ice hockey, deregulating the legislation and permitting PSAs to sign with agents could encourage them to do so at a much earlier age due to the fact that they feel they will not be recruited by collegiate or professional teams unless they have one.

RNB:esb

ATTACHMENT
SUPPLEMENT NO. 7
DI Leadership Council 8/11

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

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

www.ncaa.org

MEMORANDUM

June 9, 2011

TO: Division I Amateurism Cabinet.

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

SUBJECT: Revised Definitions of an Agent.

The culture surrounding agent recruitment of prospective student-athletes (PSAs) and student-athletes continues to evolve. Historically, contract advisors recruited student-athletes on an individual basis and late in a student-athlete's collegiate career, as he or she made the transition from collegiate sports to the professional ranks. Over the years, however, the salaries of professional athletes have risen, age restrictions to participate in professional sports leagues have changed, notoriety of elite student-athletes has increased with scouting and media exposure, and the interest of outside third parties in elite athletes is now greater than ever.

This, in turn, has created an industry of individuals including runners, financial advisors, marketing representatives, business managers, brand managers and street agents who seek to broker elite PSAs and student-athletes to both professional and collegiate organizations for financial gain. Although many governing bodies have attempted to impose regulations on these individuals and their activities, the competitive nature of the industry has resulted in many finding ways to skirt the rules.

Each year, the NCAA Agent, Gambling and Amateurism Activities (AGA) staff observes new trends. One trend, however, has remained constant: the use of outside third parties to recruit and solicit PSAs and student-athletes for financial gain. These third parties operate free of any governing body's jurisdiction, and historically they do not trigger the NCAA definition of an agent. In order for the NCAA to attempt to regulate the interaction of these individuals with PSAs and student-athletes, the staff is proposing three options for the cabinet to consider. Each option is outlined below.

<u>Option No. 1</u>

The first option was considered by the cabinet during its February meeting:

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 or her athletic ability or reputation, or, (2) seeks to represent or gain financially."

The cabinet indicated that the above definition is overly broad and captures some individuals who should not be considered "agents" under NCAA bylaws. High school coaches and parents were provided as examples of such persons.

In particular, street agents who purport to be scouting or recruiting services, yet who in reality attempt to broker PSAs to member institutions for financial gain, would be included within this definition. Indeed, this is the fundamental distinction between Option No. 1 and Option No. 2. Option No. 2 only captures those street agents who broker current student-athletes to agents or professional organizations; Option No. 1 incorporates street agents who seek to exploit prospective student-athletes' athletic ability for financial gain.

Option No. 2

Definition of an agent: "A person who directly or indirectly (1) represents or attempts to represent a PSA or student-athlete in the marketing of his or her athletic ability or reputation for financial gain; or (2) seeks to obtain any type of financial gain or benefit from securing a PSAs enrollment at an institution or a student-athletes' potential earnings as a professional athlete. This may include but is not limited to a certified contract advisor, financial advisor, marketing representative, or anyone who is employed or associated with such persons."

Option No. 2 brings contract advisors, financial advisors, marketing representatives, and certain third parties under the definition of an agent. The staff continues to monitor individuals associated with PSAs who attempt to broker certain PSAs to institutions in return for financial gain or benefit. This option captures individuals who seek to gain financially from a student-athlete's potential earnings as a professional athlete, and the staff believes that it captures those individuals who seek to gain financially from securing a PSAs enrollment at an institution.

Option No. 3

Definition of an agent: "Any person who, directly or indirectly, recruits or solicits a PSA or student-athlete to enter into an agent contract or contract with a professional team, or who, for any type of financial gain, procures, offers, promises, or attempts to obtain tangible benefits, employment or promotional fees for a PSA or student-athlete with a professional sports team or as a professional athlete, or with any promoter who markets or attempts to market a PSAs or student athlete's athletic ability or athletic reputation."

The definition presented above would include contract advisors, marketing representatives, and certain third parties who attempt to broker PSAs or student-athletes to agents. However, it

_____

would not likely include financial advisors inasmuch as financial advisors do not necessarily market a PSA or a student-athlete's athletic ability or reputation; rather, they gain financially from a PSAs or student-athlete's salary and/or earnings therefrom. Financial advisors, however, often have loose associations with other agents, and the staff has become aware of instances where those agents use such associations as a way to indirectly recruit PSAs or student-athletes. An unintended consequence of this option could result in baseball and ice hockey scouts and general managers, due to the way their drafts are operated, being included within this definition insofar as they could be defined as a "person who, directly or indirectly, solicits a PSA or student-athlete to enter into a … contract with a professional team."

RNB:esb

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
DIVISION I LEADERSHIP COUNCIL
AUGUST 2, 2011, MEETING

- ***ACTION ITEMS.***

  - None.

- ***INFORMATION ITEMS.***

  1. **Men's Basketball Recruiting Discussion**. The Leadership Council received reports from its two men's basketball recruiting subcommittees regarding concepts recommended for consideration by the full Council. The Council noted that there should be a logical progression within the recruiting model and conducted its discussions with that in mind. The Council agreed on concepts in several areas within the recruiting model, but noted that other areas required further discussion and feedback. The Council's recommendations will be distributed to various constituent groups [e.g., Collegiate Commissioners Association (CCA), National Association for Athletics Compliance (NAAC), DIA Faculty Athletics Representatives, Collegiate Commissioners Association Compliance Administrators (CCACA), Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet] for feedback prior to final review in October, at which time the Council will finalize its recommendations for consideration by the Board of Directors at its October meeting. The details regarding the Council's recommendations can be found in the attachment to this report.

  2. **Discussion of Agent Activities.** Rachel Newman, NCAA director of agent, gambling and amateurism activities, informed the Council of the following strategies being developed to address the agent-related issues:

     a. **Definition of an Agent.** The Amateurism Cabinet has agreed to sponsor legislation for the 2011-12 legislative cycle to expand the definition of an agent to limit the use of outside third parties to recruit and solicit prospective and enrolled student-athletes for financial gain.

     b. **Agent Registration Program.** The Amateurism Cabinet has reviewed a proposed program for agent registration and has asked that staff seek feedback regarding the program from the National Association of Athletics Compliance (NAAC), the Division I Leadership Council and various professional sports players' associations.

     c. **Potential Legislation Regarding the Use of Agents and Advisors Prior to Enrollment.** The Amateurism Cabinet has reviewed recommendations to consider legislation to allow the use of agents and advisors prior to enrollmen

for nonopt-in drafts that allow players to be drafted out of high school. The Amateurism Cabinet did not support the position to permit the use of agents in these sports at this time. Discussion regarding sports-specific legislation regarding agents will continue.

d. **Collaboration with the National Association of Attorney Generals (NAAG) and State Agencies.** The NCAA staff has contacted NAAG in an effort to determine if the current definition of an "athlete agent" under the Uniform Athlete Agent Act (UAAA) subjects third party actors to penalties for violating the UAAA. The staff will continue its efforts to collaborate with NAAG and other interested state and federal agencies.

e. **National Football League (NFL)/National Football League Players Association (NFLPA)/National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA)/Collegiate Commissioners Association (CCA)/American Football Coaches Association (AFCA) Task Force.** The staff plans to continue its discussions with the NFL/NFLPA/NCAA/CCA/AFCA Task Force in an effort to address improper agent activity with football student-athletes in order to better collaborate on educational and enforcement initiatives.

f. **National Basketball Associatin (NBA)/National Basketball Players Association (NBPA)/NCAA Dialogue.** Similar to football, the staff plans to continue its discussions with the NBA and NBPA in an effort to address improper agent activitiy in the sport of men's basketball.

g. **Women's Basketball Group on Agent Issues.** The staff plans to develop a task force to address agent issues in the sport of women's basketball.

h. **Educational Initiatives.** The staff continues to work on creating comprehensive agent education for all key stakeholders.

The Leadership Council took no formal action but encouraged its Agent Subcommittee to continue discussion and monitoring of these issues.

3. **Multidivisional Reclassification – Opposite Gender – NCAA Bylaw 20.4.1.2**. The Leadership Council reviewed a request from the Division I Administration Cabinet that it consider sponsoring legislation to permit current non-Division I institutions with only one sport (other than football and basketball) classified in Division I to seek reclassification of one sport of the opposite gender. The Council asked that staff provide the following information for its review in October:

a. Draft of a legislative proposal that would permit the institutions that currently have only one sport in one gender classified in Division I to seek reclassification in one sport of the opposite gender.

b. Information regarding the reclassification process.

c. A proposed reclassification fee and how it was calculated.

d. Possible time limitation for the opportunity to reclassify a second sport.

4. Transgender Student-Athlete Presentation. The Council received a presentation regarding a proposed Association-wide policy to addresss transgender student-athlete participation in intercollegiate athletics. The policy will go before the Executive Committee for review and approval during its August 11, 2011, meeting.

[Note: For additional information and resources realated to transgender student-athletes, go to www.ncaa.org/gender_equity and select LGBTQ Resources under the Current News section.]

5. 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.

6. Future Meetings.

a. October 13, 2011, Indianapolis, IN.

b. January 12, 2012, Indianapolis, IN

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

ATTACHMENT

Preliminary Division I Men's Basketball Recruiting Model

Feature	Current	Leadership Council Recommendation	Additional Comments/Outstanding Isssues
Recruiting calendar evaluations			

April	No evaluations permitted at nonscholastic events.	• Permit evaluations at certified nonscholastic events on two weekends.
		• Neither weekend can fall on ACT/SAT testing dates or Easter.
		• Events must be subject to NCAA certification program.
			• Further define time frame of the weekend as part of the basketball event certification criteria to minimize missed class time. Suggested time frame from Friday 6 p.m. until Sunday 4 p.m.
			• Continue to study a model that provides for the establishment of non-exclusive evaluation camps as either a pilot or full-blown program. Issues to be determined:
			  • Site(s).
			  • Numbers and ages of PSAs.
			  • Format.
			  • Management (NCAA, USA Basketball, iHoops).
			  • Coaches ability to work camps.
			  • Cost.

July	Evaluations permitted at certified nonscholastic events during two 10-day evaluation periods.	• Permit evaluations at nonscholastic certified events during a total of 12 days in July; the 12 days would consist of three four-day periods (with intervening dead periods) that run from Thursday at 5 pm to Sunday at 5 pm.
		or
		• Permit evaluations at nonscholastic certified events during two seven-day periods with an intervening dead period; eliminate the last week in July.
			• Event certification criteria needs to be modified to include time frame for attending events. Proposed Thursday start time and Sunday end time subject to further discussion.
			• Continue to study a model that provides for the establishment of non-exclusive evaluation camps as either a pilot or full-blown program. Issues to be determined:
			  • Site(s).
			  • Numbers and ages of PSAs.
			  • Format.
			  • Management (NCAA, USA Basketball, iHoops).
			  • Coaches ability to work camps.
			  • Cost.

Feature	Current	Leadership Council Recommendation	Additional Comments/Outstanding Isssues
Communication with PSAs			
Types	Phone, e-mail, fax only.	Eliminate restrictions on all modes of communication beginning August 1 prior to the junior year in high school.	
Phone call frequency	• June 15 of sophomore year through July 31 of junior year of high school: One per month. • August 1 prior to senior year of high school: Unlimited during contact period; two per week otherwise. • Two-year institutions and four-year PSAs: One call per week.	• Permit phone and text communication starting June 15 prior to junior year in high school – one call in June/ one call in July. • Keep July communication restrictions. • Unlimited communication beginning August 1 prior to junior year in high school.	Should text messages in addition to phone calls be allowed before August 1 prior to the junior year?
Off-campus contacts			
Off-campus contact starting point	July 1 after junior year of high school.	• Off campus contacts may be made with a prospect during the junior year in high school. • September contact period – contacts during the junior year only at the prospect's educational institution. • April contact period – contacts during the junior year only at the prospect's educational institution or at the prospect's residence.	• All contacts would be included in the limitations on the permissible number of contacts and recruiting opportunities. • Requested feedback on whether the April contact should be allowed only at the prospect's educational institution. • Current rule limiting visits to a prospect's educational institution to not more than once a week would remain applicable.
Off-campus contact in conjunction with an evaluation	Prohibited during evaluation period.	• Permit contact with juniors and seniors at the prospect's educational institution in conjunction with an evaluation (except during the time period when classes are in session and during the day of competition), provided scholastic authorities or parents and /or legal guardians are present.	• Bring back for additional discussion in October. • Should the starting date coincide with the September contact period? • All contacts/evaluations at the prospect's educational institution would count as a single recruiting opportunity. • May be necessary to change recruiting calendar

Feature	Current	Leadership Council Recommendation		Additional Comments/Outstanding Isssues
				terminology since contacts/evaluations would be permitted [with some restrictions] during both a contact and an evalution period.
Official visits				
Starting point	Senior year of high school.	• The weekend after the Men's Basketball Championship of the junior year thru the senior year of high school.		• Current requirements (standardized test score, high school transcript, register with Eligiblity Center, placed on institution's IRL) necessary to provide an official visit would remain applicable. • Included in the total number of permissible visits for the prospect and the institution.
Travel expenses	Prospect.	• May be provided to the prospect and two parents/legal guardians.		
On-campus staged evaluations (OCE) (formerly known as tryouts)	Prohibited.	• OCE permitted beginning the weekend after the Men's Basketball Championship of the junior year high school. • Limitations to be determined.		Bring back for additional discussion at October meeting.
		Division II Model • On-campus or normal practice/ competition site. • One OCE per PSA per institution. • Must be high school senior	**NABC (Based on recommendations made in 2004)** • On-campus. • 6 OCEs per PSA. • 18 OCEs per institution. • Between first permissible date for official visit and beginning of early NLI period, OCE may only occur during an official visit.	Bring back for additional discussion at October meeting.

Feature	Current	Leadership Council Recommendation		Additional Comments/Outstanding Isssues
		or older. • Typically after completion of season. • Pre-OCE physical. • Up to 2 hours. • May include testing and competition with team.	• Following the senior season, OCE may occur during official or unofficial visit. • No missed class time for OCE. • Up to 2 hours. • OCEs must be closed and unpublicized. • Only PSAs and S-As may participate.	
Summer Relationship Building/Athletics Development	Prohibited	Permit entering and continuing student-athletes to engage in summer athletics development [eight hours of conditioning per week, of which no more than two hours can be devoted to skill instruction], regardless of enrollment of summer school.		• Particpation at the discretion of the student-athlete. • Student-athletes not receving financial aid to attend summer school would be responsible for expenses.

Leadership Council Attendance
August 2, 2011, Meeting

Leadership Council members in attendance:
Michael Alden, University of Missouri, Columbia, Big Twelve Conference, chair
McKinley Boston, Jr., New Mexico State University, Western Athletic Conference
Shonna Brown, America East Conference (alternate)
Morgan Burke, Purdue University, Big Ten Conference (joined via telephone)
Peg Bradley-Doppes, University of Denver, Sun Belt Conference
Barry Collier, Butler University, Horizon League (alternate)
Janet Cone, University of North Carolina, Asheville, Big South Conference
Joan Cronan, University of Tennessee, Southeastern Conference
Beth DeBauche, Ohio Valley Conference
Peter Fields, Montana State University-Bozeman, Big Sky Conference
Dan Gavitt, Big East Conference (alternate)
Chet Gladchuk, U.S. Naval Academy, Patriot League
Ted Gumbart, Atlantic Sun Conference (alternate)
Robin Harris, Ivy League
Alan Hauser, Appalachian State University, Southern Conference
Jack Hayes, Hofstra University, Colonial Athletic Association
R.C. Johnson, University of Memphis, Conference USA
Cynthia K. Jones, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Missouri Valley Conference
Paul Kowalczyk, Colorado State University, Mountain West Conference
Scott Krapf, Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
Myndee Kay Larsen, Summit League
Susan Cross Lipnickey, Miami University, Mid-American Conference
Janet Lucas, University of California, Riverside, Big West 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
John Ritschdorff, Marist College, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference
Duer Sharp, Southwestern Athletic Conference
Ky Snyder, University of San Diego, West Coast Conference
Kevin Weiberg, Pacific-12 Conference (alternate)
Bobby Williams, Sam Houston State University, Southland Conference
Mark Wilson, Tennessee Technological University, Ohio Valley Conference

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

Leadership Council members not in attendance: Sandy Barbour, University of California, Berkeley, Pacific-12 Conference; Harold Bardo, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Missouri Valley Conference; Mike Bitter, Stetson University, Atlantic Sun Conference; Dave Blank, Elon University, Southern Conference; Jonathan (Jon) LeCrone, Horizon League; John Marinatto, Big East Conference; Derrick Ramsey, Coppin State University, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference, and Dennis Thomas, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference.

Guests
Jim Haney, executive director, National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC), and Shane Lyons, Division I Legislative Council (former chair).

NCAA staff members in attendance: Libby Harmon, Michelle Hosick, LuAnn Humphrey, Steve Mallonee, Karen Morrison, Jarrett Newby, Bill Nesidal, Rachel Newman, Donald Remy, Julie Roe Lach, and Naima Stevenson also were present during portions of the meeting.