A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association
Division I Leadership Council

Hyatt Downtown
Indianapolis, Indiana

October 13, 2011
8 a.m. to 3 p.m.

1. Welcome and introductions.

2. Division I Governance Update.

   a. Report of the August 2, 2011, Leadership Council meeting. [Supplement No. 1] [**Anticipated Action Item**]

   b. Report of the August 11, 2011, Board of Directors meeting. [Supplement No. 2]

   c. Key/Action Items from the September Division I cabinet meetings. [Supplement No. 3.]

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

3. Update on discussions regarding conference and institutional networks.

4. Multidivisional Reclassification – Opposite Gender – NCAA Bylaw 20.4.1.2. [Supplement No. 4] **[Anticipated Action Item]**

5. Discussion of men's basketball recruiting model. [Supplement No. 5A. Supplement No. 5B to be posted prior to the meeting.] [**Anticipated Action Item**]

6. Update from Agent Subcommittee. [Supplement No. 6.]

7. NCAA Convention review. [Supplement Nos. 7A and 7B.]

8. Other items of business.

9. Adjournment.

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

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 d
		• ates 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.

Communication with PSAs			

Feature	Current	Leadership Council Recommendation	Additional Comments/Outstanding Isssues
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 terminology since contacts/evaluations would

Feature	Current	Leadership Council Recommendation		Additional Comments/Outstanding Isssues
				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 or older.	**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	Bring back for additional discussion at October meeting.

Feature	Current	Leadership Council Recommendation		Additional Comments/Outstanding Isssues
		• Typically after completion of season. • Pre-OCE physical. • Up to 2 hours. • May include testing and competition with team.	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.

ADDENDUM
SUPPLEMENT NO. 1
DI Leadership Council 10/11

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
Dave 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.

REPORT OF THE AUGUST 11, 2011, MEETING OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1. **Report of the April 28, 2011, Board of Directors Meeting. The Board approved the report of its April 28, 2011, meeting, noting that the approval of the recommendations of the Task Force to Clarify the Roles of the Committee on Infractions and the Infractions Appeals Committee should include the following clarification:**

   - **When the Committee on Infractions requests that the academic and membership affairs staff provide an interpretation of applicable legislation based on facts submitted, written notice of the request and the response shall be provided to all involved parties (e.g., institution, enforcement staff, Committee on Infractions).** (Unanimous voice vote) [Reference Supplement No. 2.]

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

   a. **Presidential Retreat.** President Emmert thanked the Board members for their lively discussion during the retreat the previous two days and noted that participants in the retreat have asked that he appoint working groups and establish an agenda with aggressive timelines for the Board to act on their recommendations that address the following areas:

      (1) Financial Sustainability.

         (a) Institutional and NCAA resource efficiencies that can be achieved through the review of NCAA rules and athletics practices (e.g., personnel, travel, recruitment).

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

      (2) Integrity of the Collegiate Model.

         (a) Review and amend the NCAA Division I Manual to reduce the volume of unenforceable and inconsequential rules that fail to support our core principles and place an emphasis on the most strategically important matters. The group is also charged with developing filters that ensure new legislation aligns and addresses our core principles and values.

(b) Charge the NCAA Enforcement Staff, Division I Committee on Infractions and Division I Infractions Appeals Committee to propose a multi-level enforcement penalty structure.

BOARD ACTION: The Board directed President Emmert to bring to the Board in October an action plan (including the formation of several working groups and possible action items) that would expeditiously address the issues in the areas of financial sustainability and integrity of the collegiate model. (Unanimous voice vote.)

b. Status Report on Work of Bowl Game Licensing Task Force. Harvey Perlman, chair of the Task Force, provided the Board with an interim report on the work of the Task Force, which included recommendations in the area of governance, advertising and sponsorship, and student-athlete welfare. In its review of bowl game licensing, the Task Force noted that the purpose of NCAA regulation of postseason football bowls should be to assure that the bowls reflect the collegiate model of intercollegiate athletics. In that context, the NCAA has a strong interest in assuring that bowls are governed with integrity, that they are managed in a way that is consistent with student-athlete welfare, and that their commercial, promotional and sponsorship activities be consistent with the values associated with collegiate sports. The Task Force will distribute its preliminary recommendations to constituent groups [e.g., Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) commissioners, DIA Athletics Directors, DIA Faculty Athletics Representatives, bowl operators) for review and comment with plans to present its final report to the Board in October.

c. NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Report. Walt Harrison, chair of the Committee on Academic Performance (CAP), presented the following committee recommendations to the Board: [Reference Supplement Nos. 1A and 1B.]

(1) Academic Performance Rate (APR) Penalty Benchmark.

(a) That the Board amend the Academic Performance Rate (APR) penalty benchmark from the current multi-year rate of 900 to a multiyear rate of 930 in order to avoid penalties within the new penalty structure.

(b) Replace the current filter system used for determining historical penalties with a single filter system that is based on improvement and is available to all teams/institutions.

(c) Approve a longer transition timeline for lower resourced institutions.

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the revised APR penalty benchmark and the filter systems. (Unanimous voice vote.)

(2) Academic Performance Program (APP) Penalty Structure. That the Board approve a revised single APP penalty structure that will be cumulative and progressive and consist of five levels.

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the revised penalty structure in principle and directed CAP to bring to the Board in October a final recommendation for a multi-year penalty structure that incorporates the APR benchmark (930) as the four-year academic performance requirement for a team's eligibility to participate in any postseason event. (Unanimous voice vote.)

(3) Occasion-Three and –Four Historical Penalty Waiver Hearing Procedures. That the Board approve a revision to CAP's current policies and procedures for Occasion-Three and –Four Historical Penalty waiver hearings that requires the institutional staff member responsible for the implementation of the institution's APR improvement plan be in attendance at the institution's in-person penalty waiver hearing.

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the revision to the waiver hearing policies and procedures as recommended above. (Unanimous voice vote.)

(4) Division I Academic Performance Program Supplemental Support Fund. That the Board approve and fund the APP Supplemental Support Fund (SSF) for two additional years (i.e., 2011-12 and 2012-13).

BOARD ACTION: The Board agreed to approve the APP Supplemental Support Fund for two additional years. (Unanimous voice vote.)

(5) Appointment of Vice Chair. That the Board appoint President Roderick McDavis of Ohio University as vice chair of the committee.

BOARD ACTION: The Board voted to appoint President Roderick McDavis as vice chair of the committee. (Unanimous voice vote.)

It was noted that legislation to address the 2-4 transfer academic requirements are included in the 2011-12 legislative cycle and the Board expressed its intent to consider the legislation by the end of the academic year. In addition, the Board expects the Academic Cabinet to present recommendations regarding enhanced initial

eligibility standards, which could include a partial qualifier group that would qualify for financial assistance but not competition during the initial year in residence.

d. **Institutional and Conference Networks.** Board members previously received a letter from the chair of the Big 12 Board of Directors noting their recent action to set a moratorium of at least a year to prohibit high school content from being broadcast on Big 12 institutional media platforms. In that regard, the staff recommended that the Board endorse a staff interpretation of current recruiting rules to preclude the broadcast of any youth programming on an institutional- or conference-branded network.

BOARD ACTION: The Board voted to endorse the staff interpretation, noting that discussions will continue throughout the upcoming year to determine the best course of action for the Association relative to this issue. (Unanimous voice vote.)

3. **NCAA Executive Committee Report**. During its April 28, 2011, meeting, the Executive Committee took action to recommend restructuring of the inclusion advocacy committees within the Association's governance structure, which included the dissolution of the Executive Committee Subcommittee on Gender and Diversity Issues. The Executive Committee noted the need for greater involvement of presidents within the substructure to provide guidance and insight at the policy development level. To achieve this goal, the Executive Committee recommended that the divisional presidential bodies consider sponsoring legislation to modify the composition of the NCAA Committee on Women's Athletics (CWA) and the NCAA Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee (MOIC) by increasing the size of each committee from 15 to 18 members and to specify that the three additional positions be filled by a president from each division. Further, that there be an equal distribution of committee members from each division. [Reference Supplement Nos. 3A and 3B.]

BOARD ACTION: The Board used its authority to adopt Proposal No. 2011-09 as noncontroversial legislation to modify the composition of the CWA and MOIC as recommended. (Unanimous voice vote.)

4. **Division I Governance Structure Update**.

a. **Report of the August 2, 2011, Meeting of the Leadership Council**. Mike Alden, chair of the Division I Leadership Council, highlighted the following issues from its August 2, 2011, Leadership Council meeting: [Reference Supplement No. 5.]

(1) Men's Basketball Recruiting Model. The Leadership Council received reports from its two men's basketball recruiting subcommittees and developed recommendations for concepts to be considered in a new men's basketball recruiting model. The Council's recommendations will be distributed to various constituent groups for feedback prior to final review in October. The Council will present its final recommendations to the Board during its October meeting, at which time the Board will be asked to sponsor legislation for the 2011-12 legislative cycle.

(2) Agents. The Leadership Council received a report on several strategies being developed to address agent-related issues. The Council took no formal action, but encouraged its Agent Subcommittee to continue discussion and monitoring of agent-related issues.

b. Report of the July 14, 2011, Teleconference of the Division I Legislative Council. Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, chair of the Division I Legislative Council, reported on actions taken during the Legislative Council's July 14, 2011, teleconference. [Reference Supplement No. 6.]

[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) Legislative Actions. Due to the receipt of the requisite number of requests for override votes, the Legislative Council reconsidered its previous actions to adopt Proposal Nos. 2010-30 and 2009-100-A and took the following actions:

(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, with limited exceptions. The Legislative Council voted to maintain its previous action to adopt the proposal. The Board took no action.

(b) Proposal No. 2010-30 – Recruiting – Telephone Calls – Time Period For Telephone Calls – Sports Other Than Football. This proposal would apply the current telephone rule in men's basketball to all sports other than football. The Legislative Council reversed its previous action and defeated the proposal. The Board took no action.

(2) Board of Directors Resolution. The Legislative Council continued its discussion of the Board's resolution to review the legislative process and developed two concepts for which it requests Board endorsement: [Reference Supplement No. 7.]

(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.

BOARD ACTION: The Board endorsed the concept of two overlapping two-year cycles and asked that draft legislation be brought to the Board for review and sponsorship in October. (Unanimous voice vote.)

(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. In addition, for Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) specific legislation, the number would increase from 15 to 25 and 40 to 50. Further, it is recommended that the same minimum threshold numbers that are applicable to FCS specific legislation be established for Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) specific legislation.

BOARD ACTION: **The Board used its authority to adopt Proposal No. 2011-10 as emergency legislation, effective immediately, to increase the requisite number of override requests as recommended above.** (Unanimous voice vote.)

5. **Division I Committee on Infractions**. The NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet requested the Board reappointment Britton Binowsky, commissioner, Conference USA; Melissa Conboy, deputy director of athletics, University of Notre Dame, and John Black, attorney (public member) to the Committee on Infractions. [Reference Supplement No. 9.]

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the reappointments as recommended. (Unanimous Voice Vote.)

6. **Division I Infractions Appeals Committee**. The committee requested the Board approve several bylaw revisions and the Division I Administration Cabinet recommended one committee appointment and several reappointments. [Reference Supplement No. 10A.]

a. **Bylaw 32.10 Revision.** The committee recommended that the Board approve a revision to Bylaw 32.10 that would establish one action to meet the submission deadlines for written documents and would simplify the determination of whether those deadlines are met.

b. **Bylaw 32.10.6 Revision.** The committee recommended that the Board approve a revision to Bylaw 32.10.6 that would grant the committee the authority to review requests to waive the procedures established for the written appeal process.

c. **Bylaw 32.11.3 Revision.** The committee recommended that the Board approve a revision to Bylaw 32.11.3 that would grant the committee the authority to review requests to waive the policies and procedures for conducting hearings.

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the three legislative revisions as recommended by the committee. (Unanimous voice vote.)

d. **Committee Appointment and Reappointments**.

(1) Appointment. The Division I Administration Cabinet recommended the Board appoint W. Anthony Jenkins (Dickinson Wright PLLC, Detroit, Michigan) as a public member of the committee. [Reference Supplement No. 10B.]

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the appointment of W. Anthony Jenkins (Dickinson Wright PLLC, Detroit, Michigan) as a public member of the committee. (Unanimous voice vote.)

(2) Reappointments. The Division I Administration Cabinet recommended the Board reappoint David Williams II, vice chancellor/general counsel, Vanderbilt University, Southeastern Conference, and Jack Friedenthal, professor of law, George Washington University, Atlantic 10 Conference, to the committee. [Reference Supplement No. 10C.]

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the reappointments as recommended. (Unanimous voice vote.)

7. **Division I Administration Cabinet Recommendation**. The Administration Cabinet recommended that the Board elect Florida Gulf Coast University, Houston Baptist University, University of North Carolina Central and University of South Carolina Upstate to active Division I membership status. The cabinet also recommended that the Board

approve the conference applications of the Great West Conference, a multi-sport conference, and the National Lacrosse Conference, a single-sport conference. [Reference Supplement No. 8.]

BOARD ACTION: The Board voted to elect the four recommended institutions to active Division I membership status and approved the two conference applications. (Unanimous voice vote.)

8. Future Meeting Dates.

a. October 27, 2011, Indianapolis, Indiana.

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

c. April 26, 2012, 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

ADDENDUM
SUPPLEMENT NO. 2
DI Leadership Council 10/11

NCAA DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS
August 11, 2011, MEETING ATTENDANCE

Board members in attendance:
Stanley Albrecht, Utah State University, Western Athletic Conference
Guy Bailey, Texas Tech University, Big 12 Conference
William Beauchamp, University of Portland, West Coast Conference
Judy Genshaft, University of South Florida, Big East Conference, chair
Nathan Hatch, Wake Forest University, Atlantic Coast Conference
David Hopkins, Wright State University, Hhorizon League
Sidney McPhee, Middle Tennessee State University, Sun Belt Conference
William Meehan, Jacksonville State University, Ohio Valley Conference
Ann Millner, Weber State University, Big Sky Conference
Harris Pastides, University of South Carolina, Southeastern Conference
John Peters, Northern Illinois University, Mid-American Conference
Edward Ray, Oregon State University, Pacific-12 Conference
David Schmidly, University of New Mexico, Mountain West Conference
Lou Anna Simon, Michigan State University, Big Ten Conference
Steadman Upham, University of Tulsa, Conference USA
Timothy Wright, University of California, Riverside, Big West Conference

Board members not in attendance:
William R. Harvey, Hampton University, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference
David Skorton, Cornell University, Ivy League

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

Guests from other Division I governance bodies:
Michael Alden, University of Missouri, chair of the Division I Leadership Council
Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Ivy League, chair of the Division I Legislative Council
Walter Harrison, University of Hartford, chair of the Division I Committee on Academic Performance
Harvey Perlman, University of Nebtraska, chair of the Division I Bowl Licensing Task Force

Other NCAA staff members in attendance: Scott Bearby, Erik Christainson, Joni Comstock, Diane Dickman, Mark Emmert, Bernard Franklin, Lynn Holzman, Michelle Hosick, Brad Hotstetter, Jim Isch, Amy Kudwa, Kevin Lennon, Steve Mallonee, Keith Martin, Kathleen McNeely, Karen Morrison, Delise O'Meally, Tom Paskus, Todd Petr, Dennie Poppe, Ronnie Ramos, Bill Regan, Donald Remy, Wallace Renfro, Julie Roe Lach, Greg Shaheen, Jennifer Strawley, Robert Vowels, Wendy Walters and Bob Williams.

Key Items from the September Division I Cabinet Meetings

1. Academic Cabinet.

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

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

2. Administration Cabinet.

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

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

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

3. Amateurism Cabinet.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. Championships/Sports Management Cabinet.

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

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

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

6. Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet.

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

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

Multidivisional Reclassification – Opposite Gender – NCAA Bylaw 20.4

During its August 2 meeting, the NCAA Division I Leadership Council reviewed NCAA Proposal No. 2010-100 related to the recently adopted new Division I membership standards. Specifically, the Leadership Council focused on the provisions of the proposal that eliminated any further multidivisional reclassification. There have been some concerns brought to the attention of the Division I membership regarding non-Division I institutions that currently sponsor either a single Division I men's or single women's sport (other than football and basketball), but do not sponsor a single sport for both genders. The data shows that of the approximately 45 institutions classified as multidivisional member, 28 of those members sponsor only a single men's or women's sport (not both). 24 of the 28 institutions sponsor only a single Division I men's sport, but not a Division I women's sport. 12 of these institutions sponsor Division I men's ice hockey, but not Division I women's ice hockey.

The Leadership Council, at the request of the NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet, was asked to 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 in the opposite gender. The Leadership Council directed the staff to draft a legislative proposal for review at its October meeting to accomplish this objective and to include in the proposal information related to the length/requirements of the reclassification process, a proposed application fee and how it was established and a possible time limitation for the opportunity for institutions to reclassify a second sport.

The staff recommends that the process be identical to the two-year process that existed prior to the adoption of Proposal No. 2010-100 and recommends that the application fee be increased from $5000 to $10,000. Multidivisional members do not share in the revenue distribution and enhancement benefit programs available only to Division I members, but do receive benefits in the form of branding, as well as an increase as it relates to Division I administrative services and championship expenses in comparison to Division II and III institutions. Thus, the recommendation is to raise the application fee an additional $5000. Further, the staff does not recommend any time limitation for the opportunity to reclassify a second sport, in part because of the relatively few institutions that are even able to take advantage of the proposal, but also due to the unknown consequences that potentially may result from a Title IX review and directive. There are two proposals attached for your review, one including a five-year time limitation and the other having no limitation. The two proposals are otherwise identical.

2011-

DIVISION MEMBERSHIP -- MULTIDIVISIONAL CLASSIFICATION -- RECLASSIFICATION OF A SPORT OF THE OPPOSITE GENDER -- FIVE-YEAR PERIOD

Intent: To permit, for a five-year period beginning June 1, 2012, a member of Division II or Division III that had one sport classified in Division I during the 2010-11 academic year to petition to have one sport of the opposite gender, other than football or basketball, classified in Division I, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 20.4.1, as follows:

20.4.1 Multidivision Classification. A member of Division II or Division III may have a sport classified in Division I, provided the sport was so classified during the 2010-11 academic year. Such a classification shall continue until the institution fails to conduct the sport in Division I in any following academic year.

> **20.4.1.1 Reclassification of a Sport of the Opposite Gender -- Five-Year Period. For a five-year period beginning June 1, 2012, a member of Division II or Division III that had one sport classified in Division I during the 2010-11 academic year may petition to have one sport of the opposite gender, other than football or basketball, classified in Division I.**
>
> > **20.4.1.1.1 Notification/Application Requirement. An institution's chancellor or president shall submit to the national office written notice of the institution's intention to reclassify and a completed application. The notice and application shall be received in the national office (by mail or electronic transmission) not later than June 1 two years prior to the August 1 of the year the institution intends to reclassify the applicable sport. Any form received after June 1 shall be postmarked not later than May 25. The notice and application shall be accompanied by a $10,000 fee and a strategic plan that addresses the Division I philosophy statement (see Bylaw 20.9) and the athletics certification program operating principles (see Bylaw 22.2). If the institution fails to meet the requirements of reclassification, the application fee shall be refunded, less any expenditure for educational costs related to the reclassification process.**
> >
> > **20.4.1.1.2 Compliance with Criteria. If the institution meets all applicable division membership criteria of this article (other than scheduling requirements during the first year of reclassification) and complies for the two years preceding June 1 of the year the institution intends to reclassify the applicable sport with all other bylaw requirements as they pertain to the**

sport in question, the institution shall be eligible for participation in the division in that sport effective the August 1 of the year that the institution selects as its effective date.

20.4.1.1.3 Reclassification Requirements.

20.4.1.1.3.1 First Year. During the first year of reclassification, an institution shall satisfy the following requirements:

(a) Attend an orientation session conducted by the national office staff related to the application of Division I membership requirements. Institutional representatives required to attend the orientation session are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator;

(b) Submit an annual report and updated strategic plan by June 1 at the end of the first academic year based on feedback received from the previous year's report; and

(c) Report all violations to the Administration Cabinet as part of the required annual report.

20.4.1.1.3.2 Second Year. During the second year of reclassification, an institution shall satisfy the following requirements:

(a) Full compliance with all Division I legislation and membership requirements; and

(b) Submit an annual report and updated strategic plan confirming compliance with all Division I legislation and membership requirements; and

(c) Report all violations to the Administration Cabinet as part of the required annual report.

20.4.1.1.3.3 Compliance Review Requirement. The institution must engage in a compliance review (at the institution's expense) during the multidivision reclassification period. The review must be conducted

by an authority outside the athletics department (e.g., multisport conference, outside consultant), subject to approval by the Administration Cabinet. A copy of the report of the compliance review must be kept on file at the institution and a copy must be submitted to the Administration Cabinet.

Source:

Effective Date: Immediate; process to begin with applications received by June 1, 2012.

Proposal Category: Amendment

Topical Area: Division Membership

Rationale: This proposal provides a limited exception for a small group of Division II and Division III institutions that already sponsor a sport for one gender in Division I. 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 institutions, 24 sponsor only a men's sport and four institutions sponsor only a women's sport. In addition, 12 institutions (11 of which are in Division II) sponsor only the sport of men's ice hockey. This proposal would allow those 28 institutions the opportunity, for a reasonable period of time, to apply to have one sport of the opposite gender from the one classified in Division I also reclassified to Division I. It is possible that many of the 28 institutions may have had plans to reclassify an additional sport before the current legislation was adopted and the preceding moratorium on reclassifications. Further, there many potential issues that arise for the affected institutions as result of a Title IX review and directive.

Impact on Student-Athlete's Time (Academic and/or Athletics): None.

2011-

DIVISION MEMBERSHIP -- MULTIDIVISIONAL CLASSIFICATION -- RECLASSIFICATION OF A SPORT OF THE OPPOSITE GENDER

Intent: To permit a member of Division II or Division III that had one sport classified in Division I during the 2010-11 academic year to petition to have one sport of the opposite gender, other than football or basketball, classified in Division I, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 20.4.1, as follows:

20.4.1 Multidivision Classification. A member of Division II or Division III may have a sport classified in Division I, provided the sport was so classified during the 2010-11 academic year. Such a classification shall continue until the institution fails to conduct the sport in Division I in any following academic year.

> **20.4.1.1 Reclassification of a Sport of the Opposite Gender. A member of Division II or Division III that had one sport classified in Division I during the 2010-11 academic year may petition to have one sport of the opposite gender, other than football or basketball, classified in Division I.**
>
> > **20.4.1.1.1 Notification/Application Requirement. An institution's chancellor or president shall submit to the national office written notice of the institution's intention to reclassify and a completed application. The notice and application shall be received in the national office (by mail or electronic transmission) not later than June 1 two years prior to the August 1 of the year the institution intends to reclassify the applicable sport. Any form received after June 1 shall be postmarked not later than May 25. The notice and application shall be accompanied by a $10,000 fee and a strategic plan that addresses the Division I philosophy statement (see Bylaw 20.9) and the athletics certification program operating principles (see Bylaw 22.2). If the institution fails to meet the requirements of reclassification, the application fee shall be refunded, less any expenditure for educational costs related to the reclassification process.**
> >
> > **20.4.1.1.2 Compliance with Criteria. If the institution meets all applicable division membership criteria of this article (other than scheduling requirements during the first year of reclassification) and complies for the two years preceding June 1 of the year the institution intends to reclassify the applicable sport with all other bylaw requirements as they pertain to the sport in question, the institution shall be eligible for participation in the**

division in that sport effective the August 1 of the year that the institution selects as its effective date.

20.4.1.1.3 Reclassification Requirements.

20.4.1.1.3.1 First Year. During the first year of reclassification, an institution shall satisfy the following requirements:

(a) Attend an orientation session conducted by the national office staff related to the application of Division I membership requirements. Institutional representatives required to attend the orientation session are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator;

(b) Submit an annual report and updated strategic plan by June 1 at the end of the first academic year based on feedback received from the previous year's report; and

(c) Report all violations to the Administration Cabinet as part of the required annual report.

20.4.1.1.3.2 Second Year. During the second year of reclassification, an institution shall satisfy the following requirements:

(a) Full compliance with all Division I legislation and membership requirements; and

(b) Submit an annual report and updated strategic plan confirming compliance with all Division I legislation and membership requirements; and

(c) Report all violations to the Administration Cabinet as part of the required annual report.

20.4.1.1.3.3 Compliance Review Requirement. The institution must engage in a compliance review (at the institution's expense) during the multidivision reclassification period. The review must be conducted by an authority outside the athletics department (e.g., multisport

conference, outside consultant), subject to approval by the Administration Cabinet. A copy of the report of the compliance review must be kept on file at the institution and a copy must be submitted to the Administration Cabinet.

Source:

Effective Date: Immediate; process to begin with applications received by June 1, 2012.

Proposal Category: Amendment

Topical Area: Division Membership

Rationale: This proposal provides a limited exception for a small group of Division II and Division III institutions that already sponsor a sport for one gender in Division I. 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 institutions, 24 sponsor only a men's sport and four institutions sponsor only a women's sport. In addition, 12 institutions (11 of which are in Division II) sponsor only the sport of men's ice hockey. This proposal would allow those 28 institutions the opportunity to apply to have one sport of the opposite gender from the one classified in Division I also reclassified to Division I. It is possible that many of the 28 institutions may have had plans to reclassify an additional sport before the current legislation was adopted and the preceding moratorium on reclassifications. Further, there many potential issues that arise for the affected institutions as result of a Title IX review and directive.

Impact on Student-Athlete's Time (Academic and/or Athletics): None.

Excerpt from the Report of the June 21-23, 2011, Meeting of the NCAA Committee on Women's Athletics

Multidivisional reclassification – opposite gender -- NCAA Bylaw 20.4.1.2. The Committee on Women's Athletics (CWA) engaged in a thorough discussion regarding the application of new Division I membership requirements and the elimination of multidivisional reclassification. It was noted this issue was being discussed by the Division I administration cabinet. The committee unanimously supported permitting institutions that currently have 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.

In its review of the issue, the committee emphasized that institutions which already have a Division I sport and seek to elevate an opposite gender sport should have the opportunity to do so in order to provide equitable student-athlete access to competitive opportunities.

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.

Communication with PSAs			

Feature	Current	Leadership Council Recommendation	Additional Comments/Outstanding Isssues
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 terminology since contacts/evaluations would

Feature	Current	Leadership Council Recommendation		Additional Comments/Outstanding Isssues
				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 or older.	**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	Bring back for additional discussion at October meeting.

Feature	Current	Leadership Council Recommendation		Additional Comments/Outstanding Isssues
		• Typically after completion of season. • Pre-OCE physical. • Up to 2 hours. • May include testing and competition with team.	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.

Proposal No. 2011-23 Definition of an Agent

Proposal Number: 2011-23

Title: AMATEURISM -- DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS -- AGENT

Intent: To specify that an agent is any individual who, directly or indirectly, represents or attempts to represent an individual for the purpose of marketing 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 educational institution or from a student-athlete's potential earnings as a professional athlete.

Bylaws: Amend 12.02, as follows:

12.02 DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS

12.02.1 Agent. An agent is any individual who, directly or indirectly:

(a) Represents or attempts to represent an individual for the purpose of marketing his or her athletics ability or reputation for financial gain; or

(b) Seeks to obtain any type of financial gain or benefit from securing a prospective student-athlete's enrollment at an educational institution or from a student-athlete's potential earnings as a professional athlete.

12.02.1.1 Application. An agent 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.

12.02.1 through 12.02.6 renumbered as 12.02.2 through 12.02.7, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet

Effective Date: Immediate

Category: Amendment

Topical Area: Amateurism

Rationale: As the salaries of professional athletes have risen, age restrictions to participate in professional sports leagues have changed and the notoriety of elite student-athletes has increased with scouting and media exposure, the interest of outside third parties in elite athletes is now greater than ever. As a result, an industry of individuals has been created, including runners, financial advisors, marketing representatives, business managers, brand managers and street agents who seek to broker elite athletes for financial gain. Although 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 circumvent the rules. One constant is the use of outside third parties. These third parties typically operate free of any governing body's jurisdiction. In order to regulate the interaction of these individuals with prospective student-athletes and student-athletes, the definition of an agent must be broadened. This proposal is not intended to include parents or legal guardians, athletics department staff members, former teammates or those individuals who have the best interest of a prospective student-athlete or student-athlete in mind in providing assistance or information, provided they do not intend to receive a financial gain for their assistance.

Budget Impact: None.

Impact on Student-Athlete's Time (Academic and/or Athletics): None.

Position Statement(s)

Date Printed: October 5, 2011

documentcenter.ncaa.org/msaa/gov/DI Committees/Leadership Council/2011-10 Leadership Council/06, Agent Definition Legislation.pdf:vlm/10/6/11

Proposal No. 2011-23 Definition of an Agent

none

History

Jun 10, 2011: Submit; Submitted for consideration.

Jun 28, 2011: Amateurism Cabinet, Sponsored

PROFESSIONAL LEAGUES DRAFT COMPARISON

	NBA	NFL	MLB	NHL	MLS	WNBA
Professional league eligibility requirements for draft.	Player must be at least 19 years old; and must be one year removed from high school graduation (if not an international player).	Player must be at least three years removed from high school.	High school players who have graduated high school and not yet attended college; and four-year college players who have either completed their junior or senior years or are at least 21 years old.	All players age 18 or older are eligible except: players on the reserve list of a club; players who have been claimed in two prior Entry Drafts; and players who have previously played in the NHL and became a free agent.	NCAA student-athletes who have exhausted their eligibility, unless that student-athlete has chosen to be a part of Generation Adidas.	An individual 22 years old; a graduate from a four-year university; or an individual who has attended a four-year university who either has no remaining intercollegiate eligibility or renounces her remaining intercollegiate eligibility by written notice to the WNBA at least 10 days prior to such draft.
Draft application deadline.	The fourth week of April.	January 15.	None.	None.	None.	None.
Draft withdrawal deadline.	The second week of June.	72 hours after early-entry deadline (midnight January 18).	Any drafted player with remaining collegiate eligibility that does not sign a contract with the MLB team that has drafted him prior to midnight (Eastern time) on August 15 will be placed back into the draft pool for the next year's draft.	None.	None.	None.

	NBA	NFL	MLB	NHL	MLS	WNBA
NCAA draft rule.	One time exception: student-athlete must withdraw from draft by May 8 to remain eligible to compete in intercollegiate athletics.	One time exception: student-athlete must declare intention to resume intercollegiate participation within 72 hours of draft declaration date.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	One time exception: provided the student-athlete is not drafted, student-athlete must declare intention to resume intercollegiate participation within 30 days after the draft.
Approximate date of draft.	Around June 24.	Around April 22 to 24.	Around June 7 to 9.	Around June 25 to 26.	Around January 14.	Around April 8.
Approximate date of combine/ workouts.	NBA teams can conduct or attend workouts with early-entry players around April 29. NBA Draft Combine around May 19 to 23.	Around February 23 to March 1.	None.	Around May 24 to 29.	Around January 8 to 13.	None.
Is there an Advisory Committee?	Yes.	Yes.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Agent Interaction	Prospective student-athlete's identified in middle and high school. Third parties attach themselves sometimes during middle school years and increasing throughout high school.	Although the NFLPA junior rule prohibits agents from contacting student-athlete's until they are three years removed from high school, agents have formed alliances with third parties to build relationships.	Agents and advisors actively recruit and sign prospective student-athlete's during high school due to the non opt-in draft. Advisors continue that relationship when/if student-athlete's enroll at institutions. Canadian hockey league recruits players out of high school to play professionally.	Agents and advisors actively recruit and sign prospective student-athlete's during high school due to the non opt-in draft. Advisors continue that relationship when/if student-athlete's enroll at institutions	International agents might try to develop relationships with top prospective student-athlete's and student-athlete's in high school to play overseas.	Agent/advisors develop relationship with student-athlete's during junior and senior collegiate season. International agents could develop relationships earlier to try and recruit student-athlete's s to play overseas.

Who could trigger new agent definition (option 2) – based upon AGA case precedent	Contract advisors; trainers; advisors; financial advisors; disability insurance representatives; brand managers; business managers; runners; former student-athletes; marketing representatives; jewelers.	Contract advisors; trainers; advisors; financial advisors; disability insurance representatives; brand managers; business managers; runners; former student-athletes; marketing representatives; jewelers.	Contract advisors; trainers; advisors; financial advisors; disability insurance representatives; brand managers; business managers; runners; former student-athletes; marketing representatives; jewelers.	Contract advisors; trainers; advisors; financial advisors; disability insurance representatives; brand managers; business managers; runners; former student-athletes; marketing representatives; jewelers.	Contract advisors; trainers; advisors; runners.	Contract advisors; trainers; advisors; financial advisors; disability insurance representatives; runners; former student-athletes.

This proposal is not intended to include parents or legal guardians, athletics department staff members, former teammates or those individuals who have the best interest of a prospective student-athlete or student-athlete in mind in providing assistance or information, provided they do not intend to receive a financial gain for their assistance.

In the sports of ice hockey and soccer, many student-athletes choose to enter into an international draft. In ice hockey specifically, many student-athletes enter into the Canadian draft.

** Third parties include the following: trainers, advisors, financial advisors, disability insurance representatives, brand managers, business managers, runners, former student-athletes, marketing representatives, jewelers.

ATTACHMENT B
SUPPLEMENT NO. 6
DI Leadership Council 10/11

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

Highlights of the Uniform Athlete Agents Act (UAAA) and the Sports Agent Responsibility and Trust Act (SPARTA)

Title:	**Uniform Athlete Agents Act (UAAA)**	**Sports Agent Responsibility and Trust Act (SPARTA)**
Author:	National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws.	Former Representative Bart Gordon (D-TN), Former Representative Tom Osborne (R-NE), and Senator Ron Wyden (D-OR).
Date of Enactment:	40 States, Washington D.C. and the U.S. Virgin Islands have adopted the model act since 2000.	The legislation was signed into law by President George W. Bush on September 24, 2004.
Athlete Agent Registration:	An athlete agent is required to register in a state before initiating contact with a student-athlete to induce them to enter into an agency contract. If a student-athlete initiates contact with an athlete agent, the agent has seven days to submit an application of registration. The Act provides for reciprocal use of applications in states which have adopted the UAAA.	The Act does not have an athlete agent registration component. However, it does contain a "Sense of Congress" section that encourages states to enact the Uniform Athlete Agents Act because of its important registration requirement.
Prohibited Conduct:	• An agent may not give false or misleading information or promises with the intent to induce a student-athlete into signing an agency contract. • An agent is prohibited from furnishing anything of value to a student-athlete before signing a contract.	• An agent may not give false or misleading information or promises with the intent to induce a student-athlete into signing an agency contract. • An agent is prohibited from furnishing anything of value to a student-athlete before signing a contract. • Predate or postdate an agency contract.

Notice:	An athlete agent and a student-athlete are required to notify the athletic director of the educational institution within 72 hours of entering into an agency contract or before the next athletic event in which the student-athlete may participate.	An athlete agent and a student-athlete are required to notify the athletic director of the educational institution within 72 hours of entering into an agency contract or before the next athletic event in which the student-athlete may participate.
Contract Language:	An agency contract is required to have the following language. Absent this language the contract becomes voidable by the student-athlete. **If you sign this contract:** **(1) You may lose your eligibility to compete as a student-athlete in your sport:** **(2) If you have an athletic director, within 72 hours after entering into this contract, both you and your athlete agent must notify your athletic director; and** **(3) You may cancel this contract within 14 days after signing it. Cancellation of this contract may not reinstate your eligibility.**	An agency contract is required to have the following language. **"Warning to Student-Athlete: If you agree orally or in writing to be represented by an agent now or in the future you may lose your eligibility to compete as a student-athlete in your sport. Within 72 hours after entering into this contract or before the next athletic event in which you are eligible to participate, whichever occurs first, both you and the agent by whom you are agreeing to be represented must notify the athletic director of the educational at which you are enrolled, or other individual responsible for athletic programs at such educational institution, that you have entered into an agency contract."**

Penalties:	• Allows for criminal penalties. • Provides educational institutions the right to bring a civil action against an athlete agent or former student-athlete for damages caused by a violation of the Act. • Allows for administrative penalties.	• Allows the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) to treat a violation of this Act as a violation of FTC rules on unfair and deceptive acts or practices. • Provides educational institutions the right to bring a civil action against violators of the Act. Also, provides authority for a state to bring a civil action against a violator of the Act.

NCAA/09/27/11/EB:ms

ATTACHMENT D
SUPPLEMENT NO. 6
DI Leadership Council 10/11

MEMORANDUM

September 20, 2011

TO: Rachel Newman Baker.

FROM: Libby Harmon and Bill Nesnidal.

SUBJECT: Amateur Draft Report.

The purpose of this research and analysis was to determine trends from data of underclassmen student-athletes leaving college early to enter the National Basketball Association (NBA) or National Football League (NFL) Draft's. The data from this report originated from NFL tracking and research as well as an enforcement staff compilation of NBA Draft data and NFL Draft trends. This information is reflected in the analysis contained in this memorandum and the attached chart.

NBA trends

For the 2008, 2009 and 2010 drafts, at least half of the underclassmen who entered and currently play in the NBA were drafted after their freshman or sophomore years.

About 40 percent of the total number of underclassmen who declared for the draft in the past three years currently plays in the league.

About 94 percent of the underclassmen drafted by the league over the past year are still playing.

NFL trends

Most underclassmen are drafted in the first three rounds in the NFL Draft. Since 1990, 71 percent of underclassmen were drafted in the first three rounds, and 38 percent were drafted in the first round.

Since 1990, 60.8 percent of the underclassmen eligible to be drafted were selected by an NFL team.

Utilizing a five-year outlook, an average of 7.6 percent underclassmen drafted by the NFL are released from the league each year. This number increases to an average of 12 percent released from the league during the fourth and fifth seasons after the initial draft year.

Conclusion

Several trends and conclusions can be drawn from the NBA and NFL Draft data provided in this memorandum. Specifically, once an underclassman student-athlete is drafted into either league, there is a high retention rate. The retention rate is higher in the NFL than the NBA; however, there is a slight but steady decrease in the retention rate in both leagues.

On average, those underclassmen eligible to declare for the NFL Draft have a higher percentage to be drafted by the NFL than those underclassmen eligible to declare for the NBA Draft. Potentially, more underclassmen student-athletes believe they will be drafted by the NBA than actually are. Compared to those underclassmen's expectations of being drafted by the NFL. Additionally, it is important to keep in mind the difference in the number of roster spots for each league, approximately 53 roster spots in the NFL and 15 roster spots in the NBA.

While the NBA Draft's fewer underclassmen, many of those undrafted underclassmen pursue other options, such as Europe, to continue their professional careers. However, aside from the NFL, those wishing to pursue a professional football career do not have many other opportunities compared to those wishing to pursue a professional basketball career outside the NBA.

In conclusion, the numbers of underclassmen who declare for the NFL and NBA Draft's are on the rise. This data could be used in the future to educate underclassmen student-athletes and institutions regarding how to weigh the options to continue pursuing a college degree versus pursuing a professional career. It would be helpful to continue collecting and tracking this data for future NBA and NFL Draft's to be able to identify any changes in the current trends.

RNB:mrs

ATTACHMENT

Draft Season	League	Number	Draft Season		Season + 1		Season + 2	
2008	NBA	28	28	100.00%	27	96.43%	24	85.71%
	NFL	39	38	97.44%	39	100.00%	37	94.87%
2009	NBA	26	26	100.00%	25	96.15%		
	NFL	41	41	100.00%	41	100.00%		
2010	NBA	35	35	100.00%				
	NFL	46	45	97.83%				

Figure No. 1: Underclassmen drafted by the NBA and NFL that remained in the league after their first three years.

NFL					
Years	**Total Players Eligible**	**Players Selected**	**Players Not Selected**	**Percentage Selected**	**Percentage Not Selected**
2008	70	39	31	55.7%	44.3%
2009	58	41	17	70.7%	29.3%
2010	62	46	16	74.2%	25.8%
NBA					
Years	**Total Players Eligible**	**Players Selected**	**Players Not Selected**	**Percentage Selected**	**Percentage Not Selected**
2008	49	28	21	57.1%	42.9%
2009	74	26	48	35.1%	64.9%
2010	80	35	45	43.8%	56.3%

Figure No. 2: Underclassmen eligible and selected for the NFL and NBA drafts during the past three years.

		Draft Season		Season + 1		Season + 2		Season + 3		Season + 4		Season + 5	
Draft Season	**No.**	**53 Man Roster**		**Return**		**Return**		**Return**		**Return**		**Return**	
2005	38	34	89.5%	33	86.8%	26	68.4%	26	68.4%	24	63.2%	21	55.3%
2006	34	31	91.2%	29	85.3%	29	85.3%	27	79.4%	24	70.6%		
2007	29	27	93.1%	28	96.6%	27	93.1%	26	89.7%				
2008	39	35	89.7%	39	100%	35	89.7%						
2009	41	40	97.6%	39	95.1%								
2010	46	45	97.8%										
Average			93.2%		92.8%		84.1%		79.2%		66.9%		55.3%

Figure 3. The length of time the underclassmen drafted by the NFL remained in the league.

Division I Meetings
2012 Annual Convention Meeting Schedule

	Wednesday January 11		Thursday, January 12				Friday, January 13	Saturday, January 14
7	LGC/SAAC Breakfast (7 – 8 a.m.)							
7:30		Conference Meetings (7:30 a.m.–7 p.m.						Joint SAAC/BOD Breakfast (7:30 – 9 a.m.)
8	**Legislative Council (LGC) (8 a.m. - 5 p.m.)**		Legislative Council (LGC) (8 – 10 a.m.)			Leadership Council (8 a.m. – 3		
8:30					Conference Meetings (8:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.)			
9							Status of Presidential Retreat Initiatives (9 a.m. – noon)	Board of Directors Meeting (9 a.m. – 5 p.m.)
9:30				Assn-wide Programming (9:30 – 11a.m.)				
10								
10:30								
11				Assn-wide Programming (11:15 – 12:15)				
11:30								
Noon						SAAC will join for Lunch		BOD Luncheon (12 - 1 p.m.)
12:30				Assn. Luncheon (12:30 – 2 p.m.)				
1								Board of Directors Meeting Continues
1:30							Executive Committee Meeting *(1:30 – 4:30 p.m.)*	
2				Assn-wide Programming (2:15 – 3:45 p.m.)				
2:30								
3								
3:30			Opening Business Session (4 – 5:30 p.m.) (Doors open at 3:30)					
4								
4:30								
5								
5:30			Delegates Reception (5:30 – 7 p.m.)					
6							Honors Celebration (6-8 p.m.)	
6:30								
7								
7:30								
8								
8:30								
9								
10								

Meetings either DI LGC/LDC Councils should attend. Additional Association-wide events. Meetings DI Board would be interested in attending.

All meetings will be held in the Marriott unless specified differently.

09/15/11:vlm

NCAA Convention
2012 INDIANAPOLIS

Filter Schedule of Events

Tuesday, January 10, 2012

7 a.m. to 6 p.m.	NCAA Convention Registration *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
8 a.m. to 4 p.m.	NCAA/NACUBO Athletics Business Officer Program *Who Can Attend: By pre-registration only*
1 to 2:45 p.m.	Scholarly Colloquium - NCAA Academic Reform: History, Context, and Challenges *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
2 to 10 p.m.	NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Meeting *Who Can Attend: Division I national SAAC members*
2 to 11 p.m.	Big East Conference Legislative Meeting *Who Can Attend: Must be a member of this conference to attend*
3 to 4:30 p.m.	Scholarly Colloquium - NCAA Academic Reform: Results *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
4 to 6 p.m.	NCAA Division I Football Championship Subdivision Governance Committee *Who Can Attend: Must be a member of this committee to attend*
4:45 to 6 p.m.	Scholarly Colloquium - Presentation of Selected Papers *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
5 to 8 p.m.	NCAA Pathway Program *Who Can Attend: By invitation only*
6 to 7 p.m.	NCAA Divisions I, II and III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Joint Dinner *Who Can Attend: All national SAAC members*

Wednesday, January 11, 2012

6:30 to 7:15 a.m.	NCAA Be Well Fitness Class - Yoga *Who Can Attend: All attendees*

7 a.m. to 6 p.m.	NCAA Convention Registration *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
7:30 to 8:30 a.m.	NCAA Divisions I, II and III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Joint Breakfast *Who Can Attend: All national SAAC members*
8 a.m. to 2 p.m.	NCAA Playing Rules Oversight Panel Meeting *Who Can Attend: Must be a member of this committee to attend*
8 a.m. to 4 p.m.	NCAA/NACUBO Athletics Business Officer Program *Who Can Attend: By pre-registration only*
8 a.m. to 5 p.m.	NCAA Division I Legislative Council *Who Can Attend: Must be a member of this committee to attend*
8:30 a.m. to 8 p.m.	NCAA Pathway Program *Who Can Attend: By invitation only*
8:30 a.m. to 10 p.m.	NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Meeting *Who Can Attend: Division I national SAAC members*
10:15 to 11:45 a.m.	NCAA Educational Session - Athletics and Student Affairs: Partnering for Student-Athlete Success *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
10:15 to 11:45 a.m.	NCAA Educational Session - Structuring and Staffing the Intercollegiate Athletics Department *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
10:15 to 11:45 a.m.	NCAA Educational Session - The New Era in NCAA Championships 89:ONE *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
Noon to 1:30 p.m.	NCAA Keynote Luncheon *Who Can Attend: By pre-registration only, standby line also available as space allows*
1:30 to 5 p.m.	NCAA Convention Trade Show *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
1:30 to 6:30 p.m.	NCAA Championships Bid Opportunities Booth *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
1:30 to 6:30 p.m.	NCAA Committee Administration Booth *Who Can Attend: All attendees*

1:30 to 6:30 p.m.	NCAA FARA Booth *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
1:30 to 6:30 p.m.	NCAA Scholarship Programs Booth *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
1:30 to 6:30 p.m.	NCAA Sports Wagering Information Booth *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
1:30 to 6:30 p.m.	NCAA Student-Athlete Affairs Booth *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
1:45 to 2:45 p.m.	NCAA Educational Session - Academic Success and Missed Class Time *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
1:45 to 2:45 p.m.	NCAA Educational Session - NCAA Inclusion Summit ... What's Next? *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
1:45 to 2:45 p.m.	NCAA Educational Session - Telling the Story of the Student-Athlete *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
1:45 to 3 p.m.	Scholarly Colloquium - Presidents, Chancellors and Athletics Directors Discuss Academic Reform **(Note: panel will continue until 3:30 p.m.)** *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
3 to 4 p.m.	Scholarly Colloquium - **(Panel continued)** Academic Reform Panel, Conclusions, Discussions and Closing Remarks *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
3 to 4 p.m.	NCAA Educational Session - Compliance in the Contemporary Athletics Environment *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
3 to 4 p.m.	NCAA Educational Session - Inclusion of Transgender Student-Athletes *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
3 to 4 p.m.	NCAA Educational Session - Students First: Giving Student-Athletes the College Experience They Deserve *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
3 to 4 p.m.	NCAA National Office Building Expansion Tour *Who Can Attend: All attendees*

5 to 6:30 p.m.	NCAA Convention Trade Show Reception *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
5 to 6:30 p.m.	NCAA Divisions I, II and III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Joint Dinner *Who Can Attend: All national SAAC members*

Thursday, January 12, 2012

6:30 to 7:15 a.m.	NCAA Be Well Fitness Class - Zumba *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
7 a.m. to 6 p.m.	NCAA Convention Registration *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
8 to 10 a.m.	NCAA Division I Legislative Council *Who Can Attend: Must be a member of this committee to attend*
8 a.m. to 3 p.m.	NCAA Division I Leadership Council *Who Can Attend: Must be a member of this committee to attend*
8:30 a.m. to 7 p.m.	NCAA Pathway Program *Who Can Attend: By invitation only*
9 to 11 a.m.	NCAA Educational Session - Enforcement Experience *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
9:30 to 10:30 a.m.	NCAA National Office Building Expansion Tour *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
9:30 to 11 a.m.	I-AAA Athletics Directors Association Membership Meeting *Who Can Attend: Must be a member of this association to attend*
9:30 to 11 a.m.	NCAA Educational Session - Education-Impacting Disabilities: Student-Specific Impact, Campus-Wide Solutions *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
9:30 to 11 a.m.	NCAA Educational Session - The Division III Student-Athlete Experience *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
9:30 to 11 a.m.	NCAA Educational Session - Title IX: The Latest Developments and Trends *Who Can Attend: All attendees*

9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.	NCAA Championships Bid Opportunities Booth *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.	NCAA Convention Trade Show *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.	NCAA FARA Booth *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.	NCAA Scholarship Programs Booth *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.	NCAA Sports Wagering Information Booth *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.	NCAA Student-Athlete Affairs Booth *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
11:15 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.	NCAA Educational Session - Addressing Violence: Cross-Campus Solutions *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
11:15 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.	NCAA Educational Session - Budgeting to Success *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
11:15 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.	NCAA Educational Session - Getting Our Attention: Non-Medical Use of ADHD Stimulants on College Campuses *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
11:15 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.	NCAA Educational Session - Using Technology to Work Smarter on NCAA Division III Campuses *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
12:30 to 2 p.m.	NCAA Association Luncheon *Who Can Attend: By pre-registration only, standby line also available as space allows*
2:15 to 3:45 p.m.	NCAA Educational Session - New NCAA Division I Athletics Certification Program *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
2:15 to 3:45 p.m.	NCAA Educational Session - Social Media: Building and Engaging an Online Community *Who Can Attend: All attendees*

2:15 to 3:45 p.m.	NCAA Educational Session - The FAR in the Enforcement Process: Contributing to Institutional Control *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
4 to 5:30 p.m.	NCAA Opening Business Session *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
5:30 to 7 p.m.	NCAA Delegates Reception *Who Can Attend: All attendees*

Friday, January 13, 2012

6:30 to 7:15 a.m.	NCAA Be Well Fitness Class - Pilates *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
7 to 8:30 a.m.	NCAA Divisions I, II and III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Joint Breakfast *Who Can Attend: All national SAAC members*
7 a.m. to 8 p.m.	NCAA Convention Registration *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
7:30 to 9 a.m.	NCAA President's Breakfast *Who Can Attend: Presidents and Chancellors only*
8:30 a.m. to noon	NCAA Pathway Program *Who Can Attend: By invitation only*
8:30 a.m. to 6 p.m.	NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Meeting *Who Can Attend: Division I national SAAC members*
9 a.m. to noon	NCAA Division I Session - Status of Presidential Retreat Initiatives *Who Can Attend: All Division I attendees*
1:30 to 4:30 p.m.	NCAA Executive Committee *Who Can Attend: Must be a member of this committee to attend*
6 to 8 p.m.	NCAA Honors Celebration *Who Can Attend: By pre-registration only, standby line also available as space allows*

Saturday, January 14, 2012

6:30 to 7:15 a.m.	NCAA Be Well Fitness Class - Boot Camp *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
6:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.	NCAA Convention Registration *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
7 to 8:30 a.m.	NCAA Delegates Breakfast *Who Can Attend: All attendees*
7:30 to 9 a.m.	NCAA Division I Board of Directors/Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Breakfast *Who Can Attend: Must be a member of one of these committees to attend*
9:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.	NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Meeting *Who Can Attend: Division I national SAAC members*
9 a.m. to 5 p.m.	NCAA Division I Board of Directors *Who Can Attend: Must be a member of this committee to attend*
11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	NCAA Delegates Lunch *Who Can Attend: All attendees*

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
DIVISION I LEADERSHIP COUNCIL
OCTOBER 13, 2011, MEETING

ACTION ITEMS.

1. **Men's Basketball Recruiting Model.** The NCAA Division I Leadership Council continued its discussion of previously developed concepts to be included in a men's basketball recruiting model. The Leadership Council agreed to recommend that the NCAA Division I Board of Directors take final action on a men's basketball recruiting model that provides for earlier and increased access to prospective student-athletes by Division I coaches. [Note: See Attachment A for details of the new recruiting model and the explanation of changes.]

2. **Summer Access to Student-Athletes.** During its discussions regarding a men's basketball recruiting model, the Leadership Council raised the issue of men's basketball coaches having access to their current student-athletes during the summer in order to build better relationships and to further develop athletics skills. The Leadership Council agreed to recommend that the Board of Directors take final action on its recommendation to 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 enrollement in summer school. [Note: See Attachment B for the summer skill development recommendation.]

3. **Multidivisional Reclassification – Opposite Gender -- NCAA Bylaw 20.4.1.2**. The Leadership Council agreed to recommend that the NCAA Division I Board of Directors adopt noncontroversial legislation that would permit current Division II and Division III institutions that had one sport (other than football and basketball) classified in Division I for the 2010-11 academic year to petition to have one sport of the opposite gender reclassified to Division I. The Leadership Council agreed that the reclassification process should be identical to the two-year process that existed before the adoption of Proposal No. 2010-100, that the application fee should be increased to $10,000 and that there be no time limitation for the opportunity to reclassify a second sport.

4. **Definition of an Agent**. The Leadership Council reviewed Proposal No. 2011-23, which would modify the definition of an agent to include any individual who, directly or indirectly, represents or attempts to represent an individual for the purpose of marketing 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 educational institution or from a student-athlete's potential earnings as a professional athlete. The Leadership Council expressed its support for the proposal and agreed to recommend that the NCAA Division I Legislative Council use its authority to adopt the proposal as noncontroversial legislation.

INFORMATION ITEMS.

1. **Report of August 2, 2011, Leadership Council Meeting**. The Leadership Council approved the report of its August 2, 2011, meeting, noting that the last sentence of Item No. 1 of the report should indicate that details regarding the concepts discussed by the Leadership Council regarding a new men's basketball recruiting model could be found in the attachment to the report, rather than implying that the recommendations in the attachment were all inclusive or final.

2. **Update on Presidential Retreat Initiatives**. The Leadership Council received an update regarding the work of the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance (CAP) and the four working groups established as a result of discussions during the retreat. The Council expressed the following concerns:

   a. That there may be unintended consequences with current student-athletes who want to negotiate a new multi-year financial aid agreement and, if not successful, choose to transfer to another institution and be immediately eligible for competition. This could negatively impact the team's Academic Performance Rate (APR).

   b. That the Association may receive negative feedback from the media and the public if there is a $2,000 limit on miscellaneous expenses that student-athletes may receive above the value of a full grant-in-aid, rather than allowing aid up to the actual full cost of attendance.

   c. That when considering enhancements to the initial-eligibility and two-year college transfer requirements, CAP should be mindful of the potential impact on minority prospective student-athletes.

   d. That there be consistent and regular communication with all Division I presidents and other constituent groups as the working groups develop their recommendations.

3. Discussion of Agent Activities. Mark Hollis, chair of the NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet, reported on the work of the Division I Amateurism Cabinet regarding the following agent-related issues:

a. Agent Registration Program. The Amateurism Cabinet expressed its support for a national agent registration program, noting that such a program would provide institutions with information about agents that would otherwise be unavailable.

b. Potential Legislation Regarding the Use of Agents and Advisors Prior to Enrollment. The Amateurism Cabinet continued its discussions regarding the use of agents and advisors prior to enrollment for nonopt-in drafts that allow players to be drafted out of high school. The Amateurism Cabinet did not support permitting the use of agents in these sports at this time. Discussion regarding sports-specific legislation regarding agents will continue.

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

5. Future Meetings.

a. January 12, 2012, Indianapolis, IN

b. April 2012, TBD, 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

Preliminary Division I Men's Basketball Recruiting Model

Feature	Current	Leadership Council Recommendation	Additional Comments
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, which should include an additional requirement that the event may not begin before Friday 6 pm and must conclude no later than Sunday 4 pm.	
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 Wednesday at 5 pm to Sunday at 5 pm.	• The evaluation period would consist of the first three four-day periods (Wednesday 5 p.m. – Sunday 5 p.m.) beginning with the first Wednesday on or after July 6. • The staff can continue discussion regarding whether event certification criteria should be modified to require events to conclude at an earlier time on the final day.
Communication with PSAs			
Types	Phone, e-mail, fax only.	• Eliminate restrictions on all modes of communication on or after June 15 following the completion of the prospect's sophomore year in high school. • Eliminate communication restrictions applicable to prospects particpating in certified basketball events (April/July). .	
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.		

Feature	Current	Leadership Council Recommendation	Additional Comments
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. • Recruiting periods other than April – contacts during the junior year only at the prospect's educational institution. • April recruiting period – contacts during the junior year only at the prospect's educational institution or at the prospect's residence.	• 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 recuiting opportunities with juniors and seniors to be either contacts or evaluations. Contacts may not be made during the time period when classes are in session or during the day of a prospect's competition. • The current academic year recruiting calendar shall maintain recruiting periods, but will eliminate distinctions between contact and evaluation periods.	• Institutions are permitted to still have seven recuiting opportunities during each academic year.
Official visits			
Starting point	Senior year of high school.	• January 1 of the junior year through 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.	

Feature	Current	Leadership Council Recommendation	Additional Comments	
On-campus skill evaluations (OCE) (formerly known as tryouts)	Prohibited.	• Support the concept of permitting prospects to participate in OCEs.	The Leadership Council will develop the parameters of an OCE model for consideration at its January 2012 meeting. Possible models for consideration are listed below:	
			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.

Summer Relationship Building/Athletics Development

Feature	Current	Leadership Council Recommendation	Additional Comments
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.	• Participation at the discretion of the student-athlete. • Student-athletes not receiving financial aid to attend summer school would be responsible for expenses.

Leadership Council Attendance
October 13, 2011, Meeting

Leadership Council members in attendance:
Michael Alden, University of Missouri, Columbia, Big Twelve Conference, chair
Harold Bardo, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Missouri Valley Conference
Mike Bitter, Stetson University, Atlantic Sun Conference
Dave Blank, Elon University, Southern Conference
McKinley Boston, Jr., New Mexico State University, Western Athletic Conference
Morgan Burke, Purdue University, Big Ten Conference
Peg Bradley-Doppes, University of Denver, Sun Belt Conference
Joan Cronan, University of Tennessee, Southeastern Conference
Beth DeBauche, Ohio Valley Conference
Chad Dwyer, America East Conference (alternate)
Peter Fields, Montana State University-Bozeman, Big Sky Conference
Dave Gavitt, Big East Conference (alternate)
Chet Gladchuk, U.S. Naval Academy, Patriot League
Robin Harris, Ivy League
Jack Hayes, Hofstra University, Colonial Athletic Association
Kyle Kallander, Big South Conference (alternate)
Paul Kowalczyk, Colorado State University, Mountain West Conference
Scott Krapf, Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
Myndee Kay Larsen, Summit League
Jonathan (Jon) LeCrone, Horizon League
Susan Cross Lipnickey, Miami University, Mid-American Conference
Janet Lucas, University of California, Riverside, Big West Conference
Judy MacLeod, Conference USA (alternate)
Clyde McCoy, University of Miami, Atlantic Coast Conference
John McCutcheon, University of Massachusetts, Atlantic 10 Conference
Noreen Morris, Northeast Conference
Derrick Ramsey, Coppin State University, Mid-Eastern Athletic 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

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

Leadership Council members not in attendance: Sandy Barbour, University of California, Berkeley, Pacific-12 Conference; Janet Cone, University of North Carolina, Asheville, Big South Conference; R.C. Johnson, University of Memphis, Conference USA and John Marinatto, Big East Conference.

Guests
Jim Haney, executive director, National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC), and Mark Hollis, chair of the NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet.

NCAA staff members in attendance: Angie Cretors, Michelle Hosick, Brad Hostetter, LuAnn Humphrey, Steve Mallonee, Chance Miller, Jarrett Newby, Stacey Osburn, Jobrina Perez, Donald Remy, Kris Richardson, Dave Schnase, Geoff Silver and Naima Stevenson also were present during portions of the meeting.