A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association
Division I Leadership Council

Hyatt Regency Houston — April 4, 2011
Houston, Texas — 8 a.m. to 3 p.m.

1. Welcome and introductions.

2. Presentations regarding men's basketball recruiting by two panels of Division I head men's basketball coaches.

3. Update from the Leadership Council men's basketball recruiting subcommittees. [Morgan Burke and Robin Harris, chairs, to provide an update to the Leadership Council.]

4. Presentation by a panel of individuals involved with nonscholastic men's basketball event operations.

5. Feedback from Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) members regarding men's basketball recruiting.

6. Report from working group reviewing the NCAA Olympic Sport Liaison Committee recommendations. [Supplement No. 1.]

7. Governance Update.

   a. Division I matters.

      (1) Report of the January 13, 2011, Leadership Council meeting. [Supplement No. 2] [**Anticipated Action Item**]

      (2) Report of the January 15, 2011, Board of Directors meeting. [Supplement No. 3]

      (3) Update from the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

   b. Association-wide matters.

      - Report from the January 15, 2011, NCAA Executive Committee meeting. [Supplement No. 4]

8. Other items of business.

9. Adjournment.

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

March 25, 2011

TO: NCAA Division I Leadership Council.

FROM: Peg Bradley-Doppes, chair
NCAA Division I Leadership Council Subcommittee on Olympic Sports Efforts.

SUBJECT: Olympic Sports Efforts.

As directed by the NCAA Division I Leadership Council, the NCAA Division I Leadership Council Subcommittee on Olympic Sports Efforts reviewed the December 17, 2010, executive summary prepared by the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee/National Governing Bodies (NGBs) Working Group. [Attachment]

During the course of two conference calls, the subcommittee examined the rationale provided for each recommendation included in the summary and expressed support for all of the recommendations. While the subcommittee made minor adjustments to three of the recommendations, the adjustments do not substantively alter the main goals set forth in the executive summary.

Furthermore, the subcommittee proposes that the recommendations be combined to form a single recommendation to suggest that the NCAA national office appoint a senior leader whose duties would include the responsibility for creating collaborative strategies to prioritize and sustain Olympic sports within the collegiate structure. The subcommittee also recommends that the duties be added to an existing senior-level position (rather than creating a new position on the NCAA staff).

Specifically, the duties would involve overseeing the following:

- Creating an Olympic/NCAA sport network of NGB and athletics department executives who are appointed by their respective organizations (e.g., institutions/organizations appoint a "senior Olympic administrator" to assist in communicating and tracking Olympic-sport related information, NGBs appoint senior-level collegiate liaison).
- Developing a communication program that provides frequent and ongoing dialogue between the respective parties to galvanize support and sustain initiatives.
- Increasing involvement with NCAA sport committees for NGBs and coaches associations and vice versa.

- Developing a strategy to maximize the use of pre-existing institutional facilities within the athlete development structure for Olympic sport.
- Collaborating with the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) and NGBs to explore potential growth opportunities for Olympic sports where opportunities exist including NCAA-sponsored sports that currently may not be Olympic sports (e.g., softball, lacrosse, bowling, cross country and rugby).
- Promoting and recognizing the contributions of the collegiate system and the college student-athlete and coach to the success of the U.S. Olympic Team.
- Creating coaching education and fundraising programs that increase the value of at-risk programs and Olympic sports at the institutional level.
- Ensuring that the involved stakeholders continue to discuss/review the mutual obligations and focus given to the topics and issues surrounding at-risk and Olympic sports.
- Enhancing the promotion of the NCAA championships that are Olympic sports through a cooperative effort provided from the USOC and NGBs.

It is the subcommittee's belief that designating a senior staff member at the national office with specific duties relative to Olympic sports will continue to improve the relationship between the national office and the USOC and NGBs. In addition, the implementation of the recommendations listed above should assist in helping Olympic sports grow at the collegiate level while at the same time acknowledge the importance of collegiate sports to the success of the U.S. Olympic efforts.

As a reminder, the other members of the subcommittee are Joan Cronan, Tom Douple, Lynn King and Susan Lipnickey.

We look forward to discussing this topic at the Leadership Council's April 4 meeting.

PBD:rlh

Attachment

FINAL REPORT

Olympic Sports Liaison Committee/National Governing Bodies Working Group
Executive Summary

Following the 2010 Olympic Assembly, the NCAA Olympic Sports Liaison Committee (OSLC) established a working group, composed of two athletic directors and one conference commissioner, executive directors from three National Governing Bodies (NGBs) and staff members from the NCAA and USOC. The OSLC/NGB working group's focus is concern for at-risk sports, and developing recommendations that could promote increased collaboration between the USOC, the NCAA, and the NGBs to support the daily needs of various athletic programs and their institutions.

The impact of the recent economy and the continued erosion of programs have renewed emphasis at the NGB and USOC level on the inter-relationship between collegiate sport and the athlete development pipeline (ADP) that produces the U.S. Olympic Team. The NGB leadership of at-risk sports and the USOC is engaged in a collective effort to support the NCAA and its member institutions with a plan that helps sustain collegiate programs.

In recent years, two important reports addressed the relationship between the USOC and the NCAA: a report of the NCAA/USOC Joint Task Force in 2005; and a report from TSE Consulting in June 2007. Two key principles summarize the importance of those reports: an economic solution must be created that helps sustain at-risk Olympic sports; and the USOC, NGB and NCAA leadership must be engaged in a meaningful partnership to address issues.

The working group reviewed strategies designed to keep Olympic sports alive within the NCAA structure and has created a list of recommendations that are big picture in nature, easily implemented, and could have a substantial effect in meeting mutually beneficial objectives. ***One the most significant conclusions is a clear acknowledgement that those connected with the interests of sport within the NCAA and USOC must work together on a more consistent and collaborative basis and create real progress in the promotion of their common values.***

Circumstances

- The recent economic downturn has increased the pressures for institutions and athletic departments regarding the funding for sport programs. These increased pressures affect the long-term ability for institutions to meet the challenges of providing equitable opportunities. Not only does this increase the at-risk environment, but it also severely diminishes the chance for growth at the institutional level.

- There is little recognition and few incentives to make Olympic sports a priority on most campuses, however, the participants represent some of the best examples of student-athletes.
- Collegiate programs play an integral role in the ADP for many Olympic sports, including the involvement of coaches, access to facilities, and training athletes.
- Enrollment-driven schools may benefit from the inclusion of Olympic sports and provide a basis for the cost-effective growth of programs.

The OSLC/NGB working group developed five direct recommendations that, if implemented, will elevate the focus of Olympic sport to a higher level through creative thinking and cooperation.

Direct Recommendations

1. ***Clearly appoint senior leaders at the USOC and the NCAA who share the responsibility for creating a collaborative strategy to prioritize and sustain Olympic sports within the collegiate structure. Priorities include:***
    - Creating an Olympic/NCAA sport network of NGB and athletic department executives who are appointed by their respective organizations (e.g., institutions/organizations appoint a "senior Olympic administrator" to assist in communicating and tracking Olympic-sport related information, NGB's appoint senior-level collegiate liaison);
    - Developing a communication program that provides frequent and on-going dialogue between the respective parties to galvanize support and sustain initiatives;
    - Organizing educational symposiums for coaches and that include strategies for institutional fund-raising;
    - Developing a strategy to maximize the use of pre-existing institutional facilities within the athlete development structure for Olympic sport;
    - Increasing involvement and representation on NCAA sport committees for NGBs and coaches associations and vice-versa;
    - Exploring potential growth opportunities of Olympic sport where opportunities exist.

2. ***Promote and recognize the contributions of the collegiate system and the college student-athlete to the success of the U.S. Olympic Team.***
    - Create campaigns and recognition programs that are student-athlete and institutionally focused. These include advertising campaigns, internal NGB and institutional campaigns, and recognition opportunities for universities that contribute to Olympic success. Emphasis should be based on encouraging broad-based NCAA programs.

_____

3. ***Create coaching education and fund-raising programs that increase the value of at-risk programs and Olympic sport at the institutional level.***
    - There is an acknowledgement that everyone benefits from helping college coaches become better "administrators." The working group also shares the perspective that fund-raising that supports the institutional goals and policies of the respective universities should be prioritized.

4. ***Continue frequent discussion and acknowledgement of the OSLC/NGB Working Group to review the mutual objectives and focus given to the topics and issues surrounding at-risk and Olympic sport*.**
    - Clear progress, insight and ideas are emerging from the on-going discussions and combined efforts of this working group, and immediately implementable recommendations are being developed.
    - Frequent discussion and review of legislation that helps the Olympic movement and the student-athlete should continue.

5. ***Enhance the promotion of the NCAA Championships for Olympic sports through a cooperative effort from the USOC and NGBs***.
    - Through cooperative efforts with the NCAA championship staff, the USOC and the NGBs can play a key role to elevate and support NCAA Championships that are part of the Olympic movement.

Summary

There is much to be gained by creating a synergistic ~~a~~pproach that combines the power of the NCAA, its member institutions, the U.S. Olympic Committee, and the NGBs. These organizations represent hope, opportunity, and the dreams of many young student-athletes who aspire to represent their university and/or country on the field of play. As sport administrators and stewards of these efforts, we must acknowledge our mutual objectives and work closely to achieve them.

Respectfully submitted,

The Olympic Sports Liaison/<u>NGB</u> Working Group:
Dave Roach, Colgate University, Co-Chair
Steve Penny, USA Gymnastics, Co-Chair
Rich Bender, USA Wrestling
Peg Bradley-Doppes, University of Denver
Zak Ivkovic, CUNY Division III Conference
Chuck Wielgus, USA Swimming
12.17.10

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

- ***ACTION ITEMS.***

None.

- ***INFORMATION ITEMS.***

1. **Discussion of Agents.** Rachel Newman-Baker, NCAA director of agents, gambling and amateurism activities, and Jimmy Sexton, sports agent and co-owner of Sports Trust Advisors, shared information with the Leadership Council on ways in which agents enter the lives of prospective and enrolled student-athletes, and how they influence the decisions student-athletes ultimately make regarding professional career opportunities. The following concepts were offered as a potential answer to address agent issues:

   a. Education. In providing information about the ways agents approach student-athletes, it was emphasized that early education is one of the best opportunities institutions have to provide their student-athletes with accurate information about agents and professional sports opportunities. The earlier institutions begin the education process with their student-athletes integrated with credible information from the agent community, the better decisions student-athletes will make in the long-run.

   b. New Definition of an Agent. The Council reviewed a proposed definition of an agent that would broaden the scope to include outside third parties who have become affiliated with prospective or enrolled student-athletes. The Council appeared to be receptive to a change in the definition, but cautioned against making changes that would place a "strict liability" standard on prospective or enrolled student-athletes for actions of third parties.

   c. Agent Contact Calendar. The Council reviewed a proposed agent contact calendar for the sport of football that would create permissible time periods for agent contact with student-athletes with remaining eligibility. There was concern expressed about the enforceability of such a calendar by either the NCAA or the National Football League Players Association (NFLPA); however, the Council agreed that it should continue to be discussed.

   d. National Agent Registration Program. The Council reviewed a proposed national agent registration program that could serve as a resource for institutions and student-athletes that would assist in the agent/advisor education process. The Council appeared receptive to such a program, noting that continued discussion with various governance bodies and the membership will be necessary.

2. **Discussion of Men's Basketball Recruiting.** The Leadership Council received presentations regarding the men's basketball recruiting environment from representatives of various men's basketball stakeholders [i.e., Dan Beebe, Collegiate Commissioners Association (CCA); Neil Dougherty, iHoops; Jim Haney, National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC); Floyd Keith, Black Coaches and Administrators (BCA); Jim Tenopir, National Federation of High Schools (NFHS)]. Among themes/concepts that were shared with the Leadership Council:

   - Outside third parties have more access to prospective student-athletes than member institutions' coaches. The NCAA should consider revising its rules to allow college coaches to have personal contact with prospects.
   - The April and July evaluation periods are crucial for college coaches to evaluate prospects in competition against players of similar ability. The NCAA may want to consider decreasing the number of days in the July evaluation period and adding an evaluation period in April.
   - The NCAA should consider permitting off-campus contacts, official paid visits and possibly on-campus tryouts during a prospect's junior year of high school.
   - The NCAA should consider eliminating the telephone call and text messaging restrictions.
   - Changes made to the recruiting model should consider the differences in resource levels among Division I institutions.
   - Changes made to the recruiting model should consider the influence of technology on communications in the process.
   - "Third parties" are a reality in the current recruiting environment, and can be a positive influence on the prospect if trained and motivated.
   - Coaches should be viewed as teachers when considering opening up opportunities to interact with underclass prospects.
   - Consider measures that would support high school programs.

   At its April 4 meeting, the Council will continue its discussion of men's basketball recruiting and will hear presentations from additional interested groups, including head coaches, the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC), possibly event or summer camp operators and apparel companies.

3. **Report from the NCAA Olympic Sports Liaison Committee**. The Leadership Council received a report from the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee/National Governing Bodies (NGB) Working Group regarding its review of issues related to endangered sports and sports that face challenges to their growth. The working group's focus was a concern for at-risk sports and developing recommendations that could promote increased collaboration between the United States Olympic Committee (USOC), NCAA and NGBs to support the needs of various athletics programs. The working group reviewed strategies designed to keep Olympic sports viable within the NCAA structure and presented five recommendations that could have a substantial effect in meeting mutually beneficial objectives. It was noted that this is an issue that needs some focus and

attention, and the Leadership Council agreed to include this on the agenda of its next meeting for a more complete review.

4. **Legislative items in the 2010-11 cycle of potential interest to the Leadership Council.** The Leadership Council was updated on various actions taken during the Legislative Council's January 12-13, 2011, meeting, which was occurring simultaneously with the Leadership Council.

5. **Report from the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.** Division I SAAC Chair Nick Fulton presented a report of the committee's recent meeting and priorities for the upcoming year. Given this was Fulton's last meeting as chair, the Council thanked him for his service and commended him for his work in representing Division I student-athletes.

6. **Litigation Report.** Scott Bearby, interim NCAA general counsel, provided this report.

7. **Other Business.** It was noted that the members of the Leadership Council will be contacted via e-mail to participate on subcommittees that will be able to work between Council meetings on projects related to agents or the men's basketball recruiting model. An administrative committee also was suggested to assist on agenda development between meetings.

8. **Future Meetings**.

   a. April 4, 2011, Houston, Texas.

   b. October, 2011, TBD.

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

REPORT OF THE JANUARY 15, 2011, MEETING OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1. Report of the October 28, 2010, Board of Directors Meeting. **The Board approved the report of its October 28, 2010, meeting.** (Unanimous voice vote) [Reference Supplement No. 1.]

2. Report of the October 28, 2010, Executive Committee Meeting. The Board reviewed a report of the October 28, 2010, meeting of the Executive Committee and took no action. [Reference Supplement No. 2.]

3. Report of the Division I Presidential Advisory Group. The Board received a report from Ann Millner, chair of the Division I Presidential Advisory Group (PAG), regarding the group's January 10, 2011, conference call. The Board was informed of PAG's views regarding various Board agenda items as they were considered by the Board. [Reference Supplement No. 4.]

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

   a. **Athletics Certification.** Dr. Emmert noted that the staff is conducting a review of the NCAA's athletics certification process in an effort to streamline the process and reduce the resource burden on member institutions. Recommendations for possible changes in the process will be presented as they are developed to various governance entities and the membership for feedback.

   b. **Recent Enforcement and Student-Athlete Reinstatement Cases.** Dr. Emmert noted that there has been much attention in the media recently regarding several student-athlete reinstatement cases and the various penalties imposed. The Board was informed that a review of NCAA legislation has begun in an effort to address situations currently not contemplated under NCAA legislation as well as to evaluate consistency of philosophies among responsible staffs and committees. Dr. Emmert suggested that the issue is more complex than merely changing the bylaws and the Association must work collaboratively with constituent groups to address the issues. It is hoped that recommended actions will be presented to the Board in April.

   c. **NCAA Advertising Policies/Bowl Game Licensing**. Dr. Emmert reminded the Board of concerns expressed regarding GoDaddy.com participating as a naming sponsor of an NCAA-licensed bowl game. He noted that the criticism has caused him to question whether the NCAA should continue to license such games, and, if so, what the appropriate number of bowl games should be and how advertising for these

games should be regulated. It was also suggested that a moratorium on the proliferation of bowl games be enacted while these issues are considered. It was determined that such a moratorium should be discussed further in April.

d. **NCAA GOALS and SCORE Studies.** The Board received a presentation regarding the findings of the 2010 NCAA GOALS and SCORE studies. GOALS is a study of approximately 20,000 current student-athletes that was conducted during spring 2010. The presentation focused on an analysis of three general hot-button areas: 1) recruitment and college choice; 2) ethical leadership issues, and 3) student-athlete time demands. SCORE is a study of over 7,000 former student-athletes who entered college in 1996. Analyses for the SCORE presentation focused on long-term academic outcomes and attempted to identify important influences on eventual academic success.

e. **Supplemental Distribution**. Dr. Emmert informed the group that the Finance Committee of the Executive Committee will be recommending that the Executive Committee approve a supplemental distribution of approximately $27,000,000 to be dispensed to the Division I membership at the end of January.

BOARD ACTION: **The Board voted to approve the recommendation of the Finance Committee for a Division I supplemental distribution of $27,000,000 to be dispensed at the end of January.** (Unanimous voice vote)

5. Litigation Update. Scott Bearby, NCAA interim general counsel, provided this report to the Board.

6. Division I Committee on Academic Performance Appointment. The Board voted to approve a two-year extension of the term of Walter Harrison as chair of the committee. [Reference Supplement No. 7.]

7. Division I Governance Structure Update.

a. **Report of the January 13, 2011, meeting of the Leadership Council**. Mike Alden, chair of the Division I Leadership Council, reported briefly on the January 13, 2011, Leadership Council meeting. [Refer to Attachment A for the full report.]

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

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

(b) New Definition of Agent.

(c) Agent Contact Calendar.

(d) National Agent Registration Program.

(2) Men's Basketball Recruiting Model. The Leadership Council received presentations regarding the men's basketball recruiting environment from representatives of various men's basketball stakeholders [i.e., Black Coaches and Administrators (BCA), Collegiate Commissioners Association (CCA), iHoops, National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC), National Federation of High Schools (NFHS)]. The Council will continue its recruiting discussions at its April 4 meeting, which will include presentations from additional interested groups.

(3) Olympic Sports Liaison Committee Report. The Leadership Council received a report from the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee/National Governing Bodies (NGB) Working Group regarding a review of issues related to endangered sports and sports that face challenges to their growth. The Council noted that this is an issue that needs some focus and attention, and the Council agreed to include this on the agenda of its next meeting for a more complete review.

b. Report of the January 12-13, 2010, meeting of the Division I Legislative Council. Shane Lyons, chair of the Division I Legislative Council, reported that the Legislative Council adopted 63 proposals, defeated 25 proposals and sent 29 proposals out for comment. The following Legislative Council actions were identified for Board discussion: [Refer to Attachment B for the full report and voting results.]

(1) Adopted Proposals.

(a) Proposal No. 2010-100 -- Division Membership – Elimination of Provisional and Multidivisional Membership – Reclassification Process and Multisport Conference Requirements. This proposal would implement the new Division I membership standards. Several Board members noted concerns expressed by the ice hockey community regarding the elimination of multi-divisional membership for Divisions II and III institutions. It is anticipated that institutions with concerns regarding the elimination of multi-divisional membership are continuing to evaluate the impact of this proposal and may encourage legislation for the 2011-12 cycle to address the matter. No action was taken.

(b) Proposal No. 2010-117 -- NCAA Membership -- Affiliated And Corresponding Membership -- Requirements For Affiliated

Membership And Elimination Of Corresponding Membership. This proposal would eliminate the corresponding membership category and redefine the affiliated membership category. No action was taken.

(2) Proposals sent out for comment.

(a) **Proposal Nos. 2010-16-C -- Personnel -- Limitations On The Number And Duties Of Coaches -- Noncoaching Staff Members -- Basketball -- Limit Of Two; 2010-18-C -- Personnel -- Limitations On The Number And Duties Of Coaches -- Bowl Subdivision Football -- Noncoaching Staff Members -- Limit Of Six; and 2010-20-C -- Personnel -- Limitations On The Number And Duties Of Coaches -- Championship Subdivision Football -- Noncoaching Staff Members -- Limit Of Four.** These proposals relate to limits on non-coaching sports-specific staff members in football and basketball. No action was taken.

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

(c) **Proposal No. 2010-26 -- Amateurism – Promotional Activities – Use of a Student-Athlete's Name or Likeness.** This proposal would revise legislation related to promotional activities and the use of student-athletes' names and likenesses. No action was taken.

(d) **Proposal Nos. 2010-51-A – Eligibility – General Eligibility Requirements – Full-Time Enrollment – Requirement For Competition – Nontraditional Courses, 2010-51-B -- Eligibility – General Eligibility Requirements – Full-Time Enrollment – Requirement For Competition – Nontraditional Courses – Up To 50 Percent Minimum Requirement and 2010-60 – Eligibility – Progress-Toward-Degree Requirements – Regulations For Administration Of Progress Toward Degree – Nontraditional Courses.** These proposals would allow student-athletes to use nontraditional courses to satisfy full-time enrollment and progress-toward-degree requirements. No action was taken.

(e) **Proposal No. 2010-59-C -- Eligibility – Progress-Toward-Degree Requirements – Eligibility for Competition -- Fulfillment of Credit**

Hour Requirements – Fall Term Academic Requirements for Future Competition -- One-Time Exception To Regain Full Eligibility -- Football. This proposal is an alternative to the Football Academic Working Group's (FAWGs) proposal that would permit a one-time exception to the requirement that a football student-athlete earn nine semester/eight quarter hours in the fall term or lose eligibility for the first four games of the next season with the opportunity to reduce the ineligibility to two games if the student-athlete earns 27 semester/40 quarter hours before the following fall term. No action was taken. [Note: FCS previously sent Proposal Nos. 2010-59-A, 2010-59-B and 2010-59-C out for comment.]

(f) **Proposal No. 2010-110 Playing And Practice Seasons And Recruiting -- Mandatory Medical Examination -- Sickle Cell Solubility Test -- Written Release.** This proposal would eliminate the opportunity for an individual to decline and sign a written release for the sickle cell solubility test. No action was taken.

(3) Other Proposals.

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

BOARD ACTION: **The Board voted to table Proposal No. 2010-12 until its April meeting.** (Unanimous voice)

(b) **Proposal No. 2010-48 -- Recruiting -- Use Of Recruiting Funds -- Recruiting Or Scouting Services -- List Of Permissible Recruiting Services -- Men's Basketball.** The Legislative Council adopted this proposal, which would require that the NCAA national office publish men's basketball scouting services that are deemed to meet the required standards for subscription.

BOARD ACTION: The Board voted to rescind the action of the Legislative Council and restore Proposal No. 2010-48 to the 2010-11 legislative cycle. (Unanimous voice vote)

(c) **Proposal Nos. 2010-58-A -- Eligibility, Financial Aid And Playing And Practice Seasons -- Summer Academic Preparation And College Acclimatization -- Men's Basketball, Proposal No. 2010-58-B --**

Eligibility, Financial Aid And Playing And Practice Seasons -- Summer Academic Preparation And College Acclimatization -- Men's Basketball – Six Hours Requirement For Incoming Student-Athletes, and Proposal No. 2010-58-C -- Eligibility, Financial Aid And Playing And Practice Seasons -- Summer Academic Preparation And College Acclimatization -- Men's Basketball – National Service Academy Exception. These proposals were defeated and would establish a summer academic preparation and college acclimatization model for men's basketball student-athletes.

BOARD ACTION: The Board voted to restore Proposal No. 2010-58-C to the 2010-11 legislative cycle. (Unanimous voice vote)

(d) Proposal No. 2010-109-B – Executive Regulations – Administration of NCAA Championships – Restricted Advertising and Sponsorship Activities – Professional Sports Organizations Or Teams – Financial Sponsorship Of NCAA Or Conference Championships. The Legislative Council adopted this proposal, which would allow professional sports organizations to serve as financial sponsors for conference and NCAA championships.

BOARD ACTION: The Board voted to table Proposal No. 2010-109-B until its April meeting. (Unanimous voice vote)

8. Future meeting Dates.

a. April 28, 2011, National Office, Indianapolis, Indiana.

[Note: The Board agreed to participate in a joint dinner (6 p.m.) and meeting (7-9 p.m.) with the PAG on April 27, 2011, to discuss the enforcement experience.]

b. August 11, 2011, National Office, Indianapolis, Indiana.

c. October 27, 2011, National Office, Indianapolis, Indiana.

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

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

The National Collegiate Athletic Association
January 16, 2011 SDB/JGC:vlm

NCAA DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS
JANUARY 15, 2011, MEETING ATTENDANCE

Board members in attendance:
Stanley Albrecht, Utah State University, Western Athletic Conference
Guy Bailey, Texas Tech University, Big 12 Conference
Charles Bantz, Indiana University-Purdue University of Indianapolis, Summit League
William Beauchamp, University of Portland, West Coast Conference
Greg Dell'Omo, Robert Morris University, Northeast Conference
Judy Genshaft, University of South Florida, Big East Conference, chair
Nathan Hatch, Wake Forest University, Atlantic Coast Conference
William Meehan, Jacksonville State University, Ohio Valley Conference
Ann Millner, Weber State University, Big Sky Conference
John Peters, Northern Illinois University, Mid-American Conference
Edward Ray, Oregon State University, Pacific-10 Conference
David Schmidly, University of New Mexico, Mountain West Conference
Lou Anna Simon, Michigan State University, Big Ten Conference
Lee Todd, University of Kentucky, Southeastern Conference

Board members not in attendance:
William R. Harvey, Hampton University, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference
Sidney McPhee, Middle Tennessee State University, Sun Belt Conference
Kevin Mullen, Siena College, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference
Steadman Upham, University of Tulsa, Conference USA

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
Shane Lyons, Atlantic Coast Conference, chair of the Division I Legislative Council

Other NCAA staff members in attendance: Scott Bearby, Erik Christianson, Joni Comstock, Mark Emmert, Bernard Franklin, Lynn Holzman, Michelle Hosick, Jim Isch, Kevin Lennon, Steve Mallonee, Keith Martin, Delise O'Meally, Stacey Osburn, Tom Paskus, Todd Petr, Donald Remy, Wallace Renfro, Julie Roe Lach, Greg Shaheen, Robert Vowels, Bob Williams and Brandon Wright.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association
January 16, 2011 SDB/JGC:vlm

MINUTES OF THE
NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

San Antonio Marriott Rivercenter
San Antonio, Texas

January 15, 2011

Participants:

Michael Alden, University of Missouri, Columbia
Charles Bantz, Indiana Univ.-Purdue Univ. at Indianapolis
Drew Bogner, Molloy College
James Bultman, Hope College
Rick Cole, Dowling College
Judy Genshaft, University of South Florida
James Harris, Widener University
Nathan Hatch, Wake Forest University
Ann Millner, Weber State University
J. Patrick O'Brien, West Texas A&M University
John Peters, Northern Illinois University
Edward Ray, Oregon State University, chair
David Schmidly, University of New Mexico
Lou Anna Simon, Michigan State University
Lee Todd, University of Kentucky
Mark Emmert, NCAA
Bernard Franklin, NCAA
Delise O'Meally, NCAA, recording secretary

William Harvey, Hampton University; Chris Martin, College Conference of Illinois & Wisconsin; Sidney McPhee, Middle Tennessee State University; and Kevin Mullen, Siena College, were not able to participate.

Also in attendance were: Scott Bearby, interim general counsel and vice president of legal affairs; Joni Comstock, senior vice president of championships; Jim Isch, chief operating officer; Kevin Lennon, vice president of academic and membership affairs; Keith Martin, interim vice president of administration/chief financial officer; Donald Remy, NCAA general counsel and vice president of legal affairs-designate; Wallace Renfro, vice president and senior advisor to the NCAA president; Greg Shaheen, interim executive vice president of championships and alliances; Robert Vowels, vice president of student-athlete affairs and leadership development programs; Bob Williams, vice president of communications; David Berst, Daniel Dutcher and Mike Racy, NCAA governance vice presidents; and Jackie Campbell and Terri Steeb, NCAA governance directors.

[Note: These minutes contain only actions taken (formal votes or stated "sense of the meeting") in accordance with NCAA policy regarding minutes of all Association entities. While certain items on the Committee's agenda were acted on at various times throughout the meeting, all final actions within a given topic are combined in these minutes for convenience of reference.]

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m. by the chair, President Ray. All members were present as noted above.

1. Welcome and announcements. Ray welcomed Rick Cole, director of athletics at Dowling College and incoming chair of the Division II Management Council. Also, Ray presented James Harris, chair of the Division III Presidents Council, with an award for his service to the Executive Committee.

2. Approval of October 28, 2010, meeting minutes.

   It was VOTED

   "To approve the Executive Committee minutes of the October 28, 2010, meeting as distributed."

3. NCAA President report. President Emmert noted that each of the items on the president's report had been discussed during the respective divisional presidential meetings. Further discussion will occur during the April round of meetings.

4. NCAA Executive Committee Finance Committee report.

   a. Fiscal year 2009-10 audited financial statements. The Finance Committee met with the audit firm of KPMG to review fiscal year 2009-10 financial statements and conduct the required audit communications and review.

      (1) KPMG issued an unqualified opinion for the fiscal year statements ending August 31, 2010.

      (2) Highlights of the Consolidated Statement of Financial Position are:

         (a) The Association's total assets increased by approximately $67 million in comparison to the prior year. The increase was primarily in the investment holdings as of year-end, including approximately

$18 million in restricted investments from the 2010 bond issuance proceeds. These proceeds will be used to partially fund the building project that was approved in the prior year.

(b) The state, through White River State Park, leased the NCAA the additional land required for the new building project and extended the lease for the current office building for 50 years with three ten-year options. Since the NCAA pays only a dollar a year for this lease, this required a revaluation of the existing building and the addition of the contributed land as part of the revised lease agreement with White River State Park. The end result was a $19 million decrease to contributions receivable over the life of the lease due to changes in the accounting pronouncements, the downtown market for office leases, and the historical growth in lease rates.

(c) Deferred revenue increased by $14 million. Most of the increase is timing related to collection of championship revenues for the Men's Final Four, Frozen Four and Women's Final Four ticket sales. In addition, Arbiter generated more subscription sales than in the prior year.

(d) NCAA issued tax-exempt revenue bonds to partially finance the construction of the headquarters' expansion over a 10-year period at a rate of less than three percent. This resulted in an $18 million increase to net bonds payable.

(e) The Association had an overall increase in revenue of $47.9 million this past year, primarily related to the increases in television and marketing rights fees, as well as an increase of $15 million in investment earnings as a result of the bounceback in the investment markets.

(f) Contributions' revenue was a negative $10 million related to the revaluation of the existing NCAA building and the addition of the contributed land.

(g) The distribution to Division I expenses increased approximately 11 percent. This is due to the eight percent increase approved in the distribution plan, plus a supplemental distribution of $15 million approved in the prior year.

(h) Division I championships expenses increased approximately six percent, which is mostly the result of higher travel costs this year. Travel costs were higher because there was a reduction to the inventory of commercial airfare, which led to increased charter usage.

(i) The increase in Association-wide expenses is primarily due to the recognition of a one-time $3 million in amortization expense related to the prepayment of the National Invitation Tournament (NIT) liability. The remaining NIT liability of $19.2 million was paid off in October 2010 using a four percent discount rate and saving the Association dollars over the remaining life of the payment.

(j) Excess revenues over expenses for the year were approximately $43 million.

It was VOTED

"To approve the fiscal year 2009-10 audited financial statements."

b. Recommended uses of unallocated net assets. Fiscal year 2009-10 year ended with the Association having $28.5 million in unrestricted net assets available for allocation. The Finance Committee recommended the surplus be used in the following manner:

(1) $27 million distributed back to the Division I members.

(2) $1.5 million allocated to fund transition expenses related to national office restructuring.

It was VOTED

"To approve the proposed unallocated net assets allocations."

c. Recommended target balance for quasi-endowment reserve. The Finance Committee reviewed the quasi-endowment purpose, the funding reserve policies, the current and future targeted balance, the asset allocation policies and an investment committee performance report. Since more than 90 percent of the revenues are the result of one revenue stream, the committee continued to support the need for a quasi-endowment reserve to sustain championships, Association-wide programming and operations, and at least 50 percent of the Division I revenue distribution in the year of a catastrophic event for a period of time not to exceed one year.

The committee noted that the growth of the quasi-endowment could be slowed by modifying the current funding policy to remove the requirement that 50 percent of the year-end unallocated net assets be allocated and invested in the quasi-endowment. These additional funds likely would go directly back to the Division I membership. The Finance Committee also reduced the future funding target from $500 million to $380 million to align it with a one-year funding target to sustain operations and meet the minimum 50 percent of the Division I revenue distribution.

It was VOTED

"To approve the revised quasi-endowment policy and targeted balance."

d. Recommended budget allocations for 2011-12. The NCAA is in the second year of a biennial budget cycle. This budget process will only address inflationary adjustments necessary to maintain the current level of services. The revenue increase for the coming year is projected at approximately two percent. The Finance Committee recommended the following allocations:

(1) The recommended Division I revenue distribution is increased by $14.8 million. In the prior year, a portion of the inflationary dollars was reserved in order to meet the Division I student-athlete distribution commitments that were required to settle the White litigation. All other distributions are budgeted for a two percent increase.

(2) New initiatives totaling $200,000 that were approved in the prior year were allocated to championships and the basketball enforcement area.

(3) The recommended increase for the Divisions II and III allocations is $1.06 million. The Divisions II and III allocations are the respective increases in revenue allocations.

(4) One percent allocation of $1.5 million is to provide President Emmert some flexibility to come back in April with specific budget recommendations. The specific budget recommendations will be reviewed by the Finance Committee and presented to the Executive Committee for approval at its April meeting.

It was VOTED

"To approve the 2011-12 proposed budget allocations."

e. First quarter fiscal year 2010-11 budget to actual.

(1) The Association has limited financial activity in the first quarter, with the majority of revenues and expenditures occurring in the second half of the year related to championship activity and revenue distributions.

(2) Television and marketing rights revenue received is 15 percent of the budget and is consistent with the prior year. Championships revenue is two percentage points ahead of the prior year as men's basketball tickets sales revenue is slightly higher than the prior year.

(3) The Association's expenses are approximately 10 percent of the total budget for the first quarter, which is higher than the prior year because of a $17.2 million settlement with a third party that occurred in October 2010.

5. NCAA Division I Board of Directors and Divisions II and III Presidents Councils reports.

a. Division I Board of Directors. The Committee received an update on the actions of the Division I Board of Directors that included the following:

(1) Postseason football bowl licensing and NCAA advertising policies. Discussed the NCAA's involvement in postseason football bowl licensing and how the Association's advertising policies should apply. The Board will continue these discussions in April.

(2) Supplemental distribution. Approved the Finance Committee's recommendation for a supplemental distribution of $27 million to be dispensed to the Division I membership at the end of January.

(3) Membership categories. The Division I Legislative Council adopted Proposal No. 2010-117, which would eliminate the corresponding membership category and redefine the affiliated membership category.

b. Division II Presidents Council. The Committee received an update on the actions of the Division II Presidents Council that included the following:

(1) 2011 NCAA Convention. Division II completed another successful Convention. The membership voted on 24 proposals during Saturday's business session – 21 of those were passed by the membership, and three were defeated. Significant proposals include the following:

(a) Division II Convention Proposal No. 2011-12—NCAA membership. Per the request of the NCAA Executive Committee Working Group on Membership, this proposal eliminates corresponding membership and modifies the requirements for affiliated membership.

(b) Proposal No. 2011-18—eligibility—freshman academic requirements. This proposal specifies that a nontraditional course to satisfy NCAA core-course requirements must meet certain requirements and ensures that incoming students are prepared to meet the rigors of college life as students who have had a traditional high school education; the legislation aligns the Division II legislation more closely to that of Division I.

(c) Proposal No. 2011-19—eligibility—two-year college transfers. This proposal adds the requirement that two-year college transfer student-athletes also complete a minimum of six semester or eight quarter hours of transferable English credit and three semester or four quarter hours of transferable math credit prior to transferring. It holds two-year college students who were partial qualifiers or nonqualifiers to the same standards as four-year college students by requiring them to complete college-level coursework in English and math at the two-year institution. This legislation aligns the Division II legislation more closely to that of Division I.

(d) The Division II membership also approved three more proposals in the "Life in the Balance" legislative initiative that shortens the length of Division II nonchampionship playing seasons for student-athletes and staffs.

(2) Division II Strategic Growth and Long-Range Projections Task Force. During the Convention, Division II engaged its governance groups and general membership in discussions regarding its strategic growth and long-range projections. The overall goal is to enhance Division II membership requirements so that it manages future growth in a strategic way; that the division takes steps to ensure that future growth does not create an unnecessary financial burden on the division's resources and long-range revenue allocations; and that a membership system is developed that is flexible enough to maximize growth in certain geographical areas.

(3) Review of transgender student-athletes. Mary Wilfert of the NCAA staff provided the Councils with an update on the transgender student-athlete

issue and informed them that an educational resource will be available to the membership later this spring/summer.

c. Division III Presidents Council. The Committee received an update on the actions of the Division III Presidents Council. These included:

(1) Special Olympics partnership. Consistent with the division's strategic positioning platform, the Presidents Council formally endorsed the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee's (SAAC's) national partnership with Special Olympics. The new partnership was unveiled at Saturday's business session where the division was joined by two dozen local Special Olympics athletes. This initiative follows a successful outreach to campus and conference SAACs across the division to support relief efforts in Haiti (greater than $145,000). The SAAC decided to partner with Special Olympics, given the similar values and principles shared by Division III and the Special Olympics. Approximately one-half of Division III schools have an existing relationship with the Special Olympics. Implementation of the partnership will begin in 2011-12.

(2) Division III expenses report. Continues to support further examination of Division III expenses and the development of financial dashboard indicators. The information was presented during the presidents/chancellors forum and luncheon, where feedback was very positive.

(3) Academic reporting pilot. Data from the first year of the two-year pilot were shared with the membership during Saturday's business session. The data show that Division III student-athletes graduate at a rate greater than other students. The Presidents Council remains committed to gathering data regarding the academic success of Division III student-athletes and will continue to monitor the progress of the pilot program.

(4) Executive Committee scorecard. Received initial information regarding the development of an Executive Committee scorecard and performance management program to align with the division's priorities outlined in its strategic plan. The Council supported the development of this tool to measure and assess the division's progress and success relative to its stated goals and priorities. It charged the staff and the Division III Strategic Planning and Finance Committee with developing more specifics for its April meeting.

(5) 2011 NCAA Convention. The membership addressed 14 proposals during Saturday's business session. Eleven proposals were adopted, one proposal failed, one proposal was not moved and one proposal was withdrawn. A proposal with significant Association-wide impact is as follows:

- Division III Convention Proposal No. 2011-6—NCAA membership—definitions and applications—affiliated and corresponding membership—requirements for affiliate membership and elimination of corresponding membership. At the request of the Executive Committee Working Group on Membership, this proposal eliminates corresponding membership and modifies the requirements for affiliated membership.

6. Future meetings. The Committee reviewed its future meetings schedule.

7. Adjournment. Ray adjourned the meeting at 4 p.m.

# # # # #

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

   - Earlier access is preferred;

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

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

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

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

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

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

Men’s Basketball Recruiting Model Alternatives

Background

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

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

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

Objectives and consensus

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

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

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

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

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

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

A pair of recruiting calendar alternatives

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

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

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

Alternative 1

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

Alternative 1 features the following changes to the recruiting calendar:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Alternative 2

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

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

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

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

In the near term, Alternative 2 proposes:

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

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

kw/mm
3/31/2011

Proposed alternatives to basketball recruiting model

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

mm—3/28/2011

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SCHEDULE

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

Thursday, May 26 Arrival of Athletes and Selection Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

    - to reduce off-campus recruiting travel for coaches.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Basketball Recruiting Model Possible Options

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

Activity	Current	Possible Options	

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

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

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

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

Activity	Current	Possible Options

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

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

- ***ACTION ITEMS*.**

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

- ***INFORMATION ITEMS*.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. Future Meetings.

a. July, 2011, TBD.

b. October, 2011, TBD.

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

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

Leadership Council Attendance
April 4, 2011, Meeting

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

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

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

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

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

Men's Basketball Recruiting Model Alternatives

Background

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

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

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

Objectives and consensus

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

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

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

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

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

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

A pair of recruiting calendar alternatives

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

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

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

Alternative 1

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

Alternative 1 features the following changes to the recruiting calendar:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Alternative 2

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

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

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

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

In the near term, Alternative 2 proposes:

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

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

kw/mm
3/31/2011

Proposed alternatives to basketball recruiting model

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

mm—3/28/2011

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SCHEDULE

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

Thursday, May 26 Arrival of Athletes and Selection Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

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