A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association
Division I Leadership Council

NCAA National Office — April 12, 2012
Indianapolis, Indiana — 8 a.m. to 3 p.m.

1. Welcome and introductions.

2. Division I Governance Update.

   a. Report of the January 12, 2012, Leadership Council meeting. (Supplement No. 1) [**Anticipated Action Item**]

   b. Report of the January 14, 2012, Board of Directors meeting. (Supplement No. 2)

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

3. Update from Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Working Groups – Rules and Enforcement. (Supplement Nos. 3A and 3B)

4. Discussion of women's basketball recruiting model. (Supplement No. 4)

5. Update from Agent Subcommittee. (Supplement No. 5)

6. Discussion of criteria for conference membership in Division I governance/championships structure. (Supplement No. 6 to be distributed prior to the meeting.)

7. Update on Review of NCAA Division I Athletics Certification Program.

8. Update on Status of Implementation of New Membership Communications Initiative.

9. Other items of business.

10. Adjournment.

DIVISION I LEADERSHIP COUNCIL

Michael Alden, chair

Subd	Name and Contact Information	Conference Representing	Term Expiration
FBS	Mr. Michael Alden Director of Athletics University of Missouri, Columbia Mizzou Arena 1 Champions Drive, Suite 200 Columbia, MO 65211 Phone: 573-882-2055 Fax: 573-884-5499 E-mail: aldenm@missouri.edu	Big 12 Conference Assistant: Sandra Matthew Matthews@missouri.edu	April 2014*
FBS	Ms. Sandy Barbour Director of Athletics University of California, Berkeley 115 Haas Pavilion Berkeley, CA 34720-4422 Phone: 510-642-5316 E-Mail: athletic.director@berkeley.edu	Pacific-12 Conference	April 2014*
Div. I	Dr. Harold Bardo Faculty Athletics Representative Southern Illinois University at Carbondale Wheeler Hall, RM 210A, MC 4323 Carbondale, Illinois 62901 Phone: 618-453-1650 Fax: 618-453-1919 E-mail: hbardo@siumed.edu	Missouri Valley Conference	April 2015*
Div. I	Dr. Mike Bitter Faculty Athletics Representative Stetson University 421 N. Woodland Blvd., Unit 8398 DeLand, Florida 32720 Phone: 386-822-7422 Fax: 386-822-7426 E-mail: mbitter@stetson.edu	Atlantic Sun Conference	April 2015*
FCS	Mr. Dave Blank Director of Athletics Elon University 2500 Campus Box Elon, North Carolina 27244 Phone: 336/278-6800 Fax: 336/278-6767 E-mail: dblank@elon.edu	Southern Conference	April 2015*

Subd	Name and Contact Information	Conference Representing	Term Expiration
FBS	Mr. McKinley Boston, Jr. Director of Athletics New Mexico State University 1815 Wells Street Las Cruces, NM 88003 Phone: 505-646-7630 Fax: 575-646-1672 E-mail: boston@nmsu.edu E-mail: Sylrfier@nmsu.edu	Western Athletic Conference	April 2014*
FBS	Ms. Peg Bradley-Doppes Director of Athletics University of Denver 2201 E. Asbury Avenue Denver, Colorado 80208 Phone: 303-871-3399 Fax: 303-871-3040 E-mail: pbd@du.edu	Sun Belt Conference Executive Assistant Lisa Bridges E-mail: lisa.bridges@du.edu 303/871-4048	April 2014*
FBS	Mr. Morgan J. Burke Director of Athletics Purdue University 1000 North University Street IAF, Room 230 West Lafayette, IN 47907 Phone: 765-494-3189 Fax: 765-496-1280 E-mail: mjb@purdue.edu	Big Ten Conference	April 2014*
FCS	Ms. Janet Cone Director of Athletics University of North Carolina, Asheville One University Heights, CPO#2600 Asheville, North Carolina 28804-8513 Phone: 828-251-6922 Fax: 828-251-6386 E-mail: jcone@unca.edu	Big South Conference Associate AD Terri Brne Tbrne@unca.edu 828/251-6930	April 2012*
FBS	Ms. Joan Cronan Director of Women's Athletics University of Tennessee Brenda Lawson Athletic Center Knoxville, TN 37996 Phone: 865-974-8358 Fax: 865-974-0111 E-mail: jcronan@utk.edu	Southeastern Conference	April 2014*

Subd	Name and Contact Information	Conference Representing	Term Expiration
FBS	Mr. Eugene Daniels Colorado State University 1113 West Plum Street, Apartment 203A Fort Collins, Colorado 80521 Phone: 970-481-9261 Email: Eugene.daniels89@gmail.com	Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Mountain West Conference	January 2013*
FCS	Ms. Beth DeBauche Commissioner Ohio Valley Conference 215 Centerview Drive, Suite 115 Brentwood, TN 37027 Phone: 615/371-1698 Fax: 615/371-1788 E-mail: bdebauche@ovc.org	Ohio Valley Conference	April 2015*
FCS	Mr. Peter Fields Director of Athletics Montana State University-Bozeman #1 Bobcat Circle Bozeman, MT 59717-3380 Phone: 406-994-4226 Fax: 406-994-2278 E-mail: pfields@msubobcats.com	Big Sky Conference Belinda Pence 406/994-5435 bpence@msubobcats.com	April 2012*
FCS	Mr. Chet Gladchuk Director of Athletics U.S. Naval Academy 566 Brownson Road Annapolis, Maryland 21402 Phone: 410-293-8910 Fax: 410-293-8950 E-mail: gladchuk@usna.edu	Patriot League	April 2012*
FCS	Ms. Robin Harris Executive Director Ivy League 228 Alexander Street, 2nd Floor Princeton, New Jersey 08540 Phone: 609-258-6426 Fax: 609-258-1690 E-mail: robinharris@ivyleaguesports.com	Ivy League Assistant: Robin Patsey robin@ivyleaguesports.com	April 2012*

Subd	Name and Contact Information	Conference Representing	Term Expiration
FCS	Mr. Jack Hayes Director of Athletics Hofstra University Athletic Department 245 Hofstra University Hempstead, New York 11549-2450 Phone: 516-463-6750 Fax: 516-463=4860 Email: Jack.Hayes@Hofstra.edu	Colonial Athletic Association	April 2015*
Div. I	Ms. Amy Huchthausen Commissioner America East Conference 215 First Street, Suite 140 Cambridge, MA 02142 Phone: 617/695-6369 Fax: 617/695-6380 E-mail: huchthausen@americaeast.com	America East Conference	April 2012
FBS	Mr. R.C. Johnson Director of Athletics The University of Memphis 570 Normal Street, Room 101 Memphis, TN 38152-3730 Phone: 901-678-2335 Fax: 901-678-5078 e-mail rjohnson@memphis.edu	Conference USA	April 2014*
FBS	Ms. Lisa Kelleher Senior Associate Director of Athletics University of Nevada, Las Vegas 4505 Maryland Parkway Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-0001 Phone: 702-895-4760 Email: lisa.kelleher@unlv.edu	Mountain West Conference	April 2014
Div. I	Ms. Myndee Kay Larsen Associate Commissioner The Summit League 340 West Butterfield Road, Suite 3D Elmhurst, IL 60126 Phone: 630-516-0661 Fax: 630-516-0673 E-mail: larsen@thesummitleague.org	Summit League	April 2015*

Subd	Name and Contact Information	Conference Representing	Term Expiration
Div. I	Mr. Jonathan (Jon) LeCrone Commissioner Horizon League 201 S. Capitol Avenue, Suite 500 Indianapolis, Indiana 46225 Phone: 317-237-6222 Fax: 317-237-6220 E-mail: jlecrone@horizonleague.org	Horizon League Assistant: Cindy French cfrench@horizonleague.org 317/237-5624	April 2012*
FBS	Ms. Susan Cross Lipnickey Faculty Athletics Representative Miami University 214 Phillips Miami, Ohio 45056 Phone: 513-529-9247 Fax: 513-523-0900 E-Mail: lipnicsc@muohio.edu	Mid-American Conference	April 2014*
Div. I	Ms. Janet Lucas Executive Associate Director of Athletics University of California, Riverside 900 University Avenue Riverside, California 92521 Phone: 951-827-4572 Fax: 951-827-2453 E-Mail: janet.lucas@ucr.edu	Big West Conference	April 2012
FBS	Mr. John Marinatto Commissioner Big East Conference 15 Park Row West Providence, Rhode Island 02903 Phone: 401-272-9108 Fax: 401-831-8060 E-Mail: jmarinatto@bigeast.org	Big East Conference Assistant: Sarah Emmett	April 2014*
FBS	Mr. Clyde McCoy Faculty Athletics Representative University of Miami 1120 NW 14th Street, Room 905 Miami, FL 33136 Phone: 305-243-6005 Fax: 308-243-3353 E-mail: cmccoy@med.miami.edu	Atlantic Coast Conference	April 2014*

Subd	Name and Contact Information	Conference Representing	Term Expiration
Div. I	Mr. John McCutcheon Director of Athletics University of Massachusetts Mullins Memorial Convocation Center Amherst, MA 01003 Phone: 413.545.9652 Fax: 413.545.1727 E-mail: jmccutch@admin.umass.edu	Atlantic 10 Conference	April 2012
FCS	Ms. Noreen Morris Commissioner Northeast Conference 399 Campus Drive, Vantage Court North Somerset, New Jersey 08873 Phone: 732-469-0440 Fax: 732-469-0744 E-mail: nmorris@northeastconference.org	Northeast Conference	April 2015*
FCS	Mr. Derrick Ramsey Director of Athletics Coppin State University 2500 W. North Ave. Baltimore, MD 21216 Phone: 410/951-3737 Fax: 410/951-3717 E-mail: dramsey@coppin.edu	Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference	April 2015*
Div. I	Mr. John Ritschdorff Faculty Athletics Representative Marist College 3300 North Road Poughkeepsie, New York Phone: 845-575-3629 Fax: 845-575-3479 E-Mail: john.ritschdorff@marist.edu	Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	April 2012*
FCS	Mr. Duer Sharp Commissioner Southwestern Athletic Conference 2101 6th Avenue, Suite 700 Birmingham, A 35203 Phone: 205/251-7573 Fax: 205/297-9820 E-mail: d.sharp@swac.org	Southwestern Athletic Conference	April 2015*

Subd	Name and Contact Information	Conference Representing	Term Expiration
Div. I	Mr. Ky Snyder Director of Athletics University of San Diego 5998 Alcala Park San Diego, CA 92110 Phone: 619/260-2930 Fax: 619/260-2213 E-mail: kysnyder@sandiego.edu	West Coast Conference	April 2015*
FCS	Mr. Bobby Williams Director of Athletics Sam Houston State University Box 2268; 620 Bowers Huntsville, Texas 77341 Phone: 936-294-4205 Fax: 936-294-3538 E-mail: bwilliams@shsu.edu	Southland Conference	April 2012*

* Not eligible for reselection.

Leadership Council Liaisons:
Mr. S. David Berst, vice president for Division I, dberst@ncaa.org
Ms. Jacqueline (Jackie) Campbell, director of Division I, jgcampbell@ncaa.org
Mr. Bernard Franklin, executive vice president of Membership and Student-Athlete Affairs, bfranklin@ncaa.org
Mr. Kevin Lennon, vice president of Academic and Membership Affairs; klennon@ncaa.org

NCAA Division I Governance Staff:
Mr. S. David Berst, vice president for Division I, dberst@ncaa.org
Ms. Jacqueline (Jackie) Campbell, director of Division I, jgcampbell@ncaa.org
Ms. Vicki L. McEachran, executive assistant for Division I, vmceachran@ncaa.org

Indy address for mail: P.O. Box 6222, Indianapolis, IN 46206-6222
Indy address for shipments: 1802 Alonzo Watford Sr. Drive, Indianapolis, IN 46202
Phone: 317/917-6222; Fax: 317/917-6808

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I LEADERSHIP COUNCIL JANUARY 12, 2012, MEETING

ACTION ITEM.

- **Men's Basketball Recruiting.** At the request of the NCAA Division I Board of Directors, the Leadership Council reviewed remaining issues related to the Division I men's basketball recruiting model regarding: (1) Involvement of coaches with enrolled men's basketball student-athletes during the summer months for weight training, conditioning and skill-related instruction; and (2) On-campus evaluations (OCE) of men's basketball prospective student-athletes.

  a. Summer Access to Enrolled Student-Athletes. The Leadership Council agreed to recommend that the NCAA Division I Board of Directors approve a summer access model that permits institutional staff members to conduct or supervise summer athletics activites in accordance with specified requirements (i.e., enrollment in summer school, opt-out academic benchmarks). [Note: See Attachment A for details of the new summer access model.]

  b. On-Campus Evaluations for Prospective Student-Athletes. The Leadership Council agreed to recommend that the Division I Board of Directors approve on-campus evaluations (OCE) for prospective student-athletes under specified conditions. [Note: See Attachment B for details of on-campus evaluations.]

INFORMATION ITEMS.

1. **Report of October 12, 2011, Leadership Council Meeting**. The Leadership Council approved the report of its October 12, 2011, meeting.

2. **NCAA President's Report.** President Emmert noted the need to address institutional integrity and shared responsibility, particularly in determining the appropriate role for decentralizing rules and for the nature of rules institutions should be held accountable. In this regard, President Emmert noted that at the request of the Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Collegiate Model Rules and Enforcement Working Groups, he plans to create another working group to discuss institutional integrity and shared responsibility. In addition, in order to enhance the Association's communication efforts, new membership and external outreach initiatives are underway to educate and inform the Association's many audiences, establish bi-directional communications with the NCAA and to foster advocacy on the NCAA's behalf.

3. Update on Presidential Retreat Initiatives. The Leadership Council received an update regarding the work of the four Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Working Groups.

a. Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group. The group was reminded that Proposal Nos. 2011-96 – "Miscellaneous Expense Allowance" and 2011-97 – "Multi-year Grants in Aid" will be reconsidered by the Board of Directors at its next regularly scheduled meeting on January 14, 2012. The Leadership Council discussed the working group's proposed modifications to Proposal No. 2011-96 – "Miscellaneous Expense Allowance," which would modify the provisions for the $2,000 miscellaneous expense allowance and rescind the portion of the proposal that provided that all nonathletics financial aid will no longer count toward team limits. The working group also recommended that the Board of Directors reaffirm its original action to adopt Proposal No. 2011-97 – "Multi-year Grants in Aid," which would result in an online override vote by the Division I active member institutions and conferences. The Leadership Council noted the membership's concern with the effective dates of these proposals and the process by which they were developed.

b. Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Resource Allocation Working Group. The group discussed the Board of Directors Consent Package of Action Items from the Resource Allocation Working Group. The Leadership Council expressed concern regarding several of the recommendations and suggested that a broader agenda be developed for future consideration.

c. Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Collegiate Model -- Rules Working Group. The group was informed that guided by the October 2011 resolution endorsed by the Board of Directors, the Rules Working Group has continued its discussion regarding a new regulatory culture and review of specific principle-based outcomes and operational bylaws. The working group will request that the Board take the following actions at its January 14, 2012, meeting: (1) Support the general approach outlined for a new regulatory approach; (2) Endorse a moratorium on legislation for the 2012-13 legislative cycle (unless part of the presidential reform agenda); and (3) Support the creation of a new group to address issues of institutional integrity.

d. Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Collegiate Model -- Enforcement Working Group. The group was informed that the Enforcement Working Group will update the Board on its work regarding a violation and penalty structure, as well as the enforcement process and concept of shared responsibility.

4. NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Issues Committee Request. The Leadership Council reviewed a request from the Division I Women's Basketball Issues Committee that the Council conduct a comprehensive review of the women's basketball recruiting model,

much like the rececntly completed review of the men's basketball recruiting model. The Council agreed to conduct such a review.

5. **Update from Leadership Council's Agent Subcommittee.** Rachel Newman, NCAA managing director of enforcement, updated the Council regarding:

   a. The status of the work of the Leadership Council Agent Subcommittee and how that aligns with the work of the Bylaw 12 subgroup of the Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Collegiate Model Rules Working Group;

   b. The Uniform Athlete Agent Act (UAAA) Summit conducted in Washingon, D.C. on November 17, 2011, and

   c. The formation of an NCAA Football Focus Group within the NCAA enforcement group.

6. **Criteria for Conference Membership in Division I Governance/Championships Structure.** The Leadership Council received a presentation from several representatives of the Great West Conference regarding a possible waiver of NCAA Bylaws 20.02.5.1 and 20.02.5.4 so that the Great West Conference would immediately be recognized as an active Division I multi-sport conference. The Leadership Council requested that staff provide more detailed information regarding the Great West Conference and the chronology of its efforts to meet the requirements to become an active Division I multi-sport conference for the Council's review at its April 12, 2012, meeting.

7. **Men's Basketball Competition Committee Sportmanship Initiative.** Byron Hatch, NCAA director of championships alliances, informed the Leadership Council of the Men's College Basketball Officiating, LLC (MCBO) Competition Committee's plan to address on-court sportsmanship and behavior of coaches, players and officials in an effort to elevate the image of the sport and positively impact the game environment. The Council applauded the committee's efforts and expressed its support for the plan.

8. **Report from the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC).** Scott Krapf, chair of the Division I SAAC, presented a report of the committee's priorities for the upcoming year. As this was the final meeting Scott Krapf would attend as chair of the Division I SAAC, the Leadership Council thanked him for his service and wished him well with his future endeavors.

9. Future Meetings.

a. April 12, 2012, Indianapolis, Indiana.

b. October 2012, TBD, Indianapolis, Indiana.

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

Division I Leadership Council January 12, 2012, Meeting	
ATTENDEES	**ABSENTEES**
Mike Alden, University of Missouri, Big 12 Conference	Clyde McCoy, University of Miami, Atlantic Coast Conference
Lindsey Babcock, Atlantic Coast Conference (alternate)	
Sandy Barbour, University of California, Pacific-12 Conference	
Harold Bardo, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Missouri Valley Conference	
Mike Bitter, Stetson University, Atlantic Sun Conference	
Dave Blank, Elon University, Southern Conference	
McKinley Boston, Jr., New Mexico State University, Western Athletic Conference	
Peg Bradley-Doppes, University of Denver, Sun Belt Conference	
Morgan J. Burke, Purdue University, Big Ten Conference	
Janet Cone, University of North Carolina, Asheville, Big South Conference	
Joan Cronan, University of Tennessee, Southeastern Conference	
Beth Debauche, Ohio Valley Conference	

Peter Fields, Montana State University-Bozeman, Big Sky Conference	
Chet Gladchuk, United States Naval Academy, Patriot League	
Robin Harris, Ivy League	
Jack Hayes, Hofstra University, Colonial Athletic Association	
Amy Huchthausen, America East Conference	
R.C. Johnson, University of Memphis, Conference USA	
Lisa Kelleher, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Mountain West Conference	
Scott Krapf, Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee	
Myndee Kay Larsen, Summit League	
Jonathan LeCrone, Horizon League	
Susan Cross Lipnickey, Miami University, Mid-American Conference	
Janet Lucas, University of California, Riverside, Big West Conference	
John Marinatto, Big East Conference	
John McCutcheon, University of Massachusetts, Atlantic 10 Conference	
Noreen Morris, Northeast Conference	
Derrick Ramsey, Coppin State University, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference	
John Ritschdorff, Marist College, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	
Duer Sharp, Southwesterm Athletic Conference	
Ky Snyder, University of San Diego, West Coast Conference	
Bobby Williams, Sam Houston State University, Southland Conference	
NCAA staff liaisons in attendance: David Berst, Jacqueline Campbell, Kevin Lennon	

Other Guests in attendance: Eugene Daniels, vice-chair of the Division I SAAC; Jim Haney, executive director, National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC); Matthew Holland, president, Utah Valley University; Jim Hollis, chair of the NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet; Michael Jacobson, director of athletics, Utah Valley University; Robert Nelsen, president, University of Texas, Pan American, and Alexis Schug, associate athletic director, New Jersey Institute of Technology.
Other NCAA staff members who were in attendance for portions of the meeting: Scott Bearby, Mark Emmert, Byron Hatch, Lynn Holzman, Michelle Hosick, Greg Johnson, Kevin Lennon, Steve Mallonee, Jarrett Newby, Rachel Newman, Chad Radford, Donald Remy, Wallace Renfro, Stacey Osoburn, Robert Vowels, Bob Williams, Monica Woods and Chuck Wynne.

Summer Access to Men's Basketball Student-Athletes

	Incoming Freshman, and Two-Year and Four-Year College Transfers	**Student-Athletes Following Completion of the First Year of Collegiate Enrollment**	**Student-Athletes Following Completion of the Second Year of Collegiate Enrollment**	**Student-Athletes Following Completion of the Third Year of Collegiate Enrollment**
Requirements for Summer Access to Student-Athletes	Must be enrolled in summer school. *For incoming freshmen at national service academies participating in basic training programs, enrollment in summer school would not be necessary.	Must be enrolled in summer school, **OR** If not enrolled in summer school, must present a 2.2 grade point average (GPA) and have successfully completed 30 semester/45 quarter credit hours.	Must be enrolled in summer school, **OR** If not enrolled in summer school, must present a 2.2 GPA and shall have completed successfully at least 50 percent of the course requirements in the student's specific degree program.	Must be enrolled in summer school, **OR** If not enrolled in summer school, must present a 2.2 GPA and shall have completed successfully at least 75 percent of the course requirements in the student's specific degree program.
Summer Access = Eight hours per week of weight training, conditioning and skill instruction (two-hour limit on skill instruction) for a maximum of eight weeks. Summer access may occur only when student-athlete is enrolled in summer school (e.g., six-week summer school session would permit participation in athletics activities for only six weeks), unless student-athlete meets the specified opt-out academic benchmarks.				
Effective Date: Immediate.				

On-Campus Evaluations (OCE) -- Men's Basketball Prospective Student-Athletes
Effective Date: Immediate

Who may Participate	The OCE shall involve only high school seniors and two-year college prospects who have exhausted eligibility or four-year transfer student-athletes.
When	• The OCE shall not be conducted prior to the conclusion of the prospect's season and may be conducted no later than the opening day of the institution's fall term. • The OCE shall be conducted during a prospect's official or unofficial visit.
Details of OCE	• The OCE may be no longer than two hours in duration and may involve the institution's enrolled student-athletes. The OCE must be included in the institution's 20-hours of countable athletically related activities if it occurs during the institution's playing season or during the institution's two hour of skill instruction (as part of the eight hours per week) if conducted outside the playing season. • Current prohibitions regarding activities for enrolled student-athletes one week prior to final exams would remain applicable.
How Many	• An institution may provide only one OCE per prospect. • The rules governing OCEs apply separately to the time period in which a prospect completes high school eligibility and to the time period after the prospect enrolls in a collegiate institution.
Health and Safety Issues	Additional regulations related to the health and safety of the OCE participants (e.g., medical examinations) that currently exist in the Division II tryout model also will apply.

REPORT OF THE JANUARY 14, 2012, MEETING OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1. **Report of the October 27, 2011, Board of Directors Meeting. The Board approved the report of its October 27, 2011, meeting.** (Unanimous voice vote)

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

   a. **Men's College Basketball Officiating, LLC (MCBO) Sportsmanship Initiative**. The Board was informed that the Competition Committee of the MCBO has developed a plan to address on-court sportsmanship and behavior of coaches, players and officials in an effort to elevate the image of the sport and positively impact the game environment.

   b. **Institutional Integrity and Shared Responsibility**. President Emmert noted the need to address institutional integrity and shared responsibility, particularly in determining the appropriate role for decentralizing rules and the nature of the rules for which institutions should be held accountable. William Powers, president of the University of Texas, joined the meeting and suggested that in order to address institutional integrity issues, risk management programs should be applied across university campuses and include the athletics department. He noted that a modern risk enterprise and sentencing guidelines approach could assist institutions in addressing many of the compliance and enforcement issues facing athletics departments today. President Emmert noted that at the request of the Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Collegiate Model – Rules and Enforcement Working Groups, he plans to create a new working group to address institutional integrity and shared responsibility.

3. **Representation on the Division I Board Directors**. Greg Dell'Omo, vice-chair of the Northeast Conference President's Council and member of the NCAA Division I Presidential Advisory Group, raised with the Division I Board of Directors the issue of full representation on the Board. Several of the nonFootball Bowl Subdivision (FBS) members of the Board expressed concern that without full representation, there are a significant number of conferences that do not feel they have a voice in the current governance structure. President Emmert noted that he will bring back to the Board in August a proposal that will suggest how presidents can engage in a conversation about governance models.

4. <u>Presidential Retreat Initiatives</u>.

a. NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance. Walt Harrison, chair of the Committee on Academic Performance, presented the following recommendations:

(1) That the Board of Directors reinstate Proposal No. 2011-65 – Eligibility – Two-Year College Transfers – Year of Academic Readiness at Two-Year College to the 2011-12 legislative cycle and table it.

BOARD ACTION: **The Board agreed to reinstate the proposal and then moved to tabled it.** (Unanimous Voice Vote)

(2) That the Board approve the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP) Penalty Waiver Directive. [See Attachment A for details of the APP Penalty Waiver Directive.]

BOARD ACTION: **The Board approved the APP Penalty Waiver Directive.** (Unanimous Voice Vote)

(3) That the Board approve an amendment to the APP policies and procedures providing an additional waiver appeal opportunity for teams that do not meet the postseason competition academic requirements.

BOARD ACTION: **The Board approved the amendment to the APP policies and procedures as recommended.** (Unanimous Voice Vote)

b. Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group. Sidney McPhee, chair of the Student-Athlete Well-Being Group, presented the following recommendations based upon reconsideration of the legislation by the working group and comments and discussion by membership groups during the 2012 NCAA Convention:

(1) That in its reconsideration of Proposal No. 2011-97 – "Multi-Year Grants in Aid," the Board of Directors should reaffirm its original action to adopt the proposal.

BOARD ACTION: The Board voted to reaffirm its original action to adopt Proposal No. 2011-97. [For 13 (Adams, Albrecht, Beauchamp, Genshaft, Hatch, Hopkins, McPhee, Millner, Peters, Ray, Schmidly, Simon, White), Against 2 (Bailey, Meehan).] As a result of this action, the proposal will proceed to an on-line one vote per active member institution and multi-

sport conference override vote. It is anticipated that the vote will take place in February.

(2) That in its reconsideration of Proposal No. 2011-96 " Miscellaneous Expense Allowance," the Board should take the following actions:

(a) Rescind the portion of the proposal that provided that all nonathletics financial aid will no longer count toward team limits.

(b) Charge the Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group with developing an alternative proposal that includes the $2,000 miscellaneous expense allowance and considers the options below, as well as a need-based component, for review by the Board at its April meeting. It was noted that the proposal would apply to grants-in-aid, effective for the 2013-14 academic year.

i. Increase the "denominator" of a full and equivalency (value) "grants-in-aid" in effect by $2,000 (not to exceed the institution's cost of attendance).

ii. Maintain a value of a full grant-in-aid at its current level, and establish an "exempt" category of miscellaneous expense funds that are designated on team squad lists for use at the institution's discretion to award up to $2,000 (not to exceed cost of attendance) for full grant recipients, as well as to provide up to the proportionate amount of applicable funds to any or all equivalency grant recipients.

BOARD ACTION: The Board reaffirmed its support for the $2,000 miscellaneous expense allowance, but directed the Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group to come back to the Board in April with an alternative proposal that considers the issues above as well as recommendations for implementation. [For 11 (Bailey, Beauchamp, Genshaft, Hatch, Hopkins, McPhee, Meehan, Ray, Schmidly, Simon, White), Against 4 (Adams, Albrecht, Millner, Peters).] This action renders Proposal No. 2011-96 moot and a new legislative proposal as described above will be considered by the Board during its April meeting, which then will subject such new legislation to a 60-day request for override vote period

c. Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Resource Allocation Working Group. Mike Adams, chair of the Resource Allocation Working Group, presented the following recommendations:

(1) That the Board adopt legislation, effective August 1, 2014, for the elimination of institutional foreign tours that occur at any time. Signed contracts dated previous to January 14, 2012, for scheduled institutional foreign tours will be honored.

BOARD ACTION: The Board voted to defeat the legislation as recommended. [For 2 (Adams, Millner), Against 13 (Albrecht, Bailey, Beauchamp, Genshaft, Hatch, Hopkins, McPhee, Meehan, Peters, Ray, Schmidly, Simon, White).]

(2) That the Board adopt legislation, effective August 1, 2012, to reduce the maximum number of Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) scholarships (counters) from 85 to 80, with a proportional decrease in the maximum number of scholarships (equivalencies) in Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) from 63 to 60, with 80 overall counters.

BOARD ACTION: The Board voted to defeat legislation to reduce scholarships in FBS football. [For 4 (Adams, Albrecht, Peters, Schmidly), Against 6 (Bailey, Genshaft, Hatch, McPhee, Ray, Simon).]

[Note: The recommendation for a reduction in FCS scholarships will be reviewed by the FCS presidents of the Division I Presidential Advisory Group in April, inasmuch as that group has final authority to act on legislation specific to FCS football.]

(3) That the Board adopt legislation, effective August 1, 2014, to reduce women's basketball scholarships from 15 to 13.

BOARD ACTION: The Board voted to defeat legislation to reduce scholarships in women's basketball. [For 7 (Adams, Albrecht, Beauchamp, Millner, Peters, Schmidly, White), Against 8 (Bailey, Genshaft, Hatch, Hopkins, McPhee, Meehan, Ray, Simon).]

(4) That the Board adopt a resolution, which specifies:

- That an immediate moratorium be instituted to cap the number of contests/dates of competition at the levels that currently exist in all sports;

- That the NCAA Division I Board of Directors commission a study to determine the maximum number of contests/dates of competition of the playing season (championship and nonchampionship segments) that is essential to the success of each NCAA sport. In addition, the Working

Group recommends that the scope of this study specifically examine how basketball contests are counted, and

- That once the study is completed and the appropriate contest/dates of competition limits are in place for each sport, that those limits remain in place for 10 years.

BOARD ACTION: The Board adopted the resolution. (Unanimous voice vote)

(5) That the Board adopt legislation, effective August 1, 2013, that limits the number of noncoaching staff members in the sports of football and men's basketball as follows:

(a) In football, a limit of 12 noncoaching staff members, whose duties include support of the football program in any capacity, including third-party contractors that may be employed by an institution. The 12 noncoaching staff members shall not include athletics trainers, academic support and compliance staff members.

(b) In men's basketball, a limit of six noncoaching staff members, whose duties include support of the men's basketball program in any capacity, including third-party contractors that may be employed by the institution. The six noncoaching staff members shall not include athletics trainers, academic support and compliance staff members.

BOARD ACTION: The Board expressed interest in taking action to address this matter, but voted to table these recommendations for reconsideration at its April meeting, and asked that additional information and feedback be gathered from the membership regarding appropriate number limitations. [For 13 (Adams, Bailey, Beauchamp, Genshaft, Hatch, Hopkins, McPhee, Meehan, Peters, Ray, Schmidly, Simon, White), Against 2 (Albrecht, Millner).]

d. Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Collegiate Model -- Rules Working Group. Kevin Lennon, NCAA vice president of academic and membership affairs, presented the following Rules Working Group recommendations:

(1) That the Board support the general approach outlined for a new regulatory structure, which includes developing principle-based outcomes to ensure that NCAA rules are value-based, meaningful, enforceable and supportive of the

collegiate model of sport. The Board noted its support for the new regulatory structure.

(2) That the Board endorse a moratorium on new legislation for the 2012-13 legislative cycle (unless part of presidential reform agenda).

BOARD ACTION: The Board voted to apply a moratorium on new legislation for the 2012-13 legislative cycle, unless it is part of the presidential agenda. (Unanimous voice vote)

e. Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Collegiate Model -- Enforcement Working Group. Ed Ray, chair of the Enforcement Working Group, and Julie Roe Lach, NCAA vice president of enforcement, updated the Board on the working group's progress with creating a multi-level NCAA rules violation structure, an enhanced penalty structure for NCAA rules infractions and re-establishing a sense of shared responsibility among the interested individuals and entities in intercollegiate athletics.

5. Division I Governance Structure Update.

a. **Report of the January 12, 2012, Meeting of the Leadership Council**. Mike Alden, chair of the Division I Leadership Council, reported on the January 12 meeting of the Council and presented the following recommendations:

(1) Summer Access to Men's Basketball Student-Athletes. That the Board take action to adopt a summer access model that permits institutional staff members to conduct or supervise summer athletics activities in accordance with specified requirements (i.e., enrollment in summer school, meeting opt-out academic benchmarks). [Note: See Attachment B for details of the summer access model.]

BOARD ACTION: The Board voted to adopt the summer access model as recommended, effective immediately. (Unanimous voice vote.)

(2) Men's Basketball Recruiting Model – On Campus Evaluations. That the Board of Directors take final action to adopt provisions for on-campus evaluations (OCE) of prospective student-athletes. [Note: See Attachment C for provisions of OCEs.]

BOARD ACTION: The Board voted to adopt the provisions for on-campus evaluations as recommended, effective immediately. (Unanimous voice vote.)

b. Report of the January 11-12, 2012, Meeting of the Division I Legislative Council. Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, chair of the Division I Legislative Council, noted that at the request of the Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Collegiate Model -- Rules Working Group, the Legislative Council tabled 49 proposals. In addition, the Council took the following actions:

(1) Voted to adopt Proposal No. 2011-23 -- Amateurism -- Definitions And Applications -- Agent, which specifies that an agent is any individual who, directly or indirectly, represents or attempts to represent an individual for the purpose of marketing his or her athletics ability or reputation for financial gain, or seeks to obtain any type of financial gain or benefit from securing a prospective student-athlete's enrollment at an educational institution or from a student-athlete's potential earnings as a professional athlete.

(2) Voted to adopt Proposal No. 2011-45 -- Recruiting -- Tryouts -- Nonscholastic Practice Or Competition And Noninstitutional Camps And Clinics -- Women's Basketball, which specifies that in women’s basketball, an institution [including any institutional department (e.g., athletics, recreational/intramural)] shall not host, sponsor or conduct a nonscholastic basketball practice or competition in which women's basketball prospective student-athletes participate on its campus or at an off-campus facility regularly used by the institution for practice and/or competition by any of the institution's sport programs, and to establish limited exceptions, as specified; further, specifies that the use of an institution's facilities for noninstitutional camps is limited to the months of June, July and August; finally, to prohibit evaluations at noninstitutional events, camps or clinics that occur on a Division I campus during evaluation periods.

(3) Voted to adopt Proposal No. 2011-46 -- Recruiting -- Tryouts -- Nonscholastic Practice Or Competition And Noninstitutional Camps Or Clinics – Football, which specifies that in the sport of football, an institution [including any institutional department (e.g., athletics, recreational/intramural)] shall not host, sponsor or conduct a nonscholastic football practice or competition (e.g., seven-on-seven events) in which football prospective student-athletes participate on its campus or at an off-campus facility regularly used by the institution for practice and/or competition by any of the institution's sport programs; further, to limit the use of institutional facilities for noninstitutional camps or clinics that include prospect-aged participants to June and July in bowl subdivision football and to June, July and August in championship subdivision football.

(4) Voted to defeat Proposal No. 2011-64 -- Eligibility -- Seasons Of Competition: Five-Year Rule -- Five Seasons Of Eligibility – Football, which specifies that a student-athlete in the sport of football shall not engage in more than five seasons of intercollegiate competition and may only engage in a fifth season at an institution at which the student-athlete previously used a season of competition.

6. **Supplemental Distribution.** Ed Ray, chair of the Executive Committee, informed the Board that the Finance Committee recommended that the Executive Committee approve a supplemental distribution of approximately $36,000,000 to be dispensed to the Division I membership.

BOARD ACTION: The Board voted to approve the recommendation of the Finance Committee and authorized distribution of a Division I supplemental distribution of $36,000,000 to mutli-sport conferences. (Unanimous voice vote) [Note: Ann Millner was not present.]

7. **Status Report on Review of NCAA Division I Athletics Certification Program.** Troy Arthur, NCAA director of academic and membership affairs, updated the Board on the work of the NCAA Division I Athletics Certification Committee in its review of the Division I Athletics Certification program. The Board received information regarding proposed name changes to the certification program and the committee, system development, organizational changes and the accountability spectrum.

8. **NCAA Membership – Accreditation Policy.** The Board reviewed a proposed Association-wide membership accreditation policy that shall be used to assist in determining whether an active or provisional NCAA member institution meets the applicable membership requirements regarding accreditation as further set forth in Article 3 of the NCAA Constitution.

BOARD ACTION: The Board voted to endorse the policy. (Unanimous voice vote) [Note: Ann Millner was not present.]

9. **Future Meeting Dates**.

a. April 25-26, 2012, Indianapolis, Indiana.

[Note: There will be a joint meeting of the Division I Presidential Advisory Group and the Board of Directors on Wednesday, April, 25, 2012, from 1-5 p.m. to review and discuss reports of several of the Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Working Groups. The Board of Directors will convene its regular meeting on Thursday, April 26, 2012.]

b. August, 2, 2012, Indianapolis, Indiana.

c. Tuesday, October 30, 2012, Indianapolis, Indiana.

d. January 19, 2013, Grapevine, Texas.

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

Division I Board of Directors January 14, 2012, Meeting	
ATTENDEES	**ABSENTEES**
Michael Adams, University of Georgia, Southeastern Conference (alternate)	William R. Harvey, Hampton University, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference
Stanley Albrecht, Utah State University, Western Athletic Conference	Harris Pastides, University of South Carolina, Southeastern Conference
Guy Bailey, Texas Tech University, Big 12 Conference	David Skorton, Cornell University, Ivy League
William Beauchamp, University of Portland, West Coast Conference	Steadman Upham, University of Tulsa, Conference USA
Judy Genshaft, University of South Florida, Big East Conference, chair	
Nathan Hatch, Wake Forest University, Atlantic Coast Conference	
David Hopkins, Wright State University, Horizon League	
Sidney McPhee, Middle Tennessee State University, Sun Belt Conference	

William Meehan, Jacksonville State University, Ohio Valley Conference	
Ann Millner, Weber State University, Big Sky Conference	
John Peters, Northern Illinois University, Mid-American University	
Edward Ray, Oregon State University, Pacific-12 Conference	
David Schmidly, University of New Mexico, Mountain West Conference	
Lou Anna Simon, Michigan State University, Big Ten Conference	
Timothy White, University of California, Riverside, Big West Conference	
NCAA staff liaisons in attendance: David Berst, Jacqueline Campbell	
Other Guests: William Powers, University of Texas	
Other NCAA staff members in attendance for portions of the meeting: Troy Arthur, Erik Christianson, Joni Comstock, Diane Dickman, Amy Dunham, Mark Emmert, Bernard Franklin, Lynn Holzman, Michelle Hosick, Jim Isch, Kevin Lennon, Steve Mallonee, Kathleen McNeely, Jarrett Newby, Delise O'Meally, Stacey Osburn, Tom Paskus, Todd Petr, Denny Poppe, Donald Remy, Wallace Renfro, Julie Roe Lach, Ronnie Ramos, Crissy Schluep, Dave Schnase, Greg Shaheen, Jennifer Strawley, Robert Vowels, Wendy Walters, Bob Williams and Niu Xiaomu.	

NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Academic Performance Program Access to Postseason and Penalty Waiver Directive

Background.

The central purpose of the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP) is to ensure that the NCAA Division I membership is dedicated to providing student-athletes with an exemplary education and intercollegiate athletics experience in an environment that recognizes and supports the primacy of the academic mission of its member institutions while enhancing the ability of student-athletes to earn a degree.

When a team's academic performance, measured by the multiyear NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR), falls below 930, that team becomes ineligible for postseason competition and is subject to penalties. The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance has established a transition period in which the APP penalty benchmark will be 900 in 2011-12 and 2012-13. In addition, filters are applied to teams' data to account for improvement and resources in the penalty calculation. NCAA Division I Bylaws 18.4.2.3.1, 23.2.2.3 and 23.3 provide for waivers of APP penalties or access to postseason competition. The committee has approved this directive to provide guidance to the NCAA staff and the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Subcommittee on Appeals in reviewing APP penalty waiver requests.

Guiding Principles.

1. Requests to waive ineligibility for postseason and APP Level One, Two and Three penalties will be considered independently. The requests are filed simultaneously, but the access to postseason competition and APP penalties have different standards for relief.

2. APP penalty and postseason waiver requests involve a review of the entire athletics team's overall academic performance. The APR is a team rate and not based on the academic performance of a single student-athlete. Therefore, the review of waiver requests shall consider all student-athletes included in the team's multiyear APR. This approach considers the loss of all APR points, not just those of select students. This approach could be referred to as the "top-down approach" (e.g., start at an APR of 1000 and explain the loss of all points).

3. APR Improvement Plans are reviewed with the waiver request. Plans should be designed to assist teams in achieving APRs above the penalty benchmarks in a reasonable time by identifying and addressing issues impacting a team's APR with measurable goals, steps to achieve the stated goals and a timetable for implementation.

4. The identification of academically under-performing teams that are subject to an APP penalty includes consideration of resource level and squad size. Therefore, the staff/subcommittee/committee will generally not consider these elements in its review of APP penalty waiver or loss of access to postseason waiver requests.

Waivers of Ineligibility for Postseason Competition.

1. First Occasion Team is Ineligible for Postseason Competition. Institutions are permitted to submit a waiver request the first occasion a team is subject to postseason competition ineligibility. The committee has established a high threshold for relief in these cases and generally relief will not be provided.

   - Factors to be Considered. The staff/subcommittee will consider the following factors in reviewing such a request:

     (1) Extraordinary Mitigating Circumstances. The institution's cited mitigation must be clearly out of the control of the institution, the athletics department and the team's student-athletes. It must pertain to matters not previously addressed in the APP (e.g., small squad size, institutional mission). Finally it must have impacted the team over the multiple years that make up the four-year APR. An example of mitigation that would be considered extraordinary is a natural disaster that impact a team's APR over multiple years. An example of mitigation that would not be considered extraordinary would be head coaching change, significant leadership change at the institution, or institutional reclassification.

     (2) APR Improvement Plan. An institution's commitment to improving the penalized team's academic performance as outlined in the APR Improvement Plan must be considered in reviewing a waiver requesting relief from postseason competition ineligibility. Plans will be reviewed for focus on critical areas impacting academic success as well as other components demonstrating the institution's accountability toward meeting the stated goals of the APP (e.g., graduating student-athletes).

(3) Academic Factors. A waiver request must include a comprehensive review of the team's historical academic trends to determine if the team's placement in the APP penalty structure is the result of habitual underperformance or the result of some anomaly event (see the list on Page No. 4). Trending will also be evaluated to determine if the team is making progress with respect to the penalty benchmark.

(4) Alternative Penalty Options. An institution may request that an alternative penalty be imposed in lieu of postseason ineligibility. The institution must include an explanation of how the alternate penalty equates to a loss of postseason access.

2. Second Occasion Team is subject to Loss of Postseason Competition. Institutions are permitted to request a waiver of a team's loss of access to postseason competition.

- Factors to be Considered. The second or subsequent time a team loses access to postseason competition, the staff/subcommittee/committee will review the request using the same factors used in considering an APP penalty waiver (see Page Nos. 4 – 7 for more information). If a team has demonstrated meaningful improvement and some of the factors in item 3-b below are present, the level of mitigation required to receive relief may be less stringent than what is required the first occasion a team was ineligible for postseason competition.

3. Notes on Outcomes. A loss of access to postseason competition waiver request will be approved, conditionally approved or denied.

a. First occasion loss of access to postseason waiver requests should be denied if the institution cannot demonstrate extraordinary mitigating circumstances as described on Page No. 2. Other factors listed in item number one above will be examined, but absent extraordinary mitigation are not likely to result in an approval.

b. Second and subsequent waivers of loss of access to postseason competition should be denied if the institution cannot demonstrate:

(1) Significant academic improvement that is sustainable;

(2) Mitigating circumstances as defined on Page No. 7;

(3) An APR Improvement Plan that demonstrates the institution's commitment to improving the team's academic performance by identifying critical issues that have impacted the team's APR and addressing those issues with clear steps and measurable goals; and

(4) An expectation that the team will achieve an APR of 930 or higher in a reasonable period of time.

APP Penalty Waivers.

Institutions are permitted to request a waiver of a team's APP penalties. The staff/subcommittee/committee will consider the following factors in reviewing such a request:

1. Academic Factors. Evaluating a team's academic performance is an important part of the APP penalty waiver process. The staff/subcommittee/committee's review of a team's academic performance may include consideration of the following elements:

   a. A comprehensive review of the team's historical APP performance, including any penalty history and academic trends to determine if the team's placement in the APP penalty structure is the result of habitual underperformance or the result of some anomaly event. Trending will also be evaluated to determine if the team is making sustainable progress toward the penalty benchmark.

   b. The team's Graduation Success Rate and Federal Graduation Rate, if available.

   c. Eligibility and Retention. The team's eligibility and retention will be compared against the following:

      (1) All other Division I teams in the same sport.

      (2) The institution's teams.

   d. The team's academic profile including hours earned, grade-point average, eligibility and retention points.

e. The academic profile of the team when admitted to the member institution, including admissions status as compared to the general student-body and/or other student-athletes at the institution.

f. The number of graduates the team has generated over the four years that make up the multiyear rate.

g. The number of student-athletes who were not academically eligible and not retained included in the multiyear APR.

h. Other academic data elements that may be relevant to the case.

2. Other Factors. The staff/subcommittee/committee's review of a team's academic performance may also include consideration of the following elements:

a. Size of variance between the team's APR and the applicable APP penalty benchmark (930).

b. The team's single-year APRs that comprise the multiyear rate. Specifically, the number of single-year APRs above or below the penalty benchmarks (930).

c. The institution's history of implementation of its APR Improvement Plan as well as the current plan's ability to address critical issues.

d. Mitigating circumstances that have affected the team's APR (see below).

e. An institution may request that an alternative penalty be imposed in lieu of the assigned APP penalty or a penalty option from the menu offered at Level Three. Should an institution offer an alternative penalty, the staff/committee/subcommittee would consider the various factors as well as the alternate penalty in the decision. The institution must demonstrate how the alternate penalty equates to the penalty it would replace.

f. Teams asserting that they have advanced in the penalty structure due to corrections to APP data identified in an APP data review must demonstrate that the current penalty is due to a lost opportunity for the institution to identify academic issues impacting the teams academic performance; to develop an appropriate APR Improvement Plan and to have an opportunity to rectify academic issues. If the institution can demonstrate this lost opportunity to identify and correct academic issues

affecting the team's academic performance the staff and/or subcommittee/committee may consider this a mitigating circumstance warranting relief from a penalty, however all such requests will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to allow for other factors to be reviewed as well.

3. Mitigating Circumstances. Circumstances will be considered as compelling mitigating factors if the institution can demonstrate that it had a direct correlation to the team's ability to earn eligibility/graduation and/or retention points supported by objective documentation. The institution may reference mitigation that was considered in a previous waiver request if the impact of the mitigation is evidenced in the current APR. Waiver decisions will analyze those circumstances that may be unique events resulting in academically low performing year(s) versus habitually underperforming teams. A team's APR that is negatively affected by a unique one-time circumstance, but otherwise is not historically an underperforming team, should be treated differently than a team that has a history and pattern of academic underachievement.

Circumstances not considered compelling mitigation may include, but are not limited to, the following:

a. Unreasonable reliance by a student-athlete on misinformation from an institutional staff member (e.g., misadvisement);

b. Institutional lack of understanding regarding the APP;

c. Failure to develop and implement an APR Improvement Plan;

d. Conferences and/or institutions with more stringent academic standards than NCAA Division I progress-toward-degree requirements; or

e. Circumstances submitted in a request to receive an adjustment of an individual student-athlete's APR retention and/or eligibility or graduation point if the institution received relief for those circumstances by way of an APR adjustment.

Institutions are limited to submitting information concerning mitigating circumstances only for the academic years used to calculate that team's current multiyear APR. However, the staff, subcommittee and committee reserve the right to consider any relevant information that would explain the team's historical performance.

4. Level Three Penalty Options. An institution with a team subject to Level Three penalties must self-impose penalties from a list of menu options. These penalties are in addition to the prescribed penalties. The institution may also elect to request an alternative penalty be imposed. The staff/committee will consider the institution's self-imposed penalty elements in the waiver decision. The staff/committee can also prescribe additional penalties for the team.

5. Notes on Outcomes. An APP penalty waiver request will be partially or fully approved or conditionally approved, or denied. Requests will likely be denied if the institution cannot demonstrate:

   a. Significant academic improvement that is sustainable; OR

   b. The team is performing well academically but for one or more years of APP data impacted by compelling, documented mitigating circumstances;

   c. An APR Improvement Plan that demonstrates the institution's commitment to improving the team's academic performance by identifying critical issues that have impacted the team's APR and addressing those issues with clear steps and measurable goals;

   d. An expectation that the team will achieve an APR of 930 or higher in a reasonable period of time; and

   e. Appropriate self-imposed penalties at Level Three.

Use of Conditional Approvals.

Waivers of APP penalties and ineligibility for postseason competition may receive conditional approval. A waiver that is conditionally approved does not waive the team's penalty unless the team satisfies the stated condition(s). These conditions may include, but are not limited to:

1. Acceptable implementation of the institution's written APR Improvement Plan;

2. Attendance at mandatory educational sessions;

3. Meeting or maintaining single-year eligibility and retention goals and/or, meeting or maintaining a specified single-year APR without the inclusion of delayed-graduation points;

4. Requiring the institution to implement certain elements of its APR Improvement Plan determined to be "critical" to improved academic performance;

5. Requiring the institution to demonstrate it has satisfied its commitment of resources to enhance academic support initiatives that are part of the institution's APR Improvement Plan or cited in its APP penalty waiver/hearing rationale;

6. Requiring the institution to impose limits, restrictions or penalties that are part of its APR Improvement Plan or cited in its waiver/hearing rationale (e.g., withhold a head coach from contests);

7. Requiring an institution to use the NCAA Facilitating Learning and Achieving Graduation/Graduation Risk Overview program; and

8. Requiring an institution comply with identified minimal academic profiles for entering student-athletes that are part of its APR Improvement Plan or its waiver/hearing rationale. *(Revised: 10/2008;10/2010)*

An institution/team that fails to meet the stated condition(s) by the given timeframe shall have the waiver decision converted to a denial and the APP penalty must be applied to the team. The institution must impose the applicable penalty within the prescribed period of time.

Review of Conditionally Approved Penalty Waivers.

At some point established by the committee, such as the start of the academic year following the year in which the waiver was conditionally approved, the staff verifies that all established conditions were met (e.g., single-year APR, acceptable implementation of APR Improvement Plan). If the staff concludes that the team has not satisfied the condition(s) of the penalty waiver, the subcommittee and staff may consider mitigating circumstances presented by the institution. Such reviews shall occur on a case-by-case basis, and shall include consideration of any mitigation for the team's failure to reach the target APR, as well as the totality of the team's circumstances with regard to the imposed conditions. In such cases, the staff will review factors including improvement in the single-year and multiyear APR, how close the team came to meeting the target and mitigating circumstances. This action does not change an institution's opportunity to explain why it failed to meet the condition(s) or to appeal a decision by the staff to the subcommittee. The subcommittee will hear such appeals via teleconference. The subcommittee's decision is final.

Finally, if it is determined that a conditional waiver is not satisfied and the waiver is denied, the institution must impose the resulting penalties in the time period prescribed by the committee, but generally the academic year following denial of the appeal or, if there was no appeal, following determination that the conditions were not met (e.g., determined condition was not met in 2011-12 results in the imposition of the penalties in 2012-13).

If the team is subject to a penalty in the next academic year, the team is potentially subject to the penalty level that was conditionally waived and the next penalty level if it fails to meet the conditions of the waived penalty.

APR Improvement Plans.

APR Improvement Plans are meant to encourage institutions that have a team with an APR below 930 to implement strategies to improve the academic performance, retention and graduation of the student-athletes on the team. Institutions seeking relief from an APP penalty are expected to demonstrate that the team's academic performance will improve and will achieve an APR of 930 in a reasonable period of time. Therefore, APR Improvement Plans submitted with a waiver will be reviewed as follows:

1. Institutions/teams will be accountable for identifying issues impacting the penalized team's ability to move its APR above the established penalty benchmark. The following shall be addressed:

    a. Identify any issues impacting the academic performance, retention and graduation of the team's student-athletes and develop specific and measurable goals to address the issues, steps to meet the goals, timetable for implementation and persons responsible for each step outlined in the plan.

    b. Identify specific target APR goals for the team(s) for the current academic year that will assist the team in meeting the 930 benchmark in a reasonable period of time.

    c. Identify all steps the institution has taken toward implementation of any previous APR Improvement Plan and progress toward the measurable goals.

2. If an institution fails to create and submit an acceptable APR Improvement Plan, as defined by the committee, there is a presumption that any penalty waiver request will be denied.

Summer Access to Men's Basketball Student-Athletes

	Incoming Freshman, and Two-Year and Four-Year College Transfers	**Student-Athletes Following Completion of the First Year of Collegiate Enrollment**	**Student-Athletes Following Completion of the Second Year of Collegiate Enrollment**	**Student-Athletes Following Completion of the Third Year of Collegiate Enrollment**
Requirements for Summer Access to Student-Athletes	Must be enrolled in summer school. *For incoming freshmen at national service academies participating in basic training programs, enrollment in summer school would not be necessary.	Must be enrolled in summer school **OR** If not enrolled in summer school, must present a 2.2 grade point average (GPA) and have successfully completed 30 semester/45 quarter credit hours.	Must be enrolled in summer school **OR** If not enrolled in summer school, must present a 2.2 GPA and shall have completed successfully at least 50 percent of the course requirements in the student's specific degree program	Must be enrolled in summer school **OR** If not enrolled in summer school, must present a 2.2 GPA and shall have completed successfully at least 75 percent of the course requirements in the student's specific degree program
Summer Access = Eight hours per week of weight training, conditioning and skill instruction (two-hour limit on skill instruction) for a maximum of eight weeks. Summer access may occur only when student-athlete is enrolled in summer school (e.g., six-week summer school session would permit participation in athletics activities for only six weeks), unless student-athlete meets the specified opt-out academic benchmarks.				
Effective Date: Immediate.				

On-Campus Evaluations (OCE) -- Men's Basketball Prospective Student-Athletes
Effective Date: Immediate

Who may Participate	The OCE shall involve only high-school seniors and two-year college prospects who have exhausted eligibility or four-year transfer student-athletes.
When	• The OCE shall not be conducted prior to the conclusion of the prospect's season and may be conducted no later than the opening day of the institution's fall term. • The OCE shall be conducted during a prospect's official or unofficial visit.
Details of OCE	• The OCE may be no longer than two hours in duration and may involve the institution's enrolled student-athletes. The OCE must be included in the institution's 20-hours of countable athletically related activities if it occurs during the institution's playing season or during the institution's two hour of skill instruction (as part of the eight hours per week) if conducted outside the playing season. • Current prohibitions regarding activities for enrolled student-athletes one week prior to final exams would remain applicable.
How Many	• An institution may provide only one OCE per prospect. • The rules governing OCEs apply separately to the time period in which a prospect completes high school eligibility and to the time period after the prospect enrolls in a collegiate institution.
Health and Safety Issues	Additional regulations related to the health and safety of the OCE participants (e.g., medical examinations) that currently exist in the Division II tryout model also will apply.

Rules Working Group seeks feedback on draft documents

Mar 19, 2012 3:34:48 PM

By Michelle Brutlag Hosick
NCAA.org

The Collegiate Model: Rules Working Group is asking the Division I membership to review additional concepts from the Collegiate Model: Rules Working Group and provide feedback on draft documents.

The drafts include a set of overarching commitments for the division, specific concepts for three bylaws, and drafts of rewritten bylaws related to personnel, recruiting and student-athlete awards and benefits.

The group intends to revise the Division I rule structure to focus on the NCAA's core values and principles. In doing so, the group is working to reduce the number of rules and replace them with regulations that are meaningful, enforceable and support the collegiate model. The desired result is to create an increased sense of shared responsibility for rules compliance across member institutions, conferences and the national office.

The changes are designed to reduce the administrative burden on campuses by making clear the outcomes the rules seek to achieve rather than prescriptively managing behavior.

The group is seeking membership input on the working group webpage created for that purpose. Members are invited to comment on the proposed commitments, the specific concepts within Bylaws 11 (conduct and employment of athletics personnel), 13 (recruiting) and 16 (awards, benefits and expenses) as well as the draft rewrite of Bylaw 11.

The commitments, which serve as a framework for the rewritten bylaws, are designed to complement the Association's principles found in the NCAA constitution and help define the Division I collegiate model. The proposed commitments are:

- The commitment to institutional integrity and sportsmanship
- The commitment to institutional control and compliance
- The commitment to amateurism
- The commitment to fair competition
- The commitment to student-athlete well-being
- The commitment to academic standards.
- The commitment to responsible recruiting standards

Each commitment will be more thoroughly defined based on membership feedback, and additional commitments may be considered. Other commitments not within the purview of the

working group (for example, diversity and inclusion) are not being considered for revision at this time.

During its February meeting, the working group spent several hours in an intensive review of Bylaws 11, 13 and 16 with the goal of simplifying each article and eliminating portions that are unenforceable or inconsequential while still maintaining the core ideas that support NCAA values.

Through that review, the group members identified various concepts that could help reshape each bylaw. The process was aided by feedback gathered at February cabinet meetings and from other groups, including the Division I Athletics Directors, Division 1A Faculty Athletics Representatives, the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association and the National Association for Athletics Compliance.

The materials now available to the membership include information regarding the initial concepts, rationale for proposed changes and points to consider.

The communication will be targeted, with detailed proposals provided to the practitioners such as compliance officers. Full materials are available to all members for comment at www.NCAA.org/workinggroups.

The working group is requesting feedback on these concepts by April 20 to allow the group time to analyze the feedback and determine whether more specific, iterative feedback requests are necessary.

SUPPLEMENT NO. 3A-2
DI Leadership Council 4/12

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 19, 2012

TO: NCAA Division I Conference Commissioners.

FROM: Jim Barker, chair
NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model – Rules.

SUBJECT: Requesting feedback of proposed changes to select NCAA bylaws.

As you know, the Division I presidents concluded a two-day summit this past August calling for bold, sweeping changes to improve intercollegiate athletics. Building on the momentum from that summit, the Rules Working Group has been working to reduce the number of rules and emphasize those that are of priority importance – moving from an overly codified environment to one that is values-driven and emphasizes shared responsibility. To date, the working group has made progress in attempting to refine a set of "institutional commitments" that reflect our values and will serve as guideposts for both the adoption and the elimination of specific rules.

As the working group develops final proposals for the NCAA Division I Board of Directors to review later this year, the working group is seeking membership feedback on a number of concepts related to Bylaws 11 (personnel), 13 (recruiting) and 16 (awards and benefits). The working group will incorporate your feedback over the course of the spring and revise its recommendations as appropriate during the summer. We will share those iterative drafts and solicit additional feedback during the coming months, including during upcoming conference meetings.

Attached please find the materials on which we seek your feedback – these have also been sent to representatives on your campuses. Attachment A is our draft of a set of revised institutional commitments. Attachment B is a set of substantive concepts that, if accepted, would eliminate considerable portions of Bylaws 11, 13 and 16. Attachment C is an affirmative draft and serves as an example of what could be a new Bylaw 11 supported by the commitments and the substantive concepts. We attempt here to simplify and reorganize the language for clarity, and have supplied rationales for the proposed changes. Finally, Attachment D is a color-coded version of the existing Bylaw 11 that more clearly delineates what could be eliminated in Bylaw 11 if the Working Group's initial work were adopted. Please review the materials with your staff and provide your feedback not later than April 20, 2012. Your feedback can be provided at www.ncaa.org/workinggroups. A timeline for the working group's efforts can also be found at this location.

Thank you in advance for your continued support of the presidentially led reform agenda.

JB:ld

Attachments

NCAA WORKING GROUP ON THE COLLEGIATE MODEL – RULES
PROPOSED CHANGES TO NCAA CONSTITUTION (ART. 2)

As part of this Working Group's charge, it is necessary to review certain provisions of the NCAA Constitution. Specifically, Article 2 of the Constitution is entitled "Principles for Conduct of Intercollegiate Athletics" and describes 16 different Principles "to which the members are committed." Constitution 2.01.[1] Some of those Principles address matters not strictly within the purview of this Working Group. These include Principles 2.3 (Gender Equity), 2.4 (Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct), 2.6 (Nondiscrimination) and 2.7 (Diversity within Governance Structures). While those provisions are addressed below (see new Commitments 2.4 and 2.9), the focus of this Group is on provisions most directly related to Articles 11-17.

Provisions in Article 2 outline broad commitments of the Association. They are designed to articulate the priorities and set the overall direction for the Association, as expressed by member institutions. They are intentionally broad, as implementing detail is provided in supporting and specific bylaws. All bylaws in the Manual, and all future legislation, should advance one or more of these provisions. Thus, there is a thread that runs from the broad commitments in Article 2, through the general provisions of each Article and into every bylaw ultimately adopted by the membership.

The proposed revisions that follow generally use current language from Article 2 as a starting point. Recommended changes are designed to (1) more accurately capture the fundamental principles of the Collegiate Model, (2) update arguably obsolete language, and (3) streamline and simplify provisions in Article 2. The revisions are also designed to reduce confusing overlap of common terms presently used in the Manual. For example and for purposes of discussion, "principles" in Article 2 could be called "commitments" and references to "rules," "regulations," or "rules and regulations" could be replaced with a simple reference to "bylaws."

In addition to language changes, this recommendation removes several stand-alone sections of Article 2 for purposes of discussion. These include Constitution 2.12 (Eligibility), 2.13 (Financial Aid), 2.14 (Playing and Practice Seasons) and 2.15 (Postseason Competition). While these items clearly support the Collegiate Model, they do not necessarily require individual constitutional provisions because each is addressed by other commitments. Notes about how these provisions fit within Article 2 follow related commitments.

Specific questions regarding individual commitments are embedded in the recommendations below. In addition, general questions to consider include the following:

1. Are there additional commitments that should be included in the NCAA Constitution?

[1] Citations are to numbers and titles appearing in the 2011-12 Division I Manual.

CONFIDENTIAL
ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE
ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT

2. Should these commitments be reworded to be more specific or less specific?

3. Are these commitments understandable and consistent with the Collegiate Model?

4. Are any of these commitments unique to Division I, or are they all Association-wide?

In conclusion, reasonable minds can and do differ about the NCAA's enduring values and how they should be articulated. These draft proposals are designed to encourage productive feedback about furthering the Collegiate Model of athletics. Accordingly, further debate and analysis will be important.

CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE 2

Elements of the Collegiate Model

2.1 ENACTMENT OF BYLAWS

Bylaws enacted by the Association's members governing the conduct of intercollegiate athletics shall be designed to advance the Collegiate Model, foster competition in amateur athletics and promote the Association's enduring values set forth in this Constitution. In some instances, a careful balancing of these values may be necessary to help achieve the purposes of the Association.

[*Note: This provision is derived from current Constitution 2.01 (General Principle).*]

- *Does this make sufficiently clear that subsequent bylaw proposals need to support the NCAA's most basic principles and commitments?*

2.2 THE COMMITMENT TO AMATEURISM

Member institutions shall conduct their athletics programs for students who participate as a part of their educational experience, thus maintaining a line of demarcation between student-athletes who choose to participate in the Collegiate Model from athletes competing in the professional model.

[*Note: This provision updates and clarifies Constitution 2.9 (Amateurism). It is designed to clearly state the membership's dedication to amateur competition, while allowing flexibility for implementing definitions and bylaws. It is also broad enough to capture portions of Constitution 2.13 (Financial Aid) and, when combined with other commitments, would allow that provision to be removed as a stand-alone section in Article 2.*]

- *Are there specific subjects that should be added here in support of amateurism?*

2.3 THE COMMITMENT TO FAIR COMPETITION

Alternative 1:

Bylaws of the Association shall be designed to promote the opportunity for institutions and eligible student-athletes to engage in fair competition. Member institutions shall abide by uniform bylaws in areas impacting athletics competition including but not limited to personnel, eligibility and amateurism, recruiting, financial aid, the length of playing and practice seasons and the number of institutional competitions per sport. However, bylaws shall not be designed to foreclose advantages that may arise from an institution's decisions regarding allocation of resources or from advantages or disadvantages that may arise from geographical location.

Alternative 2:

The member institutions are committed to the principle of competitive fairness. Competitive fairness requires that student-athletes compete against their peers. This requires that all member institutions compete within the framework of the collegiate model of athletics where athletic competition is an integral part of the student-athlete's effort to acquire a degree in higher education. Competitive fairness suggests that the framework for the student's experience should be one in which academic pursuit is expected and reinforced, where the student-athletes are competing against amateurs like themselves rather than against professionals, and where the rules of the game as well as rules relating to recruitment, eligibility, financial aid and benefits, and conduct do not impose burdens on any team or individual that are not imposed on all teams or individuals. Competitive fairness does not support rules or regulations that prevent or reduce the advantages that arise from a student-athlete's level of talent or an institution's financial or other natural advantages.

[*Note: These alternatives are designed to update and clarify Constitution 2.10 (Competitive Equity). They are also designed to capture portions of Constitution 2.12 (Eligibility), 2.13 (Financial Aid), 2.14 (Playing and Practice Seasons) and perhaps 2.15 (Postseason Competitions) and 2.9 (Amateurism).*]

1. *Feedback on the scope of "fair competition" and the level of specificity to include in this provision would be helpful.*

2. *Please also provide feedback on whether this provision should include the proposed language clarifying that "fair competition" does not mean removing all advantages that may inure to a member institution based on its resources or other factors.*

2.4 THE COMMITMENT TO INTEGRITY AND SPORTSMANSHIP

It is the responsibility of each member institution to conduct its athletics programs and manage its representatives and student-athletes in a manner that promotes the ideals of higher education and the integrity of intercollegiate athletics. Member institutions are committed to encouraging behavior that advances the interests of the Association, its membership and the Collegiate Model. All individuals associated with intercollegiate athletics programs and events should adhere to such fundamental values as respect, fairness, civility, honesty and responsibility. These values should be manifest not only in athletics participation, but also in the broad spectrum of activities affecting the athletics programs.

[*Note: This would represent a new addition to Article 2, derived in part from Constitution 2.4 (Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct).*]

- *Please provide feedback on whether this language captures the overall concepts of integrity and sportsmanship and, if not, what should be added.*

2.5 THE COMMITMENT TO INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL AND COMPLIANCE

It is the responsibility of each member institution to monitor and control its athletics programs, its representatives and its student-athletes to assure compliance with the Constitution and bylaws of the Association. It is also the responsibility of each member institution to report all instances of noncompliance to the Association and cooperate with the Association's enforcement efforts. Upon a finding of one or more violations, an institution shall be subject to such disciplinary and corrective actions as may be recommended by the Association on behalf of the entire membership.

[*Note: This contains elements of Constitution 2.1 (Institutional Control and Responsibility) and 2.8 (Rules Compliance).*]

- *Please provide feedback on whether this provision makes clear the general responsibility of member institutions to comply with applicable bylaws, and to cooperate in related investigations.*

2.6 THE COMMITMENT TO STUDENT-ATHLETE WELL-BEING

Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be conducted in a manner designed to enhance the well-being of student-athletes who choose to participate and to prevent undue commercial or other influences that may interfere with their scholastic, athletics or related interests. It is the responsibility of each member institution to establish and maintain an environment in which student-athletes' activities, in all sports, are conducted as an integral part of the educational experience. Each member institution should also provide an environment that fosters fairness, sportsmanship, honesty and positive relationships between student-athletes and representatives of the institution.

[*Note: Portions of this language are borrowed from current Constitution 2.2 (Student-Athlete Well-Being) and 2.11 (Recruiting). The provision is also designed to capture portions of Constitution 2.14 (Playing and Practice Seasons) and 2.15 (Postseason Competition) and, when combined with other commitments, would allow those to be removed as stand-alone provisions in Article 2.*]

- *Please provide feedback about whether the first sentence fits better in this section or in the Commitment to Amateurism.*

2.7 THE COMMITMENT TO SOUND ACADEMIC STANDARDS

Standards of the Association governing participation in intercollegiate athletics, including postseason competition, shall be designed to assure proper emphasis on educational objectives and the academic success of student-athletes who choose to participate at a member institution. Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be maintained as a vital component of the educational program, and student-athletes shall be an integral part of the student body. Each member institution's admission and academic standards for student-athletes shall be consistent with the standards adopted by the institution for the student body in general.

[*Note: This language contains elements found in Constitution 2.5 (Sound Academic Standards) and 2.12 (Eligibility). It is broad enough to cover initial and continuing eligibility standards that are tied directly to academic readiness and performance. Other eligibility standards (such as rules about seasons of competition, transfers, outside competition and certain promotional activities) can fall within the Commitment to Fair Competition.*]

- *Please provide feedback on whether additional educational goals should be included in this provision.*

2.8 THE COMMITMENT TO RESPONSIBLE RECRUITING STANDARDS

Recruiting bylaws shall be designed to promote informed decisions and balance the interests of prospective student-athletes, their educational institutions and the Association's member institutions.

[*Note: This provision is largely subsumed by the Commitments to Fair Competition and Student-Athlete Well-Being. However, it is included as a stand-alone section here given its importance to the membership and the importance of balancing different interests.*]

- *Please provide feedback on whether this should remain a stand-alone provision or, alternatively, whether additional detail is warranted.*

2.9 THE COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

The Association shall promote an atmosphere of respect for and sensitivity to the dignity of every person. The Association should not adopt bylaws that would prevent member institutions from promoting diversity or from complying with applicable laws, ordinances or policies regarding civil rights.

2.9.1 Nondiscrimination. It is the policy of the Association to refrain from discrimination with respect to its educational programs, activities and employment policies, including on the basis of age, color, disability, gender, national origin, race, religion, creed, sexual orientation, genetic information or any other classification protected by federal law. It is the responsibility of each member institution to comply with applicable laws regarding nondiscrimination and to determine independently its own nondiscrimination policies.

2.9.2 Governance Diversity. The Association shall promote diversity of representation within its governance structure. This includes assuring diverse membership in Association-wide bodies, each divisional governing body and their supporting committees, cabinets, councils and other groups.

[*Note: This language combines provisions currently located in Constitution 2.3 (Gender Equity), 2.6 (Nondiscrimination) and 2.7 (Diversity Within Governance Structures). This provision is not specifically within the purview of this Working Group. These provisions are included to demonstrate how Article 2 might look upon completion.*]

- *Please provide feedback on whether these provisions adequately address the NCAA's commitment to diversity and inclusion.*

Please click the following button to attach this form to an email: **rulesworkinggroup@ncaa.org**

(Bylaw 11)

National Collegiate Athletic Association
Working Group on the Collegiate Model – Rules

NCAA Bylaw 11 (Conduct and Employment of Athletics Personnel)
Concepts Discussion Document

The purpose of this document is to solicit input from the NCAA Division I membership on concepts currently being considered by the NCAA Working Group on the Collegiate Model – Rules. This feedback will be used by the working group as it continues to finalize its recommendations for the NCAA Division I Board of Directors. Please forward any feedback and comments to rulesworkinggroup@ncaa.org.

Name:

Institution/Conference/Organization:

Title:

Date:

Concept No. 1: Eliminate the regulations governing contractual agreements and compensation from sources outside an institution.

Rationale: The regulations governing contractual agreements between an institution and its athletics department staff members and the receipt of compensation from sources outside the institution are not of national significance. It should be each institution's responsibility to address these matters in accordance with its own policies and procedures.

Points to Consider:

1. Reduces administrative burden for compliance staff.

2. Athletics staff should be treated in the same manner as all institutional employees.

3. The significant increase in the number of athletics department staff members, especially part-time employees, makes the annual reporting process a significant undertaking.

Questions:

1. Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

2. Are institutional policies, if implemented, enough to maintain institutional control? Why or why not?

Concept No. 2: Eliminate the regulations defining recruiting coordination functions that must be performed by head or assistant coaches.

Rationale: The regulations defining recruiting coordination functions that must be performed only by a head or assistant coach are not of national significance and, in many instances, present enforcement challenges. Each institution should be responsible for establishing its own policies and procedures related to the recruitment of prospective student-athletes, including the roles and responsibilities of all athletics department staff members. The current rules requiring off-campus recruitment to be performed only by countable coaches would remain applicable.

Points to Consider:

1. Eliminating such regulations would reduce compliance monitoring; countless hours are spent defining "recruiting coordination" and "clerical tasks."

2. Elimination of the recruiting coordination function restrictions could result in a proliferation in the number of noncoaching staff members employed by institutions.

3. Administrative personnel decisions should be left to institutional discretion, not regulated by legislation.

4. May alleviate some of the administrative burden on coaches and permit them to focus more attention on traditional coaching duties and the needs of current student-athletes.

5. Valuable experience can be gained by individuals interested in pursuing a coaching career.

6. Potential increase in expenditures if institutions hire additional noncoaching administrative personnel.

Question:

- Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

Concept No. 3: Eliminate the annual certification requirement applicable to coaches involved in off-campus recruiting.

Rationale: The annual certification requirement is not of national significance. Institutions and/or conferences, at their discretion, should be responsible for developing rules education materials/tests designed to ensure that coaches engaged in recruiting activities have a sufficient working knowledge of the recruiting rules.

Points to Consider:

1. Exam was instituted when many institutions did not have fully dedicated compliance departments in place.

2. Intent was to ensure athletics recruiters have sufficient understanding of NCAA recruiting rules before recruiting off campus.

3. Requires coaches to focus on rules and to interact with the compliance staff.

4. Passage rate at Division I for the last three years has been 97 percent.

5. Institutions could establish a more robust continuing education program with assistance from the NCAA national office?

Questions:

1. Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

2. Are there other more effective ways to conduct a certification program for coaches in order to ensure they are knowledgeable of the rules? Why or why not?

Concept No. 4: Eliminate the regulations governing scouting of opponents and permit live, in-person scouting or prohibit all live in-person scouting in all sports, while retaining the current exceptions in NCAA Bylaw 11.6.1 (basketball, football and women's volleyball prohibition) through Bylaw 11.6.4 (cost of exchanging video).

Rationale: The regulations governing scouting of opponents are not of national significance. Widespread availability of video would suggest minimal competitive advantage would be gained from in-person scouting and would be offset by the coach's diversion from other coaching responsibilities.

Points to Consider:

1. NCAA Division I Legislative Council did not support eliminating the scouting prohibition in its entirety, but instead preferred prohibiting live scouting in all sports, with exceptions for same site competition activities.

2. Intent of original legislation was cost savings.

3. Some sports may not have extensive videos for exchange.

Questions:

1. Do you support the concept of eliminating the regulations governing scouting of opponents in its entirety and allow institutions to decide when and whom to scout at its discretion? Why or why not?

2. Do you support modifying the rule to prohibit all live in-person scouting of opponents, while maintaining current exceptions (e.g., scouting future opponents participating in same site events)? Why or why not?

Concept No. 5: Eliminate coaching categories.

Rationale: The elimination of coaching categories is designed to simplify/deregulate the coaching limitations without compromising the principle of fair competition.

Points to Consider:

1. This change would maintain a specific number of countable coaches in each sport.

2. Undergraduate/graduate student coaches in all sports who meet certain academic-based criteria and strength and conditioning coaches [in sports other than Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) football] would be exempt from limitations.

3. Eliminates the volunteer coach category.

4. Institutions should keep on file a list of countable coaches, but such a requirement would not be a national regulation. A conference, at its discretion, may request the list.

5. The issues related to noncoaching staff members in the sports of football and basketball continue to be discussed.

Questions:

1. Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

2. Do you support excluding graduate assistant coaches as countable coaches in all sports, provided the graduate student is enrolled full time, in good academic standing and has no previous collegiate or professional coaching experience? Why or why not?

   - Does excluding all graduate assistant coaches as countable coaches equitably offset the four current graduate assistants permitted in FBS football? Should additional countable coaches be permitted in FBS?

3. Do you support the elimination of the volunteer coaching category? Why or why not?

4. If the volunteer coaching category is eliminated, would you support sports that currently include a volunteer coach being permitted to employ one additional countable coach to offset the elimination? Why or why not?

5. Should sports with multiple volunteer coaches be permitted to hire more than one additional countable coach? Why or why not?

6. Do you support establishing numbers of noncoaching staff members who may be involved in supporting football or basketball programs in any capacity? If not, please specify other, more effective ways (e.g., bench limitations) to control issues related to the proliferation of noncoaching staff members in football and basketball.

7. Do you support establishing specific criteria for determining a countable coach as set forth in revised Bylaw 11.3.1 (control of employment and salaries)? Why or why not? [Note: This would eliminate current legislation related to temporary consultants and noncoaching staff members.]

   - Is there concern that the recommended criteria will result in an increase in noncoaching staff members? Why or why not?

8. Do you support maintaining the current number of strength and conditioning coaches in FBS (5)? Why or why not?

Concept No. 6: Create additional regulations to prohibit the employment of coaches who remain employed in coaching prospective student-athletes who participate on nonscholastic teams/clubs.

Rationale: Limits opportunities for third party involvement in institutional athletics programs as well as eliminates unenforceable rules that require institutions to attempt to monitor recruiting conversations and conduct that occurs in the course of secondary employment.

Points to Consider:

1. The Legislative Council discussed potential resistance by coaches from being employed at local nonscholastic sports clubs (under current restrictions) while employed at a Division I institution.

2. Part-time coaches in nonrevenue sports have used the local sports club exception to supplement income.

Question:

- Do you support establishing a regulation that would prohibit an institution from employing coaches who remain employed in coaching prospective student-athletes who participate on nonscholastic teams/clubs? Why or why not?

Concept No. 7: Create additional regulations prohibiting the employment of individuals associated with prospective student-athletes in noncoaching categories in all sports.

Rationale: The proposal is designed to limit opportunities for third party involvement in the recruiting process. The current rule is applicable only in men's basketball, but it is likely that this trend has extended to other sports or will do so in the near future.

Points to Consider:

1. In men's basketball, the hiring abuses were more prevalent in noncoaching staff positions and, oftentimes, new positions are created on the staff for individuals associated with a prospective student-athlete.

2. May be difficult to apply in some sports due to the pool of potential employees.

Questions:

1. Do you support additional regulations prohibiting the employment of individuals associated with prospective student-athletes in noncoaching categories in all sports? Why or why not?

2. Do you support additional regulations prohibiting the employment of individuals associated with prospective student-athletes in noncoaching categories in only certain sports? Why or why not?

Concept No. 8: Eliminate the restrictions governing the number of off-campus recruiters at any one time (the baton rule).

Rationale: The rule was initially adopted as a cost containment measure, but there is no data, anecdotally or otherwise, that would suggest the rule has furthered its objective. Each institution should be responsible for establishing its own policies and procedures related to the off-campus recruitment of prospective student-athletes by authorized countable coaching staff members.

Points to Consider:

1. Not of national significance.

2. Presents enforcement challenges.

3. Would reduce unnecessary compliance monitoring.

Question:

- Do you support the concept of eliminating the restrictions governing the number of off-campus recruiters at any one time? Why or why not?

Please click the following button to attach this form to an email: **rulesworkinggroup@ncaa.org**

National Collegiate Athletic Association
Working Group on the Collegiate Model – Rules

NCAA Bylaw 13 (Recruiting)
Concepts Discussion Document

The purpose of this document is to solicit input from the NCAA Division I membership on concepts currently being considered by the Working Group on the Collegiate Model – Rules. This feedback will be used by the working group as it continues to finalize its recommendations for the NCAA Division I Board of Directors. Please forward any feedback and comments to rulesworkinggroup@ncaa.org.

A draft of a re-written NCAA Bylaw 13 (recruiting), similar to the re-written version of Bylaw 11 (conduct and employment of athletics personnel), will be available once the working group evaluates initial feedback on these concepts.

Name:

Institution/Conference/Organization:

Title:

Date:

Concept No. 1: Establish an earlier date by which prospective student-athletes who have demonstrated a commitment to attend an institution are no longer considered prospective student-athletes for purposes of applying recruiting rules (offers and inducements).

Rationale: The proposed change is designed to further student-athlete success and well-being by allowing an individual who has demonstrated a commitment to attend a particular institution to be treated similarly to the enrolled student-athlete attending that institution.

Points to Consider:

- The Working Group on the Collegiate Model – Rules, Bylaw 13 Subgroup suggests that the date would be the date on which the prospective student-athlete signs a National Letter of Intent (NLI), or for institutions not subscribing to the NLI, the date on which the prospective student-athlete signs a written offer of admission and/or financial aid.

- Promotes the player/coach relationship by permitting greater access between the coach and an incoming signee.

Questions:

1. Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

2. Should another date other than the signing of the NLI or an institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid be used to trigger when an individual is no longer considered a prospective student-athlete in relation to the recruiting rules? If so, what would be that date/trigger?

Concept No. 2: Establish regulations that provide for earlier access (specific initial dates for communication and contact) with prospective student-athletes.

Rationale: The establishment of regulations that provide for earlier access with prospective student-athletes is designed to support student-athlete success and well-being by allowing both the prospective student-athlete (and his or her family) and the institution greater opportunities to make more informed, and thus more sound recruiting decisions.

Point to Consider:

- The subgroup suggest that June 15 at the completion of the prospective student-athlete's sophomore year is the appropriate date and should be uniform for all sports.

Questions:

1. Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

2. Do you support the June 15 date for all sports? Why or why not?

Concept No. 3: Eliminate restrictions governing modes and restrictions (numerical limitations) on recruiting communication.

Rationale: The current regulations governing modes and restrictions on recruiting communication are cumbersome and present numerous enforcement challenges. Institutions and/or conferences, at its discretion, should be responsible for establishing policies and procedures governing the recruitment of prospective student-athletes by athletics department staff members.

Points to Consider:

- Reduces administrative burden for compliance staff.
- There is growing concern that current prohibitions on electronic transmissions are outdated and lagging behind prospective student-athletes' use of technology.
- Current limitations are inhibiting the exchange of information in the most efficient, cost effective and least intrusive means as compared to other forms of communication, such as telephone calls.
- Institutions have been permitted to send an unlimited number of emails to prospective student-athletes for several years and there have not been any concerns regarding frequency or intrusion.
- Research indicates that a clear majority of teenagers are texting and have unlimited texting plans.
- Establishing a single date on which to begin all communication with a prospective student-athlete will bring uniformity and simplicity to the legislation.
- June 15 at the completion of the prospective student-athlete's sophomore year is being supported as the permissible date to initiate contact and communication.

Question:

- Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

Concept No. 4: Development of more flexible recruiting calendars based on a specified number of recruiting days, with specified dead periods (e.g., days surrounding the initial NLI signing date and the NCAA championship in the particular sport) and recruiting periods.

Rationale: The development of more flexible recruiting calendars based on a specified number of recruiting days will allow each institution to better assess its recruiting needs, while furthering the principle to shield prospective student-athletes from undue pressure in the recruiting process.

Points to Consider:

- In-person, off-campus recruiting contacts and evaluations would be permitted during a "recruiting period."
- The subgroup notes that it is advisable to seek input from the respective coaches associations regarding the appropriate annual number of recruiting days per sport, but also support an additional filtering process before reaching a definitive conclusion. [Note: The NCAA Division I Recruiting and Personnel Issues Cabinet previously has compiled data from coaches associations on this topic.]
- If supported, additional time will be necessary to develop the details of the proposal.
- There will continue to be an initial date governing contacts.

Questions:

1. Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

2. Do you support no limitations on the number of recruiting opportunities per prospective student-athlete? Why or why not?

3. If you support maintaining the limit of seven recruiting opportunities per prospective student-athlete, do you support eliminating the distinction between contacts and evaluations? Why or why not?

Concept No. 5: Eliminate the legislation related to publishing/providing admissions, graduation rates and NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) data, banned drug list and initial-eligibility standards to prospective student-athletes. These activities would continue as NCAA national office/NCAA Eligibility Center policies.

Rationale: The current legislation is not consequential as it codifies policies that will continue to be implemented, regardless of their inclusion in the NCAA Manual.

Points to Consider:

- The subgroup supports the elimination of legislation related to publishing/providing admissions, graduation rates and APR data, banned drug list and initial eligibility to prospective student-athletes.

- Institutions would remain responsible for responding to any questions raised by prospective student-athletes and their parents or legal guardians regarding initial-eligibility, academic rates, the NCAA banned drug list and nutritional supplements.

Question:

- Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

Concept No. 6: Deregulate printed recruiting materials either by eliminating the rule entirely or, in the alternative, prohibit sending or providing prospective student-athletes any recruiting materials other than general correspondence. In the latter instance, institutions could post materials on its website to be accessed by a prospective student-athlete.

Rationale: The current legislation presents enforcement challenges and does not further the principle of fair competition.

Points to Consider:

- The subgroup supports the deregulation of printed recruiting materials and suggests that both alternatives be presented to the membership for feedback.
- The subgroup suggests that a proposal consistent with the feedback provided by the membership be adopted in April taking into consideration an appropriate effective date for implementation.
- Would reduce compliance monitoring.
- Technology has created other less costly means of providing information to prospective student-athletes.

Questions:

1. Do you support the concept of eliminating all restrictions on printed recruiting materials? Why or why not?

2. Do you support a prohibition on sending or providing prospective student-athletes any recruiting materials other than general correspondence and allow all other recruiting materials to be only available on an institution's web site? Why or why not?

Concept No. 7: Eliminate restrictions related to general advertising or promotional materials designed to solicit the enrollment of prospective student-athletes, while maintaining prohibitions against personalized promotions.

Rationale: The current restrictions related to general (as opposed to personalized) advertisements/promotions present enforcement challenges and does not further the principle of fair competition.

Points to Consider:

- The subgroup supports the elimination of restrictions related to general advertising or promotional materials designed to solicit the enrollment of prospective student-athletes, while maintaining prohibitions against personalized promotions, but requests additional feedback from the membership regarding the scope of deregulation.

- Would reduce compliance monitoring.

Question:

- Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

Concept No. 8: Reduce the restrictions governing official visits (e.g., entertainment radius, support groups, activities, number of hosts), while requiring institutions to address such issues through written policies.

Rationale: Many of the restrictions governing official visits are not of national significance, have been adopted primarily to address isolated instances of conduct that resulted in a perceived recruiting advantage and often present monitoring difficulties for institutional compliance personnel. It is more appropriate that many of these issues be addressed through the institution's written policies as required under current legislation.

Points to Consider:

- The subgroup supports eliminating many of the restrictions governing official visits and notes it is more appropriate that many of these issues be addressed through the institution's written policies as required under current legislation.

- The subgroup notes that it is advisable to develop a list of the activities that should be addressed by the institution in its policies and procedures.

- The subgroup requests additional feedback from the membership regarding the activities that should be eliminated and suggests additional time may be necessary to reach consensus on the list of activities to be addressed in the institution's policies and procedures.

- Current legislation was intended to establish a reasonable and appropriate environment during an official visit that more closely resembles normal life for an enrolled student-athlete.

- Approach is similar to the current concussion management plan legislation.

Questions:

1. Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

2. Are there certain regulations that should be eliminated? If so, what are those regulations?

3. Is it necessary for the conference office to provide some oversight? Why or why not?

Concept No. 9: Eliminate all recruiting publicity regulations entirely or, in the alternative, after a prospective student-athlete commits to an institution.

Rationale: Many of the regulations prohibiting institutions from publicizing interest in a particular prospective student-athlete appear to be motivated by a desire to minimize a "keep up with the Jones" mentality, as well as to address the perception that comments made by an institutional staff member about a prospective student-athlete have provided the institution with a recruiting advantage. Given the advances in technology and the increased use of social networks, such comments are often difficult to monitor as well as to enforce, and it is arguable that such publicity is of significant consequence to the prospective student-athlete when making his or her recruiting decision. At a minimum, the publicity regulations have no consequence once a prospective student-athlete has committed to an institution.

Points to Consider:

- The subgroup supports deregulation of publicity rules and requests feedback from the membership on both alternatives.
- The subgroup notes that it may be necessary to maintain the prohibition against media presence during recruiting contacts/visits.
- Would reduce compliance monitoring.

Questions:

1. Do you support the concept of eliminating all recruiting publicity regulations? Why or why not?

2. Do you support the concept of eliminating all recruiting publicity regulations after a prospective student-athlete commits to an institution? Why or why not?

3. Do you support maintaining the prohibition against media presence during recruiting contacts and visits? Why or why not?

Concept No. 10: Eliminate all regulations related to the involvement of an institution and institutional staff members in high school all-star games.

Rationale: Many of the regulations prohibiting institutional involvement in high school all-star games were designed to curb any perceived recruiting advantages coaches and institution may gain from their participation as hosts or as part of the selection committee. However, the legislation is not of national significance and not necessary.

Points to Consider:

- Difficult to determine if there are actual advantages gained by either hosting high school all-star games or being involved with the selection process.
- Institution may currently host such events provided the provisions of Bylaw 13.11.3.2 (activities not involving institution's staff) are met.
- Could be a possible revenue source for institutions.
- Would reduce compliance monitoring.

Questions:

1. Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

2. Do you support eliminating all regulations related to the involvement of an institution and institutional staff members in high school all-star games other than the involvement of institutional staff members in the selection process for high school all-star games?

3. Should there be a limitation on the number of high school all-star games an institution may host? Why or why not?

4. Should there be a limitation on the number of high school all-star games institutional staff members may be involved in? Why or why not?

Concept No. 11: Expand on-campus evaluations to all sports.

Rationale: This concept in men's basketball was developed after a comprehensive review of the Division I men's recruiting model and was designed to facilitate sound recruiting decisions by both institutions and prospective student-athletes through the establishment of an on-campus evaluation opportunity. An on-campus evaluation, which might involve several prospective student-athletes, may provide valuable information for both the prospective student-athlete and the institution to make a better informed decision. Such benefits would also be useful in all other sports.

Points to Consider:

- Appropriate medical safeguards have been established to ensure the health, safety and well-being of the prospective student-athlete while participating in the evaluation.

- Could improve the decision-making process between prospective student-athlete and coaches and lead to higher retention among student-athletes.

- Permitting a tryout with a prospective student-athlete should provide a better opportunity for the prospective student-athlete to evaluate himself or herself against current student-athletes and for the coaching staff to evaluate the prospective student-athlete interacting with current players and his or her ability to succeed in the program at the institution, thus increasing the chances of retaining that prospective student-athlete throughout his or her entire collegiate career.

- Division II has a similar rule.

- In men's basketball, legislation was designed primarily to provide opportunities for those senior prospective student-athletes that did not sign NLIs or perhaps were late bloomers.

Questions:

1. Do you support the concept? Why or why not?

2. Should there be any limitations on who can participate in the on-campus evaluations and the time period as to when they may occur? Why or why not?

Concept No. 12: Modify the camps and clinics legislation, as specified.

Rationale: Much of the regulations for camps and clinics have been piecemealed together in response to isolated incidents. Overhauling the legislation would simplify the rules and reduce compliance monitoring on campuses

Points to Consider:

- Would reduce compliance monitoring.
- Need to consider anti-trust issues with any potential changes.
- Regulation of camps and clinics could be accomplished through written policies.

Questions:

1. Do you support the concept? Why or why not?

2. Are there specific changes that need to be made to the camps and clinics legislation?

3. Should camps and clinics legislation related to the employment of current student-athletes be eliminated? Why or why not?

4. Should camps and clinics legislation related to the employment of prospective student-athletes be eliminated? Why or why not?

5. Should the legislation restricting the employment and participation of football prospective student-athletes, who are high school seniors, in institutional camps and clinics be eliminated? Why or why not?

Please click the following button to attach this form to an email: **rulesworkinggroup@ncaa.org**

National Collegiate Athletic Association
Working Group on the Collegiate Model – Rules

NCAA Bylaw 13 Recruiting Calendar and Recruiting Person Day Models

The purpose of this document is to solicit input from the NCAA Division I membership on concepts currently being considered by the Working Group on the Collegiate Model – Rules. This feedback will be used by the working group as it continues to finalize its recommendations for the NCAA Division I Board of Directors. Please forward any feedback and comments to rulesworkinggroup@ncaa.org.

Name:

Institution/Conference/Organization:

Title:

Date:

Definitions

- *Recruiting-Person Days:*
  A recruiting-person day is defined as one coach engaged in a recruiting activity of a prospective student-athlete. If multiple coaches are engaged in recruiting activities on the same day, each one will use a recruiting person day.

- *Recruiting Days:*
  A recruiting day is defined as a coach engaged in a recruiting activity of a prospective student-athlete. If multiple coaches are engaged in recruiting activities on the same day it will only count as one recruiting day.

- *Recruiting Period:*
  A recruiting period is a period of time when it is permissible for authorized athletics department staff members to make in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts and evaluations during the academic year.

- *Dead Period:*
  A dead period is a period of time when it is not permissible to make any in-person recruiting contacts or evaluations or to permit official or unofficial visits by prospective student-athletes to the institution's campus.

- *Recruiting Opportunities:*
  A recruiting opportunity occurs when a permissible authorized athletics department staff member conducts a contact or evaluation of a prospective student-athlete.

Baseball

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Baseball staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Baseball staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: American Baseball Coaches Association national convention (current rule).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Baseball Championship (new recommendation).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you support limiting the summer to an evaluation period only? ◯ Yes ◯ No

3. Would you support changing the current quiet periods into dead periods? ○ Yes ○ No

   a. September 1 through the second Thursday of September. ○ Yes ○ No

   b. The Friday of the week of the fall signing of the NLI through the month of February. ○ Yes ○ No

4. Are there any additional dates that should be included in a dead period? ○ Yes ○ No

5. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Women's Bowling

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Women's bowling staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Women's bowling staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: National Collegiate Bowling Championship (new recommendation).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ○ Yes ○ No
3. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ○ Yes ○ No
4. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Cross Country/Track and Field

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Cross country/track and field staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Cross country/track and field staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Cross Country Championship (current rule).
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: U.S. Track and Field and Cross Country Coaches Association national convention (current rule).
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Indoor Track Championship (current rule).
- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Outdoor Track Championship (current rule).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.

2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ◯ Yes ◯ No

3. Do you want to change the current quiet periods into dead periods? ◯ Yes ◯ No

   a. August 1 through the second Saturday in August. ◯ Yes ◯ No

   b. The day after the second Sunday in December through January 2. ◯ Yes ◯ No

4. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ◯ Yes ◯ No

5. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Women's Equestrian

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Women's Equestrian staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Women's Equestrian staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: National Intercollegiate Championship Events (new recommendation).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ○ Yes ○ No
3. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ○ Yes ○ No
4. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Fencing

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Fencing staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Fencing staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: U.S Fencing Coaches Association national convention (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Fencing Championship (new recommendation).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ○ Yes ○ No
3. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ○ Yes ○ No

4. NCAA Proposal No. 2011-56 recommended additional quiet periods, would you like those quiet periods changed into dead periods? ○ Yes ○ No

   a. August 1 through August 31. ○ Yes ○ No

   b. May 1 through June 15. ○ Yes ○ No

5. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Field Hockey

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Field hockey staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Field hockey staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday prior to the first permissible contest date (Proposal No. 2011-57).
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 24 through January 2 (Proposal No. 2011-57).
- Dead Period: National Field Hockey Coaches Association national convention (Proposal No. 2011-57).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Field Hockey Championship (current rule).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ○ Yes ○ No

3. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ◯ Yes ◯ No

4. Proposal No. 2011-57 recommended additional quiet periods, would you like those quiet periods changed into dead periods? ◯ Yes ◯ No

   a. First permissible contest date through the following Thursday. ◯ Yes ◯ No

   b. December 17 through December 23. ◯ Yes ◯ No

   c. Monday following the second weekend of U.S. Field Hockey Association National Indoor tournament through April 30. ◯ Yes ◯ No

5. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Golf

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Golf staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Golf staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: National Golf Coaches Association national convention (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Golf Championship (new recommendation).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ○ Yes ○ No

3. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ○ Yes ○ No

4. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Gymnastics

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Gymnastics staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Gymnastics staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday before Thanksgiving Day through the Sunday after (Proposal No. 2011-58) women only.
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 18 through January 1 (Proposal No. 2011-58) women only.
- Dead Period: National Association of Collegiate Gymnastics Coaches/Women national convention (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: National Collegiate Women's Gymnastics Championship (current rule).
- Dead Period: Season-ending tournament for men's gymnastics (new recommendation).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.

2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ◯ Yes ◯ No

3. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ◯ Yes ◯ No

4. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Ice Hockey

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Ice hockey staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Ice hockey staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: American Hockey Coaches Association national convention (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Hockey Championship (current rule).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ○ Yes ○ No

3. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ◯ Yes ◯ No

4. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Men's Lacrosse

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Men's lacrosse staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Men's lacrosse staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: The day after the second Monday in August through August 31 (current rule).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: Wednesday before Thanksgiving through Sunday after Thanksgiving (current rule).
- Dead Period: December 24 through the first Sunday in January (current rule).
- Dead Period: Intercollegiate Men's Lacrosse Coaches Association national convention (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Men's Lacrosse Championship (current rule).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ○ Yes ○ No

3. Do you want to change the current quiet periods into dead periods? ☐ Yes ☐ No

   a. The day after the first Monday in August through the second Monday in August. ☐ Yes ☐ No

   b. The Monday after Thanksgiving through December 23. ☐ Yes ☐ No

   c. The day after Martin Luther King Jr. day through the last day of February. ☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Women's Lacrosse

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Women's lacrosse staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Women's lacrosse staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: Wednesday before Thanksgiving through Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: U.S. Intercollegiate Lacrosse Coaches Association national convention (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Women's Lacrosse Championship (current rule).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ○ Yes ○ No

3. Do you want to change the current quiet periods into dead periods? ☐ Yes ☐ No

   a. Those days during August 1 through August 31 not designated for contact purposes. ☐ Yes ☐ No

   b. The Wednesday before Thanksgiving through January 1. ☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Rifle

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Rifle staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Rifle staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Men's and Women's Rifle Championship (new recommendation).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ◯ Yes ◯ No

3. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ○ Yes ○ No

4. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Women's Rowing

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Women's rowing staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Women's rowing staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Collegiate Rowing Coaches Association national convention (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Rowing Championship (new recommendation).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ○ Yes ○ No

3. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ○ Yes ○ No

4. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Women's Rugby

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Women's rugby staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Women's rugby staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: National Governing Body Championship (new recommendation).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ○ Yes ○ No
3. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ○ Yes ○ No

4. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Men's Volleyball

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Men's volleyball staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Men's volleyball staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Men's Volleyball Championship (new recommendation).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ○ Yes ○ No
3. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ○ Yes ○ No

4. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Women's Volleyball and Sand Volleyball

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Women's volleyball staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Women's volleyball staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: American Volleyball Coaches Association national convention (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Volleyball Championship (current rule).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ○ Yes ○ No

3. Do you want to change the current quiet periods into dead periods? ◯ Yes ◯ No

   a. Monday following the first Sunday of December through the Tuesday prior to the Division I Women's Volleyball Championship. ◯ Yes ◯ No

   b. January 1 to the Friday prior to Martin Luther King Jr. Day. ◯ Yes ◯ No

   c. May 1 to Friday prior to Memorial Day. ◯ Yes ◯ No

4. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ◯ Yes ◯ No

5. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Skiing

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Skiing staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Skiing staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: National Collegiate Men's and Women's Skiing Championship (new recommendation).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ○ Yes ○ No

3. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ◯ Yes ◯ No

4. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Soccer

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Soccer staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Soccer staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Soccer Championship (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: National Soccer Coaches Association of America national convention (new recommendation).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ◯ Yes ◯ No

3. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ○ Yes ○ No

4. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Softball

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Softball staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Softball staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: National Fastpitch Coaches Association national convention (current rule).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Softball Championship (current rule).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ○ Yes ○ No

3. Do you want to change the current quiet periods into dead periods? ◯ Yes ◯ No

   - Thanksgiving Day through January 1 ◯ Yes ◯ No

4. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ◯ Yes ◯ No

5. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Swimming and Diving

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Swimming and diving staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Swimming and diving staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Swimming and Diving Championship (new recommendation).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ◯ Yes ◯ No

3. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ◯ Yes ◯ No

4. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Tennis

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Tennis staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Tennis staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule)
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation)
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation)
- Dead Period: Intercollegiate Tennis Association national convention (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Tennis Championship (new recommendation).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ○ Yes ○ No

3. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ◯ Yes ◯ No

4. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Water Polo

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Water polo staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Water Polo staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule) women only.
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Water Polo Championship (new recommendation).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ○ Yes ○ No

3. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ◯ Yes ◯ No

4. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Wrestling

Recruiting Person Days Recommendation:
Wrestling staff members shall not exceed 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year recruiting periods.

or

Recruiting Day Recommendation:
Wrestling staff members shall not exceed 80 recruiting days during the academic year recruiting periods.

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the fall signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: December 24 through December 26 (new recommendation).
- Dead Period: Monday through Thursday of the week that includes the initial date for the spring signing of the NLI (current rule).
- Dead Period: National Wrestling Coaches Association national convention (Proposal No. 2011-59).
- Dead Period: NCAA Division I Wrestling Championship (new recommendation).
- Recruiting Periods: Any period other than a dead period.

Questions:

1. Please provide feedback on the recommended changes to the recruiting calendar.
2. Would you want the summer to be an evaluation period only? ○ Yes ○ No

3. Are there any additional dates that should be protected with a dead period? ○ Yes ○ No

4. Do you prefer the 100 recruiting-person day or 80 recruiting day model?

Please click the following button to attach this form to an email: **rulesworkinggroup@ncaa.org**

National Collegiate Athletic Association
Working Group on the Collegiate Model -- Rules

NCAA Bylaw 16 (Awards, Benefits and Expenses for Enrolled Student-Athletes) Concepts Discussion Document

The purpose of this document is to solicit input from the NCAA Division I membership on concepts currently being considered by the NCAA Working Group on the Collegiate Model -- Rules. This feedback will be used by the working group as it continues to finalize its recommendation in select bylaws for the NCAA Division I Board of Directors. Please forward any feedback and comments to rulesworkinggroup@ncaa.org.

A draft of a rewritten NCAA Bylaw 16 (awards, benefits and expenses for enrolled student-athletes), similar to the rewritten version of Bylaw 11 (conduct and employment of athletics personnel), will be available once the working group evaluates initial feedback on these concepts.

Name:

Institution/Conference/Organization:

Title:

Date:

Concept No. 1: Modify the awards legislation so that institutions, conferences and the NCAA have the discretion to determine who may receive awards and when the awards may be provided and to permit a student-athlete to contribute to the purchase of a permissible award.

Rationale: Deregulating the legislation related to the timing of a student-athlete's receipt of an award (i.e., during the academic year or during the summer) will create consistency within the legislation. Further, institutions and conferences will have the discretion related to the eligibility for such awards (e.g., eligible for competition) and the student-athlete experience is enhanced when a student-athlete is permitted to contribute to an award that he or she may otherwise not be able to receive due to institutional budgets.

Points to Consider:

- Reduces some administrative burden for compliance staff.
- Will enhance the student-athlete experience.

Questions:

1. Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

2. Should there be one legislated total overall value of awards annually for student-athletes? If so, what should that value be?

3. Should value limits be entirely removed, thus allowing institutions to determine appropriate values? Why or why not?

4. Should value limits be entirely removed allowing conferences to determine appropriate values for its members? Why or why not?

Concept No. 2: Modify the noninstitutional awards legislation so that institutions or the awarding agency may provide actual and necessary expenses (e.g., travel) associated with a student-athlete receiving a noninstitutional award for athletics accomplishments.

Rationale: Deregulating the legislation related to an institution providing expenses for a student-athlete to receive a noninstitutional award (e.g., hometown award, established regional, national or international award) will create consistency within the legislation. Currently, an institution may provide expenses for a student-athlete to receive only a conference award or a special recognition award by the president of the United States or by the governor or legislative body of the state in which the member institution is located, or the international equivalent. However, an institution may not provide expenses for a student-athlete to receive a hometown or an established regional, national or international award.

Points to Consider:

- Reduces some administrative burden for compliance staff.
- Will enhance the student-athlete experience.

Question:

- Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

Concept No. 3: Modify the academic counseling/support services legislation to permit the NCAA, institution or conference to provide any academic support, career counseling or personal development services that are determined to be reasonable and appropriate for the success of the student-athlete.

Rationale: This concept eliminates the current prescriptive academic counseling/support services legislation and allows an institution to use its discretion in providing academic support, career counseling or personal development services to its student-athletes while protecting and enhancing the educational and personal well-being of the student-athlete. For example, an institution should establish policies on the use of institutionally owned computers or electronic devices. Further, an institution is in the best position to determine whether expenses for course supplies and field trips are appropriate regardless of whether the supplies or trip are required for the course and specified in the institution's catalog. The NCAA, institutions and conferences should be able to provide any academic support, career counseling or personal development services that are determined to be reasonable and appropriate for the success of the student-athlete.

Points to Consider:

- Reduces administrative burden for compliance staff.
- Institutions are in the best position to determine what academic counseling, career counseling or support services are reasonable and appropriate for its student-athletes.
- Supports academic and personal well-being of student-athletes.

Questions:

1. Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

2. Should the institutionally offered academic support, career counseling or personnel development programming encompassed by this concept be limited to on campus or within the locale of the institution? Why or why not?

3. Should the institutionally offered academic support, career counseling or personnel development programming encompassed by this concept be integrated within the institution's services to the general student population? Why or why not?

Concept No. 4: Modify the medical expenses legislation to permit the NCAA, institution or conference to provide medical expenses and services that are determined to be reasonable and appropriate for the health, safety and physical and mental well-being of the student-athlete.

Rationale: Eliminates the prescriptive medical expenses legislation and allows an institution to use discretion in providing medical expenses and services to its student-athletes and protects and enhances the health, safety and physical and mental well-being of student-athletes. Current legislation specifically identifies the permissible medical expenses (e.g., medical insurance, drug-rehabilitation expenses) that an institution may provide to a student-athlete, incidental to the student-athlete's participation in intercollegiate athletics. The NCAA, institutions and conferences should be able to provide any medical expenses and services that are determined to be reasonable and appropriate for the health, safety and physical and mental well-being of the student-athlete.

Points to Consider:

- Reduces administrative burden for compliance staff.
- Institutions are in the best position to determine what medical services are necessary and appropriate for its student-athlete physical well-being.
- Supports personal well-being of student-athletes.

Question:

- Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

Concept No. 5: Eliminate the housing legislation related to athletics dormitories and athletics blocks. Further, to require that an institution have established policies related to student-athlete housing. The policies shall include, but are not limited to, assurance that student-athletes are assigned housing that supports the student-athlete's integration within the general student-body.

Rationale: The current legislation related to athletics dormitories and athletics blocks is overly prescriptive. Instead, maintaining the legislative provision requiring an institution to apply the same institutional housing policies to student-athletes as it applies to the student-body in general and also having established policies and procedures related to student-athlete housing is an appropriate legislative outcome. Eliminating the legislation related specifically to athletics dormitories and athletics blocks supports the notion that student-athletes should be treated similarly to all students and that an institution's policies related to housing blocks should be applied across all students at the institution, regardless of participation in intercollegiate athletics.

Points to Consider:

- The overarching extra benefit rule requires an institution apply the same housing policies to student-athletes as it applies to the student-body in general.

- Some institutions have existing on-campus housing policies that result in segments of the student-body (e.g., business majors, international students, freshman), unrelated to athletics, being assigned to specific dormitories or blocks.

- Off-campus housing of student-athletes is not regulated under the current legislation, unless the institution is involved in its arrangement. This may result in groups of student-athletes, through their own arrangements, living together. Student-athletes living together on campus in similar groupings should not be prohibited if institutional policies allow for such an outcome.

Question:

- Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

Concept No. 6: Modify the housing legislation to indicate that housing may be provided when a student-athlete is required to be on campus for practice or competition and is not living at home, regardless of when this occurs (e.g., during the academic year, during a vacation period).

Rationale: This modification simplifies the legislation, does not change the outcome of benefits received by the student-athlete and removes the prescriptive nature of the legislation that is addressed by the general rule related to extra benefits. Currently, the legislation prescribes the expenses for room and board that may be provided to a student-athlete during a vacation period. Rather than detailing the specific instances during a vacation period when housing may be provided, if at any point during a calendar year a student-athlete is required to be on campus for practice or competition, the institution may provide housing, unless the student-athlete is living at home.

Point to Consider:

- Membership has continually supported deregulation of this area.

Question:

- Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

Concept No. 7: Modify the meals legislation to permit an institution or conference to provide, as a benefit incidental to participation, food to student-athletes at any time or during specified time periods.

Rationale: The elimination of prescriptive legislation related to meals associated with practice, competition, vacation-period expenses, institutional committee service, and fruit, nuts, and bagels simplifies the application of the legislation. This modification promotes student-athletes' nutritional health and physical and mental well-being by allowing institutions the autonomy to address the specific needs of student-athletes.

Points to Consider:

- Proper nutrition is an important aspect of athletics performance. Institutions are in the best position determine what amount and types of food are necessary for its student-athletes' nutritional health and physical and mental well-being.

- Membership has continually supported deregulation of this area.

- Concept is framed as being a benefit incidental to participation. However, there may initially be administrative challenges in determining how and if to factor this concept into the financial aid grant when such a benefit is not available to the general student-body.

Questions:

1. Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

2. Should the legislation permit only food and not the provision of cash in lieu of food? Why or why not?

3. If cash may be provided, should it not exceed the amount provided by the institution to institutional staff member on away-from-campus trips? Why or why not?

4. Should the legislation permit food at any time only when a student-athlete is enrolled as a full-time student? Why or why not?

5. Should the legislation permit food at any time only during the declared playing and practice season? Why or why not?

6. Should this concept be available to all student-athletes, including walk-ons? Why or why not?

Concept No. 8: Modify and replace all existing references to a student-athlete's parents, legal guardians, or spouse to a "relative or individual of a comparable relationship" throughout Bylaw 16.

Rationale: This model proposes replacing the current and varying legislative references with a broader definition for individuals who would be permitted to receive identified benefits in conjunction with the student-athlete's experience. Specifically, these individuals would be defined as a "relative or individual of comparable relationship." This model would encompass nontraditional families, yet maintain a regulatory level that encourages a shared responsibility between student-athletes and institutions. Institutions are in the best position to determine who in a student-athlete's life is a relative or individual of comparable relationship. Because this model maintains a level of legislative definition, it may minimize undue pressures from third parties or individuals associated with prospective student-athletes.

Points to Consider:

- Supports the student-athlete experience.
- Expanding the category of families and relatives will take into account nontraditional families and the ever-changing definition of family.
- May increase compliance monitoring in order to determine if an individual is one of a comparable relationship to a student-athlete.
- Easier application because all identified benefits would be available to individuals covered by "relatives and individuals of comparable relationship."
- Agent legislation is still applicable.

Question:

- Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

Concept No. 9: Modify the expense legislation to permit an institution to have the discretion to provide expenses to any "relative or individual of comparable relationship" or student-athletes to be present in situations of any illness or injury (e.g., remove reference to "life-threatening").

Rationale: The modification of this legislation allows an institution to use discretion to provide expenses when illnesses or injuries are not life threatening but affect a student-athlete or member of a student-athlete's family; thereby, supporting student-athletes' physical and mental well-being while eliminating the administrative burden of requesting legislative relief of the ever-changing definition of family.

Points to Consider:

- Reduces administrative burden for compliance staff by eliminating the need to determine if an injury or illness is life threatening or not and the need to submit a waiver.
- An institution should be permitted to use its discretion in providing benefits for family and friends to be present when a student-athlete is injured.
- Supports student-athlete well-being.

Question:

- Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

Concept No. 10: Modify the legislation to permit unlimited complimentary admissions to an institutional awards banquet in which a student-athlete is being honored to any "relative or individual of comparable relationship."

Rationale: This proposal creates uniformity and allows institutional discretion in the application of complimentary admissions to an institutional awards banquet for a student-athlete's relative or individual of comparable relationship. Further, this modification promotes the student-athlete experience by providing greater opportunities for members of a student-athlete's family to share in the student-athlete's success.

Points to Consider:

- Supports the student-athlete experience.
- Expanding the category of who may receive the complimentary admissions will take into account nontraditional families.
- Family members of a student-athlete may not be able to be present during an institutional awards banquet due to the cost of admission.

Question:

- Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

Concept No. 11: Modify the legislation to permit reasonable meals and food for a student-athlete's "relative or individual of comparable relationship" in conjunction with educational meetings, celebratory events and on an occasional basis for other reasons.

Rationale: Current legislation allows only refreshments in conjunction with educational meetings or celebratory events (e.g., senior night) and on an occasional basis for other reasons. This concept provides a more hospitable and practical approach. Further, it does not require the institution to define "occasional" and would eliminate confusion over what is considered a refreshment and what is considered a meal.

Points to Consider:

- Supports the student-athlete experience.

- Expanding the category of who may receive reasonable refreshments will take into account nontraditional families.

Question:

- Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

Concept No. 12: Modify the team entertainment legislation to permit the NCAA, conference or institution to provide reasonable entertainment in conjunction with, as determined by the institution, practice or competition (e.g., remove restrictions on professional sports tickets, movies).

Rationale: This concept eliminates the mileage requirement and allows institutions to exercise its discretion with regard to the entertainment it wishes to provide to student-athletes associated with practice or competition.

Points to Consider:

- Supports the student-athlete experience.
- Provides additional entertainment options other than just movies in conjunction with a home contest.
- Allows entertainment to occur in any location associated with practice or competition.

Question:

- Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

Concept No. 13: Modify the legislation related to expenses provided by the institution for practice and competition to permit an institution to provide actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete's participation in practice, competition and when representing the institution in other events (e.g., remove legislation related to departure/return restrictions, practice-weather exceptions, nonsport apparel, retention of athletics equipment and apparel).

Rationale: The legislation may be simplified by deregulating many of the prescriptive bylaws. Specifically, a general rule which states that an institution may provide actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete's participation in required events when representing the institution and in conjunction with practice and competition, including a foreign tour, and any associated fees (e.g., sports organization membership, passport) provides enough framework for an institution to determine how to apply the legislation. Simplifying the legislation surrounding the provision of expenses for travel allows an institution to use discretion when providing expenses, including incidental expense funds in accordance with institutional policies, when the student-athlete is representing the institution, whether that is for competition or other events (e.g., goodwill tours, media appearances, student-athlete advisory committee meetings).

Points to Consider:

- Provisions of these expenses would be left to each institution's discretion.
- May reduce compliance monitoring and the need to file a waiver in certain situations (e.g., departure prior to 48 hours before competition).
- Supports the student-athlete experience.
- Institutions should already have a missed class time policy that applies to all students.

Questions:

1. Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

2. Are there specific areas within this concept that would still require some level of regulation? Please provide any additional explanation.

3. Provide examples of specific items that should be included in a definition of actual and necessary expenses for travel associated with practice, competition and representing an institution.

Concept No. 14: Modify the legislation to permit an institution to provide actual and necessary expenses related to national team tryouts and championship events (e.g., eliminate limitations on expenses for specified number of tryouts); to establish a general rule to permit a student-athlete to receive actual and necessary expenses and reasonable benefits associated with national team practice and competition (e.g., eliminate specific event restrictions) and; to establish a general rule to permit a student-athlete's relatives or individuals of a comparable relationship to receive nonmonetary benefits provided to the relatives or individuals of comparable relationships of all national team members in conjunction with practice and competition (e.g., eliminate only Olympic Games exception).

Rationale: This will simplify the current legislation by allowing an institution to use discretion when providing expenses for a student-athlete's participation in an unlimited number of national team tryouts and championship events. Creation of a general rule that allows actual and necessary and reasonable benefits associated national team practice and competition enhances student-athlete well-being and eliminates the need for prescriptive legislation. Finally, expanding the legislation related to family benefits associated with the Olympic Games to relatives and individuals of comparable relationship and to any national team practice or competition, while retaining the provisions about which entities may provide the benefits supports student-athlete well-being.

Points to Consider:

- Opportunity to represent one's country may outweigh any concerns with regard to competitive equity.
- Retaining limitations on actual and necessary expenses and reasonable benefits ensures the student-athlete maintains his or her collegiate amateur status.
- National team selection process for many sports includes more than one round (tier) of tryout events, which may take place at different sites and on different dates.
- Some sports provide more than one opportunity in which a student-athlete may compete in an effort to advance in the national team selection process if the student-athlete fails to advance from the first round (tier).
- Student-athlete's relatives and individuals of comparable relationships should have similar opportunities to receive benefits as other participants.

Questions:

1. Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

2. Do you support a limit (other than two) on the number of national team tryouts an institution may provide expenses? Why or why not?

3. Do you support expanding the legislation to all national team tryouts, practice and competition? Why or why not?

Concept No. 15: Modify the legislation to permit an institution to provide, at its discretion, former student-athletes the same benefits available to current student-athletes (e.g., medical expenses, tickets to athletics events, academic support services, professional development opportunities).

Rationale: The current parameters are designed to deter an institution from using post-athletics eligibility benefits as an incentive in the recruiting process. However, regulations exist that preclude an institution from providing former student-athletes benefits available to current student-athletes. Recently, the financial aid legislation was amended to permit former student-athletes to receive institutional financial aid in any term in which they are enrolled (full time or part time), even beyond six years of enrollment. Expanding the benefit legislation in a similar manner by permitting greater institutional discretion in this area, yet still being guided by what are permissible benefits for current student-athletes is an appropriate approach.

Points to Consider:

- Such decisions would be left up to each institution's discretion.
- May increase monitoring concerns.

Question:

- Do you support this concept? Why or why not?

Please click the following button to attach this form to an email: **rulesworkinggroup@ncaa.org**

This document is for reference purposes only. It represents a proposed draft of Bylaw 11 should the concepts in the discussion document be supported by the Division I membership.

ARTICLE 11
Conduct and Employment of Athletics Personnel

The operating bylaws in this Article are designed to further the Division I Collegiate Model and the NCAA's commitments identified in Article 2. These bylaws are important to the Association because they set forth the responsibilities of member institutions to adopt policies and to conduct their athletics programs in a manner consistent with the Division I Collegiate Model and the enduring values of this Association. [New Preamble]

11.1 General Provisions

11.1.1 Institutional Policies. Each member institution shall establish, publish and adhere to policies, including accountability measures, to ensure appropriate institutional control of athletics department staff members, to promote an environment of integrity and to prohibit relationships with outside individuals/entities that are in conflict with Association and or institutional values. (New Bylaw)

11.1.2 Recruiting. Only countable coaches shall engage in off-campus recruiting activities. Each member institution shall establish, publish and adhere to policies and procedures, consistent with NCAA bylaws, related to the recruitment of prospective student-athletes, including the roles and responsibilities of all athletics department staff members. (New Bylaw)

11.1.3 Coaching. Coaching staff members employed by an institution, rather than ancillary institutional athletics personnel or outside individuals not associated with the institution, shall engage in coaching student-athletes in the intercollegiate athletics setting. (New Bylaw)

11.2 Responsibilities of Athletics Department Personnel

11.2.1 Employment. Member institutions, as opposed to any outside persons or entities, shall be responsible for determining who they employ and the amount of salary each employee receives, consistent with Association bylaws and subject to institutional policies and procedures. [Currently NCAA Bylaw 11.3.1]

11.2.2 Honesty and Sportsmanship. Individuals employed by or associated with a member institution in connection with intercollegiate athletics shall act with honesty and sportsmanship at all times so that intercollegiate athletics and member institutions represent the honor and dignity of fair play and the generally recognized high standards associated with wholesome competitive sports. [Currently Bylaw 11.1.1]

11.2.3 Responsibility for Violations of NCAA Regulations. Institutional staff members found in violation of NCAA regulations may be subject to disciplinary or corrective action as set forth in the provisions of the NCAA enforcement procedures, whether such violations occurred at the certifying institution or during the individual's previous employment at another member institution. Member institutions, which maintain authority over personnel decisions, but which decide not to comply with such recommendations, may be subject to appropriate sanctions. (New Bylaw)

11.2.4 Responsibility of Head Coach. It shall be the responsibility of an institution's head coach to promote an atmosphere of compliance within the program supervised by the coach and to monitor the activities regarding compliance of personnel involved with the program who report directly or indirectly to the coach. [Currently Bylaw 11.1.2.1]

11.2.5 Representing Individuals in Marketing Athletics Ability/Reputation. Staff members of the athletics department of a member institution shall not represent, directly or indirectly, any individual in the marketing of athletics ability or reputation to an agent, a professional sports team or a professional sports organization, including receiving compensation for arranging commercial endorsements or personal appearances for former student-athletes, and shall not receive compensation or gratuities of any kind, directly or indirectly, for such services. [Currently Bylaw 11.1.4]

11.3 Coaching Staff

11.3.1 Countable Coach. An institutional staff member or any other individual outside the institution (e.g., consultant, professional instructor) with whom the institution has made arrangements must count toward the total number of coaches once the individual participates (in any manner) in the any of the following: (New Bylaw)

(a) Provides technical or tactical instruction related to the sport to a student-athlete; or

(b) Makes or assists in making tactical decisions related to the sport during practice or competition.

11.3.2 Manager. A manager is an individual who performs traditional managerial duties (e.g., equipment, laundry, hydration) and is not treated as a countable coach if he or she meets the following additional criteria [Currently Bylaw 11.01.6 (a)-(e)]

(a) The individual shall be a full-time undergraduate or graduate student (see Bylaws 14.1.8.2 and 14.1.8.2.1.4), except that during his or her final semester or quarter of a degree program, he or she may be enrolled in less than a full-time program of studies, provided he or she is carrying (for credit) the courses necessary to complete the degree requirements;

(b) The individual may participate in limited on-court or on-field activities during practice (e.g., assist with drills, throw batting practice) or competition (e.g., assist with warm-up activities) involving student-athletes on a regular basis;

(c) The individual shall not provide instruction to student-athletes;

(d) The individual shall not participate in countable athletically related activities (e.g., practice player) except as permitted in Bylaw 11.3.2; and

(e) In baseball, the individual shall forfeit any remaining eligibility in the sport at the institution at which the individual serves as a manager.

11.3.3 Number of Coaches. The number of countable coaches who may be employed by an institution per sport are as follows: [New Bylaw]

Baseball 4
Basketball, Men's 4
Basketball, Women's 4
Bowling, Women's 3
Equestrian 4*
Fencing, Men's 3
Fencing, Women's 3
Football, Bowl Subdivision 10**
Football, Championship Subdivision 11
Field Hockey 4
Golf, Men's 3
Golf, Women's 3
Gymnastics, Men's 4
Gymnastics, Women's 4
Ice Hockey, Men's 4
Ice Hockey, Women's 4
Lacrosse, Men's 4
Lacrosse, Women's 4
Rifle, Men's 3
Rifle, Women's 3
Rowing, Women's 4*
Rugby, Women's 3
Sand Volleyball, Women's 3
Skiing, Men's 3
Skiing, Women's 3
Soccer, Men's 4
Soccer, Women's 4
Softball 4
Swimming, Men's 3
Swimming and Diving, Men's 4
Swimming, Women's 3
Swimming and Diving, Women's 4
Tennis, Men's 3
Tennis, Women's 3

Cross Country, Men's (Without Track and Field) 3
Track and Field, Men's 4*
Cross Country/Track and Field, Men's 4*
Cross Country, Women's (Without Track and Field) 3
Track and Field, Women's 4*
Cross Country/Track and Field, Women's 4*
Volleyball, Men's 4
Volleyball, Women's 4
Water Polo, Men's 3
Water Polo, Women's 3
Wrestling 4

* These sports presently use multiple volunteer coaches. These numbers will need to be revisited.
** Although FBS football would have an unlimited number of graduate assistants, the proposed change in the requirements related to the student coach position may necessitate an increase in the total number of countable coaches.

11.3.3.1 Exceptions to Number of Coaches. No individual other than the countable coaches set forth in Bylaw 11.3.3 may participate in any manner in the coaching of the intercollegiate team of a member institution, with the following exceptions: [Currently Bylaws 11.7.2.1, 11.7.3.1 and 11.7.4.2]

(a) **Weight or Strength Coach.** A weight (strength and conditioning) coach may conduct flexibility, warm-up and physical conditioning activities prior to any game and prior to or during any practice or other organized activities without being included in the limitations on number of coaches. Not more than five weight or strength coaches are permitted to work with a football program in any capacity, including all workouts (required and voluntary), practices and game-related activities. [Currently Bylaws 11.7.2.1.1, 11.7.3.1.1 and 11.7.4.2.1]

(b) **Student Coach.** The number of coaches in this section do not apply to undergraduate or graduate student coaches who are enrolled as full-time students, provided such students are in good academic standing as determined by the institution for all such students and have no previous collegiate or professional coaching experience. Such students may receive financial aid consistent with financial aid that may be provided to a student-athlete. The number of student coaches in each sport shall not exceed the number of coaches in the sport per Bylaw 11.3.3. (New Bylaw)

(c) **Football Championship Subdivision - Varsity/Freshman Team Football Program.** An institution that conducts a championship subdivision football program that includes a varsity team and a freshman team may employ

two additional coaches. Freshman eligibility for varsity team participation must be prohibited by the institution and the freshman team must participate in five or more intercollegiate contests in order for the two additional coaches to be employed. Such additional coaches may perform football-related duties only during the permissible playing and practice season in football. [Currently Bylaw 11.7.3.1.3]

(d) **Football Championship Subdivision - Varsity/Junior Varsity/Freshman Team Football Program.** An institution that conducts a championship subdivision football program that includes a varsity team, a junior varsity team and a freshman team may employ four additional coaches. Freshman eligibility for varsity or junior varsity team participation must be prohibited by the institution, the junior varsity team must participate in at least four intercollegiate contests and the freshman team must participate in at least five intercollegiate contests in order for the four additional coaches to be employed. Such additional coaches may perform football-related duties only during the permissible playing and practice season in football. [Currently Bylaw 11.7.3.1.4]

(e) **Football Championship Subdivision - Varsity/Junior Varsity Football Program.** An institution that conducts a championship subdivision football program that includes a varsity team and a junior varsity team may employ two additional coaches. The institution's junior varsity team must participate in at least four intercollegiate contests in order for the two additional coaches to be employed. Such additional coaches may perform football-related duties only during the permissible playing and practice season in football. [Currently Bylaw 11.7.3.1.5]

(f) **Additional Coaches -- National Service Academies.** National service academies may employ four additional football coaches and two additional basketball coaches. [Currently Bylaws 11.7.2.1.4 and 11.7.4.2.5]

(g) **Exception for Lightweight Rowing.** An institution that conducts a rowing program that includes heavyweight rowing and lightweight rowing may employ two additional coaches. Each of the institution's rowing teams must have at least one "eight" or two "fours" that compete in at least four spring events. [Currently Bylaw 11.7.4.2.6]

11.3.3.2 Combined Sports Program. A member institution that conducts a combined program in a sport (one in which all coaching staff members in the same sport are involved in practice activities or competition with both the men's and women's teams on

a daily basis) may employ the total number of coaches specified separately for men and for women in that sport. [Currently Bylaw 11.7.4.1]

11.3.4 Replacement Due to Extenuating Circumstances. An institution may replace temporarily or on a limited basis one of its countable coaches if the coach is unable to perform any or all of his or her duties because of extenuating circumstances (e.g., suspension, prolonged serious illness, pregnancy). The replacement coach may perform only those coaching, administrative or recruiting duties, including the telephoning of prospective student-athletes, that the replaced coach is unable to perform. [Currently Bylaw 11.7.1.1.1.2]

11.3.5 Replacement for National or Olympic Team Coaches. An institution may replace a coach temporarily or on a limited basis when that coach takes a leave of absence to participate on or to coach a national team or Olympic team, provided the replacement is limited to a one-year period and the coach who is replaced performs no recruiting or other duties on behalf of the institution. [Currently Bylaw 11.7.1.1.1.3]

11.4 Individual Associated with a Prospective Student-Athlete. During a two-year period before a prospective student-athlete's anticipated enrollment and a two-year period after the prospective student-athlete's actual enrollment, an institution shall not employ (or enter into a contract for future employment with) an individual associated with the prospective student-athlete in any athletics department non-coaching staff position or in a strength and conditioning staff position. (New Bylaw)

11.5 High School, Preparatory School, Two-Year College or Nonscholastic Coach. An institution may not employ a high school, preparatory school, two-year college or nonscholastic coach who remains a coach in the same sport at the high school, preparatory school, two-year college or nonscholastic organization (e.g., outside team, local sports club, recruiting/scouting service). This provision does not preclude employment of a high school, preparatory school, two-year college or nonscholastic coach in a different sport. Men's and women's teams in the same sport are considered different sports for purposes of this bylaw. Men's and women's teams in the same sport are considered different sports even if an athlete from the opposite gender is playing on a high school, preparatory school or two-year college men's or women's team, provided the team is classified as a separate team (as opposed to a "mixed" team) by the appropriate institution or the state high school, preparatory school or two-year college governing body. (New Bylaw)

11.6 Off-Campus Scouting. Off-campus, in-person scouting of opponents is prohibited, except as provided in this section. (New Bylaw)[1]

[1] The working group supported the alternative concept of eliminating the prohibition against scouting opponents, which if supported by the Division I membership, would result in the elimination of Bylaw 11.6 in its entirety.

11.6.1. Participation in Same Event at the Same Site. An institution may scout future opponents also participating in the same event at the same site without being subject to the scouting prohibition. [Currently Bylaws 11.6.1.1 and 11.6.2.1]

11.6.2 Purchasing Video—Postseason. In basketball and women's volleyball, following the selection of any postseason championship field until the conclusion of the championship, it shall be permissible for the participating institution to pay the costs of purchasing video for scouting purposes from individuals or professional scouting services. [Currently Bylaw 11.6.1.2]]

11.6.3 Cost of Exchanging Video. It shall be permissible to pay the costs of exchanging video for scouting purposes in any sport, including the expenses of an individual traveling to pick up the video. [Currently Bylaw 11.6.4]

11.6.4 Use of Commercial Entity. It shall be permissible in all sports for an institution to obtain video of a future opponent's athletics contests for scouting purposes from a commercial entity that provides video recording/dubbing services. [New Bylaw]

This document is for reference purposes only. It provides an overview of the Bylaw 11 regulations that would be removed, maintained or moved to another section of the manual if the concepts set forth in the discussion document are supported by the Division I membership.

ATTACHMENT D
SUPPLEMENT NO. 3A-2
DI Leadership Council 4/12

Bylaw, Article 11
Conduct and Employment of Athle
Personnel

Action	Color
Delete	Red
Maintain	No color
Move Elsewhere	Green

11.01 DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS

Elimination of coaching categories. The bylaws would continue to place sport-specific numerical limits on countable coaches and would exempt undergraduate/graduate student coaches and strength and conditioning coaches (in sports other than Football Bowl Subdivision football) from such limitations. It is proposed that each sport that currently includes a volunteer coach would be able to employ one an additional coach to offset the elimination of the volunteer coach category. For those sports with multiple volunteer coaches, it may be necessary to seek input from their respective coaches associations to determine the appropriate number of additional coaches.

11.01.1 Bonus. A bonus is a direct cash payment over and above an athleti recognition of a specific and extraordinary achievement (see Bylaw 11.3.2.3).

11.01.2 Coach, Head or Assistant. A head or assistant coach is any co department to perform coaching duties and who serves in that capacity on a *8/1/92)*

11.01.3 Coach, Graduate Assistant—Bowl Subdivision Football an football, a graduate assistant coach is any coach who has received a baccalaur baccalaureate degree or has exhausted athletics eligibility (whichever occurs lat appointment as a graduate assistant under the policies of the institution. In wo who has received a baccalaureate degree and qualifies for appointment as a graduate assistant under the policies of the institution. In bowl subdivision football and women's rowing, the individual is not required to be enrolled in a specific graduate degree program unless required by institutional policy. The following provisions shall apply: *(Revised: 1/10/91, 1/10/92, 1/9/06 effective 8/1/06, 12/15/06, 1/8/07 effective 8/1/07, 4/29/10 for new appointments)*

(a) The individual shall be enrolled in at least 50 percent of the institution's minimum regular graduate program of studies, except that during his or her final semester or quarter of the degree program, he or she may be enrolled in less than 50 percent of the institution's minimum regular program, provided he or she is carrying (for credit) the courses necessary to complete the degree requirements. If the individual fails to complete all degree requirements during the term in which he or she is enrolled in less than 50 percent of the institution's minimum regular program, the result shall be an institutional violation per Constitution 2.8.1. An institution may appoint a midyear replacement graduate assistant coach who is enrolled in less than 50 percent of the institution's minimum regular graduate program of studies (or is not yet enrolled), provided the graduate assistant coach has been accepted for enrollment in a graduate program beginning with the next regular academic term; *(Adopted: 1/8/07 effective 8/1/07, Revised: 1/16/10 effective 8/1/10)*

(b) The individual may not receive compensation or remuneration in excess of the value of a full grant-in-aid for a full-time student, based on the resident status of that individual, and the receipt of four complimentary tickets to the institution's intercollegiate football and basketball games;

(c) Graduate and postgraduate financial assistance administered outside the institution (e.g., NCAA postgraduate scholarship) shall be excluded from the individual's limit on remuneration, provided such assistance is awarded through an established and continuing program to aid graduate students and the donor of the assistance does not restrict the recipient's choice of institutions; *(Adopted: 1/11/89)*

(d) The individual may not serve as a graduate assistant coach for a period of more than two years except that if the individual successfully completes 24-semester or 36-quarter hours during the initial two-year period, the individual may serve as a graduate assistant coach for a third year. The Legislative Council Subcommittee for Legislative Relief may approve a waiver of these limitations based on the fact that the student's service as a coach and enrollment as a graduate student were interrupted for reasons that are unrelated to athletics, or to personal or family finances, and that are beyond the control of the institution or the coach. Such a waiver may not be granted solely to permit the completion of a graduate program; *(Revised: 1/16/93, 11/1/07 effective 8/1/08)*

(e) Compensation for employment from a source outside the institution during the academic year shall be excluded from the individual's limit on remuneration, provided the institution does not arrange such employment and the compensation is for work actually performed. The member institution may not arrange on- or off-campus employment opportunities except for summer employment, which is permissible regardless of whether the student remains enrolled in the graduate program during the summer;

(f) A graduate student coach may accept employment benefits available to all institutional employees (e.g., life insurance, health insurance, disability insurance), as well as expenses to attend the convention of the national coaches association in the coach's sport, without the value of those benefits being included; *(Revised: 11/1/01 effective 8/1/02, 1/9/06 effective 8/1/06)*

(g) The individual may receive cash to cover unitemized incidental expenses during travel and practice for NCAA championship events or licensed postseason bowl contests in accordance with the parameters by which student-athletes may receive such expenses pursuant to Bylaw 16.8.1.6; *(Adopted: 1/15/11 effective 8/1/11)*

(h) The institution may provide actual and necessary expenses for the individual's spouse and children to attend a licensed postseason football game or an NCAA championship or, in women's rowing, for the season-ending tournament(s) specified in Bylaw 17.15.5.3-(b); and *(Revised: 1/9/06 effective 8/1/06)*

(i) The individual may not evaluate or contact prospective student-athletes off campus, regardless of whether compensation is received for such activities. The individual may not perform recruiting coordination functions (see Bylaw 11.7.1.2); however, it is permissible for a graduate assistant coach to make telephone calls to and receive telephone calls from prospective student-athletes, provided the coach has successfully completed the coaches' certification examination per Bylaw 11.5.1.1. *(Revised: 1/9/96 effective 8/1/96, 5/26/06)*

11.01.3.1 Replacement of Graduate Assistant Coach. The compensation or remuneration set forth in Bylaw 11.01.3 shall be charged against an academic year. Once the amount set forth in Bylaw 11.01.3-(b) is paid to a graduate assistant coach for that academic year, additional funds may not be spent on a replacement until the start of the next academic year, even though the graduate assistant coach leaves the institution's athletics program during the academic year. *(Adopted: 1/11/94, Revised: 1/9/06 effective 8/1/06, 12/15/06, 1/8/07 effective 8/1/07)*

11.01.4 Coach, Undergraduate Student Assistant. An undergraduate student assistant coach is any coach who is a student-athlete who has exhausted his or her eligibility in the sport or has become injured to the point that he or she is unable to practice or compete ever again, and who meets the following additional criteria: *(Revised: 1/12/04 effective 8/1/04, 4/29/10 effective 8/1/10)*

(a) Is enrolled at the institution at which he or she most recently participated in intercollegiate athletics; *(Revised: 4/29/10 effective 8/1/10)*

(b) Is enrolled as a full-time undergraduate student in his or her first baccalaureate degree program (see Bylaw 14.1.8.2), except that during his or her final semester or quarter of the baccalaureate degree program, he or she may be enrolled in less than a full-time degree program of studies, provided he or she is carrying (for credit) the courses necessary to complete the degree requirements; *(Revised: 1/12/04 effective 8/1/04, 8/11/09, 4/29/10 effective 8/1/10)*

(c) Is receiving no compensation or remuneration from the institution other than the financial aid that could be received as a student-athlete and expenses incurred on road trips that are received by individual team members; and *(Revised: 1/9/96)*

(d) Is not involved in contacting and evaluating prospective student-athletes off campus or scouting opponents off campus and does not perform recruiting coordination functions (see Bylaw 11.7.1.2.2). *(Revised: 5/26/06)*

11.01.5 Coach, Volunteer. In sports other than football and basketball, a volunteer coach is any coach who does not receive compensation or remuneration from the institution's athletics department or any organization funded in whole or in part by the athletics department or that is involved primarily in the promotion of the institution's athletics program (e.g., booster club, athletics foundation association). The following provisions shall apply: *(Revised: 1/10/92 effective 8/1/92, 4/26/01 effective 8/1/01)*

(a) The individual is prohibited from contacting and evaluating prospective student-athletes off campus or from scouting opponents off campus and may not perform recruiting coordination functions (see Bylaw 11.7.1.2). *(Revised: 1/16/93, 1/11/94, 5/26/06)*

(b) The individual may receive a maximum of two complimentary tickets to home athletics contests in the coach's sport. *(Revised: 1/16/93)*

(c) The individual may receive complimentary meals incidental to organized team activities (e.g., pre- or postgame meals, occasional meals, but not training table meals) or meals provided during a prospective student-athlete's official visit, provided the individual dines with the prospective student-athlete. *(Adopted: 4/29/04 effective 8/1/04, Revised: 1/10/05 effective 8/1/05)*

11.01.6 Manager. A manager is an individual who performs traditional ma and meets the following additional criteria: *(Adopted: 1/16/10 effective 8/1/10)*

Bylaw 11.01.6 will be incorporated in the section on countable coaches.

(a) The individual shall be a full-time undergraduate or graduate student (see B ylaws 14.1.8.2 and 14.1.8.2.1.4), except that during his or her final semester or quarter of a degree program, he or she may be enrolled in less than a full-time program of studies, provided he or she is carrying (for credit) the courses necessary to complete the degree requirements;

(b) The individual may participate in limited on-court or on-field activities during practice (e.g., assist with drills, throw batting practice) or competition (e.g., assist with warm-up activities) involving student-athletes on a regular basis;

(c) The individual shall not provide instruction to student-athletes;

(d) The individual shall not participate in countable athletically related activities (e.g., practice player) except as permitted in Bylaw 11.01.6-(b); and

(e) In baseball, the individual shall forfeit any remaining eligibility in the sport at the institution at which the individual serves as a manager. *(Adopted: 4/29/10 effective 8/1/10)*

11.01.7 Supplemental Pay. Supplemental pay is the payment of institutional salary by an outside source for the purpose of increasing tha

The regulations governing contractual agreements between an institution and its athletics department staff members and the receipt of compensation from sources outside the institution are not national in significance. It should be each institution's responsibility to address these matters in accordance with their own policies and procedures.

11.1 CONDUCT OF ATHLETICS PERSONNEL

11.1.1 Honesty and Sportsmanship. Individuals employed by or associated with a member institution to administer, conduct or coach intercollegiate athletics shall act with honesty and sportsmanship at all times so that intercollegiate athletics as a whole, their institutions and they, as individuals, represent the honor and dignity of fair play and the generally recognized high standards associated with wholesome competitive sports. (See Bylaw 10 for more specific ethical-conduct standards.)

11.1.2 Responsibility for Violations of NCAA Regulations. Institutional staff members found in violation of NCAA regulations shall be subject to disciplinary or corrective action as set forth in the provisions of the NCAA enforcement procedures whether such violations occurred at the certifying institution or during the individual's previous employment at another institution.

11.1.2.1 Responsibility of Head Coach. It shall be the responsibility of an institution's head coach to promote an atmosphere for compliance within the program supervised by the coach and to monitor the activities regarding compliance of all assistant coaches and other administrators involved with the program who report directly or indirectly to the coach. *(Adopted: 4/28/05)*

11.1.3 Use of Association Name or Affiliation. Staff members of member institutions and others serving on the Association's committees or acting as consultants shall not use, directly or by implication, the Association's name or their affiliation with the Association in the endorsement of products or services.

11.1.4 Representing Individuals in Marketing Athletics Ability/Reputation. Staff members of the athletics department of a member institution shall not represent, directly or indirectly, any individual in the marketing of athletics ability or reputation to an agent, a professional sports team or a professional sports organization, including receiving compensation for arranging commercial endorsements or personal appearances for former student-athletes, except as specified in Bylaw 11.1.4.1, and shall not receive compensation or gratuities of any kind, directly or indirectly, for such services. *(Revised: 1/10/92, 1/11/94)*

11.1.4.1 Exception—Professional Sports Counseling Panel and Head Coach. An institution's professional sports counseling panel or a head coach in a sport may contact agents, professional sports teams or professional sports organizations on behalf of a student-athlete, provided no compensation is received for such services. The head coach shall consult with and report his or her activities on behalf of the student-athlete to the institution's professional sports counseling panel. If the institution has no such panel, the head coach shall consult with and report his or her activities to the president or chancellor [or an individual or group (e.g., athletics advisory board) designated by the president or chancellor]. *(Revised: 11/1/01 effective 8/1/02, 3/8/06)*

11.1.5 Use of Tobacco Products. The use of tobacco products is prohibited by all game personnel (e.g., coaches, trainers, managers and game officials) in all sports during practice and competition. Uniform penalties (as determined by the applicable rules-making committees and sports committees with rules-making responsibilities) shall be established for such use. *(Adopted: 1/11/94 effective 8/1/94, Revised: 1/10/95, 1/14/97 effective 8/1/97)*

11.2 CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENTS

11.2.1 Stipulation That NCAA Enforcement Provisions Apply and an institution shall include the stipulation that a coach who is disciplinary or corrective action as set forth in the provisions of the N pay or termination of employment for significant or repetitive violations. *(Revised: 3/10/04)*

The regulations governing contractual agreements between an institution and its athletics department staff members and the receipt of compensation from sources outside the institution are not national in significance. It should be each institution's responsibility to address these matters in accordance with their own policies and procedures.

11.2.2 Athletically Related Income. Contractual agreements, including letters of appointment, between a full-time or part-time athletics department staff member (excluding secretarial or clerical personnel) and an institution shall include the stipulation that the staff member is required to provide a written detailed account annually to the president or chancellor for all athletically related income and benefits from sources outside the institution. In addition, the approval of all athletically related income and benefits shall be consistent with the institution's policy related to outside income and benefits applicable to all full-time or part-time employees. Sources of such income shall include, but are not limited to, the following: *(Revised: 1/10/92, 1/11/94, 1/10/95, 4/26/01 effective 8/1/01, 3/8/06)*

(a) Income from annuities;
(b) Sports camps;
(c) Housing benefits (including preferential housing arrangements);
(d) Country club memberships;
(e) Complimentary ticket sales;
(f) Television and radio programs; and
(g) Endorsement or consultation contracts with athletics shoe, apparel or equipment manufacturers.

11.3 COMPENSATION AND REMUNERATION

The regulations governing contractual agreements between an institution and its athletics department staff members and the receipt of compensation from sources outside the institution are not national in significance. It should be each institution's responsibility to address these matters in accordance with their own policies and procedures.

11.3.1 Control of Employment and Salaries. The institution, a determining who is to be its employee and the amount of salary the em legislation.

11.3.2 Income in Addition to Institutional Salary.

11.3.2.1 Bona Fide Outside Employment. A staff member may earn income in addition to the institutional salary by performing services for outside groups. *(Revised: 1/10/92, 4/26/01 effective 8/1/01)*

11.3.2.2 Supplemental Pay. An outside source is prohibited from paying or regularly supplementing an athletics department staff member's annual salary and from arranging to supplement that salary for an unspecified achievement. This includes the donation of cash from outside sources to the institution earmarked for the staff member's salary or supplemental income. It would be permissible for an outside source to donate funds to the institution to be used as determined by the institution, and it would be permissible for the institution, at its sole discretion, to use such funds to pay or supplement a staff member's salary.

11.3.2.3 Bonuses for Specific and Extraordinary Achievement. An institution may permit an outside individual, group or agency to supplement an athletics department staff member's salary with a direct cash payment in recognition of a specific and extraordinary achievement (e.g., contribution during career to the athletics department of the institution, winning a conference or national championship, number of games or meets won during career/season), provided such a cash supplement is in recognition of a specific achievement and is in conformance with institutional policy.

11.3.2.4 Noninstitutional Publications That Report on Athletics Program. Athletics department staff members shall not endorse (either orally or in writing) any noninstitutional publication dedicated primarily to reporting on an institution's athletics activities, except as provided in this section, and shall not write for such publications. *(Adopted: 1/16/93, Revised: 1/11/94, 4/26/01 effective 8/1/01)*

11.3.2.4.1 Educational Articles. Athletics department staff members may write educational articles related to NCAA rules and crowd control for noninstitutional publications dedicated primarily to reporting on an institution's athletics activities. *(Adopted: 1/11/94)*

11.3.2.5 Recruiting Service Consultants. Institutional athle consultants or participate on advisory panels for any recruiting or sc *1/16/93)*

It is recommended that since Bylaws 11.3.2.5 through 11.3.2.8 have a recruiting nexus, those bylaws should be considered for incorporation in the recruiting section.

11.3.2.6 Quotations and Pictures Used to Promote a Camp. An institution's coaching staff member may not promote a noninstitutional camp or clinic by permitting the use of his or her quotations and/or pictures in the camp or clinic brochure, unless that coaching staff member is employed by the camp. *(Adopted: 1/14/97 effective 8/1/97)*

11.3.2.7 Consultant for or Endorsement of Noninstitutional Athletics Events Involving Prospective Student-Athletes. An athletics department staff member may not serve as a consultant for a noninstitutional athletics event that primarily involves prospective student-athletes and may not endorse or promote such an event. *(Adopted: 1/15/11)*

11.3.2.8 Promotion or Endorsement of a Prospective Student-Athlete's Team, Coach or Athletics Facility. An athletics department staff member shall not promote or endorse a prospective student-athlete's team or coach, or an athletics facility that is primarily used by prospective student-athletes. *(Adopted: 1/15/11)*

11.4 EMPLOYMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL, PREPARATORY SCHOOL OR TWO-YEAR COLLEGE COACHES, OR OTHER INDIVIDUALS ASSOCIATED WITH PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES

11.4.1 High School, Preparatory School or Two-Year Colleg preparatory school or two-year college coach who remains a coach in t year college. This provision does not preclude employment of a hig different sport. Men's and women's teams in the same sport are conside women's teams in the same sport are considered different sports even school, preparatory school or two-year college men's or women's team, to a "mixed" team) by the appropriate institution or the state high school, preparatory school or two-year college governing body. (See Bylaw 13.12.2.2 for regulations relating to the employment of high school, preparatory school or two-year college coaches in institutional camps or clinics.) *(Revised: 1/10/91, 3/16/07, 1/16/10)*

It is recommended that Bylaw 11.4.1 be modified to include a prohibition against the employment of a coach who also coaches a nonscholastic team that includes prospect-age participants. This will result in the elimination of the local sports club exception. This proposal is designed to limit opportunities for third party involvement in institutional athletics programs as well as eliminate unenforceable rules that require institutions to attempt to monitor recruiting conversations and conduct that occurs in the course of secondary employment.

11.4.1.1 Contract for Future Employment. An institution is permitted to enter into a contractual agreement with a high school, preparatory school or two-year college coach for an employment opportunity that begins with the next academic year, provided the employment contract with the member institution is not contingent upon the enrollment of a prospective student-athlete and the coach does not begin any coaching duties (e.g., recruiting, selection of coaching staff) for the member institution while remaining associated with the high school, preparatory school or two-year college.

11.4.2 Individual Associated with a Prospective Student-Athlete—Men's Basketball. In men's basketball, during a two-year period before a prospective student-athlete's anticipated enrollment and a two-year period after the prospective student-athlete's actual enrollment, an institution shall not employ (or enter into a co with the prospective student-athlete in any athletics department noncoaching staff position or in a strength and conditioning staff position. **[E]** *(Adopted: 1/16/10; a contract signed before 10/29/09 may be honored, Revised: 6/17/11)*

It is recommended that Bylaw 11.4.2 be applicable to all sports.

11.5 CERTIFICATION TO RECRUIT OFF CAMPUS

11.5.1 Annual Certification Requirement. Only those coaches w prospective student-athletes off campus. Certification must occur on an annu

The annual certification requirement is not national in significance. Institutions and/or conferences, at their discretion, should be responsible for developing rules-education materials/tests designed to ensure that coaches engaged in recruiting activities have a sufficient working knowledge of the recruiting rules.

11.5.1.1 Certification Administration. Such certification pro cedur institutions by the member conferences of the Association or, in th e ca office or the conference office that administers the National Letter of Intent for that institution. Such certification procedures shall include a requirement that the coaches shall have passed a standardized national test developed by the NCAA national office covering NCAA recruiting legislation, including Bylaw 13 and other bylaws [e.g., Bylaws 15.3 (institutional financial aid award) and 14.3 (freshman academic requirements)] that relate to the recruitment of prospective student-athletes as a condition for being permitted to engage in off-campus recruiting. Member conferences shall establish the procedures for administering and correcting the test within each conference. *(Adopted: 1/10/91 effective 8/1/92, Revised: 1/16/93, 4/24/03)*

11.6 LIMITATIONS ON SCOUTING OF OPPON

11.6.1 Basketball, Football and Women's Volleyball Prohibi campus, in-person scouting of opponents is prohibited, except as pro *Revised: 1/14/97 effective 8/1/97)*

The regulations governing scouting of opponents are not national in significance. Widespread availability of video would suggest minimal competitive advantage would be gained from in-person scouting and would be offset by the coach's diversion from other coaching responsibilities. There are two possible alternatives, one to eliminate the rule in its entirety and the other to prohibit live scouting of opponents in all sports. The draft version of new Bylaw 11 uses the alternative that would prohibit live scouting of opponents in all sports.

11.6.1.1 Regular-Season Tournaments, Double-Header Events or Postseason Tournaments. An institution may pay the expenses of a member of its coaching staff to attend a regular-season or postseason tournament or, in basketball, a double-header event in which the institution's intercollegiate team is a participant. Under such circumstances, the individual may scout future opponents also participating in the same tournament at the same site or, in basketball, the same double-header event at the same site, without being subject to the scouting prohibition. *(Revised: 1/11/94 effective 8/1/94, 10/28/97 effective 8/1/98)*

11.6.1.2 Purchasing Video—Postseason. In basketball and women's volleyball, following the selection of any postseason championship field until the conclusion of the championship, it shall be permissible for the participating institution to pay the costs of purchasing video for scouting purposes from individuals or professional scouting services. *(Adopted: 1/12/99, Revised: 6/8/99)*

11.6.2 Sports Other Than Basketball, Football and Women's Volleyball. In sports other than basketball, football and women's volleyball, a member institution shall not pay or permit the payment of expenses incurred by its athletics department staff members or representatives (including professional scouting services) to scout its opponents or individuals who represent its

opponents, except as provided in Bylaw 11.6.3 in lacrosse. A coaching staff member who receives any expenses from the institution related to recruiting or team travel shall not scout an institution's opponents in conjunction with such travel. *(Revised: 1/14/97 effective 8/1/97, 4/23/08, 10/20/08)*

11.6.2.1 Regular-Season or Postseason Tournaments. An institution may pay the expenses of a member of its coaching staff to attend a regular-season or postseason tournament in which the institution's intercollegiate team is a participant. Under such circumstances, the individual may scout future tournament opponents also participating in the same tournament at the same site.

11.6.3 Lacrosse. In lacrosse, it shall be permissible for an institution to pay the expenses of one person to scout each opponent on one occasion. When an individual is reimbursed to travel by automobile to scout an opponent, others who travel with the individual in the same vehicle to the site are not considered to have received transportation expenses. A coach may scout opponents at his or her own expense. *(Revised: 1/11/94 effective 8/1/94, 1/14/97 effective 8/1/97)*

11.6.3.1 Regular-Season or Postseason Tournaments. An institution may pay the expenses of a member of its coaching staff to attend a regular-season or postseason tournament in which the institution's intercollegiate team is a participant. Under such circumstances, the individual may scout future tournament opponents also participating in the same tournament at the same site without being subject to the one-occasion limitation. *(Revised: 1/11/94 effective 8/1/94)*

11.6.3.2 Salary Increases to Cover Scouting Expenses. It is not permissible for an institution to increase a staff member's salary to cover expenses incurred by the staff member in scouting opponents in accordance with the provisions of Bylaw 11.6.3. *(Revised: 1/11/94 effective 8/1/94)*

11.6.3.3 Designating the Opponent. If two opponents of an institution compete against each other and an individual receives expenses for scouting the contest, the institution may designate the opponent it is scouting and then pay expenses to scout the other opponent on another occasion. If two individuals receive expenses to scout the contest, each opponent shall be considered to have been scouted on one occasion. *(Revised: 1/11/94 effective 8/1/94)*

11.6.4 Cost of Exchanging Video. It shall be permissible to pay the costs of exchanging video for scouting purposes in any sport, including the expenses of an individual traveling to pick up the video. *(Revised: 1/11/94 effective 8/1/94)*

11.6.4.1 Use of Commercial Entity. It shall be permissible in all sports for an institution to obtain video of a future opponent's athletics contests for scouting purposes from a commercial entity that provides video recording/dubbing services, provided the institution requesting the video pays no fees or expenses related to obtaining the video of the future opponent's athletics contests, except for providing a blank videotape or DVD (or other medium) and paying postage costs. *(Adopted: 2/16/00, Revised: 4/25/02 effective 8/1/02)*

11.6.5 Complimentary Game Tickets. In sports in which it is permissible to scout opponents, a member institution's staff member is permitted to receive press-box tickets or complimentary tickets from an opponent for the purpose of scouting the opponent. *(Revised: 1/11/94 effective 8/1/94, 4/25/02 effective 8/1/02)*

11.6.5.1 Lacrosse. In lacrosse, receipt of press-box tickets or complimentary tickets from an opponent shall constitute a countable scouting opportunity. *(Revised: 1/11/94 effective 8/1/94, 1/14/97 effective 8/1/97)*

11.7 LIMITATIONS ON THE NUMBER AND DUTIES OF COACHES

11.7.1 General Provisions Applicable to All Sports with Numerical Coaching Limits.

11.7.1.1 Designation of Coaching Category. An individual who coaches and either is uncompensated or receives compensation or remuneration of any sort from the institution, even if such compensation or remuneration is not designated for coaching, shall be designated as a head coach, assistant coach, volunteer coach, graduate assistant coach or student assistant coach by certification of the institution. *(Revised: 1/10/91 effective 8/1/92, 1/12/04 effective 8/1/04)*

11.7.1.1.1 Countable Coach. An athletics department staff member must count individual participates (in any manner) in the coaching of the intercollegiate team in directly related to that sport, including any organized staff activity directly related to the sp

Specific activities will be identified to clarify who will be a countable coach and rules related to noncoaching activities and use of outside consultants will be eliminated.

11.7.1.1.1.1 Noncoaching Activities. Institutional staff members invo administrative assistants, academic counselors) do not count in the institution's coaching limitations, provided such individuals are not identified as coaches, do not engage in any on- or off-field coaching activities (e.g., attending meetings involving coaching activities, analyzing video involving the institution's or an opponent's team), and are not involved in any off-campus recruitment of prospective student-athletes or scouting of opponents. *(Adopted: 1/16/93, Revised: 1/10/95, 12/13/05, 4/27/06 effective 8/1/06, 1/16/10)*

11.7.1.1.1.1.1 Exception—Noncoaching Staff Member with Sport-Specific Responsibilities. A noncoaching staff member with sport-specific responsibilities (e.g., director of operations, administrative assistant)

may participate in organized activities involving only the coaching staff or may perform administrative duties (e.g., attend meetings involving coaching activities, analyze video of the institution's or an opponent's team, track statistics during practice or competition). However, such an individual is prohibited from participating in instructional activities with student-athletes and any on-court or on-field activities (e.g., assist with drills, throw batting practice), and is prohibited from participating with or observing student-athletes in the staff member's sport who are engaged in nonorganized voluntary athletically related activities (e.g., pick-up games). *(Adopted: 1/16/10)*

11.7.1.1.1.2 Replacement Due to Extenuating Circumstances. An institution may replace temporarily or on a limited basis one of its countable coaches if the coach is unable to perform any or all of his or her duties because of extenuating circumstances (e.g., suspension, prolonged serious illness, pregnancy). The replacement coach may perform only those coaching, administrative or recruiting duties, including the telephoning of prospective student-athletes, that the replaced coach is unable to perform. *(Revised: 1/11/94, 4/25/02 effective 8/1/02)*

11.7.1.1.1.3 Replacement for National or Olympic Team Coaches. An institution may replace a coach temporarily or on a limited basis when that coach takes a leave of absence to participate on or to coach a national team or Olympic team, provided the replacement is limited to a one-year period and the coach who is replaced performs no recruiting or other duties on behalf of the institution. *(Adopted: 1/14/97 effective 8/1/97, Revised: 4/25/02 effective 8/1/02, 1/14/08)*

11.7.1.1.1.4 Use of Outside Consultants. An institution may use or arrange for a temporary consultant to provide in-service training for the coaching staff, but no interaction with student-athletes is permitted unless the individual is counted against the applicable coaching limits. An outside consultant may not be involved in any on- or off-field or on- or off-court coaching activities (e.g., attending practices and meetings involving coaching activities, formulating game plans, analyzing video involving the institution's or opponent's team) without counting the consultant in the coaching limitations in that sport. *(Adopted: 1/10/92, Revised: 3/10/04)*

11.7.1.1.2 Placement within Categories. If an institutio n has not reached its limit on the number of coaches in any category, any type of coach may be counted in that category. *(Re v*

The regulations defining recruiting coordination functions that must be performed only by a head or assistant coach are not national in significance and, in many instances, present enforcement challenges. Each institution should be responsible for establishing its own policies and procedures related to the recruitment of prospective student-athletes, including the roles and responsibilities of all athletics department staff members. The current rules requiring off-campus recruitment to be performed only by countable coaches would remain applicable.

11.7.1.2 Recruiting Coordination Functions. The following re tasks) must be performed by the head coach or one or more of the as Bylaw 11.7.4: *(Revised: 4/27/06 effective 8/1/06, 4/24/08 effective 8/1/0*

(a) Activities involving athletics evaluations and/or selection of *8/1/08)*

(b) Making telephone calls to or receiving telephone calls from prospective student-athletes (or prospective student-athletes' parents, legal guardians or coaches). *(Revised: 1/12/06, 4/24/08 effective 8/1/08)*

11.7.1.2.1 Exception—Graduate Assistant Coach—Bowl Subdivision Football and Women's Rowing. In bowl subdivision football and women's rowing, a graduate assistant coach may perform the functions set forth in Bylaw 11.7.1.2-(a) (on campus only) and 11.7.1.2-(b) if the coach has successfully completed the coaches' certification examination per Bylaw 11.5.1.1. [See Bylaw 11.01.3-(h).] *(Revised: 4/27/06 effective 8/1/06, 12/15/06)*

11.7.1.2.2 Exceptions—Noncoaching Staff Members and Noncountable Coaches.

(a) **After National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment.** A noncoaching staff member or a coach who does not count toward the numerical limitations on head and assistant coaches in Bylaw 11.7.4 may perform the functions set forth in Bylaw 11.7.1.2-(b) after the calendar day on which the prospective student-athlete signs a National Letter of Intent or the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid. *(Adopted: 1/14/08 effective 8/1/08, Revised: 8/8/08, 4/13/10, 1/15/11 effective 8/1/11)*

(b) **After Receipt of Financial Deposit.** A noncoaching institutional staff member or a coach who does not count toward the numerical limitations on head and assistant coaches in Bylaw 11.7.4 may perform the functions set forth in Bylaw 11.7.1.2-(b) after the calendar day on which the institution receives a financial deposit in response to the institution's offer of admission. *(Adopted: 4/13/10, Revised: 1/15/11 effective 8/1/11)*

(c) **Telephone Calls in Conjunction with Official Visit.** A noncoaching staff member or coach who does not count toward the numerical limitations on head and assistant coaches in Bylaw 11.7.4 may initiate telephone calls to and receive telephone calls from a prospective student-athlete or those individuals accompanying the prospective student-athlete during the prospective student-athlete's official visit transportation and during his or her official visit. *(Adopted: 1/16/10 effective 8/1/10)*

(d) **Telephone Calls Regarding Institutional Camp or Clinic Logistical Issues.** A noncoaching staff member or coach who does not count toward the numerical limitations on head and assistant coaches in Bylaw 11.7.4 may initiate

telephone calls to and receive telephone calls from a prospective student-athlete (or his or her parents, legal guardians, relatives or coach) that relate solely to institutional camp or clinic logistical issues (e.g., missing registration information), provided no recruiting conversation or solicitation of particular individuals to attend a camp or clinic occurs during such calls. *(Adopted: 9/24/09)*

11.7.2 Bowl Subdivision Football. [FBS] There shall be a limit of one head coach, nine assistant coaches and two graduate assistant coaches who may be employed by an institution in bowl subdivision football. *(Revised: 1/10/91, 1/10/92 effective 8/1/92, 12/15/06)*

The number of countable coaches in FBS will be included in the chart that references all sports.

Delayed effective date. See specific date below.

11.7.2 Bowl Subdivision Football. [FBS] There shall be a limit of one head coach, nine assistant coaches and four graduate assistant coaches who may be employed by an institution in bowl subdivision football. *(Revised: 4/28/11 effective 8/1/12)*

11.7.2.1 Exceptions to Number Limits. [FBS] No individual other than coaches designated to fill the coaching categories set forth in Bylaw 11.7.2 may participate in any manner in the coaching of the intercollegiate team of a member institution during any football game, practice or other organized activity, with the following exceptions:

11.7.2.1.1 Weight or Strength Coach. [FBS] A weight (strength and conditioning) coach may conduct flexibility, warm-up and physical conditioning activities prior to any game and prior to or during any practice or other organized activities without being included in the limitations on number of coaches.

Delayed effective date. See specific date below.

11.7.2.1.1 Weight or Strength Coach. [FBS] A weight (strength and conditioning) coach may conduct flexibility, warm-up and physical conditioning activities prior to any game and prior to or during any practice or other organized activities without being included in the limitations on number of coaches. Not more than five weight or strength coaches are permitted to work with a football program in any capacity, including all workouts (required and voluntary), practices and game-related activities. *(Revised: 1/15/11 effective 8/1/12)*

11.7.2.1.2 Undergraduate Coach. [FBS] The limits on undergraduate coaches (see Bylaw 11.01.4). *(Revised: 1/10/91 effe*

11.7.2.1.3 Sprint Football. [FBS] The limits on the numb programs. Sprint football coaches are prohibited from off-campu

11.7.2.1.4 Additional Coaches—National Service Acad additional coaches. *(Revised: 1/10/91 effective 8/1/92, 1/12/04 effe*

It is recommended that the legislation be amended and apply to all sports, as follows: ~~***Undergraduate***~~ **Student Coach. [FBS]** The limits on the number of coaches in this section do not apply to undergraduate **or graduate** coaches **who are enrolled as full-time students, provided such students are in good academic standing as determined by the institution for all such students and have no previous collegiate or professional coaching experience. Such coaches may receive financial aid that is consistent with financial aid that may be provided to a student-athlete.**~~*(see Bylaw 11.01.4).*~~ *(Revised: 1/10/91 effective 8/1/92)*

11.7.2.1.5 Special Attrition Provision. [FBS] The institutio nal attrition only if the institution had in effect prior to September 15, 1990, a written obligation to the assistant coach through academic tenure, an enforceable contract or a formal security-of-employment commitment. *(Revised: 1/10/91 effective 8/1/92)*

11.7.2.2 Contact and Evaluation of Prospective Student-Athletes. [FBS] Only those coaches who are counted by the institution within the numerical limitations on head and assistant coaches may contact or evaluate prospective student-athletes off campus. In addition, there is a limit of seven coaches (including the head coach) who may contact or evaluate prospective student-athletes off campus at any one time (see Bylaw 11.7.4). *(Revised: 4/28/05 effective 8/1/05, 5/26/06)*

11.7.2.2.1 Exception—Fall Evaluation Period. [FBS] Ten coaches (including the head coach) may evaluate prospective student-athletes at any one time during one week (any seven consecutive days) of the fall evaluation period in which no regular-season competition is scheduled. Before its first regular-season contest, the institution shall declare, in writing, the week in which it will use this exception. The selected week shall not be revised after the declaration deadline. The institution shall submit the declaration to its conference office. An independent institution shall keep the declaration on file in the office of the athletics director. *(Adopted: 1/16/10 effective 8/1/10)*

11.7.2.2.2 Banquets or Meetings. [FBS] A coaching staff m recognize prospective student-athletes that occurs during a cont regardless of whether the coach is speaking at the banquet/meeting or only attending the function. Further, the coach is not permitted to attend such a recognition banquet or meeting that occurs outside a contact or evaluation period, unless the coach has been asked to speak at the function (see Bylaws 13.1.8 and 13.02.5.4). *(Adopted: 6/8/99)*

Consideration should be given to incorporating this sentence in the appropriate section in Bylaw 13.

11.7.2.2.3 Additional Recruiters—National Service Academies. [FBS] For the national service academies, the off-campus contact and evaluation of prospective student-athletes shall be limited to a total of nine coaches at any one time, which may include the head coach. *(Adopted: 1/10/95, Revised: 1/12/04 effective 8/1/04)*

11.7.3 Championship Subdivision Football. [FCS] There shall be a limit of 11 coaches of any type who may be employed by an institution in championship subdivision football. *(Revised: 1/10/91 effective 8/1/92, 1/16/93, 1/9/96, 1/12/04 effective 8/1/04, 12/15/06)*

11.7.3.1 Exceptions to Number Limits. [FCS] No individual other than coaches designated to fill the coaching categories set forth in Bylaw 11.7.3 may participate in any manner in the coaching of the intercollegiate team of a member institution during any football game, practice or other organized activity, with the following exceptions:

11.7.3.1.1 Weight or Strength Coach. [FCS] A weight (strength and conditioning) coach may conduct flexibility, warm-up and physical conditioning activities prior to any game and prior to or during any practice or other organized activities without being included in the limitations on number of coaches.

11.7.3.1.2 Undergraduate Coach. [FBS] The limits on th to undergraduate coaches (see Bylaw 11.01.4). *(Revised: 1/10/91 effecti*

11.7.3.1.3 Varsity/Freshman Team Football Program. [FCS on football program that includes a varsity team and a freshman team m for varsity team participation must be prohibited by the institution ore intercollegiate contests in order for the two additional coaches to b all- related duties only during the permissible playing and practice sea *04 effective 8/1/04, 12/15/06)*

It is recommended that the legislation be amended and apply to all sports , as follows: ~~***Undergraduate***~~ **Student Coach. [FBS]** The limits on the number of coaches in this section do not apply to undergraduate **or graduate** coaches **who are enrolled as full-time students, provided such students are in good academic standing as determined by the institution for all such students and have no previous collegiate or professional coaching experience. Such coaches may receive financial aid that is consistent with financial aid that may be provided to a student-athlete.** ~~*(see Bylaw 11.01.4).*~~ *(Revised: 1/10/91 effective 8/1/92)*

11.7.3.1.4 Varsity/Junior Varsity/Freshman Team Football Program. [FCS] An institution that conducts a championship subdivision football program that includes a varsity team, a junior varsity team and a freshman team may employ four additional coaches. Freshman eligibility for varsity or junior varsity team participation must be prohibited by the institution, the junior varsity team must participate in at least four intercollegiate contests and the freshman team must participate in at least five intercollegiate contests in order for the four additional coaches to be employed. Such additional coaches may perform football-related duties only during the permissible playing and practice season in football. *(Revised: 1/10/91 effective 8/1/92, 1/12/04 effective 8/1/04, 12/15/06)*

11.7.3.1.5 Varsity/Junior Varsity Football Program. [FCS] An institution that conducts a championship subdivision football program that includes a varsity team and a junior varsity team may employ two additional coaches. The institution's junior varsity team must participate in at least four intercollegiate contests in order for the two additional coaches to be employed. Such additional coaches may perform football-related duties only during the permissible playing and practice season in football. *(Revised: 1/10/92 effective 8/1/92, 1/12/04 effective 8/1/04, 12/15/06)*

11.7.3.1.6 Sprint Football. [FCS] The limits on the number of coaches in this section do not apply to sprint football programs. Sprint football coaches are prohibited from off-campus recruiting.

11.7.3.1.7 Special Attrition Provision. [FCS] The institution is permitted to meet these limitations through normal attrition only if the institution had in effect prior to September 15, 1990, a written obligation to the assistant coach through academic tenure, an enforceable contract or a formal security-of-employment commitment. *(Revised: 1/10/91 effective 8/1/92)*

11.7.3.2 Off-Campus Contact and Evaluation of Prospective Student-Athletes. [FCS] Only those coaches who are counted by the institution within the numerical limitations on head and assistant coaches may contact or evaluate prospective student-athletes off campus. In addition, there is a limit of seven coaches (including the head coach) who may contact and evaluate prospective student-athletes off campus at any one time (see Bylaw 11.7.4). *(Revised: 4/28/05 effective 8/1/05)*

11.7.3.2.1 Exception—Fall Evaluation Period. [FCS] Ten coaches (including the head coach) may evaluate prospective student-athletes at any one time during one week (any seven consecutive days) of the fall evaluation period in which no regular-season competition is scheduled. Before its first regular-season contest, the institution shall declare, in writing, the week in which it will use this exception. The selected week shall not be revised after the declaration deadline. The institution shall submit the declaration to its conference office. An independent institution shall keep the declaration on file in the office of the athletics director. *(Adopted: 1/16/10 effective 8/1/10)*

11.7.3.2.2 Banquets or Meetings. [FCS] A coaching staff r recognize prospective student-athletes that occurs during a cont regardless of whether the coach is speaking at the banquet/meeting or only attending the function. Further, the coach is not

Consideration should be given to incorporating this sentence in the appropriate section in Bylaw 13.

permitted to attend such a recognition banquet or meeting that occurs outside a contact or evaluation period, unless the coach has been asked to speak at the function (see Bylaws 13.1.8 and 13.02.5.4). *(Adopted: 6/8/99)*

11.7.4 Limitations on Number of Coaches and Off-C

who may be employed by an institution and who may conta
each sport as follows: *(Revised: 1/10/91 effective 8/1/92, 1/1*
8/1/02, 1/12/04 effective 8/1/04, 4/29/04 effective 8/1/04, 4/2
1/17/09 effective 8/1/09, 1/15/11 effective 8/1/11)

The restriction on the number of coaches who may be engaged in off-campus recruiting activities at any one time (the baton rule) is not national in significance and presents enforcement challenges. The rule was initially adopted as a cost containment measure, but there is no data, anecdotally or otherwise, that would suggest the rule has furthered its objective. Each institution should be responsible for establishing its own policies and procedures related to the off-campus recruitment of prospective student-athletes by authorized countable coaching staff members.

Sport	Limit on Number of Coaches	Limit on Off-Campus Recruiters
Baseball	3	2
Basketball, Men's	4	3
Basketball, Women's	4	3
Bowling, Women's	2	2
Equestrian	3	2
Fencing, Men's	2	2
Fencing, Women's	2	2
Football, Bowl Subdivision (See Bylaw 11.7.2)	12	7
Football, Championship Subdivision (See Bylaw 11.7.3)	11	7
Field Hockey	3	2
Golf, Men's	2	2
Golf, Women's	2	2
Gymnastics, Men's	3	2
Gymnastics, Women's	3	2
Ice Hockey, Men's	3	2
Ice Hockey, Women's	3	2
Lacrosse, Men's	3	2
Lacrosse, Women's	3	2
Rifle, Men's	2	2
Rifle, Women's	2	2
Rowing, Women's	3	2 (during the academic year) 3 (during the summer)
Rugby, Women's	3	2

In sports other than football and basketball, except as noted in comments, the number of countable coaches will be increased by one to offset the elimination of the volunteer coach.

In equestrian, an increase up to five countable coaches may be warranted to offset the elimination of two volunteer coaches.

In FBS football, the number will reflect the elimination of the g-a category. FBS football would have an unlimited number of graduate assistants; however, the proposed change in the requirements related to the position may necessitate an increase in the total number of countable coaches.

In rowing, an additional increase to seven countable coaches may be warranted to offset the elimination of four volunteer coaches.

Sport	Limit on Number of Coaches	Limit on Off-Campus Recruiters
Sand Volleyball, Women's	2	2
Skiing, Men's	2	2
Skiing, Women's	2	2
Soccer, Men's	3	2
Soccer, Women's	3	2
Softball	3	2
Swimming, Men's	2	2
Swimming and Diving, Men's	3	2
Swimming, Women's	2	2
Swimming and Diving, Women's	3	2
Tennis, Men's	2	2
Tennis, Women's	2	2
Cross Country, Men's (Without Track and Field)	2	2
Track and Field, Men's	3	2
Cross Country/Track and Field, Men's	3	2
Cross Country, Women's (Without Track and Field)	2	2
Track and Field, Women's	3	2
Cross Country/Track and Field, Women's	3	2
Volleyball, Men's	3	2
Volleyball, Women's	3	2
Water Polo, Men's	2	2
Water Polo, Women's	2	2
Wrestling	3	2

In sports other than football and basketball, except as noted in comments, the number of coaches will be increased by one to offset the elimination of the volunteer coach.

In men's track and field, an additional increase up to five countable coaches may be warranted to offset the elimination of the volunteer coach for both indoor and outdoor track.
In men's track and field/cross country, an additional increase up to six countable coaches may be warranted to offset the elimination of the volunteer coach in cross country, indoor and outdoor track.
In women's track and field, an additional increase up to five countable coaches may be warranted to offset the elimination of the volunteer coach for both indoor and outdoor track.
In women's track and field/cross country, an additional increase up to six countable coaches may be warranted to offset the elimination of the volunteer coach in cross country, indoor and outdoor track.

11.7.4.1 Combined Sports Program. A member institution that conducts a combined program in a sport (one in which all coaching staff members in the same sport are involved in practice activities or competition with both the men's and women's teams on a daily basis) may employ the total number of coaches specified separately for men and for women in that sport. *(Adopted: 1/16/93)*

11.7.4.2 Exceptions to Number Limits. No individual other than coaches designated to fill the coaching categories set forth in Bylaw 11.7.4 may participate in any manner in the coaching of the intercollegiate team of a member institution during any game, practice or other organized activity, with the following exceptions: *(Revised: 1/10/91 effective 8/1/92)*

11.7.4.2.1 Weight or Strength Coach. A weight (strength and conditioning) coach may conduct flexibility, warm-up and physical conditioning activities prior to any game and prior to or during any practice or other organized activities without being included in the limitations on number of coaches. *(Revised: 1/10/91 effective 8/1/92)*

11.7.4.2.2 Undergraduate Student Coach. An institutio
Bylaw 11.01.4). The limit on the number of undergraduate st
limit on the number of coaches in the sport per Bylaw 11.7.
8/1/10)

It is recommended that the legislation be amended and apply to all sports, as follows: ~~***Undergraduate***~~ **Student Coach. [FBS]** The limits on the number of coaches in this section do not apply to undergraduate **or graduate** coaches **who are enrolled as full-time students, provided such students are in good academic standing as determined by the institution for all such students and have no previous collegiate or professional coaching experience. Such coaches may receive financial aid that is consistent with financial aid that may be provided to a student-athlete.** ~~*(see Bylaw 11.01.4).*~~ *(Revised: 1/10/91 effective 8/1/92)*

11.7.4.2.3 Volunteer Coach. In sports other than football, l
institution may use the services of one volunteer coach (per By
and cross country are separate sports for purposes of this provisi
women's championships, a combined men's and women's prog
may use two volunteer coaches. *(Adopted: 1/19/92 effective 8/1/92, Revised: 4/26/01 effective 8/1/01, 1/8/07 effective 8/1/07)*

11.7.4.2.3.1 Volunteer Coach—Women's Rowing. In women's rowing, an institution may use the services of four volunteer coaches. *(Adopted: 4/25/01 effective 8/1/01)*

11.7.4.2.3.2 Volunteer Coach—Swimming and Diving. An institution that conducts separate men's and women's swimming programs with a combined men's and women's diving program may employ three volunteer coaches, one for men's swimming, one for women's swimming and one for diving. *(Adopted: 1/10/95 effective 8/1/95)*

11.7.4.2.3.3 Volunteer Coach—Cross Country/Track and Field. An institution that sponsors cross country, indoor track and field, or outdoor track and field as separate sports may use the services of one volunteer coach for each of the sports that it sponsors. Each volunteer coach may coach student-athletes in any of the three sports throughout the academic year. *(Adopted: 4/27/00 effective 8/1/00)*

11.7.4.2.3.4 Volunteer Coach—Track and Field—Pole Vault. An institution that competes in pole vault may use the services of one additional volunteer coach (to coach both genders), limited to coaching pole vault. *(Adopted: 1/12/04)*

11.7.4.2.3.5 Volunteer Coach—Women's Equestrian. In women's equestrian, an institution may use the services of one volunteer coach for the hunt seat riding discipline and one volunteer coach for the western riding discipline. *(Adopted: 1/8/07 effective 8/1/07)*

11.7.4.2.4 Special Attrition Provision. The institution is permitted to meet these limitations through normal attrition only if the institution had in effect prior to September 15, 1990, a written obligation to the assistant coach through academic tenure, an enforceable contract or formal security-of-employment commitment. *(Revised: 1/10/91 effective 8/1/92)*

11.7.4.2.5 Additional Coaches—National Service Academies. National service academies may employ two additional coaches in basketball. *(Revised: 1/10/91 effective 8/1/92, 1/12/04 effective 8/1/04)*

11.7.4.2.6 Exception for Lightweight Rowing. An institution that conducts a rowing program that includes a heavyweight rowing and a lightweight rowing may employ two additional coaches. Each of the institution's rowing teams must have at least one "eight" or two "fours" that compete in at least four spring events. *(Adopted: 1/9/96 effective 8/1/96)*

11.7.4.2.7 Graduate Assistant Coach—Women's Rowing. In women's rowing, an institution may employ one graduate assistant coach (see Bylaw 11.01.3). *(Adopted: 1/9/06 effective 8/1/06)*

11.7.4.3 Off-Campus Recruiting—At Any One Time. It is permissible for a coach to leave campus to engage in off-campus contact or evaluation before another coach who is off campus actually returns to campus, provided the total number of coaches recruiting on behalf of the institution at any time does not exceed the permissible number. The coach being replaced must complete his or her recruiting activities before another coach may begin any off-campus recruiting activity. Further, the replaced coach may not engage in additional recruiting activities until after he or she has returned to the institution's campus. *(Adopted: 1/10/93, Revised: 4/28/05 effective 8/1/05, 12/13/05)*

11.7.4.3.1 Exception—Basketball—July Evaluation Periods. During the July evaluation periods, a replaced coach is not required to return to the institution's campus before engaging in additional recruiting activities, provided not more than three coaches engage in off-campus recruiting activities each day. *(Adopted: 4/30/09)*

11.7.4.3.2 Exception—Sports Other Than Basketball—June, July and August. In sports other than basketball, during June, July and August, a replaced coach is not required to return to the institution's campus before engaging in additional recruiting activities, provided not more than the permissible number of off-campus recruiters in the particular sport engage in off-campus recruiting activities each day (see Bylaw 11.7.4). *(Adopted: 1/15/11)*

11.7.4.4 Banquets or Meetings. In sports other than football, a is [illegible] designed to recognize prospective student-athletes that occurs duri [illegible] recruiter in the applicable sport, regardless of whether the coach is speaking at the banquet/meeting or only attending the function. In those sports with recruiting calendars (e.g., basketball, softball), a coach is not permitted to attend such a recognition that occurs outside a contact or evaluation period, unless the coach has been asked to speak at the function (see Bylaw 13.1.8). *(Adopted: 6/8/99, Revised: 8/14/02)*

Consideration should be given to incorporating this sentence in the appropriate section in Bylaw 13.

11.7.4.5 On-Campus Events—Women's Basketball. In women's basketball, a coaching staff member who attends an athletics event on the institution's campus that involves women's basketball prospective student-athletes is considered an off-campus recruiter. *(Adopted: 1/16/10 effective 8/1/10)*

FIGURE 11-1

The Figure is no longer necessary as a result of the deregulation of coaching categories.

Coaches' Compensation and Benefits

		Head Coach (Bylaw 11.01.2) Assistant Coach (Bylaw 11.01.2)	Volunteer Coach (Bylaw 11.01.5)	Graduate Assistant Coach (Bylaw 11.01.3)	Undergraduate Student Assistant Coach (Bylaw 11.01.4)
I. Compensation or Remuneration					
A.	In excess of full grant-in-aid based on nonresident status	X			
B.	Not more than full grant-in-aid based on actual resident status			X	X
C.	Compensation or remuneration from athletics department prohibited		X		
D.	May receive camp compensation from athletics department	X	X	X	X
E.	May receive camp compensation from source other than athletics department	X	X	X	X
F.	Employment outside athletics department arranged by institution	X	X	X (only during summer)	X
G.	May receive compensation from institution for duties actually performed outside athletics department, from source outside of athletics department	X	X		X
H.	Bowl or postseason-play bonuses	X			
I.	Established graduate or postgraduate award administered outside the institution			X	
II. Benefits					
A.	Complimentary-ticket limit	Unlimited	2 (home contests only in coach's sport)	4	4*
B.	Training table (over and above I-A, B and C compensation)	X			
C.	Use of car (over and above I-A, B and C compensation)	X			
D.	Country club/health club membership or similar complimentary services (over and above I-A, B or C compensation)	X			
E.	Benefits available to all institutional employees (life insurance, health insurance,	X		X	

	disability insurance, tuition waiver)				
F.	Reduction in teaching load without reduction in non-athletics department compensation in recognition of coaching duties (in addition to I-A, B or C compensation)	X			
G.	Complimentary meals incidental to organized team activities, other than training table meals, or in conjunction with official visits		X		
H.	Actual and necessary expenses for spouse and children to attend a licensed postseason football game or an NCAA championship in football or, in women's rowing, a season-ending tournament	X		X	
I.	Incidental expenses during travel and practice for NCAA championship or licensed bowl game			X	
* Admissions, not hard tickets.					

FIGURE 11-2

Coaches' Reimbursable Expenses

		Head Coach (Bylaw 11.01.2) Assistant Coach (Bylaw 11.01.2)	Volunteer Coach (Bylaw 11.01.5)	Graduate Assistant Coach (Bylaw 11.01.3)	Undergraduate Student Assistant Coach (Bylaw 11.01.4)
Expenses—Reimbursable (Room, Board and Transportation)					
A.	Away games	X	X**	X	X
B.	Off-campus recruiting contacts*	X			
C.	Evaluate prospect*	X			
D.	Scout opponent (Bylaw 11.6)***	X			
E.	Parking expenses associated with practice and competition	X	X	X	X****

* See Bylaw 11.7.4 for limitations on the number of coaches that are permitted to contact or evaluate prospects off campus.

** Except in the sports of football and basketball.

*** Only in the sport of lacrosse (see Bylaw 11.6.3).

**** Only parking expenses associated with away-from-home practice and competition.

Executive Summary - Preliminary Report to the NCAA Membership

NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model - Enforcement
February 2012

[Note: This document is an executive summary of the Preliminary Report to the Membership working draft. The working group's efforts are continuing, and the group expects it will make changes to these proposals based on feedback from the membership and affiliated groups. The group intends to submit proposals to the Division I Board of Directors in April and August 2012 after gaining significant feedback, revising the proposals as warranted and circulating revisions to the extent possible.]

A. Background.

In August 2011, NCAA President Mark Emmert and more than 50 presidents and chancellors gathered to examine in broad terms how to sustain the collegiate model and restore public trust in college sports and the NCAA. The presidents identified five significant areas of concern: (1) standards and metrics for the academic success of Division I student-athletes; (2) the allocation of financial resources within intercollegiate rules; (3) the financial well-being of student-athletes; (4) a realigning of how rules governing intercollegiate athletics are determined and an enhanced expectation of shared responsibility at the campus, conference and national levels; and (5) the strong and swift enforcement of those rules that places the greatest emphasis on those violations that if left unattended most significantly denigrate the collegiate model.

The presidents emphasized that there are four acknowledged enduring values that are guiding the entirety of their efforts and will be the measures against which all policies and judgments will be tested:

- Student-athlete success academically and athletically is paramount.
- The collegiate model, in which athletics is embedded in the values of higher education, including shared responsibility and accountability, should be protected and sustained.
- Amateurism as a student-participation model guides the relationship between students and institutions in the collegiate model of athletics.
- Fair opportunity to compete among institutions of similar commitment to inter-collegiate athletics should guide the administration of the collegiate model.

The Working Group on Collegiate Model - Enforcement was formed to primarily focus on the fifth concern, along with contributing to a better definition and clearer expectation of shared responsibility (part of the fourth concern). As one of five committees or working groups addressing a broad spectrum of change, this is the preliminary report to the membership.

B. Brief Overview of Proposed Changes.

This working group was tasked with creating a multi-level NCAA rules violation structure and an enhanced penalty structure for NCAA rules infractions; and re-establishing a sense of shared responsibility, among the interested individuals and entities in intercollegiate athletics, for NCAA rules compliance and enforcement.

Based on the guiding principles of fairness, accountability and process integrity, the working group has (1) reached a number of conclusions regarding the NCAA's current violation, process and penalty structures, as well as the means by which responsibilities for enforcement efforts are currently shared among interested individuals and entities; (2) developed a series of recommended actions to address noted concerns with the current structures and definition of shared responsibility for rules enforcement; and (3) identified the anticipated outcomes for each of the proposed actions. .

1. Violation structure.

The working group is recommending a move from the current model (secondary/major) to a four-level violation structure. The proposed violation structure would be composed of the following levels:

- Level I – The most egregious violations. A Level I violation is a violation that seriously undermines or threatens the integrity of any of the NCAA enduring values (student-athlete success, the collegiate model, amateurism as a student model, competitive equity), including any violation that provides or is intended to provide a significant or extensive recruiting, competitive or other advantage, or significant or extensive impermissible benefit. Multiple Level II, III and/or IV violations collectively may be considered a Level I violation. Individual conduct that is unethical may be classified as a Level I violation, even if the underlying institutional violations are not considered Level I.

- Level II – Serious violations that currently fall between major and secondary violations. A Level II violation is a violation that provides or is intended to provide a minimal to significant recruiting, competitive or other advantage; or includes a minimal to significant impermissible benefit; or involves a pattern of systemic violations in a particular area. Multiple Level III and/or IV violations collectively may be considered a Level II violation. Some limited individual conduct that is unethical or dishonest may be classified as a Level II violation, even if the underlying institutional violations are not considered Level II.

- Level III – Violations that provide some advantage or impermissible benefit that warrant NCAA enforcement staff review. A Level III violation is a

violation that is isolated or limited in nature; provides no more than a minimal recruiting, competitive or other advantage; and does not include more than a minimal impermissible benefit. Multiple Level IV violations collectively may be considered a Level III violation.

- Level IV – Minor or technical issues that do not rise to the level of a serious violation. (The working group notes that this level may not be necessary, or may include only limited violations, depending on the adopted work of the rules working group.) A Level IV issue is an action/inaction that is inadvertent and isolated; limited or technical in nature; and results in a negligible, if any, recruiting, competitive or other advantage or negligible, if any, impermissible benefit. Level IV issues will not impact eligibility.

2. Process structure.

The working group recommends that the NCAA Committee on Infractions be retained to hear and decide the most significant allegations of rules violations. However, the working group recommends that the committee be composed of a more diverse group of persons (e.g., former university presidents, vice presidents, athletics administrators with compliance experience).

The working group recommends that the committee be composed of a larger pool of individuals (a minimum of 18 but ideally at least 24 voting members) from which panels will be composed. In cases involving the most serious allegations of rules violations (Level I), the group recommends that either six or seven committee members will be randomly selected from each representative group to hear the cases. In cases involving allegations of Level II violations, the group proposes that three-member panels will be selected to hear the cases.

The working group recommends a number of other process modifications, applicable to cases categorized as Level I or Level II, including the following:

- Increase the availability of written case submissions to the Committee on Infractions, at the option of the institution and/or affected individuals, with agreement by the enforcement staff, even when there is disagreement on the facts, so that certain matters may be decided without the need for a full hearing.

- Redesign the notice of allegations to allow the member institution and/or involved individuals immediate access to the information on which the allegations are based and eliminate the need for a staff-prepared case summary, yet allowing for staff rebuttal when necessary.

- Introduce the availability of informally resolved infractions cases in situations in which the involved institution and/or affected individuals do not dispute the allegations or penalties in Level I and Level II cases (as reflected in the Penalty Guidelines), thereby significantly reducing the cost and anticipated timeline in serious infractions cases.

- Introduce the option of decreasing the amount of time between the notice of allegations and the institution's response from 90 to 60 days.

- Introduce the concept of a prehearing conference, with the Committee on Infractions panel chair presiding, in which preliminary issues are resolved prior to the full hearing of the infractions case including, when applicable, any disputes regarding the level at which the allegations have been charged.

- Use of an online case materials submission system and videoconferencing.

- Introduce the concept of NCAA staff-recommended penalties, pursuant to the Penalty Guidelines.

- Increase the availability of an expedited hearing before a Committee on Infractions representative at the request of the involved institution and/or involved individuals.

- Introduce time limitations for the preparation of hearing transcripts (two weeks), as well as the issuance of infractions reports and appeals reports (four weeks).

- Add additional staff to support the office of the Committees on Infractions.

With respect to matters categorized as Level III or Level IV, the working group recommends the following:

- In situations involving Level III violations, NCAA staff will continue to work with institutions, much the same as under the current secondary violations process, to determine whether infractions have occurred and, if so, the appropriate penalties to be imposed.

- In Level III matters, member institutions would continue to have access to a case precedent database, thereby allowing confirmation that staff-imposed penalties are consistent with those imposed in previously decided similar situations.

- In situations involving Level IV issues, the conference with which the involved institution is associated will work with the institution to determine

whether issues need to be addressed and, if so, the appropriate penalties to be imposed, if any. The group anticipates that the conferences will report these actions annually to the NCAA and/or will share information of issues/ responses with the other conferences.

3. Penalty structure.

For cases involving allegations of Level I and Level II violations, the working group recommends a range of penalties set out in Penalty Guidelines. The working group recommends that a number of penalties constitute core penalties and form the basis for the Penalty Guidelines. Each of these penalties includes varying degrees of severity. The working group believes that the severity of the penalty imposed must correspond with the significance of the rule violation(s). The recommended core penalties:

(a) Competition limitations [e.g., limitations imposed on participation in postseason play for varying lengths of time (depending upon the severity of the infractions) in given sport(s)].

(b) Financial penalties [e.g., return revenue received from a given (fact-specific) event or series of events (e.g., revenues received for participation in tournament, bowl game or televised broadcasts)].

(c) Scholarship limitations [e.g., limitations of athletics scholarships in head count sports [by number or percentage, depending upon the sport(s) involved] for varying lengths of time in given sport(s)].

(d) Recruiting limitations [e.g., limitations of the number of allowable official paid visits at the institution for varying lengths of time in given sport(s)].

(e) Probation.

(f) Show cause orders (if applicable in a given case).

The working group recommends that the best means by which the committee may impose a penalty that falls within a more/less severe range of penalties is if it determines that certain aggravating and/or mitigating circumstances exist in Level I or II cases. The group continues to refine the lists of aggravating and mitigating factors. The Committee on Infractions will determine the presence and weight of the individual factors in a given case and may balance these factors in the decision-making process.

The committee may determine whether the presence of one or more of the aggravating and/or mitigating factors exist and, if so, how those factors affect the classification of the case. As a result, the presence of some aggravating factors and no mitigating factors may elevate the case classification to "aggravation" or "significant aggravation." Conversely, if there are mitigating factors in a case and no aggravating factors, the case classification would be "mitigation" or "significant mitigation."

4. Shared responsibility specific to compliance efforts and investigations.

The working group recommends that the concept of shared responsibility be better defined and specific expectations be identified for given roles within the compliance and enforcement processes. The working group will provide a final report on this issue to the Board in August 2012.

5. Head coach responsibility.

The working group proposes that the rationale for Proposal No. 2004-102, which is currently Bylaw 11.1.2.1, be amended to presume that the head coach is responsible (instead of knowledgeable and, therefore, responsible) for not promoting an atmosphere of compliance and/or monitoring his/her staff. The working group recommends that at the April 2012 meeting, the Board of Directors support a recommitment to the original intent of Bylaw 11.1.2.1 and the addition of clarifying language to the rationale.

The working group is recommending that the penalty guidelines emphasize that Level I and II violations of Bylaw 11.1.2.1 should result in a show cause order with suspension from contests as one of the show cause requirements. The working group recognizes that employment decisions related to coaches or any athletics personnel rest solely with our member institutions. The recommended specific suspension requirements are:

- For the head coach who commits a Standard Level II violation of this bylaw, his/her employing institution will be required to withhold the coach from 10 to 30 percent of the institution's next games. The suspensions may include postseason contests and/or carry over to the next season.

- For the head coach who commits a Standard Level I violation of this bylaw, his/her employing institution will be required to withhold the coach from 20 to 50 percent of the institution's next games. The suspensions may include postseason contests and/or carry over to the next season.

The working group proposes that for Level III violations, a list of identified violations warranting head coach suspension for football, men's basketball and possibly other sports be examined and expanded as appropriate to address what are presumed to be intentional secondary recruiting violations.

D. Desired Outcomes.

The specific outcomes the working group expects from the changes to the violation, process and penalty structures are noted below:

1. Violation structure.

A new violation structure that appropriately categorizes the severity of infractions and allows for different levels of accountability for institutions and individuals.

2. Process structure.

a. A much faster mode for processing violations that delivers expediency without compromising process integrity or fairness.

- Clear metrics for every stage of processing a case.

b. Clear understanding of what aspects of enforcement and student-athlete reinstatement cases can be more transparent and corresponding transparency where appropriate.

3. Penalty structure.

a. Strong penalties that are predictable, deter the risk-reward analysis and address any unfair advantage.

b. Clear definition of institutional control.

- Rewards/incentives for effective compliance programs.
- Rewards/incentives for strong institutional action to address wrong-doing.

c. Rewards/incentives for individuals acknowledging violations.

d. Increased accountability for head coaches.

4. Shared responsibility.

- Strengthened support for institutional leadership.

Clear definition of shared responsibility and resulting expectations of individuals, institutions, conferences and the national office staff.

Concepts--Division I Women's Basketball Recruiting Model

Feature	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Current Rules	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- New Rule	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Concepts	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments/Outstanding Issues
Recruiting Calendar Evaluations					
Overall Concepts	• Permissible number of coaches recruiting off campus at any one time. Three - except during July evaluation periods. • Seven recruiting opportunities per prospective student-athlete annually. • 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year per institution annually. • Evaluations of live athletics activities may occur at regularly scheduled high school, preparatory school and two-year college contests/tournaments, practices			• Change: Permit four coaches to engage in off-campus evaluations at any one time. • Maintain: Seven recruiting opportunities per prospective student-athlete annually. • Maintain: 100 recruiting-person days during the academic year per institution annually. • Maintain: Evaluations of live athletics activities may occur at regularly scheduled high school, preparatory school and two-year college contests/tournaments and practices and regular scholastic activities involving	• RWG: Considering to eliminate restriction on number of coaches recruiting at one time; all sports. • RWG: Considering to eliminate limit of seven recruiting opportunities per prospect and limit by overall number of reruiting person days by sport, per institution. • Retain 100 recruiting person days for women's basketball. • Retain scholastic evaluation legislation for men's and women's basketball. • Recommendation to RWG: Glossary of terms concept, define nonscholastic vs. scholastic.

Feature	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Current Rules	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- New Rule	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Concepts	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments/Outstanding Issues
	and regular scholastic activities involving prospective student-athletes enrolled only at the institution at which the regular scholastic activities occur.			prospective student-athletes enrolled only at the institution at which the regular scholastic activities occur. (NCAA Proposal No. 2011-34, Adopted Jan 2012). • Permit a coach to engage in recruiting conversations with a prospective student-athlete during institutional camp or clinic. (Proposal No. 2011-48)	• Proposal No. 2011-48 tabled by LGC. Request adoption in April 2012.
October	Evaluations at certified nonscholastic events permitted during Friday, Saturday and Sunday of fall contact period.			• Maintain: Permit evaluations at certified nonscholastic events during Friday, Saturday and Sunday of fall contact period. • Maintain: Evaluation period may not conflict with ACT/SAT testing dates.	• Request to retain nonscholastic evaluations format during academic year within WBB calendar (e.g., Friday, Saturday, Sunday format, no conflict with testing dates).

Feature	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Current Rules	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- New Rule	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Concepts	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments/Outstanding Issues
April	Five-day evaluation period. Evaluations at certified nonscholastic events permitted during Friday, Saturday and Sunday of Spring evaluation period.	• Permits evaluations at certified nonscholastic events on two weekends. • Neither weekend may fall on ACT/SAT testing dates or Easter. • Events must be subject to the NCAA certification program. Events may not begin before 6 p.m. Friday and must conclude not later than 4 p.m. Sunday.	Effective immediately. 2012 Weekends: • April 20-22 • April 27-29	• Maintain: Five-day evaluation period. • Maintain: Permit evaluations at certified nonscholastic events during Friday, Saturday and Sunday of spring evaluation period. • Maintain: Evaluation period may not conflict with ACT/SAT testing dates. • Add: Period may not conflict with Easter and certified events may not begin before 6 p.m. Friday and must conclude not later than 4 p.m.Sunday.	• Request to retain nonscholastic evaluations format during academic year within WBB calendar (e.g., Friday, Saturday, Sunday format, no conflict with testing dates). • Request addition of Easter.
July	Evaluations permitted at certified nonscholastic events during two 10-day evaluation periods.	Permit evaluations at nonscholastic certified events during a total of 12 days in July; the 12 days consist of three four-day periods that run from 5 p.m. Wednesday to 5 p.m. Sunday beginning with the	Effective immediately. Beginning July 6 and concluding July 31, all days or portions of days not included in the evaluation periods are considered dead periods.	Change: Permit evaluations at nonscholastic certified events during a total of 14 days in July; the 14 days consist of two seven-day periods. The first seven consecutive	• Proposal No. 2011-54 tabled by LGC. Request adoption in April 2012. Both men and women's basketball: Continue to study a model that

Feature	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Current Rules	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- New Rule	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Concepts	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments/Outstanding Issues
		first Wednesday on or after July 6.	2012 dates • July 11 (5p.m.) - July 15 (5p.m.) • July 18 (5p.m.) - July 22 (5p.m.) • July 25 (5p.m.) - July 29 (5p.m.)	days beginning July 6 and the first seven consecutive days following the end of the initial July evaluation period and a 10-day dead period. The remainder of July is a dead period (7-10-7 format). (Proposal No. 2011-54)	provides for the establishment of non-exclusive evaluation camps as either a pilot or full-blown program. Issues to be determined: • Site(s). • Numbers and ages of prospective student-athletes. • Format. • Management (NCAA, USA Basketball, iHoops). • Coaches ability to work camps. • Cost.
Communication with Prospective Student-Athletes					
Types	Phone, email, fax only.	• Eliminates restrictions on all modes of communication on or after June 15 at the completion of the prospective student-athletes sophomore year in high school. • Eliminates communication restrictions applicable to prospective student-	Effective June 15, 2012. • Communication restrictions during certified basketball events (April/July) remain applicable to prospective student-athletes' coaches and individuals associated with prospective student-athletes.	Change: Eliminate restrictions on all modes of communication.	• RWG: Considering removal of restrictions on all modes of communication; all sports.
Phone call frequency	• One telephone call during the month of April of the individual's junior year in high school on or after the Thursday after			Change: Specify period when communication with prospective student-athelte is permitted.	• RWG: Considering June 15 at completion of PSA's sophomore year in high school as trigger date for communication; all sports.

Feature	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Current Rules	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- New Rule	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Concepts	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments/Outstanding Issues
	the conclusion of the NCAA Division I Women's Final Four. • One telephone call during the month of May of the individual's junior year in high school. • One telephone call on or after June 1 through June 20 of the individual's junior year in high school. • One telephone call on or after June 21 through June 30 of the individual's junior year in high school. • Three telephone calls during the month of July following the individual's junior year in high school, with not more than one telephone call per	athletes (and prospective student-athletes' parents/legal guardians/relatives) participating in certified basketball events (April/July).			Additional discussion: Eliminate communication restrictions applicable to prospective student-athletes (and prospective student-athletes' parents/legal guardians/relatives) participating in certified basketball events (April/July)?

Feature	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Current Rules	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- New Rule	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Concepts	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments/Outstanding Issues
	week [see NCAA Bylaw 13.1.6.2.2-(c)]. If an individual attends an educational institution that uses a nontraditional academic calendar (e.g., Southern Hemisphere) the institution may begin to place one telephone call per week to the individual beginning on the opening day of classes of the individual's senior year in high school. • Thereafter, one telephone call per week outside a contact period and unlimited telephone calls during a contact period.				

Feature	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Current Rules	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- New Rule	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Concepts	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments/Outstanding Issues
Off-Campus Contacts and Evaluations					
Off-campus contact starting point	July 1 after junior year of high school.	• Off-campus contacts may be made with a prospective student-athlete during the junior year in high school. • Recruiting periods other than April – contacts during the junior year only at the prospective student-athlete's educational institution. • April recruiting period – contacts during the junior year only at the prospective student-athlete's educational institution or at the prospective student-athlete's residence.	Effective August 1, 2012. • Current rule limiting visits to a prospective student-athlete's educational institution to not more than once a week remains applicable.	• Change: Earlier permissible date when off-campus contacts may be made with a prospective student-athlete.	RWG: Considering TBD date to permit off-campus contact and same date for communication; all sports (e.g., June 15 following completion of junior year). Additional discussion: appropriate date for off-campus contacts. Additional discussion: Off-campus contacts may be made at the prospective student-athlete's educational institution or residence at specific times?
Off-campus contact in conjunction with an evaluation	Prohibited during evaluation period.	• Permits recruiting opportunities with juniors and seniors to be either contacts or evaluations. Contacts may not be made during the time period when classes are in session or during the entire day of a prospective student-	Effective August 1, 2012. • Institutions are permitted to still have seven recruiting opportunities during each academic year. • The two weekends in April and the three four-day periods in July	Change: Permit recruiting opportunities with juniors and seniors to be either contacts or evaluations. Contacts may not be made during the time period when classes are in session or during the entire day of a prospective student-	RWG: Considering redefinition of recruiting or dead periods; all sports. During recruiting periods contact and evaluations permissible (no longer distinguish).

Feature	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Current Rules	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- New Rule	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Concepts	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments/Outstanding Issues
		athlete's competition. • The current academic year recruiting calendar establishes recruiting periods, during which contact and evaluation is permissible.	in which coaches are permitted to observe prospective student-athletes participating in certified nonscholastic events are evaluation periods only. In general, no contacts with any prospective student-athletes are permitted during these periods.	athlete's competition.	
Official Visits					
Starting Point	Senior year of high school. May not occur during a dead period.	• January 1 of the junior year through the senior year of high school.	Effective August 1, 2012. • Current requirements (standardized test score, high school transcript, register with NCAA Eligibility Center, placed on institution's Institutional Requet List) necessary to provide an official visit remain applicable. • Included in the total number of permissible	Change: Specify starting point. • Current requirements (standardized test score, high school transcript, register with NCAA Eligibility Center, placed on institution's IRL) necessary to provide an official visit remain applicable.	RWG: Considering January 1 of the junior year through the senior year of high school; one per institution.

Feature	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Current Rules	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- New Rule	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Concepts	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments/Outstanding Issues
			visits for the prospective student-athlete and the institution. • Permits official visits during the summer.	• Included in the total number of permissible visits for the prospective student-athlete and the institution. • Permits official visits during the summer. • Does not permit official visits during a dead period.	
Travel Expenses	Prospective Student-Athlete	• May be provided to the prospective student-athlete and two parents/legal guardians.	Effective August 1, 2012.	No position stated yet: May be provided to the prospective student-athlete and one parent/legal guardian.	

Feature	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Current Rules	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- New Rule	Men's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Concepts	Women's Basketball Recruiting Model -- Additional Comments/Outstanding Issues
Other Concepts					
On-campus skill evaluations (OCE) formerly known as tryouts	Prohibited	See document for outline of men's model.		No position stated yet.	Considerations: Only during official visits. For those who haven't signed yet.
Academic and Access Model for Prospective Student-Athletes and Student-Athletes	Countable athletically related activites during the summer are prohibited.	See document for outline of men's model.		No position stated yet.	Considerations: Premise was to permit opportunity to enhance skills. Individual sport SA's may request to work with coach during summer. Why not team sport SA's? Focus on individualized skill development. No team practice.

SUPPLEMENT NO. 5A
DI Leadership Council 4/12

MEMORANDUM

March 23, 2012

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

TO: NCAA Leadership Council.

FROM: Leadership Council Agent Subcommittee.

SUBJECT: Agent Registration program.

The agent subcommittee is asking the Leadership Council to recommend legislation that all agents/advisors who wish to represent a student-athlete in their future professional athletics career to register with the NCAA.

The NCAA will share the pertinent information about registered agents/advisors through one database accessible by member institutions. This measure will assist in providing information to member institutions and student-athletes who are making decisions about their potential professional careers. Additionally, this online database will help educate student-athletes and institutions on specific agents by providing items such as agent contact information, list of employees, agent disciplinary history, etc.

Remaining issues for discussion:

1. Agent Incentive. There needs to be some incentive for the agent to register in this program. One possibility is nonregistered agents would not be permitted to participate in on-campus agent days or other athletics department meetings or functions.

2. Student-athlete/Prospective Student-Athlete Eligibility. A player's eligibility may be affected if he/she has hired or utilized the services of a non-registered agent. In the similar manner as a violation of accepting benefits from an agent (Bylaw 12.3.1.2), any player who had contact with a non-registered agent would have to seek reinstatement.

RNB:mrs

Confidential/ For NCAA Committee Discussion Only

NCAA Agent Registration Program

Overview

The goal of an NCAA Agent Registration Program is to register all agents/advisors who wish to represent student-athlete's in their future professional athletics careers with the NCAA. The NCAA will share the pertinent information about registered agents/advisors through one database accessible by member institutions. This measure will assist in providing information to member institutions and student-athletes who are making decisions about their potential professional careers. Additionally, this online database will help educate student-athletes and institutions on specific agents by providing items such as agent contact information, list of employees, agent disciplinary history, etc.

Mission

- To establish a program that can assist student-athletes and member institutions in the education of agents/advisors and the role these individuals will play in the student-athletes future professional career.

- To compile one database that organizes individuals that would trigger the NCAA definition of an agent and various professional league players associations' registered agents/advisors contact information, list of employees or other individuals employed to recruit on their behalf, representation history and list any disciplinary actions against them. It will be used as a go-to resource for all institutional personnel to assist our student-athletes in his or her transition to a professional sports career.

- To create a quick and easy process for certified agents and any individual that wishes to represent prospective or enrolled student-athletes to register with the NCAA, thus allowing their information to be easily accessible by member institutions and allowing an opportunity to provide education to the group as well.

Benefits

- A national registration program allows one central database to serve all member institutions with information about agents/advisors. Currently, some member institutions have their own agent registration program in place. However, information in separate databases may be inaccurate and out of date. Additionally, many institutions do not have any registration programs and are unfamiliar with many of the agents/advisors, and therefore are unable to

provide student-athletes with appropriate advice regarding the agent process. This database will help to curb the lack of knowledge that some institutions struggle with.

- A registration program allows NCAA staff and member institutions to have a better accounting of agents/advisors, and will facilitate direct communication between agents/advisors; institutions and NCAA staff, thus allowing institutions and the NCAA staff to have accurate information about each agent.

- This registration program allows for an opportunity to provide education about NCAA rules and regulations to agents/advisors at the time of registration, thus ensuring that all agents and advisors receive the same NCAA rules education pertaining to agent activities, regardless of sport or professional league players association rules education.

- This registration program provides a secure web-based system through which registration for agents/advisors would be effortless and easily accessible for member institutions to view information useful to student-athletes in their transition to a professional sports career.

Registration Process

1. Who has to register?

Any agent or advisor who wishes to represent a student-athlete or meet with a student-athlete on campus must register.

a. According to NCAA rules, an agent is any individual who markets a student-athlete's skills to any professional team (e.g., contact professional teams to discuss student-athlete's skills, set up tryouts for student-athlete with professional teams).

b. The term "advisor" is not defined in the NCAA Manual, but rather is a term that has been adopted by some, in part, to suggest compliance with NCAA agent legislation. The label an individual places on himself or herself is irrelevant to whether or not that individual triggers NCAA agent legislation. Any person that engages in impermissible activities could be considered an agent under NCAA legislation.

c. The NCAA definition of agent can include financial planners, business managers, "brand" managers, marketing representatives or any other individual who wishes to represent the student-athlete at the professional level or profit from a student-athletes future professional career.

2. How do individuals register?

a. Agents will register with the NCAA through a secure website. The agents will be required to submit:

- Name;
- Agency;
- Business address;
- Phone numbers (office and cell);
- Email address;
- Social network profiles/names;
- Business website;
- Names of individuals employed by the agent;
- States registered, and years certified;
- Organization/player association registrations, and years certified;
- List of clients;
- List of former clients; and
- List of past disciplinary actions taken against the agent by any players associations.

b. Before submitting their information, agents will be required to read through applicable NCAA bylaws and sign a statement verifying they have read and understand the NCAA agent legislation and that the information provided is accurate and true.

c. Once an applicant submits his/her information, NCAA personnel will review the applicant's information with the appropriate professional players association and state.

3. Are there any requirements for agents before registration?

No. If the definition of an agent changes, then all individuals that might meet the definition would need to register. Thus, this would include financial advisors, marketing reps, etc.

4. Who will have access to the NCAA Agent Registration Database?

a. Once an agent is registered with the NCAA Agent Registration Database, that agent will have access to the database to be able to view his/her profile. It would need to be discussed if that access should be limited only to the agent's personal profile or the profiles of other registered agents as well.

b. All member institutions will have a unique username and password to access the NCAA Agent Registration Database. Institutional personnel will be able to browse and view

agent profiles. The information they will see will be the same information an agent would see if an agent signed on. The most convenient way to accomplish this is to build the database within the current LSDBi.

c. Agents and institutional personnel will be able to search the list and view information based on select criteria (i.e., name, agency, email address, facebook/twitter profile name, registration state).

5. How often must agents register with the NCAA?

An agent must renew his or her registration every year or when his/her information changes. The renewal application will go through the same verification process as the original application. This will also account for any situation whereby an agent's status with applicable player associations and/or states changes.

Remaining Issues

1. It is unclear how to make this NCAA registration program a mandatory requirement for agents when the NCAA has no real authority over the agent.

   Possible Resolution:

   a. Most likely, there would need to be legislation requiring an agent to be registered with the NCAA prior to going on campus or contacting student-athletes.

   b. Enforcement of this legislation would be left up to institutions, in the same matter as any other Bylaw 12.3 violation.

      1) A player's eligibility may be affected if he/she has hired or utilized the services of a non-registered agent. Institutions shall give student-athletes a list of names on the approved registration list at the beginning of each season. In the similar manner as a violation of accepting benefits from an agent (Bylaw 12.3.1.2), any player who had contact with a non-registered agent would have to seek reinstatement.

   c. Institutions shall monitor the presence of agents on their campus. One possible way to address this would be to require each agent to contact the school before coming to campus. The institutions can then document which agents were on campus and at what times. It would be helpful for institutional personnel to develop some sort of relationship with the registered agents to help facilitate this communication.

2. Is there incentive for agents to register with this program?

   There needs to be some type of incentive for the agent to register with this program. Again, as previously discussed, a legislative recommendation mandating that an agent cannot meet with or speak to student-athletes on campus if they are not registered is one possibility. Additionally, nonregistered agents would not be permitted to participate in on-campus agent days or other athletic department meetings or functions.

3. Should a fee be required?

   The player associations charge an initial fee for registration, as do states that have adopted the Uniform Athlete Agent law. An item for discussion should be whether a processing fee should be charged. It is reasonable to assume that the agents would be opposed; inasmuch as they are already paying numerous fees to states/associations/etc. and do not want to pay another fee.

4. Would this NCAA Agent Registration Program have any effect on the NCAA Amateurism Certification Process (ACP) staff at the Eligibility Center?

   It would seem appropriate that the ACP staff would have access to the database in order to cross reference individuals named in the amateurism certification process of prospective student-athletes.

Items for Discussion

1. Penalty for prospective or enrolled student-athletes that do not use an NCAA registered agent?

2. Institutional culpability for allowing student-athletes or unregistered agents on to campus?

3. Enforceability of the registration process and possible violations by PSA/SA or institution.

1. Conference Request

Seeking the Leadership Council's support to permit the Great West Conference to be recognized in the Division I governance as an active Division I conference under the requirements in effect at the time of its formation. (Bylaw 20.3. 1.2 – minimum number of members required to be considered an active NCAA Division I conference)

2. Rationale for request

Beginning in 2007, The NCAA imposed a four-year moratorium that "no institution may begin the multidivisional membership reclassification process, no institution shall be permitted to seek classification or reclassification in the Football Championship Subdivision, and no new single-sport or multisport conference shall be elected to Division I conference membership." This effectively prohibited the Great West Conference from growing its membership as other Division I Independents would not join the conference with our multi-sport status and automatic qualifying eligibility unknown. Additionally, there was no independent representation involved in the legislative decision-making process**. Had the existing NCAA Division I institutions acting under the Great West been able to apply as an NCAA conference meeting the minimum 6 institution requirement, conference membership would have stabilized and fulfilled that requirement in 2008-09.**

- Attachment A - Membership Participation by Sport presents a chronology since 2005-06 of institutions that have scheduled regular and postseason competition with the Great West.

- Attachment B – Great West Conference –Active Division I Status presents the year in which active Division I status was attained by members and the impact of the moratorium on the ability to stabilize membership.

Since becoming a football only conference in 2004, the Great West began movement towards becoming a multisport conference in 2005-06. Based on advice from then NCAA President Myles Brand, in the summer of 2005 seven institutions - IPFW, Northern Colorado, North Dakota St., South Dakota St., Texas A&M-Corpus Christie, Texas-Pan American and Utah Valley – signed contracts and began regular-season competition in the sports of men's and women's basketball for the 2005-06 academic year. There was also a post-season championship conducted in the sport of cross country, with 11 institutions participating.

In 2006-07 - Northern Colorado joined the Big Sky Conference and Texas A&M-Corpus Christi joined the Southland Conference, but the remaining 5 independents were joined by New Jersey Institute of Technology to continue this journey toward achieving multi-sport status by scheduling regular-season competition in men's basketball, women's basketball, volleyball and baseball. Nine institutions also competed in a post-season cross country championship.

2007-08 is the first year of the moratorium a four-year moratorium that froze all movement up to the NCAA Division I level for both institutions and the Great West's ability to apply for multisport conference membership. IPFW, North Dakota State and South Dakota State all joined the Summit League, drastically hampering these Division I independent institutions from having the numbers required to reach active NCAA conference membership status. Eight remaining NCAA Division I independents went ahead and scheduled contests for regular-season play and also held post-season

tournaments in the sports of men's basketball, women's basketball, volleyball, baseball and cross country.

At the beginning of 2010-11 the Great West had four active Division I members with Longwood and CSU Bakersfield as potential conference members. During the first two years of the moratorium, CSU Bakersfield participated in Men's Basketball, Women's Basketball, and Women's Volleyball (2007-08 and 2008-09) and will participate in women's tennis and outdoor track and field during 2011-12. Longwood also expressed interest in joining since 2007-08 but, raised concerns about multi conference recognition and AQ as efforts to address and amend membership standards through the legislative process stalled without a voice in the governance structure . Had the Great West been able to apply for multi-sport conference membership during the moratorium, it would have been able to stabilize its membership with the minimum 6 active Division I institutions under the previous standards. Instead, there has been a steady attrition of its charter membership with Houston Baptist, University of North Dakota slated to leave and potential member Longwood searching elsewhere.

The Great West requests to be recognized as a Division I multisport conference beginning in 2012-13 based on 6 active members. If this were granted. CSU Bakersfield would join current 5 active Division I members and with multisport conference recognition permit the conference to stabilize its membership during 2012-13.

MEMBERSHIP PARTICIPATION – MEN'S BASKETBALL

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Members who Competed in Regular Season Competition	IPFW N. Colorado N. Dakota St. S. Dakota St. Tex. A&M C.C. Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	IPFW NJIT N. Dakota St. S. Dakota St. Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago St. CSU-Bakersfield Houston Baptist NJIT Utah Valley	Chicago St. CSU-Bakersfield Houston Baptist NJIT Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota S. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota S. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley
Members who Competed in Post Season Competition				N. Dakota S. Dakota Seattle	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota S. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota S. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley

---

Member	Consecutive Years of Regular Season Competition	Consecutive Years of Post Season Competition
CSU-Bakersfield	2	
Chicago State	4	3
Houston Baptist	5	3
IPFW	2	
NJIT	6	3
North Dakota	3	4
North Dakota State	2	
Northern Colorado	1	
South Dakota	2	3
South Dakota State	2	
Texas A&M, Corpus Christie	1	
Texas-Pan American	3	3
Utah Valley	7	3

MEMBERSHIP PARTICIPATION – WOMEN'S BASKETBALL

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Members who Competed in Regular Season Competition	IPFW N. Colorado N. Dakota St. S. Dakota St. Tex. A&M C.C. Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	IPFW NJIT N. Dakota St. S. Dakota St. Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago St. CSU-Bakersfield NJIT Utah Valley	Chicago St. CSU-Bakersfield Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota S. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota S. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley
Members who Competed in Post Season Competition			Chicago St. CSU-Bakersfield NJIT Utah Valley	Chicago St. Longwood NJIT Savannah St. Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley N. Dakota S. Dakota Seattle	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota S. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota S. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley

---

Member	Consecutive Years of Regular Season Competition	Consecutive Years of Post Season Competition
CSU-Bakersfield	2	
Chicago State	4	5
Houston Baptist	4	3
IPFW	2	
NJIT	6	5
North Dakota	4	4
North Dakota State	2	
Northern Colorado	1	
South Dakota	2	3
South Dakota State	2	3
Texas A&M, Corpus Christie	2	
Tex-Pan American	4	5
Utah Valley	7	5

MEMBERSHIP PARTICIPATION – BASEBALL

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Members who Competed in Regular Season Competition		IPFW N. Dakota St. S. Dakota St. N. Colorado Utah Valley	Houston Baptist N. Colorado Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley		Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT NYIT N. Colorado N. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT NYIT N. Colorado N. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT NYIT N. Colorado N. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley
Members who Competed in Post Season Competition	IPFW NYIT N. Dakota St. N. Colorado S. Dakota St. Utah Valley	Chicago St. IPFW NJIT NYIT N. Dakota St. N. Colorado S. Dakota St. Utah Valley	Houston Baptist LeMoyne NJIT NYIT Tex-Pan Am.	Houston Baptist N. Colorado Tex-Pan Am.	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT NYIT N. Colorado N. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT NYIT N. Colorado N. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT NYIT N. Colorado N. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley

---

Member	Consecutive Years of Regular Season Competition	Consecutive Years of Post Season Competition
Chicago State	3	3
Houston Baptist	3	5
IPFW	1	2
LeMoyne		1
NJIT	3	3
NYIT	3	3
North Dakota	3	3
North Dakota State	1	2
Northern Colorado	3	4
South Dakota State	1	2
Tex-Pan American	3	5
Utah Valley	3	3

MEMBERSHIP PARTICIPATION – VOLLEYBALL

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Members who Competed in Regular Season Competition	IPFW N. Colorado N. Dakota St. S. Dakota St. Tex-Pan Am Utah Valley	IPFW N. Dakota St. S. Dakota St. Tex-Pan Am Utah Valley	Chicago St. CSU-Bakersfield NJIT Providence Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago St. CSU-Bakersfield Houston Baptist Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota South Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota South Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley
Members who Competed in Post Season Competition	IPFW N. Colorado N. Dakota St. Providence S. Dakota St. Tex-Pan Am Utah Valley	IPFW N. Dakota St. Providence S. Dakota St. Tex-Pan Am Utah Valley	Chicago St. CSU-Bakersfield NJIT Providence Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	CSU-Bakersfield NJIT Providence Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota S. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota S. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago State Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley

---

Member	Consecutive Years of Regular Season Competition	Consecutive Years of Post Season Competition
Chicago State	5	3
CSU-Bakersfield	2	2
Houston Baptist	4	3
IPFW	2	2
NJIT	3	5
North Dakota	3	3
North Dakota State	2	2
Northern Colorado	1	1
Providence	1	4
South Dakota	2	2
South Dakota State	2	2
Tex-Pan American	7	7
Utah Valley	7	7

MEMBERSHIP PARTICIPATION – WOMEN'S SOCCER

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Members who Competed in Regular Season Competition	Delaware St. Howard IPFW Longwood NJIT South Carolina St. Utah Valley	Delaware St. Howard IPFW Longwood N. Dakota St. South Carolina St. S. Dakota St. Utah Valley	Delaware St. Howard Longwood NJIT S. Carolina St. Utah Valley	Delaware St. Howard Longwood NJIT S. Carolina St. Utah Valley	Delaware St. Howard Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota S. Carolina St. S. Dakota Utah Valley	Delaware St. Howard Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota S. Carolina St. S. Dakota Utah Valley	Delaware St. Howard Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota S. Carolina St. Utah Valley
Members who Competed in Post Season Competition	Howard Longwood NJIT Utah Valley	Howard IPFW Longwood N. Dakota St. S. Dakota St. Utah Valley	Delaware St. Howard Longwood NJIT S. Carolina St. Utah Valley	Delaware St. Howard Longwood NJIT S. Carolina St. Utah Valley	Delaware St. Howard Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota S. Carolina St. S. Dakota Utah Valley	Delaware St. Howard Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota S. Carolina St. S. Dakota Utah Valley	Delaware St. Howard Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota S. Carolina St. Utah Valley

---

Member	Consecutive Years of Regular Season Competition	Consecutive Years of Post Season Competition
Delaware St.	7	5
Houston Baptist	3	3
Howard	7	7
IPFW	2	1
Longwood	4	4
NJIT	5	5
North Dakota	3	3
North Dakota State	1	1
South Carolina State	7	5
South Dakota	2	2
Utah Valley	7	7

MEMBERSHIP PARTICIPATION – M & W CROSS COUNTRY

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Members who Competed in Championship Competition	UC Davis IPFW Longwood NJIT N. Dakota St. N. Colorado S. Dakota St. Tex. A&M C.C. Tex-Pan Am.	Chicago St. UC Davis IPFW Longwood NJIT N. Dakota St. N. Colorado S. Dakota St. Tex-Pan Am.	Chicago St. Houston Baptist NJIT Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago St. Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota S. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago St. Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota Seattle S. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago St. Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota Seattle S. Dakota Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley	Chicago St. Houston Baptist NJIT N. Dakota Seattle Tex-Pan Am. Utah Valley

---

TIMELINE OF MEMBERSHIP

	Chicago State	Houston Baptist	IPFW	NJIT	N. Dakota	N. Dakota State	No. Colorado	S. Dakota	S. Dakota State	TX A&M	TX Pan Am	Utah Valley
When Became Active Div. I Member	1989-90	2011-12	2007-08	2009-10	2012-13	2008-09	2007-08	2012-13	2008-09	2002-03	1976-77	2009-10
Year Joined AQ Eligible Conference			2006-07			2007-08	2006-07	2011-12	2007-08	2006-07		

2009-10 Men's Sports	Baseball	Basketball	Cross Country	Golf	Indoor Track	Outdoor Track	Football
	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Cal Poly
	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	UC Davis
	NJIT	NJIT	NJIT	North Dakota	NJIT	NJIT	North Dakota
	North Dakota	North Dakota	North Dakota	South Dakota	North Dakota	North Dakota	South Dakota
	UTPA	South Dakota	Seattle	UTPA	Seattle	Seattle	Southern Utah
	Utah Valley	UTPA	South Dakota	Utah Valley	South Dakota	South Dakota	
	NYIT	Utah Valley	UTPA		UTPA	UTPA	
	N. Colorado		Utah Valley		Utah Valley	Utah Valley	
Total	**8**	**7**	**8**	**6**	**8**	**8**	**5**

Women's Sports	Basketball	Cross Country	Golf	Soccer	Softball	Tennis	Indoor Track	Outdoor Track	Volleyball
	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Delaware St.	Houston Baptist	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Chicago St.
	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	North Dakota	NJIT	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist
	NJIT	NJIT	North Dakota	Howard	South Dakota	North Dakota	NJIT	NJIT	NJIT
	North Dakota	North Dakota	South Dakota	NJIT	Utah Valley	South Dakota	North Dakota	North Dakota	North Dakota
	South Dakota	Seattle	UTPA	North Dakota		UTPA	Seattle	Seattle	South Dakota
	UTPA	South Dakota	Utah Valley	South Dakota			South Dakota	South Dakota	UTPA
	Utah Valley	UTPA		S. Carolina St.			UTPA	UTPA	Utah Valley
		Utah Valley		Utah Valley			Utah Valley	Utah Valley	
Total	**7**	**8**	**6**	**8**	**4**	**5**	**8**	**8**	**7**

2010-11 Men's Sports	**Baseball**	**Basketball**	**Cross Country**	**Indoor Track**	**Outdoor Track**	**Football**
	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Cal Poly
	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	UC Davis
	NJIT	NJIT	NJIT	NJIT	NJIT	North Dakota
	North Dakota	North Dakota	North Dakota	North Dakota	North Dakota	South Dakota
	UTPA	South Dakota	Seattle	Seattle	Seattle	Southern Utah
	Utah Valley	UTPA	South Dakota	South Dakota	South Dakota	
	NYIT	Utah Valley	UTPA	UTPA	UTPA	
	N. Colorado		Utah Valley	Utah Valley	Utah Valley	
Total	**8**	**7**	**8**	**8**	**8**	**5**

Women's Sports	**Basketball**	**Cross Country**	**Golf**	**Soccer**	**Softball**	**Tennis**	**Indoor Track**	**Outdoor Track**	**Volleyball**
	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Delaware St.	Houston Baptist	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Chicago St.
	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	North Dakota	NJIT	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist
	NJIT	NJIT	North Dakota	Howard	South Dakota	North Dakota	NJIT	NJIT	NJIT
	North Dakota	North Dakota	South Dakota	NJIT	Utah Valley	Seattle	North Dakota	North Dakota	North Dakota
	South Dakota	Seattle	UTPA	North Dakota		South Dakota	Seattle	Seattle	South Dakota
	UTPA	South Dakota	Utah Valley	South Dakota		UTPA	South Dakota	South Dakota	UTPA
	Utah Valley	UTPA	X	S. Carolina St.			UTPA	UTPA	Utah Valley
		Utah Valley		Utah Valley			Utah Valley	Utah Valley	
Total	**7**	**8**	**6**	**8**	**4**	**6**	**8**	**8**	**7**

2011-12

Men's Sports	Baseball	Basketball	Cross Country	Indoor Track	Outdoor Track	Football
	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Cal Poly
	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	UC Davis
	NJIT	NJIT	NJIT	NJIT	NJIT	North Dakota
	North Dakota	North Dakota	North Dakota	North Dakota	North Dakota	South Dakota
	UTPA	UTPA	Seattle	Seattle	Seattle	Southern Utah
	Utah Valley	Utah Valley	UTPA	UTPA	UTPA	
	NYIT		Utah Valley	Utah Valley	Utah Valley	
	N. Colorado					
Total	**8**	**6**	**7**	**7**	**7**	**5**

Women's Sports	Basketball	Cross Country	Golf	Soccer	Softball	Tennis	Indoor Track	Outdoor Track	Volleyball
	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Chicago St.	Delaware St.	Houston Baptist	Cal-Bakersfield	Chicago St.	Cal-Bakersfield	Chicago St.
	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	Houston Baptist	Neb-Omaha	Chicago St.	Houston Baptist	Chicago St.	Houston Baptist
	NJIT	NJIT	North Dakota	Howard	North Dakota	NJIT	NJIT	Houston Baptist	NJIT
	North Dakota	North Dakota	UTPA	NJIT	Utah Valley	North Dakota	North Dakota	NJIT	North Dakota
	UTPA	Seattle	Utah Valley	North Dakota		Seattle	Seattle	North Dakota	UTPA
	Utah Valley	UTPA		S. Carolina St.		UTPA	UTPA	Seattle	Utah Valley
		Utah Valley		Utah Valley			Utah Valley	UTPA	
								Utah Valley	
Total	**6**	**7**	**5**	**7**	**4**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**6**

ATTACHMENT B
SUPPLEMENT NO. 6
DI Leadership Council 4/12

GREAT WEST CONFERENCE BY ACTIVE DIVISION I MEMBER STATUS

Institution	Year Competition Began Great West	Year Active Division I Member	Year Left for AQ Conference
University of Texas Pan-American	2005-06 **	**1976-77**	
Chicago State University	2007-08	**1989-90**	
University of Texas Corpus Christi	2005-06 **	2002-03	2006-07
Indiana University Purdue – Ft Wayne	2005-06 **	2007-08	2007-08
Longwood University***	2005-06	2007-08	2012-13
University of Northern Colorado	2005-06 **	2007-08	2006-07
North Dakota State*	2005-06 **	2008-09	2007-08
South Dakota State*	2005-06 **	2008-09	2007-08
New Jersey Institute of Technology	2005-06	**2009-10**	
Utah Valley University	2005-06 **	**2009-10**	
CSU Bakersfield***	2007-08	**2010-11**	
Houston Baptist University	2007-08	**2011-12**	
University of North Dakota	2008-09	2012-13	2012-13
University of South Dakota	2008-09	2012-13	2011-12

2008- Full conference multi-sport member

* 2004 – Affiliated charter member of Great West Football Conference
** 2005-06: Signed scheduling contract.

******* Longwood: Participated in women's soccer 2005-09, and men's and women's cross country 2005-06.
*** CSU-Bakersfield: Participated in men's basketball, women's basketball, and women's volleyball 2007-09; men's and women's outdoor track and field and women's tennis 2011-12.

TIMELINE OF MEMBERSHIP

	Chicago State	Houston Baptist	IPFW	NJIT	N. Dakota	N. Dakota State	Northern Colorado	S. Dakota	S. Dakota State	TX A&MCC	TX Pan Am	Utah Valley
Active Div. I Member	1989-90	2011-12	2007-08	2009-10	2012-13	2008-09	2007-08	2012-13	2008-09	2002-03	1976-77	2009-10
Year Left			2006-07			2007-08	2006-07	2011-12	2007-08	2006-07		

Issue: The Great West requests support to sponsor new legislation or endorsement of a waiver of the Division I membership criteria (per Bylaw 20.2.5.3) to be recognized as a multi-sport conference in NCAA governance under the provisions in effect at the time of its formation as a multi-sport conference in spring 2008. It also seeks guidance on establishing a timeline to identify eligibility for automatic qualification.

- Good faith effort based on advice from NCAA President Myles Brand.
- Followed membership criteria in place under 31.3.4.4.1 to become recognized multisport conference and requests that standard be used to determine the Great West's status.
- Attempted to address concerns during the development of 2010-100 of a new definition of a multi-sport conference that linked recognition in governance to AQ. Lack of access to governance structure, coupled with lack of vested interest resulted in no changes to address Great West's concerns. (Similar rationale used in Rhode Island Technology June 2011 appeal to Administration Cabinet)
- Continued to work with conferences during 2011-12 cycle.
- Requested president to president meeting with Mark Emmert beginning in March 2011 and September 2011. Both requests were rejected until a meeting took place on January 11, 2012.
- Unique situation of being only multisport conference during the moratorium; unlikely any other waivers would be submitted.
- Ability to stabilize membership jeopardized by lack of date certain when AQ status can be granted – which is now tied to recognition of a multisport conference.

Other

20.2.5.3 Waivers of Division I Membership Criteria. The Administration Cabinet, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant waivers of the Division I membership criteria according to the procedures specified below. *(Revised: 1/11/94 effective 9/2/94, 4/24/03 effective 8/1/03, 11/1/07 effective 8/1/08*

20.2.5.3.1 Submission of Request. The institution shall submit its written request for a waiver to the Administration Cabinet, and it shall be received in the national office not later than September 15. The request shall be signed by the institution's president or chancellor and shall include pertinent information supporting the institution's request. The Administration Cabinet, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may waive the September 15 deadline due to circumstances beyond an institution's control. *(Revised: 1/19/96, 4/24/03 effective 8/1/03, 3/8/06, 11/1/07 effective 8/1/08)*

Legislation in effect prior to the adoption of 2010-100:

31.3.4.4.1 Multi-Sport Conference. To be considered eligible for automatic qualification in a particular sport, a multi-sport conference must include six core institutions that satisfy continuity-of-membership. For the purposes of this legislation, core refers to an institution that has been an active member of Division I the eight preceding years. Further, the continuity-of-membership requirement shall be met only if a minimum of six core institutions have conducted conference competition together in Division I the preceding two years in the applicable sport. There shall be no exceptions to the two-year period. Any new member added to a conference that satisfies the continuity of membership requirements shall be immediately eligible to represent the conference as the automatic qualifier. (Revised: 4/27/00, 10/00, 4/29/04 effective 8/1/04, 8/5/04)

31.3.4.4.1.1 Exception. A multi-sport conference that adds a conference-sponsored sport may be considered for automatic qualification in that sport, provided the conference includes at least six active Division I institutions that have conducted conference competition together at the Division I level in the sport the preceding two years and the sport is sponsored by less than 50 percent of the Division I membership. (Adopted: 4/27/06 effective 8/1/06)

31.3.4.2 Requirements – National Collegiate Championship [#]. To be eligible for automatic qualification in a National Collegiate Championship, a member conference must meet the following general requirements: *(Adopted: 1/9/06 effective 8/1/06)*

(a) Have at least six active members that sponsor the applicable sport in any division (Note: A provisional member in the process of becoming an NCAA member cannot be used to meet the requisite number.);

(b) The six active members must have conducted conference competition together for the preceding two years in the applicable sport;

(c) There shall be no waivers of the two-year waiting period; and

(d) Any new member added to a conference that is eligible for an automatic bid shall be immediately eligible to represent the conference as the automatic qualifier.

Legislation enacted (2010-100):

20.02.5 Multisport Conference. A Division I multisport conference shall satisfy the requirements of this section. *(Adopted: 1/15/11 effective 8/1/11)*

20.02.5.1 Minimum Number of Members. A multisport conference shall be composed of at least seven active Division I members. The member conference shall include at least seven active Division I members that sponsor both men's and women's basketball. *(Adopted: 1/15/11 effective 8/1/11)*

20.02.5.2 Sports Sponsorship. A multisport conference shall satisfy the following requirements: *(Adopted: 1/15/11 effective 8/1/11)*

(a) The conference shall sponsor a minimum of 12 Division I sports;

(b) The conference shall sponsor a minimum of six men's sports, one of which shall be men's basketball. In addition to men's basketball, the conference shall sponsor football or two other men's team sports. A minimum of seven members shall sponsor men's basketball. A minimum of six members shall sponsor five other sports, including football or two additional men's team sports; and

(c) The conference shall sponsor a minimum of six women's sports, one of which shall be women's basketball. In addition to women's basketball, the conference shall sponsor two other women's team sports. A minimum of seven members shall sponsor women's basketball. A minimum of six members shall sponsor five other sports, including two additional women's team sports (or a minimum of five members for an emerging sport for women).

20.02.5.3 Regular Season Conference Competition. Multisport conference members shall participate in regular-season conference competition, subject to the following requirements: *(Adopted: 1/15/11 effective 8/1/11)*

(a) Basketball teams shall participate in a regular-season conference schedule of a double round robin, in-season competition, or a minimum of 14 regular-season conference contests;

(b) In football or in a minimum of two men's team sports other than men's basketball [as required in Bylaw 20.02.5.2-(b)], teams shall compete in a minimum regular-season conference schedule of five contests. A minimum of five regular-season conference contests must be hosted by one of the two competing teams at its home venue; and

(c) In a minimum of two women's team sports other than women's basketball (as required in Bylaw 20.02.5.2), teams shall compete in a minimum regular-season conference schedule of five contests. A minimum of five regular-season conference contests must be hosted by one of the two competing teams at its home venue.

20.02.5.4 Continuity. A multisport conference shall establish continuity. To establish continuity, a multisport conference must meet the requirements of Bylaw 20.02.5.1. In addition, the conference must meet the requirements of Bylaws 20.02.5.2 and 20.02.5.3 for a period of eight consecutive years. *(Adopted: 1/15/11 effective 8/1/11)*

31.3.4.4 Additional Requirements -- Sports Other Than Men's Basketball.

31.3.4.4.1 Multisport Conference. To be considered eligible for automatic qualification in a particular sport, a multi-sport conference (see Bylaw 20.02.5) must be a core conference (see Bylaw 31.02.3) and must include six institutions that sponsor the sport and conduct conference competition together. *(Revised: 4/27/00, 10/00, 4/29/04 effective 8/1/04, 8/5/04, 1/15/11 effective 8/1/11)*

31.02.3 Core Conference. A core conference is a multisport conference that has been elected to membership and, as a result of legislation, is identified in the applicable sections of Constitution 4 related to representation in the NCAA governance structure. *(Adopted: 1/15/11 effective 8/1/11)*

E-mail chain with Carol Iwaoka, consultant for the Great West

From: Carol Iwaoka [mailto:caiwaoka@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 16, 2010 12:19 PM
To: Mallonee, Steve
Subject: RE: Follow up on Membership Issues

As usual – very helpful! You pointed out the real kicker in this is how to address their status. What steps and under which standards will Great West be held to be formally recognized. Can they seek multisport conference recognition based on the standards prior to 2007 (min 6 institutions) under which they have been operating and sponsoring champ events, get recognized, and then request "credit" for meeting AQ elig requirements prior to moratorium. What are your thoughts on "next steps" and process?
Thks
Carol

From: Mallonee, Steve [mailto:smallonee@ncaa.org]
Sent: Monday, August 16, 2010 10:59 AM
To: Carol Iwaoka
Subject: RE: Follow up on Membership Issues

Once the conference becomes an active conference, the current AQ provisions would be applied to the applicable conference sport. The waiver provisions currently in the legislation would remain applicable and would actually be administered by the Championships/ Sports Management Cabinet . The only potential issue is whether a conference such as the Great West that has been operating as such, but not formally recognized as such , can use time prior to the moratorium in meeting the AQ eligibility requirements,. I suppose that would be left to the sport committee's discretion as they contemplate their recommendations, but if the conference is conducting conference competition and a championship in a particular sport and has the requisite number of members, I would be incline to allow them to count the time. Keep in mind the current legislation will require tan institution to be an active DI institution for the preceding eight years to count as one of the six core members.

I hope this is helpful.

From: Carol Iwaoka [mailto:caiwaoka@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 16, 2010 9:42 AM
To: Mallonee, Steve
Subject: RE: Follow up on Membership Issues

Steve
Thanks for getting back to me. If 31.3.4 remains unchanged (AQ) – how does 2010-100 affect a conference not yet recognized by the governance structure to be eligible for AQ provisions? Does the Administration Cabinet have same authority to monitor/waive conference provisions?

Know you're busy, so if you'd prefer a phone appointment – let me know.
Carol

From: Mallonee, Steve [mailto:smallonee@ncaa.org]
Sent: Saturday, August 14, 2010 8:22 AM
To: 'caiwaoka@gmail.com'
Subject: Re: Follow up on Membership Issues

We decided to omit the portion of proposal related to AQ eligibility so as it stands, the current standards would remain in effect. The proposal should be up on LSDBi by now.

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

From: Carol Iwaoka [mailto:caiwaoka@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 14, 2010 07:33 AM
To: Mallonee, Steve
Subject: Follow up on Membership Issues

Hi there
Thanks again for your tutorial a few weeks ago on membership…Just did a quick read on the NCAA Board report…am now working on a consulting project with Great West and curious if the issues of a waiver process and/or the AQ came up? If you're available on Monday perhaps we can also set up a time to chat.

Hope your menagerie's doing well and have a great weekend.

Carol

E-mail chain that indicates conference call with Ed/Carol on September 1, 2010

September 1 [2-3 works for me]

From: Ed Grom [mailto:grom@gwconference.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 25, 2010 10:27 AM
To: Mallonee, Steve; Berst, David
Subject: Sept 1 call date

Steve, David,

Can we do the Sept. 1 from 2-3:30 timeslot? The call should not take more than 45 minutes to an hour, I would imagine. Get back with me with the OK and I will send out dial-in information for the call. Thanks.

Ed

_____

From: Mallonee, Steve [mailto:smallonee@ncaa.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 8:50 PM
To: 'Ed Grom'; Berst, David
Subject: RE: Can we chat?

The best dates for me are either Wednesday , September 1 [9-11 am or 2-3:30 pm] OR Thursday, September 2 [9-11 am]…

From: Ed Grom [mailto:grom@gwconference.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2010 9:33 PM
To: Mallonee, Steve; Berst, David
Subject: Can we chat?

Steve, David,

Will you both have time (about an hour at the most) to get on a conference call with myself and Carol Iwaoka in the next two weeks to discuss the Great West and the proposed legislation moved forward by the Board? The only bad date I have is August 26 – I will make myself available. If you can provide two options where you both can get on the phone at the same time and chat with Carol and I, I would appreciate it.

Stephen A. Mallonee
NCAA Managing Director of Academic and Membership Affairs/ Division I Governance Liaison

E-mail chain that lead to in-person meeting with Grom on April 21, 2010

Ed,
Let's shoot for 11am on Wednesday..I will get us a room and meet you in the atrium..

From: Berst, David
Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2010 1:31 PM
To: Mallonee, Steve; Ed Grom
Subject: RE: visit

Does for me.

From: Mallonee, Steve
Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2010 1:30 PM
To: Berst, David; Ed Grom
Subject: RE: visit

Does 11 am work?? That works best for me..

From: Berst, David
Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2010 1:30 PM
To: Ed Grom; Mallonee, Steve
Subject: RE: visit

Looks like 1 pm on the 21st works for both of us. We'll put you on the calendar.
Dave

From: Ed Grom [mailto:grom@gwconference.org]
Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2010 1:52 PM
To: Mallonee, Steve; Berst, David
Subject: RE: visit

Steve, David,

I would like to schedule a meeting with you both for either Tuesday, April 20 or Wednesday, April 21. The meeting can take place either at 11 a.m. or 1 p.m., depending on your schedules. I appreciate the opportunity to sit down with you and discuss the Great West. I await your response.

Ed

From: Mallonee, Steve [mailto:smallonee@ncaa.org]
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2010 2:04 PM
To: 'Ed Grom'
Subject: RE: visit

Not sure of David's schedule..I am tied up the Legislative Council meetings and follow-up the week of April12-16….I am pretty much out-of-pocket on the 9th and a part of the 8th..The following week [19th-23rd] is a lot more flexible..The Leadership Council Report with the membership recommendations is now final, though I am not sure if it has been posted yet..I assume you have looked at the final recommendations [or are aware of them] as they may relate to your conference situation..Probably a good idea to look over them if you have not done so already..You may want to check with David directly regarding his schedule as I know he is out of the office on Association business quite frequently these days.. Hope this is helpful..

The new definition of multisport conference would be applicable, but it would not change the provisions of 31.3.4.4.1, which require six core institutions to conduct conference competition together the preceding two years. As far as credit prior to the moratorium, I think David Berst and I discussed this issue with Ed Grom, but the conference can seek clarification from the Championships/Sports Management Cabinet , since the sport committees report to and forward recommendations for automatic qualification to the Championships/Sports Management Cabinet. If the cabinet needs my assistance from an interpretations perspective, I will be happy to provide it at the appropriate time. The next step may be to discuss with Commissioner Grom.

Rec'd by
Express mail
3/21/11

March 14, 2011

Dr. Mark A. Emmert
President
NCAA
P.O. Box 6222
Indianapolis, IN 46206-6222

Dear Dr. Emmert,

I hope this letter and enclosed information finds you well.

As you may or may not be aware, the Great West Conference was expanded from an FCS football-only league to an all-sports conference in 2008 by adding several NCAA Division I independent institutions and other institutions that were in the process of making the transition from either NCAA Division II or the NJCAA to the Division I level. This expansion provided a conference home for these independent institutions who wanted to provide their student-athletes the opportunity to succeed in regular-season and championship competition at the NCAA's highest level.

Please allow this letter and accompanying information serve as a formal request to have the Great West exempted from portions of newly-enacted legislation 2010-100 and establish a timetable of when the conference can begin to be considered an active Division I conference and strive to earn automatic qualification into NCAA championship events. It is our understanding that the Great West is the only multi-sport conference affected by this request, as it was the only conference transitioning to Division I status in 2008 when a four-year moratorium on Division I membership standards held the conference in abeyance from seeking formal recognition.

I have enclosed several documents that explain our case and give the NCAA an idea of what the Great West has been facing and will face in the coming years with the present membership criteria and benchmarks.

In today's collegiate athletics, more and more time has been spent pushing institutions and conferences to do more for the student-athlete, to create better student-athlete experiences, and provide more opportunities for the student-athlete. The Great West was formed to do just that and provides more competitive opportunities for the student-athlete through regular-season competition and championship opportunities through post-season events. What the Great West strives to provide and our student-athletes have been missing are NCAA championship opportunities, a benefit to other conferences that have automatic qualification into NCAA post-season events.

Another benefit Division I active members have that Great West members do not is a voice in proposing legislation that may or may not be earmarked toward the student-athlete. The only way legislation can be introduced into the present governance structure is through a conference. Since the Great West is not recognized, schools such as Utah Valley, NJIT, Chicago State and Texas-Pan American cannot initiate proposed legislation.

Since you began as NCAA President, I have heard you discuss the instability of conference memberships across the country and the need for that situation to calm itself. Providing the Great West an exception would go far to preserve the present makeup of the league and long term stability.

A member of our Presidents Council, Commissioner Grom and I would happily entertain a visit to Indianapolis in the very near future to discuss this issue in person, or perhaps we can meet at another location to coincide with your travels in the next few weeks. This is a very important issue to our membership and one that we would like the NCAA to review in a timely manner. I appreciate your time and care regarding this issue and look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Dr. Matthew Holland
President, Utah Valley University
Great West Presidents Council Chair

Enclosures

Cc: Great West Presidents Council
Ed Grom, Commissioner

Great West Conference
Request for NCAA Active Membership

Purpose and Objective: To recognize the Great West as an active Division I conference in the NCAA governance structure under the legislated standards in effect at the time of its expansion to an all-sport conference in 2008 and to identify a timetable when automatic qualification status will be granted.

Background. The Great West Conference was formed as an all-sport conference in the spring of 2008. (Refer to Attachment for chronology). At the time, the Great West provided a home for seven NCAA member institutions comprised of Independent Division I institutions and institutions in transition to the Division I level. The formulation of this conference was based on the existing premise that there was not a minimum number of Division I active institutions required to form an active, voting Division I conference listed in the NCAA Manual.

Similarly, this new conference of member institutions was formed under the understanding that the following regulations pertaining to automatic qualifications to NCAA Championship opportunities would be applicable:

Title:*31.3.4.4.1 - Multi-Sport Conference.*

To be considered eligible for automatic qualification in a particular sport, a multi-sport conference must include six core institutions that satisfy continuity-of-membership. For the purposes of this legislation, core refers to an institution that has been an active member of Division I the eight preceding years. Further, the continuity-of-membership requirement shall be met only if a minimum of six core institutions have conducted conference competition together in Division I the preceding two years in the applicable sport. There shall be no exceptions to the two-year period. Any new member added to a conference that satisfies the continuity of membership requirements shall be immediately eligible to represent the conference as the automatic qualifier. (Revised: 4/27/00, 10/00, 4/29/04 effective 8/1/04, 8/5/04)

Title:*31.3.4.4.1.1 - Exception.*

A multi-sport conference that adds a conference-sponsored sport may be considered for automatic qualification in that sport, provided the conference includes at least six active Division I institutions that have conducted conference competition together at the Division I level in the sport the preceding two years and the sport is sponsored by less than 50 percent of the Division I membership. (Adopted: 4/27/06 effective 8/1/06)

The Great West has been functioning as a true conference since the fall of 2008. An approved Constitution and Bylaws as well as Regular Season and Championship Regulations have been in place since its first day of operation. As a conference, the Great West provides compliance assistance, conference scheduling, conference championships, student-athlete recognition services, and assistance through the Division I transition process. Since August 2009, the Great West has scheduled round-robin competition and post-season championships for the last two years in 6 sports (women's soccer, women's volleyball, men's basketball, women's basketball, softball and baseball), while also sponsoring post-season championship opportunities in 8 individual sports (men's cross country, women's cross country, men's indoor track and field, women's indoor track and field, women's golf, women's tennis, men's outdoor track and field, and women's outdoor track and field). The Great West has also added associate members in the sports of baseball, women's soccer, women's tennis, cross country and track and field to provide a more competitive balance in those sports.

Recognition as an operating conference. The Great West for all intents and purposes has been recognized since its formation as a multi-sport conference in 2008 by the NCAA as follows:

- Conference postseason events are exempted. On September 16, 2008, NCAA staff approved an exemption for Great West post-season championships events based on its functioning as a "true" conference and if not but for the moratorium, would have applied for conference membership. NCAA Managing Director for Division I staff member Steve Mallonee noted in this approval "...that although the conference cannot apply for active conference membership until 2011-12 as a result of the moratorium, we felt that if the conference could demonstrate it was in fact operating as legitimate conference, it could apply the DI legislation governing exemptions for conference championship events. Obviously, there are not any official interpretations on this type of issue, so I guess I would just low key this as some may feel you actually have to be an active DI conference to take advantage of the conference championship exception. I think we felt that since the conference is up and running, has a governance structure codified in its administrative bylaws/article and would have applied for conference membership but for the moratorium, we were ok taking the flexible approach here."

- Provides a designated "conference contact" for interpretations and legislative assistance. Alex Smith has been the Great West contact since the fall of 2008.
- Lists schools in statistical references as having Great West affiliation
- Lists Great West and institutions as members on FCS promotional materials
- Is included on NCAA governance communication for committee minutes, eligibility decisions involving Great West institutions, infraction decisions, etc.
- Participates in teleconferences and meetings of the CCACA
- NCAA staff members Lisa Koch, Greg Dana, Michael Mangarelli and John Pfeffenberger attended a Great West Compliance Coordinators meeting at the 2009 NCAA Convention in Washington DC and made a presentation on initial eligibility.
- NCAA staff members have presented on numerous monthly calls with Great West compliance offers.

Automatic Qualification (AQ) Issues. Under present legislation in effect during 2010-11, in order for a conference to gain an automatic qualification into a championship (except basketball), there must be a minimum of six members who have been active members of Division I for eight years that have competed together for the previous two years.

The Great West questions when the clock should start towards fulfilling this eight-year requirement. Institutions that are in transition from either Division II or NJCAA must comply with all the rules and regulations of Division I in their second year of the five-year reclassification period, or the seven-year period in the case of Utah Valley since it moved up from the junior college ranks. The intent of the legislation is to ensure that transitioning institutions can demonstrate their preparedness for Division I status when they are eventually approved. Given that members have been operating under the same rules as active Division I members for at least 4 years, the Great West requests that these four years be counted toward the eight-year requirement to be considered a core institution

Impact of membership moratorium and new standards on future of Great West. Having now functioned and received specific services from the NCAA and extending these services and opportunities to student-athletes for three academic years, we have been attentive to and are seriously concerned with the unintended consequences that recently enacted proposal 2010-100, specifically section 20.02.6.1, will have on the viability of the Great West. The proposal established a new definition for a multi-sport

conference to be comprised of at least seven active Division I institutions that sponsor both men's and women's basketball. This provision becomes effective August 1, 2011 for institutions that begin the reclassification process during the 2011-12 academic year or thereafter.

The Great West has been operating in good faith under pre-existing membership legislation since 2008 and has done our best to live within those guidelines through 2010-11. It is our understanding that the Great West is the only multi-sport conference that was moving towards formal Division I recognition but due to a four-year moratorium for broader review of Division I membership standards, the conference was held in abeyance from seeking formal recognition. It is now affected by the new definition for a multi-sport conference that will put our consortium of NCAA member institutions at a severe disadvantage to continue to operate for the benefit of the student-athlete.

While the Great West did monitor this proposal with NCAA staff and other conferences, the present Division I governance structure did not afford the conference formal access to the legislative process. Since all proposals for new legislation must be presented through an active Division I conference, it was especially concerning that active members such as Texas-Pan American, Chicago State, New Jersey Institute of Technology, and Utah Valley University were left without an opportunity to propose legislation and have their voice heard. This was especially challenging due to the Great West's unique position of being the only multi-sport conference established prior to the introduction of Proposal 2010-100 that would be severely impacted. In addition, because it is not formally recognized, it is unable to seek a waiver of the application of the new legislation under the SLR process.

A key aspect of Proposal 2010-100 is that an institution wishing to move up to the Division I level must have been offered membership into an active conference. With the Great West spreading from Utah to New Jersey and from North Dakota to the southern tip of Texas, this would be a viable home for those institutions that have the ambition to move up. The Great West has already had the experience of being the home of transitioning institutions Houston Baptist, NJIT, Utah Valley, North Dakota and South Dakota and all five schools can attest to the fact that being involved with the Great West has been a positive toward their eventual active membership. The Great West's ability to serve as a viable conference in preparing transitions for Division I life cannot be questioned as present members South Dakota and North Dakota have been offered membership in active conferences. It could be argued that the success their respective athletic conferences have experienced in the Great West made them an attractive candidate for their new leagues.

Request. The request of the Great West Conference and our current membership is to be "grandfathered" in as an active and voting NCAA Conference, having to still meet and fulfill all other bylaw regulations outlined within Proposal 2010-100, so that we may still be able to provide the benefits of a conference and the NCAA to the excess of 1,000 of student-athletes we serve. In addition, the Great West seeks clarification on applying 4 years toward the 8 year AQ requirement.

Granting these requests would not undermine or unravel the spirit of 2010-100 due to the unique situation and timeline under which the Great West began operating as a multi-sport conference. The position of the Great West is unique in today's landscape of the NCAA. With the new NCAA Division I standards now in place there will not be a group of institutions (that in the very least been competing together for a period of time) that will be in a position to begin a new conference from scratch.

The Great West has been striving to be recognized as an active Division I conference since its inception. Commissioners from other Division I conferences have applauded the efforts of the Great West, which is providing opportunities for the student-athletes from independent institutions. While they applaud the concept of the Great West, they sympathize with the league as the new legislations appear to put up another roadblock toward active status.

Given the state of instability in conferences around the country, in order for the Great West to become more stable and attract new members, we will need some assurance from the NCAA as to our active status and the possible timeframe when we can become an active Division I conference, and our clock toward gaining automatic qualification for NCAA championships.

Without some assurance that the Great West will be recognized as an active Division I conference and have some timetable when automatic qualification will be granted for certain sports, no other Division I independent institution will seek membership in the conference. And without those active members to achieve minimum number of active members within the conference, the Great West will not be in a position to seek automatic qualification status. Thus, both are essential and without one, the other can't take place.

Beginning with the 2011-12 academic year, the Great West will be comprised of six institutions, five of which will be active NCAA Division I status. There are two NCAA Division I institutions that have expressed sincere interest in joining the Great West if there is some assurance from the NCAA that the league would become active in status and if a timetable toward AQ eligibility is in place. There is one other institution that is in line to become an active member after its five-year transition in the 2012-13 academic year, and has also expressed an sincere interest in joining the Great West. We are asking some flexibility in fulfilling the letter of the legislation prior to the 2012-13 academic year.

We understand that this may be a situation where we are putting the cart before the horse, but in order to attract active Division I members and ultimately those institutions looking to make the transition to the Division I level, the Great West must have some assurances from the NCAA when active conference members can be granted and a timetable when AQ status can be obtained in all sponsored sports.

2011-12 Membership
Chicago State
Houston Baptist
NJIT
North Dakota
Tex-Pan American
Utah Valley

Delaware State (W soccer)
Howard (W Soccer)
South Carolina State (W Soccer)
NYIT (Baseball)
Northern Colorado (Baseball)
Seattle (Track, W Tennis)

2012-13 Membership
*Cal-Bakersfield - active
Chicago State – active
Houston Baptist - active
*Longwood - active
NJIT - active
*Seattle – final year of transition
Tex-Pan American - active
Utah Valley – active

* Prospective full members

On behalf of its members, the Great West appreciates your consideration of this request for the Great West to become an active member of NCAA Division I based on the information presented. The Great West is prepared to send members of its Presidents Council and Joint Council to Indianapolis for a meeting with you on this matter. I look forward to hearing back from you soon.

CHRONOLOGY OF GREAT WEST CONFERENCE

February 2004 – The Great West Football Conference was formed to include the following NCAA Division I-AA football programs:

UC Davis	North Dakota State University
Cal Poly	Southern Utah University
Univ. of Northern Colorado	South Dakota State University

The league applied for NCAA membership, but was denied based on the fact that there were not sufficient amount of active NCAA I-AA programs involved in the league.

August 2004-November 2011 – The Great West continued to act as an NCAA I-AA/FCS conference even though it was not recognized formally as an NCAA AQ-eligible conference. The Great West name and logo was included in NCAA FCS promotional materials distributed throughout the country and its members were listed as being affiliated with the Great West in the same materials.

The University of Northern Colorado moved to the Big Sky Conference in 2005 to drop membership numbers to five. North Dakota State and South Dakota State moved on to the Missouri Valley Football Conference in 2007 and the University of North Dakota and the University of South Dakota were added to keep the membership at five.

March 2005 – Presidents and Athletic Directors from current NCAA Division I independent institutions and several institutions transitioning from to NCAA Division I met with Steve Mallonee and Myles Brand from the NCAA to discuss the process of those members forming a new Division I athletic conference. Advice from Mallonee to the members present was to begin scheduling each other in as many team sports as possible to start the process of earning years toward continuity of membership and the start acting like a conference.

November 2007 – Athletic Directors from two NCAA Division I institutions met with the Summit League commissioner to request assistance in starting a new Division I conference from the list of active independent programs as well as several institutions transitioning up to the Division I level.

May 2008 – The idea of the formation of an all-sports conference under the Great West umbrella and 501c3 status was discussed among NCAA Division I independent institutions and several institutions making the transition to the Division I level. Representatives from nine (9) Division I independent institutions met in Oak Brook, Ill., to discuss the formation of a new conference on May 29, 2008.

May 7, 2008 – Had a phone conversation with Steve Mallonee of the NCAA staff to discuss the Great West becoming an all-sport conference and the steps needed for the league to become an active Division I conference.

June 2008 – Six of the Division I independents institutions – Houston Baptist, NJIT, North Dakota, South Dakota, Texas-Pan American, Utah Valley – agreed in principle to become members of this expanded all-sports conference under the Great West umbrella.

July 11, 2008 - The Great West announcement was made to introduce the all-sports league. Since it was late in the process for scheduling purposes in team sports, the Great West would conduct championships in the individual sports of men's and women's cross country, men's and women's indoor track and field, men's and women's outdoor track and field, and men's and women's golf during the 2008-09 academic year.

September 2008 – Full-time staff in the area of compliance and media relations was hired.

September 16, 2008 – NCAA staff approved the Great West having the ability to have its post-season championships as exempt events.

October, 2008 – Chicago State University was announced as the seventh full member of the Great West all-sports conference.

January 30, 2009 – Added New York Institute of Technology and the University of Northern Colorado as associate members in the sport of baseball. The additions bring the total number of baseball playing members to eight.

February 11, 2009 – Added Delaware State University, Howard University and South Carolina State University as associate members in the sport of women's soccer. The additions bring the total number of women's soccer playing members to eight.

August 12, 2009 – Added Seattle University as an associate member in the sports of men's and women's cross country, men's and women's indoor track and field, and men's and women's outdoor track and field.

August 2009-present – The Great West schedules round-robin competition and post-season championships in the sports of women's soccer, women's volleyball, men's basketball, women's basketball, softball and baseball, while also sponsoring post-season championship opportunities in the individual sports of men's cross country, women's cross country, men's indoor track and field, women's indoor track and field, women's golf, women's tennis, men's outdoor track and field, and women's outdoor track and field.

April 21, 2010 – Met with Steve Mallonee and David Berst at NCAA headquarters to discuss the hurdles the Great West faces with the new legislation (2010-100).

July 20, 2010 – Added Seattle University as an associate member in the sport of women's tennis. The addition brings the total of women's tennis playing members to six.

Great West Conference
NCAA Status

Institution	Began Div. I Transition	First Yr. Div. I	Joined Great West
Chicago State	N/A	1986-87	Oct. 2008
Texas-Pan American	N/A	1969-70	July 2008
NJIT	2004-05	2009-10	July 2008
Utah Valley State	2002-03	2009-10	July 2008
Houston Baptist	2007-08	2011-12	July 2008
North Dakota	2007-08	2012-13	July 2008
South Dakota	2007-08	2012-13	July 2008
*Longwood	2002-03	2005-06	
*Cal-Bakersfield	2005-06	2010-11	
*Seattle	2007-08	2012-13	

*Prospective Member

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

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

March 29, 2011

Mr. Ed Grom
Commissioner
Great West Conference
P.O. Box 9344
Naperville, Illinois 60567

Dear Ed:

Thank you for your letter dated March 14 seeking an exemption for the Great West Conference. Your letter was received on March 21. It is my understanding that your conference has worked with NCAA staff members David Berst and Steve Mallonee for several years. I trust they have provided you with good counsel.

In August 2007, the Division I Board of Directors established a membership moratorium for a four year period, ending no later than August 2011. The goal of the moratorium was to provide the Division I membership the opportunity to develop a manageable growth plan to maintain the philosophy of Division I athletic programs.

The Great West Conference expanded to a multi-sports conference in 2008, after the implementation of the Division I membership moratorium, and with the understanding a formal application would be required at the time the moratorium was lifted. It is my understanding, staff made it clear to the Conference that they would be required to fulfill any new standards adopted by the membership once the moratorium was lifted.

During this moratorium, the Great West Conference has received benefits from the NCAA in a good faith manner. These benefits include exemption of conference tournaments from contest limitations and administrative services also provided to existing conferences.

New legislation, effective with the 2011-12 academic year, establishes a definition of a multi-sport conference that must be met in order for representation in the governance structure and championship access through the automatic bid

process. The definition of a multisport conference was developed based on the current composition of the 31 existing multi-sport conferences.

The Great West does not meet the current definition of a multi-sport conference. Once the required number of institutions that sponsor basketball (seven), is achieved, it will take eight years for the conference to meet the necessary requirements.

While this proposal was in the legislative cycle, NCAA staff members advised the Great West to ask the Leadership Council to revise the standards, or seek assistance through a current Division I conference to modify the proposal to accommodate the composition of the Great West conference. The Leadership Council did not revise the proposal and no amendments were submitted by Division I conferences.

As NCAA President, I do not have the authority to grant waivers of legislation. My advice is to seek change to the current legislation by requesting the Leadership Council review the matter once again and recommend the Board of Directors sponsor a legislative change. You may also request a legislative change through sponsorship by voting Division I conferences.

Sincerely,

Mark Emmert
President

ME:cms

cc: Selected NCAA Staff Members

OCT 17 2011

_____ PLS PREPARE REPLY: MY SIG
_____ PLS ACKNOWLEDGE: MY SIG
_____ PLS ANSWER: YOUR SIG
_____ PLS SEE ME
_____ PLS HANDLE
_____ FYI AND RETURN COMMENTS
_____ FYI AND RETURN
_____ FOR YOUR INFO & FILE
SIGNATURE AND DATE _____

October 6, 2011

Mr. Mark Emmert
President
National Collegiate Athletic Association
P.O. Box 6222
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6222

Dear President Emmert:

This letter is to update you on the request by the Great West Conference to receive multidivisional conference status as detailed in our March 29, 2011, letter. Also, as chair of the conference's Presidents' Council, I request the opportunity to have an in-person meeting with you either in Indianapolis or another location convenient to you.

In short, this issue:

i. remains very important to seven current Division I members (five conference members and two active Division I independent institutions) and more than 1,800 student-athletes in the Great West Conference;
ii. is unique legislatively only to the Great West and would have no legislative impact on other current conferences if the Great West's waiver request was granted;
iii. resulted from a change in legislation (i.e., implementation of the moratorium) that adversely affects only this conference and that occurred after the conference undertook efforts to meet the then applicable pre-moratorium legislation; and
iv. could assist in the current conference realignment issues to provide other options for Division I members.

I appreciate your staff's assistance in response to the March 29 letter. The conference's efforts in this area have not been successful. More specifically, regarding these legislative efforts, both you and the NCAA staff advised the Great West to continue to seek relief through the legislative process. As you know, our conference members, while considered full members of Division I, cannot propose legislation (and also cannot have access to automatic qualification to championships, etc.) as members of a conference that is not recognized in the NCAA governance structure. As a result, the conference is at the mercy of other conferences to propose legislation. The Great West took the advice of NCAA staff and addressed its unique circumstances in the legislative process throughout the development of Proposal 2010-100. The conference communicated with members of the Leadership Council and the Collegiate Commissioners Association. Neither the Leadership Council nor any conference submitted legislation to amend the proposal during the 2010-11 cycle to address the unique circumstances of the Great West. The

Great West also recently unsuccessfully pursued conference sponsorship to submit an amendment in the 2011-12 legislative cycle. While there continues to be sympathy for the conference's plight, there was not sufficient support to initiate action.

This inequality in the legislation process also recently was reiterated in a situation involving the Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT). RIT petitioned the Administration Cabinet to support a legislative change to Proposal 2010-100 by reinstating multi-classification for a non-Division I institution under limited circumstances. In correspondence dated June 1, 2011, to the Administration Cabinet (referenced as Attachment C, Supplement 4), Dr. William Destler, President of the RIT, cited the inability by an institution not affiliated with a Division I conference to seek legislative relief without direct access to the governance structure, especially when there are not entities in the structure that have a vital interest. In essence, the other conferences are saying "if it does not affect us, we do not want to get involved".

Another ironic factor is that while several long-standing Division I members of our conference are not allowed access to certain governance processes or automatic championship qualification, a few Division II institutions making the transition to Division I will be granted access to the NCAA Division I governance structure due to their alliance with a conference, regardless of the conference' stability. In that regard, conferences that fall below minimum membership requirements have a two-year grace period to become "whole" during which time they are still a minimum of five institutions. Both are inequalities that affect the long-existing Division I members of our conference. The Great West was the only multi-sport Division I conference affected by the moratorium, as it was the only conference transitioning to Division I status in 2008 when the four-year moratorium on Division I membership standards was implemented.

The conference's current status greatly affects student-athletes. Significant efforts are undertaken by the NCAA national office to encourage institutions and conferences to create better student-athlete experiences and provide more student-athlete opportunities. The Great West provides competitive opportunities for the student-athlete through regular- and post-season events. However, the Great West cannot provide its student-athletes automatic qualifying access to NCAA championships, a benefit other conferences have through automatic qualification into NCAA post-season events. This lack of access to NCAA championships greatly affects student-athletes at all of the conference's institutions but especially at two of our conference members – Chicago State and University of Texas Pan American – and their extensive minority student-athlete population.

The conference's current status also greatly affects conference stability. As noted during your recent presentation to the Division IA Athletics Directors Association, the recent migration of institutions among conferences has increased instability with Division I. The conference's desires to attain multi-divisional status, retain its own membership, and provide opportunities for new members is a stabilizing factor in Division I.

During our in-person conversation with you, we wish to discuss obtaining the support of you and your staff in requesting a waiver of the application of Bylaws 20.02.5.1 and then

20.02.5.4 from the Subcommittee on Legislative Relief. It is our belief that continuing to rely on other conferences or the Leadership Council to sponsor legislation will continue to yield unsuccessful results as those in the structure with the authority to sponsor legislation do not have a vested interest to do so. Existing conferences have little incentive since they are protected by legislated grace periods should they fail to meet the minimum requirements. Similar to the archiving of an interpretation of a decision by the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Staff, this waiver decision could be archived soon after its granting since no other conference will again be placed in a similar situation.

In closing, I cannot overly stress the importance and uniqueness of this situation to the Great West. Seven NCAA Division I active institutions are seeking an opportunity to have a place within the NCAA governance structure and provide its student-athletes with the ability to gain automatic qualification status for NCAA championships. Thank you for your continued assistance in this matter.

Regards,

Matthew S. Holland
President, Utah Valley University
Chair, Great West Presidents Council

cc: Great West Presidents' Council
Great West Joint Council
Ed Grom, Commissioner

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

November 23, 2011

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Dr. Matthew Holland
President
Utah Valley University
800 West University Parkway, MS 104
Orem, Utah 84058

Dear President Holland:

Thank you for your letter dated October 6 in which you provided an update on the efforts of the Great West Conference to attain status as an NCAA Division I multisport conference (as defined in NCAA Bylaw 20.02.5). I apologize for not responding sooner as I have been out of the office for an extended time period, but I understand that Steve Mallonee from our office has been in conversation with Ed Grom regarding this matter.

As I mentioned in my March 29 letter to Ed, Division I established a definition of a multisport conference with the clear intent that specific standards must be met in order for the conference to be represented in the Division I governance structure and have championship access through the automatic bid process. The NCAA Division I Leadership Council was cognizant that the existing multisport conferences represented in the governance structure met those minimum standards, but it also believed that those standards (minimum number of active Division I members, sports sponsorship and continuity of membership) were vital prerequisites for any new Division I conference seeking to gain representation and automatic championship access. The recent number of conference realignments certainly has created a bit of instability among the multisport conferences currently represented in the Division I governance structure, but those conferences will continue to have to meet the new definition to maintain their current status. The two-year grace period is simply a temporary period to allow conferences that previously have met the standards the opportunity to continue to be part of the structure. Any impacted conference that fails to rectify their situation in the two-year time period would no longer be considered a core Division I conference and, as such, would be subject to loss of representation and automatic bids.

As you noted in your letter, there does not appear to be sufficient support among the Division I membership at this time to initiate action to provide the relief

desired by the conference. While I understand that there are waiver processes for many NCAA rules, I do not think it would be appropriate for a waiver to be granted in this particular instance. The NCAA Division I Legislative Council Subcommittee on Legislative Relief typically is used to provide temporary relief to address unique circumstances until the membership has had the opportunity to
sponsor legislation to rectify the matter. The waiver provides a temporary solution until the membership, through the governance process, takes action on the legislation. In this case, there does not appear to be support by the membership to sponsor legislation that would ultimately provide the relief the conference is seeking.

You also referenced the recent situation involving Rochester Institute of Technology and their petition to the NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet to support a legislative change to reinstate multidivisional reclassification for a small group of non-Division I institutions that currently have a sport of a single gender classified in Division I. The Administration Cabinet did review and support the request and forwarded a recommendation to the Leadership Council, which ultimately was approved. That same review process for requesting review is available to the Great West. You may request either the cabinet or perhaps the full Leadership Council to collectively review the matter. I would urge you to keep both Steve and David Berst involved as they can assist in facilitating requests to those entities related to membership issues.

Sincerely,

Mark Emmert
President

MAE:cms

cc: Mr. Ed Grom
Selected NCAA Staff Members

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
DIVISION I LEADERSHIP COUNCIL
April 12, 2012, MEETING

***ACTION ITEM*.**

- None.

***INFORMATION ITEMS*.**

1. **Report of January 12, 2012, Leadership Council Meeting**. The Leadership Council approved the report of its January 12, 2012, meeting.

2. **Update on Presidential Retreat Initiatives**. The Leadership Council received an update regarding the work of the four Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Working Groups.

   a. Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group. The Council was informed of the Board of Directors' request that the Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group consider alternative proposals for a miscellaneous expense allowance. The working group developed three alternatives that have been circulated for review and comment. It is anticipated that conferences will discuss these alternatives during their upcoming spring meetings and provide feedback to the working group. The Board is not expected to take further action concerning the matter until at least August for possible implementation for 2013-14.

   b. Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Resource Allocation Working Group. The Council was informed that most of the recommendations of the Resource Allocation Working Group were defeated by the Board of Directors in January. The issue of possible limitations on the number of noncoaching personnel was referred to the Rules Working Group in its review of Bylaw 11. The issue of contest limitations in all sports, as well as other Bylaw 17 topics, will be reviewed by the Rules Working Group in conjunction with the NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet.

   c. Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Collegiate Model -- Rules Working Group. The Council received an update on the progress of the Rules Working Group, and the communication and outreach plans to keep the membership informed and involved in the process. The approach to a new regulatory structure was reviewed with the Council, noting the goal of establishing rules that are meaningful, enforceable and contribute to student-athlete success. The Council was informed of the timeline of the three phases of review and which bylaws would be reviewed in each phase.

d. Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Collegiate Model -- Enforcement Working Group. The Council was informed of the Enforcement Working Group's progress in creating a multi-level NCAA rules violation structure, an enhanced penalty structure, a more efficient process structure and re-establishing a sense of shared responsibility amongst the interested individuals and entities in intercollegiate athletics.

3. **Women's Basketball Recruiting Model.** The Leadership Council Women's Basketball Recruiting Subcommittee informed the Council of the concepts under consideration for a women's basketball recruiting model. The subcommittee noted that its discussions have focused on communication with prospects (e.g., modes, start date, frequency), official visits, event certification, on-campus evaluations and summer access. The subcommittee also has discussed the summer recruiting evaluation period and noted the women's basketball coaches support for reducing the number of days they are off-campus recruiting in July. The current legislative cycle includes a proposal (Proposal No. 2011-54) that would modify the July 6-31 recruiting period to consist of, consecutively, a seven-day evaluation period, a 10-day dead period, a seven-day evaluation period and a two-day dead period. The subcommittee asked that the Council endorse the adoption of Proposal No. 2011-54, which will be considered by the NCAA Division I Legislative Council during its April 16-17 meeting. The Council unanimously endorsed the proposal with an August 1, 2012, effective date. The subcommittee will continue to discuss the concepts under consideration for a women's basketball recruiting model, with plans to seek further input from coaches, the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) and the National Federation of State High School Associations (NFHS).

4. **Update from Leadership Council's Agent Subcommittee.** The Council was updated on the Agent Subcommittee's discussion of a 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 raised a number of questions regarding the proposed program and suggested the subcommittee continue to discuss the elements of the program.

5. **Criteria for Conference Membership in Division I Governance/Championships Structure.** The Leadership Council received a presentation from several representatives of the Great West Conference regarding their request to seek a waiver or legislation that would immediately designate the Great West Conference as an active Division I multi-sport conference.

LEADERSHIP COUNCIL ACTION: **The Leadership Council voted not to support the Great West Conference's request.** (Unanimous Voice Vote.)

_____

6. **Report from the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC).** Eugene Daniels, chair of the Division I SAAC, presented a report of the committee's priorities for the upcoming year. In the coming year, the Division I SAAC will focus on:

   a. Enhancing the student-athlete voice within the Association;

   b. It's new community service initiative, a partnership with Samaritan's Feet; and

   c. Increasing the overall awareness of SAAC, particularly amongst groups outside of the Association.

7. **Update on Review of Division I Athletics Certification Program**. The Council was updated on the work of the NCAA Division I Athletics Certification Committee in its review of the athletics certification program. The Council received information on the name and purpose of the new program, as well as system development, organizational changes and the planned request for a one-year delay in the implementation of the new program.

8. **New Membership Communication Initiative**. The Council was informed of the planned implementation of a membership communication initiative designed to enhance communication between the NCAA national office and the membership. The process will be piloted by individuals in the membership, as well as national office staff members, to ensure the outlined services are operating as designed.

9. **Future Meetings**.

   - October 11, 2012, Indianapolis, Indiana.

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

Division I Leadership Council April 12, 2012, Meeting	
ATTENDEES	**ABSENTEES**
Mike Alden, University of Missouri, Big 12 Conference	Peg Bradley-Doppes, University of Denver, Sun Belt Conference
Sandy Barbour, University of California, Pacific-12 Conference	
Harold Bardo, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Missouri Valley Conference	
Mike Bitter, Stetson University, Atlantic Sun Conference	
Dave Blank, Elon University, Southern Conference	
McKinley Boston, Jr., New Mexico State University, Western Athletic Conference	
Morgan J. Burke, Purdue University, Big Ten Conference	
Janet Cone, University of North Carolina, Asheville, Big South Conference	
Joan Cronan, University of Tennessee, Southeastern Conference	
Eugene Daniels, chair of the Division I SAAC	
Beth Debauche, Ohio Valley Conference	
Peter Fields, Montana State University-Bozeman, Big Sky Conference	
Chet Gladchuk, United States Naval Academy, Patriot League	
Robin Harris, Ivy League	
Jack Hayes, Hofstra University, Colonial Athletic Association	
Amy Huchthausen, America East Conference	
R.C. Johnson, University of Memphis, Conference USA	
Lisa Kelleher, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Mountain West Conference	
Myndee Kay Larsen, Summit League	
Jonathan LeCrone, Horizon League	
Susan Cross Lipnickey, Miami University, Mid-American Conference	
Janet Lucas, University of California, Riverside, Big West Conference	

John Marinatto, Big East Conference	
Clyde McCoy, University of Miami, Atlantic Coast Conference	
John McCutcheon, University of Massachusetts, Atlantic 10 Conference	
Noreen Morris, Northeast Conference	
Derrick Ramsey, Coppin State University, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference	
John Ritschdorff, Marist College, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	
Duer Sharp, Southwestern Athletic Conference	
Ky Snyder, University of San Diego, West Coast Conference	
Bobby Williams, Sam Houston State University, Southland Conference	
NCAA staff liaisons in attendance: David Berst, Jacqueline Campbell, Kevin Lennon	
Other Guests in attendance: Ed Grom, Great West Conference; Cindy Hartmann, Duke University and Women's Basketball Issues Committee; Mike Jacobsen, Utah Valley University; Lenny Kaplan, New Jersey Institute of Technology; Muffet McGraw, University of Notre Dame and Women's Basketball Issues Committee chair; Gwendolyn Packnett, ACE Fellow, and Jennifer Rizzotti, University of Hartford and WBCA.	
Other NCAA staff members who were in attendance for portions of the meeting: Angie Cretors, Diane Dickman, Jennifer Henderson, Lynn Holzman, Michelle Hosick, LuAnn Humphrey, Matt Maher, Steve Mallonee, Rachel Newman, Jobrina Perez, Ronnie Ramos, Donald Remy, Dave, Schnase, Naima Stevenson and Wendy Walters.	