

A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association
Division I Men's Basketball Issues Committee

NCAA National Office

May 24, 2011

Indianapolis

8:30 a.m. to 3 p.m.

1. Welcome. (Mitch Barnhart)
2. NCAA tournament expansion/TV format. (Greg Shaheen)
3. Men's College Basketball Officiating, LLC. [Supplement No. 1] (Byron Hatch)
4. Sportsmanship and bench decorum. [Supplement No. 2] (Hatch)
5. Leadership Council update. [Supplement No. 3] (Steve Mallonee)
6. Legislation issues. (Mallonee)
 - a. 2010- 2011 legislation impacting Division I men's basketball. [Supplement No. 4-a]
 - b. Qualifying regular season multiple-team event (NCAA Bylaw 17.3.5.1). [Supplement Nos. 4- b and 4-c]
 - c. Preseason practice start date. [Supplement No. 4-d]
7. Academic/2-4 transfer issues. [Supplement No. 5] (Diane Dickman)
8. Event certification issues. [Supplement No. 6] (Sandy Parrott)
9. Agents, Gambling and Amateurism (AGA) update. [Supplement No. 7] (Rachel Newman-Baker)

10. Enforcement update. (Julie Roe)
11. Other issues.
12. Adjournment.

**Men's College Basketball Officiating, LLC
Women's College Basketball Officiating, LLC
Statement of Purpose**

(Adopted September 9, 2010)

The Men's College Basketball Officiating, LLC (MCBO) and Women's College Basketball Officiating, LLC (WCBO) were formed in a collaborative effort between the Collegiate Commissioners Association (CCA) and the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) to improve college basketball officiating, increase the level of accountability and enhance the level of consistency during the regular season and post-season competition.

Mission

Enhance the "culture" of the officiating community (i.e., improve the pool of officials, standardize messaging, enhance consistent application of the playing rules, points of emphasis and mechanics and remove entry barriers).

Objectives

- Enhance consistency in the application and enforcement of rules, points of emphasis and mechanics during the regular and post-season.
- Development of consistent accountability standards.
- Development of a standardized evaluation program, including enhanced observers program.
- Development of standardized educational efforts.
- Coordinated oversight of identified and emerging officiating issues.
- Diversification and improvement of officiating through defined entry processes. Expansion of the current pool of officials and development of officiating opportunities.

Men's College Basketball Officiating, LLC

Board of Managers

BOARD OF MANAGERS:	
<p>John Adams (ex-officio) National Coordinator of Men's Basketball Officiating 7510 Pine Valley Lane Indianapolis, Indiana 46250 PHONE: 317/849-2755 E-MAIL: jwasports1@aol.com</p>	<p>Britton Banowsky (FBS representative) Commissioner Conference USA 5201 N. O'Connor Boulevard, Suite 300 Irving, Texas 75039 PHONE: 214/774-1300 E-MAIL: bbb@c-usa.org</p>
<p>Scott Bearby (NCAA staff-General Counsel and Secretary) Interim Vice President of Legal Affairs P.O. Box 6222 Indianapolis, Indiana 46206 PHONE: 317/917-6913 E-MAIL: sbearby@ncaa.org</p>	<p>Dan Beebe (Big 12 representative) Commissioner Big 12 Conference 400 East John Carpenter Freeway Irving, Texas 75062 PHONE: 469/524-1000 E-MAIL: dan@big12sports.com</p>
<p>David Berst (NCAA staff) Vice President for Division I P.O. Box 6222 Indianapolis, Indiana 46206 PHONE: 317/917-6931 E-MAIL: dberst@ncaa.org</p>	<p>Mike Bobinski (ex-officio) (Division I Men's Basketball Committee representative) Associate Vice President/Director of Athletics Xavier University 3800 Victory Parkway Cincinnati, Ohio 45207 PHONE: 513/745-3417 E-MAIL: bobinski@xavier.edu</p>
<p>Jim Delany (Big Ten representative) Commissioner Big Ten Conference 1500 West Higgins Road Park Ridge, Illinois 60068 PHONE: 847/696-1010 E-MAIL: jdelany@bigten.org</p>	<p>Doug Fullerton (FCS representative) Commissioner Big Sky Conference 2491 Washington Boulevard, Suite 201 Ogden, Utah 84401 PHONE: 801/392-1978 E-MAIL: dfullerton@bigskyconference.org</p>
<p>Byron Hatch (NCAA staff) Associate Director of the Division I Men's Basketball Championship P.O. Box 6222 Indianapolis, Indiana 46206 PHONE: 317/917-6570 E-MAIL: bhatch@ncaa.org</p>	<p>Art Hyland (ex-officio) Men's Basketball Secretary-Rules Editor P.O. Box 538 Hyannisport, Massachusetts 02672 PHONE: 508/778-4811 E-MAIL: art.hyland@comcast.net</p>
<p>John Marinatto (Big East representative) Commissioner Big East Conference 15 Park Row West Providence, Rhode Island 02903 PHONE: 401/272-9108 E-MAIL: jmarinatto@bigeast.org</p>	<p>Keith Martin (NCAA staff-Treasurer) Interim Senior Vice President of Administrative Services and CFO P.O. Box 6222 Indianapolis, Indiana 46206 PHONE: 317/917-6440 E-MAIL: kmartin@ncaa.org</p>

Men's College Basketball Officiating, LLC

Board of Managers

Reggie Minton (ex-officio) (NABC representative) Deputy Executive Director National Association of Basketball Coaches 1111 Main Street, Suite 1000 Kansas City, Missouri 64105 PHONE: 816/878-6222 E-MAIL: reggie@nabc.com	Bernie McGlade (Division I representative) Commissioner Atlantic 10 Conference 11827 Canon Boulevard, Suite 200 Newport News, Virginia 23606 PHONE: 757/706-3040 E-MAIL: bmcglade@atlantic10.org
Mike Slive (Southeastern Conference representative) Commissioner Southeastern Conference 2201 Richard Arrington Boulevard North Birmingham, Alabama 35203 PHONE: 205/458-3000 E-MAIL: mlslive@sec.org	Jon Steinbrecher (FBS representative) Commissioner Mid-American Conference 24 Public Square, 15 th Floor Cleveland, Ohio 44113 PHONE: 216/566-4622 E-MAIL: jsteinbrecher@mac-sports.com
John Swofford (Atlantic Coast Conference representative) Commissioner Atlantic Coast Conference P.O. Drawer ACC Greensboro, North Carolina 27417 PHONE: 336/854-8787 E-MAIL: jswofford@theacc.org	Kevin Weiberg (Pac-10 Conference representative) Deputy Commissioner Pac-10 Conference 1350 Treat Boulevard, Suite 500 Walnut Creek, CA 94597 PHONE: 925/932-4411 E-MAIL: kweiberg@pac-10.org
Tom Yeager (FCS representative) Commissioner Colonial Athletic Association 8625 Patterson Avenue Richmond, Virginia 23229 PHONE: 804/754-1616 E-MAIL: tyeager@caasports.com	Jamie Zaninovich (Division I representative) Commissioner West Coast Conference 1250 Bayhill Drive, Suite 101 San Bruno, California 94066 PHONE: 650/873-8622 E-MAIL: izaninovich@westcoast.org

MEN'S COLLEGE BASKETBALL OFFICIATING (MCBO), LLC

Mechanics Committee/Competition Committee Roles and Responsibilities

Mechanics Committee

The primary function of the MCBO Mechanics Committee is to review and revise, on an annual basis, the officiating mechanics (e.g., officials' coverage areas, officials' positioning, officiating procedures, etc.) and update the Collegiate Commissioners Association (CCA) Men's Basketball Officiating Manual. Recommended changes are submitted by collegiate officials and conference coordinators through the Mechanics Change Proposal Form. Feedback regarding suggested changes is obtained through the annual mechanics survey. Where applicable, mechanics shall be consistent with the playing rules established by the Men's Basketball Rules Committee.

Through the years, there has been a mechanics committee that has functioned similarly to the aforementioned role. This group has been chaired by the national coordinator for men's basketball officiating and conference coordinators have volunteered to serve on the committee. There has not been a formal nomination/appointment process or defined terms for members of the committee and there has not been a formalized reporting structure for this committee.

The MCBO Mechanics Committee will formalize the nomination/appointment process for representatives on the committee. The committee will conduct its annual review/revision of the mechanics and manual according to the approved timeline. The committee's recommendations will be forwarded to the MCBO Board of Managers for review and approval. The approved mechanics will be included in the CCA Men's Basketball Officiating Manual.

Competition Committee

The primary function of the MCBO Competition Committee is to serve in an advisory role to the Men's Basketball Rules Committee. The committee may also submit recommendations, as approved by the Board of Managers, to other groups in the NCAA governance structure (e.g., Board of Directors, Men's Basketball Committee, Men's Basketball Issues Committee, etc.) as deemed necessary. The committee shall provide diverse and strategic perspectives relative to the game of collegiate men's basketball, including collaborative efforts with professional and international playing rules initiatives. The committee shall engage in strategic discussions regarding the game, "what the game should look like" in the short term and long term and how the playing rules can influence the strategic vision of the game. These strategic playing rule concepts shall serve as a significant growth catalyst for the game.

The Men's Basketball Rules Committee will continue in its current role. The Competition Committee will formulate key philosophical principles regarding the game and the manner in which it is played and officiated. The proposed principles will be reviewed and approved by the MCBO Board of Managers. The rules committee will consider rules that will achieve the philosophical principles established by the Competition Committee.

Men's College Basketball Officiating, LLC

Competition Committee

<p>John W. Adams (ex-officio) (Board member) National Coordinator of Men's Basketball Officiating 7510 Pine Valley Lane Indianapolis, Indiana 46250 PHONE: 317/590-3736 E-MAIL: jwasports1@aol.com</p>	<p>Jay Bilas (At-Large member) Moore & Van Allen, PLLC Bank of America Corporate Center 100 North Tryon Street, Floor 47 Charlotte, NC 28202 PHONE: 704/331-1080 E-MAIL: bilasj@mvalaw.com</p>
<p>Mike Brey (ex-officio) Men's Basketball Rules Committee Chair Head Men's Basketball Coach University of Notre Dame C113 Joyce Center Notre Dame, Indiana 46556 PHONE: 574/631-6107 E-MAIL: michael.p.brey.2@nd.edu</p>	<p>Jim Delany (Board member) Commissioner Big Ten Conference 1500 West Higgins Road Park Ridge, Illinois 60068 PHONE: 847/696-1010 E-MAIL: jdelany@bigten.org</p>
<p>Dan Gavitt (At-Large member) Associate Commissioner Big East Conference 15 Park Row West Providence, Rhode Island 02903 PHONE: 401/244-3278 E-MAIL: dgavitt@bigeast.org</p>	<p>Ty Halpin (ex-officio) Associate Director of Playing Rules Administration NCAA P.O. Box 6222 Indianapolis, Indiana 46206 PHONE: 317/917-6136 E-MAIL: thalpin@ncaa.org</p>
<p>Byron Hatch (ex-officio) (Board member) Associate Director of the Division I Men's Basketball Championship NCAA P.O. Box 6222 Indianapolis, Indiana 46206 PHONE: 317/917-6570 E-MAIL: bhatch@ncaa.org</p>	<p>Karl Hicks (At-Large member) Associate Commissioner Atlantic Coast Conference P.O. Drawer ACC Greensboro, NC 27417-6724 PHONE: 336/854-8787 E-MAIL: khicks@theacc.org</p>
<p>Art Hyland (ex-officio) (Board member) Men's Basketball Secretary-Rules Editor P.O. Box 538 Hyannisport, Massachusetts 02672 PHONE: 508/778-4811 E-MAIL: art.hyland@comcast.net</p>	<p>Mike Slive (Board member) Commissioner Southeastern Conference 2201 Richard Arrington Boulevard North Birmingham, Alabama 35203 PHONE: 205/458-3000 E-MAIL: mlslive@sec.org</p>

Men's College Basketball Officiating, LLC

Competition Committee

John Underwood (At-Large Member) Associate Commissioner Big 12 Conference 400 E. John Carpenter Freeway Irving, Texas 75262 PHONE: 469/524-1043 E-MAIL: junderwood@big12sports.com	Jamie Zaninovich (Board member) Commissioner West Coast Conference 1111 Bayhill Drive, Suite 405 San Bruno, California 94066 PHONE: 650/873-8622 E-MAIL: jzaninovich@westcoast.org
--	---

Men's College Basketball Officiating, LLC

Mechanics Committee

John W. Adams National Coordinator of Men's Basketball Officiating 7510 Pine Valley Lane Indianapolis, Indiana 46250 PHONE: 317/590-3736 E-MAIL: jwasports1@aol.com	Gregg Bennett (Division III) 1620 Centerville Parke Lane Manakin Sabot, Virginia 23103 PHONE: 804/337-8690 E-MAIL: gbennett@bekins.com
John Clougherty (Division I) 2002 Langham Lane Raleigh, North Carolina 27615 PHONE: 336/337-5178 E-MAIL: jclougherty@theacc.org	Reggie Cofer (Division I) 1301 Bimini Place Augusta, Georgia 30909 PHONE: 706/627-0661 E-MAIL: rcseed@aol.com
Bobby Dibler (Division I) 9525 Desert Hills Lane El Paso, Texas 79925 PHONE: 915/525-5220 E-MAIL: diblerb@sbcglobal.net	Art Hyland (ex-officio) Men's Basketball Secretary-Rules Editor P.O. Box 538 Hyannisport, Massachusetts 02672 PHONE: 508/778-4811 E-MAIL: art.hyland@comcast.net
Eddie Jackson (Division I) 1122 W. 15th Street Claremore, Oklahoma 74017 PHONE: 918/453-7274 E-MAIL: jacksone10@aol.com	Tony Stigliano (Division II) 100 North Sixth St., Suite 406 Waco, Texas 76701 PHONE: 254/714-0907 E-MAIL: tonystig@aol.com

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

MEMORANDUM

November 5, 2010

TO: Directors of Athletics at Division I Men's Basketball Institutions.

FROM: Gene Smith, chair
NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Committee

Mike Brey, chair
NCAA Men's Basketball Rules Committee.

SUBJECT: Sportsmanship Emphasis.

This communication is being sent jointly on behalf of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee and the Men's Basketball Rules Committee. The overall image and health of college basketball is at the heart of any decision made by our committees and a shared concern must be addressed at the institutional level.

Most coaches have a positive impact on the image of the sport, student-athletes and intercollegiate athletics. In recent years, progress has been made in the conduct of coaches when communicating with referees and adherence to bench decorum rules. This is the result of focused efforts by coaches, game officials and administrators alike. Numerous points of emphasis in this area – and holding officials accountable as part of the NCAA championship selection criterion – are paying dividends.

However, there remains room for further improvement. In particular, we have noted an increase in vulgar and demeaning comments by some coaches towards their student-athletes. Our committees believe the best mechanism to address this particular damaging behavior is at the institutional level.

This is a formal request to personally review your conduct expectations with your coach, which include communications with student-athletes as well as game officials and opponents.

Thank you in advance for your assistance with this request. Good luck in the upcoming year.

GS/MB:nkb

cc: Division I Men's Basketball Committee
Men's Basketball Rules Committee
Selected NABC Staff
Selected NCAA Staff



VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

MEMORANDUM

February 25, 2011

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 Division I Presidents, Chancellors, Directors of Athletics, Conference Commissioners and Head Men's Basketball Coaches.

FROM: Gene Smith, chair
NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Committee.

SUBJECT: Sportsmanship.

As the college basketball regular season draws to a close and conference tournaments begin, the Division I Men's Basketball Committee would like to clearly communicate its expectations regarding sportsmanship during the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Championship. As stewards of the game, we have a mutual responsibility to serve as leaders and role models as it relates to this topic. With your leadership, this championship will continue to be a great experience for our student-athletes and fans.

The highest level of respect and integrity which embody good sportsmanship must be exhibited throughout the championship. **Accordingly, the committee will take strong action in response to any form of misconduct and/or unsportsmanlike behavior by student-athletes and/or coaches during the championship. The basketball committee expects all game officials to strictly and consistently enforce bench decorum and the coaching box rule per Rule 10 of the Men's Basketball Rules and Interpretations. Additionally, as outlined in Rule 10, Sections 5 and 6, the committee has mandated officials to have a renewed focus and appropriately penalize the following types of unsportsmanlike behavior by student-athletes and/or coaches, including but not limited to:**

- Disrespectfully addressing or contacting an official or gesturing in such a manner as to indicate resentment; and
- Using profanity or vulgarity; taunting, baiting or ridiculing another player or bench personnel; or pointing a finger at or making obscene gestures toward another player or bench personnel.

Officials who have not and/or do not consistently enforce the rules as written shall not be selected to officiate in the championship, and those who do not enforce the rules during the championship shall be prohibited from advancing and may jeopardize their chances for future championship assignments.

N a t i o n a l C o l l e g i a t e A t h l e t i c A s s o c i a t i o n

An association of more than 1,200 members serving the student-athlete
Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

For the good of the game and each of its stakeholders, most notably our student-athletes, we appreciate your attention to this matter and respectfully request your cooperation with ensuring the atmosphere for the remainder of the basketball season exudes the highest level of fair play and sportsmanlike behavior.

GS:emh

cc: Mr. John W. Adams
Mr. Jim Haney
Mr. Reggie Minton
Men's College Basketball Officiating, LLC Board of Managers
NCAA Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct
NCAA Division I Conference Coordinators of Men's Basketball Officiating
NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Committee
NCAA Men's Basketball Issues Committee
NCAA Men's Basketball Officials
NCAA Men's Basketball Rules Committee
Selected NCAA Staff Members

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

- **ACTION ITEMS.**

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

- **INFORMATION ITEMS.**

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

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

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

2. Report from the Leadership Council Men’s Basketball Recruiting Subcommittees.

Morgan Burke and Robin Harris, chairs of the two subcommittees, reported the following factors/concepts as critical in the analysis of access to prospects and a more effective use of recruiting time and resources:

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

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

3. Report from Division I and Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) Commissioners and Head Men’s Basketball Coaches.

The Leadership Council received a report of recent discussions of men’s basketball recruiting by Division I and FCS commissioners and a head men’s basketball coach from each of those conferences. The following concepts resulted from those discussions:

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

- There should be a spring evaluation period.
 - The July evaluation period is very valuable
 - High school evaluations should be structured to allow coaches to gather as much information as possible about prospects.
 - Should consider allowing tryouts during official visits.
4. **Men's Basketball Recruiting Model Alternatives.** The Leadership Council received a document outlining men's basketball alternative recruiting models that was developed by conference office administrators with NCAA rules compliance and basketball backgrounds from the Atlantic Coast, Big Ten, Big East, Big 12, Pac-10 and Southeastern Conferences (see Attachment). While the document has not been discussed with the presidents/chancellors of the six conferences, it was offered to the Leadership Council for consideration in its discussions of men's basketball recruiting models.
5. **Status Report from the Subcommittee on Agent Issues.** Rachel Newman, NCAA director of agent, gambling and amateurism activities, noted that the Amateurism Cabinet discussed agent issues during its February meeting and will continue those discussions in June. The subcommittee plans to begin work this summer and will assess whether sport specific legislation is viable.
6. **Report from the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.** Division I SAAC Chair Scott Krapf presented a report of the committee's recent meeting and priorities for the upcoming year.
7. **Future Meetings.**
- a. July, 2011, TBD.
 - b. October, 2011, TBD.

Leadership Council chair: Mike Alden, University of Missouri

Staff Liaisons: S. David Berst, Division I governance
Jacqueline Campbell, Division I governance
Kevin Lennon, academic and membership affairs

Leadership Council Attendance
April 4, 2011, Meeting

Leadership Council members in attendance:

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

NCAA primary staff liaisons in attendance:

S. David Berst, NCAA
Jacqueline Campbell, NCAA, recording secretary
Kevin Lennon, NCAA

ADDENDUM

DI Leadership Council 04/11

Page No. 2

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

Guests:

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

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

Men's Basketball Recruiting Model Alternatives

Background

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

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

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

Objectives and consensus

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

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

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

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

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

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

A pair of recruiting calendar alternatives

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

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

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

Alternative 1

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

Alternative 1 features the following changes to the recruiting calendar:

- An April evaluation period for certified non-scholastic events would be held on Saturday-Sunday for two weeks beginning two weekends after the Final Four. If those two weekends conflict with SAT/ACT national testing dates, evaluations would be permitted during an alternate weekend in April or May.
- Summer evaluations at certified non-scholastic events would be reduced from 20 days to a 9-day period during the last three weekends (Friday-Sunday) in July.

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

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

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

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

Alternative 2

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

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

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

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

In the near term, Alternative 2 proposes:

- A 9-day period during the last three weekends (Friday-Sunday) in July during which evaluations at certified non-scholastic events may occur. This 9-day period is identical to that proposed in Alternative 1, but it would only exist for a three-year period while the transition to evaluation camps occurs.
- An additional requirement that all certified non-scholastic events include both an evaluation session and a skill-instruction component for all participants.

kw/mm

3/31/2011

Proposed alternatives to basketball recruiting model

Feature	Current	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
Official visits			
Starting point	Senior year of high school	April 15 of junior year of high school	
Travel expenses	Prospect	Prospect and two parents/legal guardians	
Off-campus contact starting point	July 1 after junior year of high school	April 15 of junior year (one contact at PSA's high school)	April 15 of junior year (two contacts at PSA's home, one contact at PSA's high school in months of April and May)
On-campus tryouts	Prohibited	Explore initiating tryouts with the following parameters: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Starting point: April 15 of the junior year of high schoolDuring official visit onlyPre-tryout physical requiredUp to 2 hoursMay including testing and competition with team; only PSAs and S-As may participateTryouts must be closed and unpublicized	
		On-campus or normal practice/competition site	Most frequently used on-campus practice site
Communications with PSAs			
Types	Phone, email, fax only	The forms of communication would not be regulated	
Phone call frequency	<ul style="list-style-type: none">June 15 of sophomore year through July 31 of junior year of high school: 1 per monthAugust 1 prior to senior year of high school: Unlimited during contact period; two per week otherwiseJC and four-year PSAs: One call per week	Starting point: August 1 prior to the junior year of high school The frequency of phone calls would not be regulated	

Feature	Current	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
Recruiting calendar evaluations			
April and May	No evaluations permitted at non-scholastic events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permit evaluations at certified non-scholastic events on two weekends (Saturday-Sunday) in late April. Dates would change if conflicts with national testing dates for SAT/ACT occur. Modify certification requirements for non-scholastic events Explore creation of evaluation camps as a pilot program. To be determined: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site(s) Numbers and ages of PSAs Format Management Coaches ability to work camps Cost 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evaluations permitted in April. Focus of spring recruiting would be on contact.
July	Evaluations permitted at certified non-scholastic events during two 10-day evaluation periods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permit evaluations at certified non-scholastic events during a 9-day evaluation period consisting of the last three Fridays-Saturdays-Sundays Modify certification requirements for non-scholastic events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permit evaluations at certified non-scholastic events during a 9-day evaluation period consisting of the last three Fridays-Saturdays-Sundays for a three-year period as a transition to evaluation camps Modify certification requirements for non-scholastic events to require both an evaluation session and a skill instruction session
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore creation of evaluation camps as a pilot program. To be determined: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site(s) Numbers and ages of PSAs Format Management Coaches ability to work camps Cost 	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

USA BASKETBALL
2011 NATIONAL TEAM TRIALS SCHEDULE

(U16 FIBA Americas Championship)
May 26-30, 2011

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

SCHEDULE

Wednesday, May 25	Arrival of Lead Clinician, Coaching Staff and Support Staff
Thursday, May 26	Arrival of Athletes and Selection Committee
	12:00-4:00p Registration - Sports Center 2
	SKILLS TRAINING SESSION 1 (Sports Center 2) - closed
	4:30-5:00p Orientation (parents and athletes)
	5:00-6:30p Group 1 - Individual Skills Clinics/Position Work
	Group 2 - Maximum Performance Session – West
Wing	
	6:30-8:00p Group 2 - Individual Skills Clinics/Position Work
	Group 1 - Maximum Performance Session – West
Wing	
Friday, May 27	SKILLS TRAINING SESSION 2 (Sports Center 2) - closed
	8:30-10:00a Group 1 - Individual Skills Clinics/Position Work
	Group 2 - USADA Information Session – West Wing
	10:00-11:30a Group 2 - Individual Skills Clinics/Position Work
	Group 1 - USADA Information Session – West Wing
	SKILLS TRAINING SESSION 3 (Sports Center 2) - closed
	1:00-2:30p Group 1 - Individual Skills Clinics/Position Work
	Group 2 - Recruiting Information Session – West
Wing	
	2:30-4:00p Group 2 - Individual Skills Clinics/Position Work
	Group 1 - Recruiting Information Session – West
Wing	
	TRIALS SESSION 1 (Sports Center 2)
	5:00-6:30p Group 1 - Team Offense & Defense/Scrimmages
	Group 2 - Parent Recruiting Session – West
Wing	
	6:30-8:00p Group 2 - Team Offense & Defense/Scrimmages
	Group 1 - Parent Recruiting Session – West Wing
Saturday, May 28	TRIALS SESSION 2 (Sports Center 2)

8:30-10:00a Group 1 - Position Work/Scrimmages
10:00-11:30a Group 2 - Position Work/Scrimmages

TRIALS SESSION 3 (Sports Center 2)

1:00-2:30p Group 1 - Position Work/Scrimmages
2:30-4:00p Group 2 - Position Work/Scrimmages

TRIALS SESSION 4 (Sports Center 2)

5:00-6:30p Group 1 - Position Work/Scrimmages
6:30-8:00p Group 2 - Position Work/Scrimmages

Sunday, May 29

TRIALS SESSION 5 (Sports Center 2)

9:00-9:15a Stretching/Shooting
9:15-10:45a Scrimmages

TRIALS SESSION 6 (Sports Center 2)

1:45-2:00p Stretching/Shooting
2:00-3:30p Scrimmages

TRIALS SESSION 7 (Sports Center 2)

5:45-6:00p Stretching/Shooting
6:00-7:30p Scrimmages

Monday, May 30

TEAM SESSION (Sports Center 2) - closed

8:30 am Announcement of U16 National Team
9:30-11:00a Team Meeting/Practice

pm Departure of Athletes, Coaches and Committee

Members

**NCAA Division I Legislation
(Impacting Division I Men's Basketball)**

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2009-100-A	RECRUITING -- TRYOUTS -- NONSCHOLASTIC PRACTICE OR COMPETITION AND NONINSTITUTIONAL CAMPS OR CLINICS -- MEN'S BASKETBALL	NCAA Division I Board of Directors	Immediate ; a contract signed before October 29, 2009, may be honored.	In men's basketball, to specify that an institution [including any institutional department (e.g., athletics, recreational/intramural)] shall not host, sponsor or conduct a nonscholastic basketball practice or competition in which men's basketball prospective student-athletes participate on its campus or at an off-campus facility regularly used by the institution for practice and/or competition by any of the institution's sport programs; further, to establish limited exceptions, as specified.	Adopted as amended by the NCAA Division I Board of Directors.
2010-15-B	PERSONNEL -- COMPENSATION AND REMUNERATION -- INCOME IN ADDITION TO INSTITUTIONAL SALARY -- CONSULTANT FOR OR ENDORSEMENT OF NONINSTITUTIONAL ATHLETICS EVENTS INVOLVING PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES -- ENDORSEMENT OF TEAM, COACH OR FACILITY	NCAA Division I Legislative Council	Immediate	To specify that 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; further, to specify that 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

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2010-16-C	PERSONNEL -- LIMITATIONS ON THE NUMBER AND DUTIES OF COACHES -- NONCOACHING STAFF MEMBERS -- BASKETBALL -- LIMIT OF TWO	NCAA Division I Legislative Council	August 1, 2012	In basketball, to specify that there shall be a limit of two noncoaching staff members (two for men's basketball and two for women's basketball) whose duties include support of the basketball program in any capacity (e.g., director of operations, video coordinator, quality control personnel, director of player development, director of community relations) who may be employed (either on a salaried or a volunteer basis) by the institution; further, to specify that clerical staff and managers and noncoaching institutional staff members whose responsibilities relate to basketball, but who do not directly support the basketball program (e.g., sports information personnel, equipment manager, academic advisor, athletic trainer, marketing staff) are exempt from the limitation on the number of noncoaching staff members.	Tabled

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2010-16-C-1	PERSONNEL -- LIMITATIONS ON THE NUMBER AND DUTIES OF COACHES -- NONCOACHING STAFF MEMBERS -- BASKETBALL -- LIMIT OF FOUR -- EXCEPTION FOR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet	August 1, 2012	To amend Proposal No. 2010-16-C, in basketball, to specify that there shall be a limit of four noncoaching staff members (four for men's basketball and four for women's basketball) whose duties include support of the basketball program in any capacity (e.g., clerical staff, director of operations, video coordinator, quality control personnel, director of player development, director of community relations) who may be employed (either on a salaried or a volunteer basis) by the institution; further, to specify that a full-time undergraduate or graduate student at the certifying institution who performs duties in support of the basketball program is exempt from the limitation on the number of noncoaching staff members.	Tabled
2010-16-C-2	PERSONNEL -- LIMITATIONS ON THE NUMBER AND DUTIES OF COACHES -- NONCOACHING STAFF MEMBERS -- BASKETBALL -- LIMIT OF TWO - - EXCEPTION FOR VIDEO PERSONNEL WHO ARE FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	Atlantic Coast Conference	August 1, 2012	To amend NCAA Proposal No. 2010-16-C, in basketball, to specify that a videographer who is a full-time undergraduate student at the certifying institution is exempt from the limitation on the number of noncoaching staff members.	Tabled

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2010-24	AMATEURISM -- INVOLVEMENT WITH PROFESSIONAL TEAMS -- PROFESSIONAL BASKETBALL DRAFT -- FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE STUDENT-ATHLETE -- MEN'S BASKETBALL	Atlantic Coast Conference	August 1, 2011	In men's basketball, to specify that the date by which a student-athlete must request that his name be removed from a professional league's draft list in order to retain his eligibility shall be the day before the first day of the spring National Letter of Intent signing period for the applicable year.	Adopted
2010-34	RECRUITING -- CONTACTS AND EVALUATIONS -- MEN'S BASKETBALL EVALUATIONS -- CERTIFIED NONSCHOLASTIC EVENTS DURING APRIL CONTACT PERIOD	Pacific-10 Conference and Big East Conference	August 1, 2011	In men's basketball, to specify that a coaching staff member may evaluate prospective student-athletes at certified nonscholastic events on Saturdays and Sundays during the April contact period.	Referred to the Leadership Council as part of its review of the men's basketball recruiting process.
2010-42	RECRUITING -- LETTER-OF- INTENT PROGRAMS, FINANCIAL AID AGREEMENTS - - REQUIREMENTS FOR VERBAL OFFER OF ATHLETICALLY RELATED FINANCIAL AID	NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet	Immediate	To specify that an institution shall not make a verbal offer of athletically related financial aid to an individual, directly or indirectly, before July 1 following his or her junior year in high school; further, to specify that an institution must have a high school transcript (official or unofficial) on file that includes the results of the individual's first five semesters or seven quarters of high school enrollment before extending a verbal offer of financial aid.	Defeated

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2010-47	RECRUITING -- USE OF RECRUITING FUNDS -- RECRUITING OR SCOUTING SERVICES -- VIDEO-ONLY SERVICES	Southeastern Conference	Immediate	To specify that an institution is permitted to use or subscribe to a video service that only provides video of prospective student-athletes and does not provide information about or analysis of prospective student-athletes, subject to the criteria that permits an institution to subscribe to a recruiting or scouting service, except that the video-only service is not required to disseminate information about prospective student-athletes at least four times a year and is not required to provide individual analysis for each prospective student-athlete in the information it disseminates.	Adopted
2010-48	RECRUITING -- USE OF RECRUITING FUNDS -- RECRUITING OR SCOUTING SERVICES -- LIST OF PERMISSIBLE RECRUITING SERVICES -- MEN'S BASKETBALL	Southeastern Conference	August 1, 2011	In men's basketball, to specify that the NCAA national office shall publish a list, on a quarterly basis, of men's basketball recruiting or scouting services deemed to meet the required standards for subscription.	Tabled

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2010-49	RECRUITING -- RECRUITING CALENDARS -- MEN'S BASKETBALL -- APRIL CONTACT PERIOD	Atlantic 10 Conference	Immediate	In men's basketball, to revise the recruiting calendar by extending the contact period in April by nine days, but designating the weekends in April after the Division I Men's Basketball Championship as quiet periods.	Referred to the Leadership Council as part of its review of the men's basketball recruiting process.
2010-50	RECRUITING -- BASKETBALL EVENT CERTIFICATION -- WOMEN'S EVENTS AND MEN'S SUMMER EVENTS -- PRICE OF ADMISSION	NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet (Men's Basketball Issues Committee) (Women's Basketball Issues Committee)	May 1, 2011; for events occurring on or after May 1, 2011.	In basketball, to specify that in order for a women's event or men's summer event to be certified, the price of admission to the event must be listed on the event certification application and the price must be made available to coaches prior to their arrival at the event.	Adopted

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2010-52	ELIGIBILITY -- GRADUATE STUDENT/ POSTBACCALAUREATE PARTICIPATION -- ONE-TIME TRANSFER EXCEPTION -- NONRENEWAL OF ATHLETICS AID AT PREVIOUS INSTITUTION -- BASEBALL, BASKETBALL, FOOTBALL AND MEN'S ICE HOCKEY	Mountain West Conference	August 1, 2011	In baseball, basketball, football and men's ice hockey, to permit a student-athlete who is enrolled in a graduate or professional school of an institution other than the institution from which he or she previously received a baccalaureate degree to participate in intercollegiate athletics, provided the student-athlete meets the conditions of the one-time transfer exception (other than the sport restrictions), has at least one season of competition remaining and the student-athlete's previous institution did not renew his or her athletically related financial aid for the following academic year.	Adopted

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2010-58-C	ELIGIBILITY, FINANCIAL AID AND PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- SUMMER ACADEMIC PREPARATION AND COLLEGE ACCLIMATIZATION -- MEN'S BASKETBALL -- NATIONAL SERVICE ACADEMY EXCEPTION	Mountain West Conference	August 1, 2011; effective beginning with the summer 2012.	In men's basketball, to establish a summer academic preparation and college acclimatization model, as specified, including exceptions for national service academies.	Tabled
2010-89	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- BASKETBALL -- LOCATION OF QUALIFYING REGULAR-SEASON MULTIPLE-TEAM EVENT -- THE BAHAMAS	Conference USA and Southeastern Conference	August 1, 2011	In basketball, to specify that a qualifying regular-season multiple-team event may occur in the Commonwealth of The Bahamas.	Adopted

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2010-111	INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL -- FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE -- MEN'S BASKETBALL	NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet (Men's Basketball Issues Committee)	Immediate	In men's basketball, to eliminate the requirement that an institution publicly disclose information regarding fiduciary relationships between the institution and prospective student-athletes' coaches.	
2010-113	RECRUITING -- CONTACTS AND EVALUATIONS -- BASKETBALL EVALUATIONS -- NONINSTITUTIONAL ORGANIZED RECRUITING EVENTS APPROVED, SPONSORED OR CONDUCTED BY A GOVERNING BODY -- EVENT CERTIFICATION	NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet (Men's Basketball Issues Committee) (Women's Basketball Issues Committee)	Immediate	In basketball, to specify that a noninstitutional organized event that is approved, sponsored or conducted by an applicable state, national or international governing body and is organized and conducted primarily for a recruiting purpose is subject to the basketball event certification program.	

Educational Column - 1 Educational Column

Title:

NCAA Bylaw 17.5.5.1.1 -- Qualifying Regular-Season Multiple-Team Event (I)

Item Ref: 1

Date Issued: March 26, 2007

Date Published: March 26, 2007

Educational Column:

Recently, several institutions and conferences have expressed concerns related to possible inconsistent and/or incorrect application of NCAA Bylaw 17.5.5.1.1 (qualifying regular-season multiple-team event). As a result of recent discussions at the February 2007 meeting of the NCAA Division I Championships/Competition Cabinet Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee, the following information is designed to provide clarification to institutional and conference staff members and basketball coaches regarding the application of the legislation to qualifying multiple-team events.

Each section of the rule is presented below with direction on how that particular section should be applied.

1. The event must be sponsored by the NCAA, an active or affiliated member or a member conference and must take place in the United States or one of its territories.

- The NCAA, an institution or conference, or an affiliated member of the NCAA may sponsor multiple events during the same academic year, provided the events are separate and distinct events (e.g., different names, different participants).
- The requirement that these entities serve as the sponsors of events is designed to promote and protect the integrity of the event and preclude a sponsor from simply lending its name to the event.

2. The event includes no more than four contests per institution and concludes not later than 14 days after the first contest of the event.

- This requirement is designed to promote a multiple-game event that is structured like a traditional tournament (i.e., bracket format, round-robin). While new formats were established last year and permitted, some formats were clearly contrary to the intent of the rule and were used as an attempt to play additional games.
- For example, an event that conducts round-robin play among four teams at two different sites (eight total teams) with a predetermined fourth game between one of the participating teams from each site is permissible. On the other hand, under this format, if the fourth game is to include a team (or two teams) that did not participate in the round-robin portion of the event, the institutions that participate in the fourth game must count it against the maximum contest limit.

3. Participation is limited, by conference, to one team per conference and, by institution, to not more than once in the same event in any four-year period.

- It may be permissible for an institution to host distinctly separate events in consecutive years or more than once in any four-year period. However, the following should provide guidance on whether the events are the same event:
- An event that has the same name is considered the same event, regardless of the venue or sponsorship arrangements.
- An event may be considered a different event, provided it is wholly separate and distinct. One obvious example is that an institution may have hosted a game in the NIT Season Tip-Off in 2006 and may also host a game in the Conference X Classic in 2007. However, it would not be permissible for an institution to have hosted the Sponsor A Classic in 2006 and host the Sponsor B Classic in 2007 if the Sponsor A Classic does not continue in 2007. Such an arrangement appears to be the same event occurring in consecutive years, the only significant change was in the name of the event. Such situations may require review by a conference office or the NCAA on a case-by-case basis to determine appropriate compliance with the intent of the rule.
- An event that involves 50 percent or more of the same participants, regardless of venue, the title or sponsorship arrangements is considered the same event. For example, if Sponsor D Classic was conducted in 2006 with four teams, it may become Sponsor F Classic for 2007 and move to a different venue; however, if two (or more) of the teams from the 2006 Sponsor D Classic are participating in the 2007 Sponsor F Classic, it will be considered the same event.

4. Each institution participating in a qualifying multiple-team event must use Bylaw 17.5.5.1-(a) as its maximum contest limitation for the playing season in which it participates in the event.

- This requires that every participating institution in an event is limited to a maximum of 27 contests, plus one qualifying multiple-team event.

References

Legislative References			Other
Div.	Number	Title	References Educational Columns: 0
I	17.3.5.1.1	Qualifying Regular-Season Multiple-Team Event.	Educational Columns: 0
			Proposals: 0

Excerpt from an e-mail exchange:

The legislation in question [17.3.5.1 and 17.3.5.1.1] was adopted by the DI membership as an alternative to the former rule that limited institutions to participating certified events such as the Maui Invitational, Preseason NIT, Coaches vs. Cancer more than twice in a four year period and counting such participation as a single contest. You may recall that the NCAA was involved in litigation with event operators regarding the “2-in-4 rule” and ultimately prevailed. The DI membership though still believed that the rule should be modified and ultimately approved the current rule that established qualifying regular-season multiple-team events. The DI membership discussed simply establishing a maximum contest limit [30] and including all contests in the limits, but there was some sentiment that the current preseason events offered both cultural and competitive opportunities for student-athletes and should be maintained in some form. In establishing the criteria for such events, the membership basically tried to establish parameters that were consistent with how the events currently were being operated. Some events often were conducted over a two week period and included as many as four contests. Some events included a format in which teams played a portion of the event at home sites and then convened at a central site to complete the event. Such events, however, never included an additional game either before or after the event involving a participant in the event against another institution that otherwise was not involved in the event. With the adoption of the new rule, there is no question that some events, new and existing, have become quite creative in trying to promote and sustain their event by ensuring the maximum four contests allowed by the legislation. I certainly can understand the points you raised regarding economic opportunity, but with all due respect, if the membership wanted to just allow institutions four contests, regardless of the format of the event, there really is no reason to even have the rule. As result, the NCAA Academic and Membership Services staff, over the course of the last few years, has been requested to review the format of events to determine the appropriate application of the legislation. In doing so, the staff has made a good faith effort to analyze these nontraditional formats and apply a “rule of reason” consistent with the intent of the original legislation, while still maintaining some flexibility as it relates to the event operator’s decision as to how to conduct the event.

With that in mind, the staff has consistently determined that a single contest involving one or few of the participants tacked on to the beginning or the end of an event against an opponent that otherwise is not even participating in the event were never intended to be considered part of the event. As such, those contests would have to be considered an additional contest included in the institutions maximum contest limitations. In fact, my colleagues with whom I discussed the matter have indicated that a request for waiver similar to your request has actually been denied in a previous year by the Legislative Council Subcommittee of Legislative Relief [SLR]. Once the event has concluded for all practical purposes, as would be the case here, it is just not reasonable to play an additional home game with an institution and consider such a game to be part of the event. Quite frankly, the same analysis would apply if the additional contest was on the front end. Consolation games involving teams who have participants in the event are quite distinguishable from the proposed format involving an isolated contest against a team that otherwise is not a part of the event.

Division I Legislation Display - 1 Cite

Title:17.3.2.2 - Women's Basketball.

Previous Cite: 17.3.2.1 Men's Basketball.

Next Cite: 17.3.2.3 Permissible Conditioning Activities.

An institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions before 5 p.m. on the date that is 40 days before the date of the institution's first regular-season contest. An institution shall not engage in more than 30 days of countable athletically related activities before its first regular-season contest. *(Adopted: 4/29/10)*

References

Other

Proposals: 1

Interpretations: 2

Legislative Relief Waivers:
2

SA Reinstatement/
Secondary Cases: 1



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

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

www.ncaa.org

MEMORANDUM

March 2, 2011

TO: NCAA Division I Conference Commissioners;
NCAA Division I Collegiate Commissioners Association Compliance Administrators;
Faculty Athletics Representative Association;
1A Faculty Athletics Representatives;
National Academic Advising Association;
National Association for Athletics Compliance;
National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics; and
Select Coaches' Associations.

FROM: Carolyn Callahan, chair
NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet.

SUBJECT: NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet: Seeking Feedback on Two-Year College Transfer Concepts.

As part of continuing academic reform efforts, the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet continued its review of two-year college transfer academic requirements during its February 2011, meeting. Based on data regarding the differences in academic profiles of two-year transfers and their nontransfer counterparts, the Academic Cabinet developed draft concepts for membership and two-year community feedback during its September 2010, meeting. The cabinet received significant feedback regarding the draft concepts. Based on feedback, the cabinet has modified the concepts and provided greater clarity in application. The cabinet again seeks input from the NCAA membership and the two-year community regarding the amended concepts with the goal of developing legislative proposals for formal NCAA membership consideration in the 2011-12 legislative cycle.

The package of concepts includes enhanced academic standards for both qualifiers and nonqualifiers, as well as the establishment of a year of academic readiness. Together, the components of the package develop minimum standards that reflect the academic preparation needed to succeed academically at a

N a t i o n a l C o l l e g i a t e A t h l e t i c A s s o c i a t i o n

An association of more than 1,200 members serving the student-athlete
Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

Division I institution. The package also provides opportunities for student-athletes, who are academically underprepared when enrolling at a two-year college, sufficient time to meet 2-4 transfer requirements.

Enclosed is a summary overview of the draft concepts developed by the cabinet. The cabinet again seeks feedback regarding the amended concepts. Please forward additional comments to Diane Dickman (ddickman@ncaa.org) or Jennifer Strawley (jstrawley@ncaa.org) at the NCAA not later than June 1, 2011. In addition, if you would like NCAA staff to attend your spring conference meetings to review the concepts and gather input from your constituents, please contact Diane or Jennifer.

Thank you again for your time in reviewing the concepts.

JFS/CC:alg

Enclosure

NCAA Division I Academic Eligibility Requirements for Two-Year College Transfers

Goals and Principles.

In its review of 2-4 transfer regulations, the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet adopted the following goals:

Establishment of 2-4 transfer requirements that:

1. Lead to enhanced first-year academic success at the four-year institution.
2. Improve academic success and graduation of 2-4 college transfer student-athletes at four-year institutions and have these outcomes more closely mirror nontransfer student-athletes.
3. Provide greater opportunity for academically underprepared student-athletes to gain the academic skills and preparation necessary to be academically successful and graduate from a four-year institution.

Key Research Findings.

1. Two-year college transfers leave college ineligible at higher rates than any other group of student-athletes, in particular after exhausting athletics eligibility.
2. Although two-year college transfer graduation rates have trended up in the last decade, they still lag behind those student-athletes who enter an NCAA Division I institution directly from high school.
3. Transfer students from two-year colleges earn academic progress rates that are significantly lower than those for transfers from four-year colleges or nontransfers.
4. Grade-point average at the two-year institution is the strongest predictor of first-year academic success at the four-year college. Aggregate ineligibility rates among two-year college transfers decrease significantly as a function of increased two-year college grade-point average. In particular, student-athletes transferring from a two-year college with low grade-point averages are much more likely to experience academic difficulties at the four-year school than any other group of students.
5. The number of physical education activity courses taken at the two-year college has a significant and independent negative relationship with four-year college success. Controlling for other factors such as grades earned, students with fewer physical education activity credits tend to perform better academically at four-year institutions.
6. Student-athletes who transfer with more academic courses taken at the two-year institution (particularly in math, science and English) perform better at four-year institutions.

Draft Concepts.

Qualifiers: Note that per current NCAA regulations, student-athletes who are qualifiers are eligible for practice and financial aid upon transfer. Thus, the following apply only to competition during their initial year of enrollment at the Division I institution.

1. Increase the transferable grade-point-average requirement from 2.000 to 2.250.
2. Expand to all sports the current men's basketball limitation of two credit hours of physical education activity courses that may be used to fulfill the transferable degree credit and grade-point-average requirements. An exception would be provided for a physical education degree program or a degree program in education that requires physical education activity courses.
3. All other 2-4 transfer regulations for qualifiers would remain in effect. This includes the student spending at least one full-time term at the two-year college and completing an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours of transferable degree credit per term.
4. The proposed changes (increased grade-point average and the limit on physical education activity courses) would also apply to 4-2-4 transfers.

Nonqualifiers: Nonqualifiers are ineligible for competition, practice and financial aid unless they meet two-year college transfer requirements.

1. Increase the transferrable grade-point-average requirement from 2.000 to 2.250 for competition purposes only. Although data clearly support the importance of an increased grade-point-average requirement, to continue to provide access to higher education for student-athletes who do not meet the increased grade-point average, athletics aid and practice may be provided for student-athletes who achieve the current 2.000 transferable grade-point average and meet all other requirements noted in Nos. 2 through 5 below.
2. Expand to all sports the current men's basketball limitation of two hours of physical education activity courses that may be used to fulfill the transferable degree credit and grade-point-average requirements. An exception would be provided for a physical education degree program or a degree program in education that requires physical education activity courses.
3. Require completion of transferable core credits at the two-year institution as follows: three semester/four quarters of math, three semester/four quarter hours of science and six semester/eight quarters of English. This adds three semester/four quarter credits of science to the current core requirement.

4. All other current requirements would remain in effect (e.g., earn Associate of Arts degree or equivalent academic two-year degree, 48 semester/72 quarters of transferable credits, minimum of three semesters/four quarters at two-year college, progress-toward-degree requirements, etc.).
5. An increase to the grade-point average, the limit of physical education activity courses and the inclusion of a core curriculum would also apply to 4-2-4 transfers. The core curriculum requirements may be earned at any previous two- or four-year institution.

Year of Academic Readiness for Student-Athletes at Two-Year Institution.

Central to the package is a concept that would target prospective student-athletes who are significantly academically underprepared by permitting an academic year in residence during the student's first year at the two-year college in order to remediate academic deficiencies. Members of the two-year college community have indicated that, for some student-athletes, it is extremely difficult to successfully complete the courses needed to meet NCAA transfer requirements in two years. This will only be enhanced by increased academic standards for two-year transfers. In addition, student-athletes who need significant remediation, or courses taught below those transferable to an NCAA institution, are sometimes attending two-year colleges part time for a semester or two in order not to trigger the start of their five-year NCAA "clock."

The draft concept of a year of academic readiness would provide additional time at the two-year college for student-athletes to become academically prepared for enrollment at a Division I institution. With the increased academic standards outlined above, the year of academic readiness would provide an option for two-year college students who may benefit from remedial courses and other opportunities to gain the academic skills needed to succeed and graduate from a four-year institution.

The general principles of the year of academic readiness are as follows:

1. The year of academic readiness must occur at the two-year college(s). No competition would be permitted during the year of academic readiness; however, student-athletes could practice and receive athletically related financial aid.
2. The year of academic readiness must be used during the student-athlete's initial year of collegiate enrollment, whenever that occurs.
3. Student-athletes would be required to register with the NCAA Eligibility Center and be certified as a nonqualifier in order to use the year of academic readiness.
4. The NCAA Eligibility Center would track student-athletes who use the year of academic readiness. Student-athletes and two-year colleges would be required to notify the NCAA Eligibility Center, during the initial year of enrollment at the two-year institution, of the

decision to use the year of academic readiness. Use of the year of academic readiness would be noted on Institutional Request List.

5. Students-athletes who elect to use the year of academic readiness must attend the two-year college(s) full time for a minimum of five full-time semesters/seven quarters prior to transferring to a Division I institution.
6. The year of academic readiness and minimum of five semesters or seven quarters of enrollment at the two-year college may occur at multiple two-year colleges.
7. The five semester or seven quarters of enrollment at the two-year college must be consecutive. Existing exceptions would remain in place (e.g., armed services, Peace Corps, official religious mission).
8. The start of the five-year NCAA eligibility “clock” would be delayed during the first year of enrollment at the two-year institution for purposes of the five-year period of eligibility and progress toward degree.
9. Student-athletes would have a maximum of two seasons of competition remaining upon enrolling at a Division I institution. Extenuating circumstances (e.g., injury) may be considered in the waiver process.
10. The year of academic readiness would not be considered a denied participation opportunity for purposes of a five-year clock extension request.
11. Student-athletes would be provided the opportunity to receive six years of athletically related financial aid within a seven-year period.
12. First year of academic enrollment for purposes of the recruiting contact legislation does not include the year of academic readiness. Therefore, on or off campus in-person recruiting contact (including unofficial and official visits) may not occur until after the second year of enrollment. Evaluation/phone calls remain available per current bylaws.
13. Current NCAA regulations (e.g., amateurism rules) related to time between high school graduation and initial full-time enrollment at the two-year institution would remain in place.

Effective Date.

The Academic Cabinet recommends that the aforementioned changes to the two-year college transfer legislation be effective for student-athletes initially enrolling full time at a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2013. The Academic Cabinet noted this effective date provides sufficient time to conduct educational outreach and provide appropriate notice.



MEMORANDUM

April 28, 2011

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 Men's Basketball Issues Committee.
NCAA Women's Basketball Issues Committee.

FROM: Sandy Parrott.
Associate Director of Basketball Certification.

SUBJECT: Input from the Committee Requested.

The basketball certification staff would like to request that the Men's and Women's Basketball Issues Committees discuss and provide their input on the following issues:

1. Update criteria for the application of the adjoining-state restrictions.

- (1) Recommendation. The basketball certification staff requests that the Men's and Women's Basketball Issues Committees review the criteria utilized for enforcing the residency requirements for teams participating in an NCAA-certified event.
- (2) Rationale. Since the criterion being utilized was developed in 2003, by the Men's Basketball Issues Committee and has not been revisited, the staff believes that the criteria/guidelines should be reviewed to determine whether any updates are necessary. These standards will be utilized in determining where a prospective student-athlete can participate and would be utilized in determining whether a waiver of the legislation should be granted. [Attachment A]

Additionally, the basketball certification staff has been questioned about rural communities that exist on two bordering states. When applying the adjoining-state rule, an exception exists for teams in cities whose metropolitan area is located on a state border. Teams from these cities (i.e., Washington D.C., Kansas City, St. Louis/East St. Louis, etc.), may include more than three team members from an adjoining-state as long as each additional participant resides within the metropolitan area.

Consideration has not been given to rural communities with similar circumstances because they would be difficult to define. The United States Census information is utilized to define the metropolitan areas of cities. In that regard, it was questioned whether the legislation should be changed to combine the previous 100-mile rule with the current adjoining-state.

Note: Now that this residency restriction has been added to the women's certified events, that women's committee would also need to acknowledge this criteria as a guideline for the application of this legislation. Additionally, the basketball certification staff and Subcommittees for Legislative Relief (SLR) staff would request that the Men's and Women's Basketball Issues Committees agree upon one set of standards.

2. Modify the SLR waiver process for waivers involving the adjoining-state rule.

- (1) Recommendation. The basketball certification staff and the SLR staff requests that the Men's and Women's Basketball Issues Committees review the process by which prospective student-athletes and their parents and coaches would file a waiver to request relief from the adjoining-state legislation.
- (2) Rationale. Since the SLR staff is limited to receiving requests from member institutions, conferences and committees, a prospective student-athlete or nonscholastic team must solicit one of these groups from within the NCAA membership to submit a waiver on their behalf. There is concern that this action could potentially create an obligation between that prospect/team and the. In that regard, the basketball certification staff is proposing that the process by which these individuals would submit a waiver request be changed to eliminate such obligations. A memorandum detailing the proposed procedures is included. [Attachment B]

SP:ms

Enclosures



MEMORANDUM

November 8, 2010

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 Men's Basketball Issues Committee
NCAA Women's Basketball Issues Committee.

FROM: Sandy Parrott
Associate Director of Basketball Certification.

SUBJECT: Update Criteria for the Application of the Adjoining-State
Restrictions.

Recommendation: The NCAA basketball certification (BBCert) staff requests that the NCAA Men's and Women's Basketball Issues Committees review the criteria utilized for enforcing the residency requirements for teams participating in an NCAA-certified event.

Rationale: Since the criterion being utilized was developed in 2003 and has not been revisited, the staff believes that the Men's and Women's Basketball Issues Committees should review the criteria/guidelines and determine whether any updates are necessary. These standards will be utilized in determining where a prospective student-athlete can participate and would be utilized in determining whether a waiver of the legislation should be granted.

Current NCAA legislation requires participants on nonscholastic teams to reside either within the same state as the team or within a geographically adjoining state, with not more than three prospects from adjoining states participating on any one team. The standard was established to deter nonscholastic teams from "renting" elite prospects from around the country for brief periods of time to compete in NCAA-certified basketball events.

The legislation, as applied, requires the prospect's legal residence (usually that of the prospect's parent(s) or legal guardian) to be located within the same state or an adjoining state of the official mailing address of the nonscholastic team.

In 2003, the subcommittee believed relief from the strict application of the legislation should be granted only in situations in which **no permissible team exists that will allow a prospect the opportunity to participate in any NCAA-certified event.** Relief should not be granted so that a prospect can play for a specific team or in a specific event.

The Men's Basketball Issues Committee initially supported the following guidelines:

- A prospect who is not an international prospect or a student at a preparatory school should be required to establish and maintain a legal residence for a **minimum of three months** prior to participating in an NCAA-certified event.
- Legal guardianship must be established in a court of law and must be permanent. (It is not permissible for a coach, family member or other individual to obtain guardianship of an athlete in order for the athlete to participate on a team in a different state in an effort to circumvent the intent of the adjoining state rule.) Additionally, the prospect is required to establish and maintain a legal residence for a **minimum of three months** prior to participating on a team in that location in an NCAA-certified event.
- International athletes must play on a team from their own country and the adjoining-state rule should be applied provincially within that country. Athletes cannot participate on a team outside their country's borders.
- An international prospect may use the legal address of the prospect's host family, provided the prospect is part of an educational exchange program and has resided with the family for a minimum of one academic year.
- An international prospect who is not part of an educational exchange program may use the host family's address if the prospect attended high school in the locale for a minimum of one academic year.
- An international prospect who is not part of an educational exchange program and whose host family's address is not in the same state as the school the prospect is attending, would not be permitted to utilize the host family's address.
- A prospect who has attended a preparatory school for a minimum of one academic year may use the address of the educational institution or the prospect's legal (home) residence.
- Two-year college prospects who have completed a minimum of one academic year may use the address of the educational institution or the prospect's legal (home) residence.
- Although the states of Alaska and Hawaii are not geographically adjoined by any other state, no states should be "designated" as adjoining states for Alaska and Hawaii.
- Prospects from Canada must comply with the same guidelines as other international prospects.

Exceptions to the Rule:

- In situations in which a team includes prospects from a metropolitan area located on a state border, the team may include more than three team members from adjoining states as long as each additional participant resides within the metropolitan area.
- It has been determined that because the intent of the adjoining-state legislation would not be violated, and that based on the restrictions imposed by the tribal membership itself, it is permissible to view a Native American tribe in its entirety as analogous to a state, regardless of the fact that its geographic location may encompass several states. Therefore, Native American athletes can participate on their tribal team regardless of their state of residence.

Staff Recommendations:

The BBCert staff would recommend that the committees affirm the above guidelines with a few additional considerations.

1. International prospective student-athletes who attend a preparatory/boarding school, but whose host family lives in a different state than the school.
2. Waive the required three-month minimum if a prospective student-athlete can produce documentation showing that state residency requirements have been met.
3. An additional exception to the rule to address rural communities that exist on two bordering states.

SP:ms



MEMORANDUM

November 8, 2010

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 Men's Basketball Issues Committee
NCAA Women's Basketball Issues Committee.

FROM: Sandy Parrott
Associate Director of Basketball Certification.

SUBJECT: Update the Process for Submitting a Subcommittee for Legislative Relief Waiver.

Recommendation: The NCAA basketball certification (BBCert) staff requests that the NCAA Men's and Women's Basketball Issues Committees review the process for submitting a waiver to request relief from the adjoining-state legislation.

Rationale: Since the Subcommittee for Legislative Relief (SLR) staff is limited to receiving requests from an entity within the NCAA membership, prospects are forced to approach the athletics department at an NCAA member institution or a conference to solicit them to file the waiver on the prospect's behalf. However, doing so seems to create an obligation between the prospect and that institution/conference.

Proposal: The BBCert staff would suggest that prospective student-athletes, their coaches and families should submit documentation to the BBCert staff. If the circumstances are consistent with the standards outlined in the adjoining-state restrictions, the BBCert staff will forward a completed request to the Men's or Women's Basketball Issues Committee liaison who will work with the Men's or Women's Basketball Issues Committee chair. The Men's or Women's Basketball Issues Committee chair will determine whether an SLR request should be forwarded and supported by the Men's or Women's Basketball Issues Committee or whether the request does not merit support. The SLR makes a determination based on the suggested guidelines and any other guidance offered by the Men's or Women's Basketball Issues Committee. Allowing the BBCert staff to act as the point person and collector of the information and submitting the waiver request on behalf of the Men's or Women's Basketball Issues Committee, would eliminate the necessity of a prospect to find an institution to submit a waiver on their behalf. It would also eliminate any obligation created by the institution in filing the waiver on the prospect's behalf.

N a t i o n a l C o l l e g i a t e A t h l e t i c A s s o c i a t i o n

An association of more than 1,200 members serving the student-athlete

Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

The procedure for filing such a waiver would occur in the following manner:

1. Written requests shall be submitted to the BBCert staff who will determine whether guidelines are met or not.
 - If guidelines are met, then the BBCert staff will complete the SLR application and forward to the Men's or Women's Basketball Issues Committee liaison who will obtain a signature on a letter from the chair of the Men's or Women's Basketball Issues Committee in support of the waiver request. The Men's or Women's Basketball Issues Committee liaison will submit the SLR application and letter of support to the SLR staff.
 - If guidelines are not met, the BBCert staff will inform the applicant that the request cannot be accommodated due to the legislation's intent.
 - If an applicant is able to have an institution or a conference submit an SLR application, SLR staff will forward a copy of the application to the BBCert staff for review and determination whether guidelines are met or not.
2. SLR will review applications received (assumption of support of a grant) and make decision. SLR will inform the BBCert staff of the decision and the BBCert staff will verbally inform applicant of decision. SLR will follow their normal policies and procedures for formal notice of the waiver approval.
3. If staff denies an SLR application from an institution or a conference on behalf of a prospective student-athlete, the decision may be appealed to the subcommittee.
4. Decision letter will be sent to prospective student-athlete/parent or institution/conference and copied to the BBCert staff.
5. Questions regarding this waiver process should be directed to the BBCert staff unless it is of a procedural nature, which should be forwarded to SLR.
6. Timeline of process once request received by the Men's or Women's Basketball Issues Committee liaison should be one business week.

SP:ms

**REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I MEN'S BASKETBALL ISSUES COMMITTEE
MAY 24, 2011, MEETING**

ACTION ITEMS.

- None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Men's Basketball Issues Updates.** The NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Issues Committee received reports/updates regarding the following items:
 - a. The operation of the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Championship; specifically, information related to tournament expansion and the television format.
 - b. The operation of Men's College Basketball Officiating, LLC.
 - c. The NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Committee and NCAA Men's Basketball Rules Committee sportsmanship initiative. It was reported that as a result of focused efforts by coaches, game officials and institutional administrators, progress has been made in the conduct of coaches when communicating with referees and adherence to bench decorum. It was noted that there remains room for further improvement, particularly in the area of vulgar and/or demeaning comments made by coaches towards student-athletes. The group agreed that this type of conduct should be addressed by institutions and conferences (as opposed to game officials) and supported the development of educational videos and best practices to provide such assistance.
 - d. Two-year college academic concepts; specifically, enhanced academic standards for both qualifiers and nonqualifiers as well as the establishment of a year of academic readiness.
 - e. Enforcement group initiatives, both internal and external.
2. **Division I Men's Basketball Recruiting Model.** The committee received an update regarding the progress of the NCAA Division I Leadership Council in the development of a new Division I men's basketball recruiting model. The group engaged in a discussion and expressed support for the "big picture" concepts that have currently been identified by the Leadership Council, including earlier/increased access between coaches and prospective student-athletes (and their parents/legal guardians), modification of the recruiting calendar that includes a decrease in the July evaluation period and additional opportunities to evaluate certified nonscholastic activities during April, a flexible recruiting calendar with the same number of recruiting days, deregulation and/or simplification of methods of

communication with prospects(and their parents /legal guardians) and a moratorium on further changes until the new model can be appropriately evaluated over a period of time.

3. Legislative Issues.

- a. The committee received an overview of 2010-11 legislative proposals impacting men's basketball. The group expressed some concern regarding the adoption of NCAA Division I Proposal No. 2010-24, the proposal to move the date for withdrawal from the NBA draft to the day before the initial date for signing the spring National Letter of Intent (NLI). Specific concerns identified included the potential inability of student-athletes to gather all necessary information to make an informed decision, the disruption of team continuity during the latter part of the regular season/NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Championship tournament and the increased media attention during the championship. The committee also discussed Proposal No. 2010-16-C and related amendments, which would establish limitations on noncoaching basketball-specific personnel and was tabled by the NCAA Division I Legislative Council in April, and expressed support for the Legislative Council's suggestion to the NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet to consider alternatives that address limits only on bench personnel (during practice and competition).
- b. The committee reviewed NCAA Bylaws 17.3.5.1 and 17.3.5.1.1 regarding qualifying regular-season multiple-team events and discussed the various event formats , but agreed not to recommend any changes to the current legislation.
- c. The committee reviewed Bylaw 17.3.2.2, the new preseason practice start date/rule governing Division I women's basketball and requested that the National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC) solicit feedback from its coaching community as to whether there is merit in proposing a similar rule in men's basketball.

- 4. Division I Basketball Event Certification Issues.** The committee received a report regarding the criteria for the application of the adjoining-state restrictions of the basketball event certification process and the process for requesting a waiver of the adjoining-state rule. The committee was requested to consider a modification to the NCAA Division I Legislative Council Subcommittee for Legislative Relief waiver process that would allow a prospective student-athlete to submit information and documentation directly to the basketball certification staff who, along with the Men's Basketball Issues committee chair, would review the information and determine whether circumstances warrant the submission of a waiver request. Under the current process, a waiver must be submitted by an entity within the NCAA governance structure or membership, which forces a prospective student-

athlete to approach an NCAA member institution or conference office to file a waiver on the prospective student-athlete's behalf. The committee recommended that the Subcommittee for Legislative Relief modify its process for the submission of waivers to allow a prospective student-athlete to submit documentation to the basketball certification staff, who would forward a completed request to the Men's Basketball Issues Committee liaison who will work with the committee chair to determine the viability of a waiver. The Subcommittee for Legislative Relief would then make a determination based on the suggested guidelines and any other guidance offered by the committee.

5. **Agents, Gambling and Amateurism Update.** The committee received a report that the NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet and the Leadership Council have continued their discussions of agents and the ways they enter the lives of enrolled and prospective student-athletes and how agents influence the decisions student-athletes ultimately make regarding professional career opportunities. It was noted that the following concepts are being considered as potential answers to addressing agent issues:

- a. Revised definition of an agent;
- b. Agent contact calendar;
- c. National agent registration program; and
- d. Enhanced education of prospective and current student-athletes.

The group also received information that 69 student-athletes requested early entry into the NBA draft and that 44 of those student-athletes remained in the draft after the current May 8 deadline. It also was noted that had the new rule (Proposal No. 2010-24) been in effect this year, only 38 student-athletes had entered the draft at the time of the withdrawal date (the day before the initial date for signing the spring NLI).

Committee Chair: Mitch Barnhart, University of Kentucky, Southeastern Conference

Staff Liaisons: Stephen A. Mallonee, academic and membership affairs

Byron Hatch, championships and alliances

LuAnn Humphrey, enforcement