A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association

Division I Presidential Advisory Group

Conference Call
Dial-In number: 888-808-6929
Access Code: 9722356

January 9, 2012
3 p.m. EST

1. Opening remarks.

2. Report of the October 26, 2011, NCAA Division I Presidential Advisory Group meeting and highlights from the October 27, 2011, NCAA Division I Board of Directors meeting. (Supplement Nos. 1A and 1B) **[Anticipated Action Item.]**

3. NCAA president's report.

4. Representation on the Division I Board of Directors. (Supplement Nos. 2A and 2B)

5. Review of agenda for the January 14, 2012, Board of Directors meeting.

   a. Update on Presidential Retreat Initiatives.

      (1) Division I NCAA Committee on Academic Performance.

      (2) Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group. (Supplement No. 3)

      [*Note: Includes update on requests for override votes on Proposal Nos. 2011-96 and 2011-97*.]

      (3) Resource Allocation Working Group. (Supplement No. 4)

      (4) Rules Working Group. (Supplement No. 5)

      (5) Enforcement Working Group. (Supplement No. 6 will be posted prior to the call.)

   b. Legislative Issues.

- Review of legislative process and discussion of proposals that are of potential interest to the Presidential Advisory Group and the Board of Directors.

  [Note: As a reminder, at its January 11-12 meeting, the Legislative Council will be responsible for considering, and ultimately voting on, all legislative proposals being considered in the annual legislative cycle. Proposals receiving at least two-thirds support by the Legislative Council at that meeting will be considered adopted but that action will not be considered final until after the conclusion of the Board of Directors January 14 meeting. Therefore, pursuant to this process, the Board has the authority to consider any proposal adopted by the Legislative Council but is not required to examine every adopted proposal. The intent of this process is to allow the Legislative Council to take final action on the day-to-day legislative matters necessary for the efficient management of Division I, and to leave to the Board the authority to address any issue facing the division. The Presidential Advisory Group (PAG) can assist the Board in identifying legislative issues appropriate for Board review and possible action. In addition, the FCS members of the PAG have jurisdiction to further consider any action taken by the FCS Governance Subcommittee of the Legislative Council. These actions will take place on Tuesday, January10 and will be reported to PAG members and conference offices via email on Thursday, January 12. We will reserve a time for a meeting or conference call of all FCS members of PAG on Friday, January 13 in the event action from that group is warranted.]

6. NCAA Governmental Relations report. (Supplement No. 7)

7. Review of 2012 NCAA Convention events. (Supplement No. 8)

8. Future meeting dates.

   a. April 25, 2012, Indianapolis, Indiana.

      [Note: The Division I Presidential Advisory Group (PAG) will meet with the Division I and FCS commissioners on Wednesday, April 25, 2012 from 8 a.m. – 12 p.m.

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

b. August 6, 2012, conference call at 3 p.m. Eastern time,

c. Monday, October 29, 2012, Indianapolis, Indiana.

d. January 14, 2013, conference call at 3 p.m. Eastern time.

9. Adjournment.

REPORT OF THE OCTOBER 26, 2011, MEETING OF THE DIVISION I PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY GROUP

1. **Discussion of Presidential Retreat Initiatives**. The Presidential Advisory Group (PAG) discussed several of the Presidential Retreat initiatives that would be acted on by the Board of Directors the following day, particularly final recommendations by the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance and the Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group. PAG members noted the following:

   a. That the work of the Student-Athlete Well-Being and Resource Allocation Working Groups are intertwined and the Board may want to consider acting on the recommendations from those groups at the same time.

   b. Institutions that are members of a multi-sport conference, but participate in football in a separate conference may experience difficulty in meeting Title IX/gender equity requirements when the football conference requires its members to provide the miscellaneous educational expenses/cost of attendance (COA) financial aid as recommended by the Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group.

   c. That the Board should be mindful of planning beyond April 2012. If the Presidential Retreat initiatives are addressed in the current academic year as planned, Division I should be planning for what occurs in future years.

2. **Follow up from August 8-9, 2011, Meeting of Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) Presidents and Commissioners.** The group received a report of the August 8-9 meeting of FCS presidents and commissioners and were informed that the focus for FCS going forward would be expansion of the NCAA Division I Football Championship to 24 teams. In this regard, a working group will be established to address possible expansion of the championship bracket and conceptually framing how to enhance the championship experience. The group was advised that the NCAA is committed to evaluating alternatives to cover costs and potential championship models during the upcoming budget cycle.

3. **Report from Leadership Council Regarding Men's Basketball Recruiting Model**. PAG reviewed the Leadership Council's recommended men's basketball recruiting model and a component rendering summer relationship building/athletics development, and commented on the following:

   a. Some PAG members expressed concern with the summer relationship building/athletics development recommendation (i.e., eight hours of conditioning and two hours with a coach per week), noting that student-athletes should be enrolled in summer school in order to participate in summer athletics activities with coaches.

b. PAG noted that if this is approved for men's basketball, other sports will want the same opportunity for summer access by coaches to student-athletes.

4. Report of April 27, 2011, Meeting. PAG approved the report of its April 27, 2011, meeting.

5. Future Meeting Dates and Times.

(a) January 9, 2012, 3 p.m. (Eastern time), conference call.

(b) April 25, 2012, Indianapolis, Indiana.

(c) July 30, 2102, 3 p.m. (Eastern time), conference call.

(d) Monday, October 29, 2012, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Subcommittee chair: William Meehan, Jacksonville State University
Staff Liaisons: S. David Berst, Division I governance
Jacqueline Campbell, Division I governance

NCAA DIVISION I PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY GROUP
OCTOBER 26, 2011, MEETING ATTENDANCE

PAG members in attendance:
James Ammons, Florida A&M University, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference
John Broderick, Old Dominion University, Colonial Athletic Association
David Chicoine, South Dakota State University, Summit League
Greg Dell'Omo, Robert Morris University, Northeast Conference
Walter Harrison, University of Hartford, America East Conference
David Hopkins, Wright State University, Horizon League
John Hurley, Canisius College, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference
Penelope Kyle, Radford University, Big South Conference
William Meehan, Jacksonville State University, Ohio Valley Conference, chair
Ann Millner, Weber State University, Big Sky Conference
Kenneth Peacock, Appalachian State University, Southern Conference
Kerry Romesburg, Jacksonville University, Atlantic Sun Conference
Timothy White, University of California, Riverside, Big West Conference
George C. Wright, Prairie View A&M University, Southwestern Athletic Conference

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

PAG members not in attendance:
William Beauchamp, University of Portland, West Coast Conference
John Bravman, Bucknell University, Patriot League
Philip Dubois, University of North Carolina, Charlotte, Atlantic 10 Conference
Joanne Glasser, Bradley University, Missouri Valley Conference
David Skorton, Cornell University, Ivy League
Randall Webb, Northwestern State University, Southland Conference

Guests from the NCAA Pathway Program in attendance:
Sherie Cornish Gordon, Norfolk State University
Kimberly Johnson, Texas Christian University
Monica Love, United States Military Academy
Kelly Mehrtens, Consultant to NCAA Pathway Program
Diane O'Brien, University of California, Santa Barbara
Melody Reifel Werner, Eastern Michigan University
Alice Tym, University of Illinois at Chicago

Other NCAA staff members in attendance: Diane Dickman, Mark Emmert, Bernard Franklin, Michelle Hosick, Jim Isch, Kevin Lennon, Kathleen McNeely, Jarrett Newby, Tom Paskus, Todd Petr, Wallace Renfro, Greg Shaheen, Jennifer Strawley and Bob Williams.

REPORT OF THE OCTOBER 27, 2011, MEETING OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1. **Report of the August 11, 2011, Board of Directors Meeting. The Board approved the report of its August 11, 2011, meeting.** (Unanimous voice vote)

2. **President's Report.** NCAA President Mark Emmert thanked the group for participating in a joint meeting with the Presidential Advisory Group (PAG) the previous day in order to review the reports of the four Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Working Groups and the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance (CAP). He noted that this Board meeting may be one of the most important in the NCAA's history as the Board will take actions that will begin a transformation of intercollegiate athletics. President Emmert emphasized the fact that the decisions made during this meeting should align with the NCAA's enduring values and support the Association's principles.

3. **Presidential Retreat Initiatives.**

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

      (1) Student-Athlete Success – Initial Eligibility.

         (a) That the Board adopt emergency legislation that requires prospective student-athletes, at a minimum, to meet the current qualifier standard in order to be eligible for practice during the first regular academic term and receipt of athletically related financial aid during the first year. Second semester (and second and third quarter) eligibility for practice will be based on successful completion of nine semester or eight quarter hours in the first regular academic term of enrollment.

         (b) That the Board adopt emergency legislation that requires prospective student-athletes to meet the following standard in order to compete in the first academic year:

            i. A grade-point average/test score average that is set at approximately one-half of a standard deviation below the national student body mean. This represents an increase from the current one standard deviation below the national student mean. The new sliding scale requires a high school core grade-point average to be approximately 0.5 grade-point average units higher for a given test score compared to the current qualifier standard (e.g., SAT of 1000 would require 2.5

high school core grade-point average for competition vs. 2.0 currently).

ii. A successful completion of 10 core courses *prior to* seventh semester (or equivalent) of high school. Seven of the 10 core courses must be successfully completed in English, math and natural/physical science.

(c) That the Board adopt legislation to expand the early academic qualifier program, details of which will be worked out over the next year.

(2) Student-Athlete Success – Two-Year College Transfer Standards.

(a) That the Board adopt as emergency legislation NCAA Proposal No. 2011-69, which increases two-year college transfer requirements for qualifiers and nonqualifiers with an effective date of August 1, 2012, for students first entering any collegiate institution (e.g., increases minimum grade-point average from 2.0 to 2.5; limits use of physical education activity credits to two units; requires a transferable physical/natural sciences course for nonqualifiers) on or after August 1, 2012.

(b) That the Board adopt as emergency legislation Proposal No. 2011-70, as written, with an effective date of August 1, 2012.

(c) That the Board allow Proposal No. 2011-65, the year of academic readiness, to progress through the normal legislative cycle.

(3) Team Success - Access to Championships and a New NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP) Penalty Structure.

(a) That the Board approve a 930 NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) as a minimum academic standard to participate in postseason competition. This includes a mission filter only in the first year a team fails to meet the benchmark and an improvement filter in the second year and beyond.

(b) That the Board approve the transition to the 930 APR to occur over the next three years.

(c) That the Board approve a three-level APP penalty structure.

(d) That the Board approve the creation of an Advisory Group for Historically Black Colleges and Universities and other low resourced institutions.

(e) That all conferences be required to develop and maintain a written policy regarding teams subject to postseason restriction with respect to automatic qualifications for postseason competition and revenue distribution.

BOARD ACTION: **The Board approved all recommendations and necessary legislative changes regarding student-athlete and team academic success as described above.** (Unanimous Voice Vote)

b. Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group. Sidney McPhee, vice chair of the Student-Athlete Well-Being Group, presented the following recommendations:

(1) Cost of Attendance.

(a) That the Board adopt legislation for aid awards that take effect August 1, 2012, or thereafter (awards may be executed before that date), to permit a Division I student-athlete who has received institutional financial aid equal to the value of a full grant-in-aid (i.e. tuition and fees, room and board and required course related books) to receive additional athletically related financial aid up to the value of the institution's "cost of attendance," or up to $2,000, whichever is less. The additional "miscellaneous expense allowance" amount is to be indexed annually to the consumer price index.

[Note: Student Athlete Opportunity Funds may be used at the institution's discretion toward these miscellaneous expenses as is currently permitted. A Pell Grant will not be included in the NCAA financial aid calculation and is considered an exempted government grant for purposes of applying NCAA regulations.]

(b) That the Board adopt legislation, effective August 1, 2012, to provide that only athletically-related aid will be counted toward team limits in equivalency sports.

[Note: All nonathletically-related financial aid now will be excluded from team equivalency computations, which will permit student-athletes to receive additional sources of financial aid without affecting team financial aid limits. The "miscellaneous expense allowance" would be applicable

once the total of athletics and other permissible aid exceeds the value of a full grant.]

(c) That the Board adopt a best practice that all prospective and enrolled student-athletes should submit the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA). Further, because the "miscellaneous expense allowance" legislation is permissive in nature, conferences should be encouraged to consider common application of this legislation among their members and sports.

(2) Multiyear Grants-In-Aid.

(a) That the Board adopt legislation to redefine the period of award for aid awards that take effect August 1, 2012, or thereafter (awards may be executed before that date), to permit athletics aid to be awarded for a period beyond the minimum of one academic year, up to the date the student-athlete exhausts eligibility to compete in all sports.

[Note: Maintain, subject to existing exceptions, legislation to require the period of award for athletics aid to be not less than one academic year. Maintain only nonathletically-related conditions in athletics aid agreements regarding cancelation or reduction of aid during the period of its award. Gradation provisions should include:

i. Maintaining current restrictions and processes on reducing or canceling athletics aid during the period of the award;

ii. Permitting institutions discretion to increase athletics aid during the period of its award, and maintaining current requirements for hearing opportunities related to reducing or canceling aid during the period of the award.]

(b) That the Board adopt legislation to be effective for awards executed on or after August 1, 2012, to require institutions to award at least a prescribed minimum of an equivalency grant to each student-athlete who receives athletics aid in an equivalency sport.

[Note: Institutions currently are required in baseball to award a minimum 0.25 equivalency award but the Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet is developing a "block grant" system. The Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group agreed that a .10 minimum may be appropriate for all sports, but the group will consider the alternative

minimum cabinet model and report a final recommendation to the Board for action in January or April 2012.]

(c) That the Board adopt legislation, effective immediately, to eliminate financial aid eligibility restrictions (five years of aid within a six-year period) to permit institutions to provide athletics aid to former student-athletes who remain at, or return to, the institution to complete their baccalaureate degree requirements.

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved all the working group's recommendations and necessary legislative changes as emergency legislation as described above. In addition, the Board agreed that the $2,000 "miscellaneous expense allowance" should be maintained for no less than three years. (Unanimous voice vote.)

c. **Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Rules Working Group**. Steadman Upham, vice chair of the Rules Working Group, requested the Board endorse a resolution that summarizes the concepts and direction outlined by the working group as they do their part to transform intercollegiate athletics. [See Attachment A for the resolution.]

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

d. **Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Enforcement Working Group**. Ed Ray, chair of the Enforcement Working Group, noted that the working group continues to review a tiered violation structure, penalty structure and the process for adjudication. The working group plans to continue discussions and make recommendations to the Board in April or August 2012, depending on when the Rules Working Group concludes its work.

e. **Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Resource Allocation Working Group**. Ann Millner, vice chair of the Resource Allocation Working Group, noted that the working group has received much feedback on various concepts it has discussed, particularly those regarding a reduction in playing seasons (championship and nonchampionship) and a reduction in scholarships (football and men's and women's basketball). The working group plans to continue discussions and make recommendations to the Board in January 2012.

4. **Communications Plan.** Bob Williams, NCAA vice president of communications, and Bob Knapp, chief executive officer of Neubrand, reviewed with the Board a communications plan/strategy that will be used to assist the NCAA in the communication of actions related to Presidential Retreat initiatives. The intent is that communication should be immediate

and consistent, so that the NCAA membership and the general public are aware of the context and importance of the changes, as well as the potential impact on intercollegiate athletics.

5. **Final Report of the Bowl Game Licensing Task Force.** Harvey Perlman, chair of the Task Force, presented the final report of the Task Force, which included the following recommendations in the area of governance, advertising and sponsorship, and student-athlete welfare:

   a. NCAA regulation of postseason bowls should be consistent with and limited by the core mission of the NCAA.

   b. That each bowl-sponsoring agency be governed by a Board of Directors that has a majority of its members from the community in which the bowl is located.

   c. The title or presenting sponsor of a certified bowl shall not advertise or appear to promote products or activities that may be detrimental to the welfare of student-athletes or the image and best interests of higher education and intercollegiate athletcs. Each bowl-sponsoring agency shall adopt policies designed to exclude advertisements associated with bowls that are inconsistent with the welfare of student-athletes, or the image and best interest of higher education and intercollegiate athletics.

   d. That conferences should require as part of their agreement with bowl title and presenting sponsors that the bowl-sponsoring agency avoid promotional activities inconsistent with the values of the NCAA or of higher education.

   e. That participating conferences should contractually require each bowl to provide a certain number of advertisements promoting the value of intercollegiate athletics and the collegiate model.

   f. That the Board for each bowl-sponsoring agency shall ensure that it is in compliance with the designated standards in the Task Force report relating to protecting student-athlete welfare, which includes the conduct of bowl games within a specified time period.

   g. That the new academic standards applied to NCAA Division I championship participation shall be equally applied to postseason bowl games.

h. That the NCAA, in consultation with conference commissioners, determine whether or not the collection of financial information would serve the interests of intercollegiate athletics.

i. That the NCAA discontinue its current detailed licensing system and should embrace and develop a certification system that provides assurance that minimum standards of governance and operation are in place.

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved all the Task Force recommendations except the portion of Item No. 4-f above specifying the period of time within which bowl games may occur. [Unanimous Voice Vote of Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) Board members.]

The Board directed staff to bring back to the Board recommendations regarding how to address the issue of possibly not having enough teams that qualify for the number of bowl games in a given year.

BOARD ACTION: While the Board endorsed the principles expressed in Item No. 4-f above, it directed staff/Task Force to work with the FBS commissioners to address a new time period for bowl games that can be considered by the Board at its April 2012 meeting. (Unanimous Voice Vote.)

6. <u>Division I Governance Structure Update</u>.

a. Report of the October 13, 2011, Meeting of the Leadership Council. Mike Alden, chair of the Division I Leadership Council, presented the following recommendations:

(1) Men's Basketball Recruiting Model. The Leadership Council concluded its discussions of concepts to be included in a men's basketball recruiting model. The Leadership Council recommended that the Board of Directors take final action to adopt a men's basketball recruiting model that provides for earlier and increased access to prospective student-athletes by Division I coaches. [Reference Attachment B for details of the new recruiting.]

BOARD ACTION: The Board adopted the recommended men's basketball recuiting model for full implementation by August 1, 2012. (Unanimous Voice Vote.)

(2) Summer Relationship and Skill Development for Student-Athletes. During its discussions regarding a men's basketball recruiting model, the Leadership

Council agreed to recommend that the Board of Directors take final action to permit entering and continuing student-athletes to engage in summer athletics development (eight hours of conditioning per week, of which no more than two hours can be devoted to skill instruction), regardless of enrollment in summer school.

BOARD ACTION: The Board supported the concept of coaches having access to prospective and current student-athletes during the summer, but asked the Leadership Council to bring back to the Board in January models for further consideration (e.g., requiring enrollment in summer school in order to participate in summer athletics activities; permitting participation in summer athletics activities without enrollment in summer school, provided student-athlete meets specified academic criteria) (Unanimous Voice Vote.)

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

BOARD ACTION: The Board adopted noncontroversial legislation as recommended. (Unanimous Voice Vote.)

b. Report of the October 17-18, 2011, Meeting of the Division I Legislative Council. Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, chair of the Division I Legislative Council, noted that in light of the continuing work of the working groups and the potential for significant changes to Division I legislation, the Council discussed broad concepts related to the legislative proposals in the 2011-12 cycle and offered feedback to the working groups in a variety of areas and anticipate guidance on processing the legislative proposals in the current cycle.

7. <u>Division I Committee on Infractions</u>. The committee recommended the Board ratify the committee's revisions to specified provisions within Bylaw 32.

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

8. **National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC) Report**. Jim Haney, executive director of the NABC, thanked the Board for the opportunities extended to the NABC and to him personally to participate in discussions regarding important matters facing the NCAA and that affect the sport of men's basketball. He outlined continuing concerns of coaches related to the APR effects when there are coaching changes and expressed support for initiatives to encourage summer school for prospective and enrolled student-athletes, and for the Leadership Council's men's basketball recruiting model. He noted that graduation and retention are key focus areas for the NABC and that new initial eligibility requirements, structure for academic redshirts and increased standards for two-year college transfers increase the need for coaches to build meaningful relationships with prospects and enrolled student-athletes to monitor and help manage academic performance.

9. **Future Meeting Dates**.

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

b. April 26, 2012, Indianapolis, Indiana.

c. August, 2, 2012, Indianapolis, Indiana.

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

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

Resolution

"*Whereas*, the working group has concluded that bold actions are necessary to change the regulatory culture in meaningful ways that, in conjunction with an enhanced enforcement structure, will better support the collegiate model by placing emphasis on the most significant regulations;

"*Whereas*, the working group recognizes the challenges inherent to our current regulatory culture, including the creation of a number of rules that are nationally insignificant, difficult to enforce and do not clearly enhance the academic and athletics success of student-athletes;

"*Be it therefore resolved*, that the working group shall establish principle-based outcomes that will apply to each operating bylaw, promote the fundamental constitutional principle of each operating bylaw and serve as the basis for legislation of national significance that merits inclusion in the Manual;

"*Be it further resolved*, that the working group shall examine "competitive equity" in terms of fairness of opportunity to compete among institutions or groups of institutions;

"*Be it further resolved*, that the working group shall identify an appropriate penalty structure that reinforces the need to adhere to established principles;

"*Be it further resolved*, that the working group shall identify opportunities to increase shared responsibility for rules compliance among those who participate in, lead and administer intercollegiate athletics at the campus, conference and national levels;

"*Be it further resolved*, that the working group shall develop a filtering process to evaluate future proposals to ensure that such legislation is consequential, readily enforceable, promotes our enduring values and further identified principle-based outcomes;

"*Be it further resolved*, that the working group shall encourage NCAA staff to reach out to membership constituents to gather feedback on concepts identified by the working group; and

"*Be it further resolved*, that the working group shall review specific principle-based outcomes and operational bylaws at its December 2011 meeting."

Division I Men's Basketball Recruiting Model

Feature	Leadership Council Recommendation	Additional Comments	Effective Date
Recruiting calendar evaluations			
April	• Permit evaluations at certified nonscholastic events on two weekends. • Neither weekend can fall on ACT/SAT testing dates or Easter. • Events must be subject to NCAA certification program, which should include an additional requirement that the event may not begin before Friday 6 pm and must conclude no later than Sunday 4 pm.		**Immediately**
July	• Permit evaluations at nonscholastic certified events during a total of 12 days in July; the 12 days would consist of three four-day periods (with intervening dead periods) that run from Wednesday at 5 pm to Sunday at 5 pm.	• The evaluation period would consist of the first three four-day periods (Wednesday 5 p.m. – Sunday 5 p.m.) beginning with the first Wednesday on or after July 6. • The staff can continue discussion regarding whether event certification criteria should be modified to require events to conclude at an earlier time on the final day.	**Immediately**
Communication with PSAs			
Types of Communication and Phone Call Frequency	• Eliminate restrictions on all modes of communication on or after June 15 following the completion of the prospect's sophomore year in high school. • Eliminate communication restrictions applicable to prospects participating in certified basketball events (April/July).		**June 15, 2012**

Feature	Leadership Council Recommendation	Additional Comments	Effective Date
Off-campus contacts			
Off-campus contact starting point	• Off campus contacts may be made with a prospect during the junior year in high school. • Recruiting periods other than April – contacts during the junior year only at the prospect's educational institution. • April recruiting period – contacts during the junior year only at the prospect's educational institution or at the prospect's residence.	• Current rule limiting visits to a prospect's educational institution to not more than once a week would remain applicable.	**August 1, 2012**
Off-campus contact in conjunction with an evaluation	• Permit recuiting opportunities with juniors and seniors to be either contacts or evaluations. Contacts may not be made during the time period when classes are in session or during the day of a prospect's competition. • The current academic year recruiting calendar shall maintain recruiting periods, but will eliminate distinctions between contact and evaluation periods.	• Institutions are permitted to still have seven recuiting opportunities during each academic year.	**August 1, 2012**
Official visits			
Starting point	• January 1 of the junior year through the senior year of high school.	• Current requirements (standardized test score, high school transcript, register with Eligiblity Center, placed on institution's IRL) necessary to provide an official visit would remain applicable. • Included in the total number of permissible visits for the prospect and the institution.	**August 1, 2012**
Travel expenses	• May be provided to the prospect and two parents/legal guardians.		**August 1, 2012**

ADDENDUM
SUPPLEMENT 1B
DI Presidential Advisory Group 1/12

NCAA DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS
October 27, 2011, MEETING ATTENDANCE

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

Board members not in attendance:
William R. Harvey, Hampton University, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference
Timothy White, University of California, Riverside, Big West Conference

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

Guests from other Division I governance bodies:
Michael Alden, University of Missouri, chair of the Division I Leadership Council
Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Ivy League, chair of the Division I Legislative Council
Jim Haney, executive director of the National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC)
Walter Harrison, University of Hartford, chair of the Division I Committee on Academic Performance
Harvey Perlman, University of Nebtraska, chair of the Division I Bowl Licensing Task Force

Guests from the NCAA Pathway Program:
Sherie Cornish Gordon, Norfolk State University
Kimberly Johnson, Texas Christian University
Monica Love, United States Military Academy
Diane O'Brien, University of California, Santa Barbara
Melody Reifel Werner, Eastern Michigan University
Alice Tym, University of Illinois at Chicago

Other Guests:
Bob Knapp, chief executive officer, Neubrand

Other NCAA staff members in attendance: Troy Arthur, Erik Christainson, Joni Comstock, Diane Dickman, Mark Emmert, Bernard Franklin, Lynn Holzman, Michelle Hosick, Tom Hosty, Jim Isch, Kevin Lennon, Steve Mallonee, Kathleen McNeely, Delise O'Meally, Tom Paskus, Todd Petr, Dennie Poppe, Bill Regan, Donald Remy, Wallace Renfro, Greg Shaheen, Jennifer Strawley, Robert Vowels, Wendy Walters and Bob Williams.

NORTHEAST CONFERENCE • 399 CAMPUS DR. • SOMERSET, NJ 08873 • PH: (732) 469-0440 • FAX: (732) 469-0744 • WWW.NORTHEASTCONFERENCE.ORG

www.twitter.com/NECsports
www.facebook.com/NECsports
www.youtube.com/NECsports

December 12, 2011

Dr. Mark Emmert
President
NCAA

Dr. Judy Genshaft
Chair
NCAA Board of Directors

Dear Chairwoman Genshaft and President Emmert:

The Northeast Conference (NEC) Council of Presidents continues to express its concern over the lack of full representation on the NCAA Division I Board of Directors.

We have expressed this concern over the last seven years through our PAG representatives (Tom Powell, Mount St. Mary's and Greg Dell'Omo, Robert Morris) and have been advised by NCAA staff that "it's not the right time." WE think it is the right time, and believe others would agree. This is exactly the right time for there to be full transparency and representation in college athletics, and we think the public would agree.

Further, the attached document entitled "NCAA Division I Board of Directors, Request for Full Representation by FCS/Division I Conferences" was included in the October 2010 PAG meeting materials. The attachment apparently has not been shared with the FBS members on the Board. The full representation issue has not appeared as an action item on the NCAA Board of Directors agenda to date. The NEC requests that the issue of full representation be included as an official agenda item for the January 2012 NCAA Board of Directors' meeting.

NEC presidents support decision-agility, yet eliminating two-thirds of the FCS and Division I conferences at any one time from direct representation in the voting process denies representation to the largest percentage of Division I schools and the largest percentage of Division I student-athletes.

I note that the NEC is not represented on any of the four working groups developed to support NCAA reform agenda initiatives. Eleven other conferences are without a representative on the working groups while many of the FBS conferences have up to four representatives participating on these very important groups.

The Northeast Conference is highly interested in the NCAA reform initiatives; however, we are precluded from fully participating in the reform discussions and voting process based on our lack of representation on the NCAA Division I Board of Directors.

Thank you for addressing this issue at the next Board meeting.

Sincerely,

Tom Powell

CC: NCAA Board of Directors
NCAA Presidential Advisory Group
David Berst, NCAA Vice President for Division I
Noreen Morris, Northeast Conference Commissioner

NCAA Division I Board of Directors
Request for Full Representation by FCS/Division I Conferences

Proposal
That the NCAA Division I Board of Directors sponsors legislation to provide full representation by all FCS/Division I Conferences on the NCAA Division I Board of Directors.

NCAA Division I Board of Directors – Legislative Review
Per NCAA Bylaw 4.2.1, the composition of the NCAA Division I Board of Directors shall include 18 members as follows:

(a) One institutional president or chancellor from each of the following 11 conferences:
- (1) ACC
- (2) Big East
- (3) Big Ten
- (4) Big 12
- (5) Conference USA
- (6) Mid-American
- (7) Mountain West
- (8) Pac-10
- (9) SEC
- (10) Sun Belt
- (11) WAC

(b) Seven institutional presidents or chancellors from among the following conferences:
- (1) America East
- (2) Atlantic 10
- (3) Atlantic Sun
- (4) Big Sky
- (5) Big South
- (6) Best West
- (7) Colonial
- (8) Horizon
- (9) Ivy
- (10) Metro Atlantic
- (11) Mid-Eastern
- (12) Missouri Valley
- (13) Northeast
- (14) Ohio Valley
- (15) Patriot
- (16) Southern
- (17) Southland
- (18) SWAC
- (19) Summit
- (20) WCC

Negative Impact of the Current Structure

As outlined above, the 11 FBS conferences have a representative on the Board of Directors on a permanent basis, whereas the 20 FCS/Division I conferences are asked to share seven positions on the Board. Based on the rotation system developed to accommodate the "shared" positions, those conferences without a representative on the Board typically experience an 8-year hiatus from direct participation on the NCAA Division I Board of Directors. Through Myles Brand's leadership, the NCAA has adopted a governance structure that emphasizes presidential oversight at the national, conference and local levels. However, the current system has a major flaw at the highest level of governance in that it purposely prevents almost two-thirds of the FCS/Division I conference presidents from having a seat at the table and an opportunity to participate in discussion relative to matters that impact the Division I athletic enterprise. Rather than encouraging presidential oversight at the national, campus and local levels, this structure disenfranchises the FCS/Division I CEO's at a time when presidential engagement is so crucial to the strategic vision and future success of the NCAA.

Values Based Decision Making – Application to the Governance Structure

In the last few months, the NCAA Board of Directors has been intimately involved in a number of issues with far reaching affects on the academic, athletic and financial future of Division I. These topics ranged from defining Division I membership, supporting academic enhancements for the sport of football, evaluating and endorsing a multi-million dollar media rights contract and determining the size of the Division I men's basketball championship. The role of the NCAA Board of Directors has continued to become increasingly important, especially in terms of academic and fiscal reform, and it is critical that each and every conference have an opportunity to participate directly in the dialogue and debate relative to these issues. Knowledge is power, and without direct access to the NCAA Board of Directors and the important issues they review and discuss, we are not arming our presidents with the knowledge they need to lead at the national, conference or local levels.

The NCAA has created a Values-Based Decision Making Task Force to ensure that the membership continues to operate in a manner that supports and defends the core values of the NCAA, which are as follows:

1. Maintain a collegiate model of intercollegiate athletics in which student-athletes participate as an avocation, balancing their academic, social and athletics experiences;

2. Ensure that the well-being of student-athletes is paramount, which includes preserving participation opportunities;

3. Maintain and preserve competitive equity among institutions while sustaining a spending model for athletics consistent with academic spending;

4. Address the critical public perception of intercollegiate athletics where there appears to be spending behaviors contrary to those elsewhere in higher education (coaching salaries vs. faculty salaries, facility build-outs on a grand scale vs. facilities that are functional, dependence on commercialism vs. sense of detachment from commercial influence elsewhere); and

5. Respect institutional autonomy and philosophical differences.

As a membership organization, the NCAA's core values clearly support the concepts of equity, balance, diversity, responsibility, respect and inclusiveness. It is unacceptable that the very structure of the Division I Board of Directors does not support the same concepts. How can the leadership group of Division I serve as the guiding force for the membership when its own governance structure and format does not espouse the values it supposed to represent?

Evaluation of the Current Structure

The primary arguments presented to support the current structure are (1) the federated governance structure was established to provide a representative form of governance that recognized the need for weighted voting and (2) the need to limit the number of individuals on the Board to ensure effective and efficient discussion and management. The Presidential Advisory Group (PAG) was subsequently established to provide all FCS/Division I conferences with an opportunity for their presidential leadership to review the Board agenda with assistance from the NCAA staff and outside entities as needed.

If the NCAA leadership is truly seeking an effective and efficient management system, they are hard pressed to explain how the current PAG format meets those goals. On the day prior to the NCAA Board of Directors' meeting, the entire NCAA Division I governance staff and numerous members of the NCAA staff (e.g., legal counsel, academic support, legislative support, research experts) spend up to an entire day at the PAG meeting presenting issues and reports. These reports are repeated in their entirety at the Board meeting the following day. Not only is this a significant duplication of efforts by the NCAA staff, it also an unnecessary obligation for PAG representatives on the Board to commit two days to this venture, when one day could be easily accommodated with an amended Board structure.

In terms of the size of the Board, many will argue that 31 members will be impractical and unmanageable, and that the associated room layout will prohibit effective discussion and interaction. If that's the case, then how can the NCAA argue that the PAG meetings have provided an effective and efficient format for the FCS/Division I presidents to discuss the Board's agenda? At the last PAG meeting, there were more than 40 people in attendance (presidents, commissioners, NCAA staff) and the discussions were lively and thorough, with a great deal of give and take. With that said, a Board with 31 members can be very manageable and should not be used as a reason for not having full representation. In fact, it should be noted that each president on the NCAA Board likely has an institutional Board of Trustees and/or participates on other Boards that exceed the requested number of 31; and thus they are experienced and versed at conducting efficient and effective meetings with a large number of participants.

Suggested Solution

The FCS/Division I conferences respectfully request full representation on the NCAA Division I Board of Directors, with each conference assigned a permanent position on the Board of Directors. It should be noted, however, that equal access to the Board does not necessarily have to equate to equal voting by all representatives on the Board. The key concern for the FCS/Division I membership is the lack of access to critical discussions and debate that take place at the NCAA Board of Directors relative to the issues impacting Division I athletics. Equal access to those discussions will not only ensure that each conference is engaged in the governance process at the national level on a consistent basis, but it enables each conference representative to directly engage the presidents in their respective conferences relative to those issues. Without the benefit of direct interaction during the NCAA Board of Directors meetings, it is extremely difficult for the chair of the conference presidents groups to engage their peers in critical discussions relative to NCAA values, strategic plans and reform initiatives.

The current structure essentially handcuffs the presidents of nearly two-thirds of the FCS/Division membership, restricting their access to important dialogue and debate and limiting their ability to effect change at the national, conference and local levels. Providing each Division I conference the opportunity to participate on the NCAA Board of Directors will more effectively empower the presidents throughout the membership and will align the Board with the NCAA's core values.

With the arrival of a new NCAA president this fall, the implementation of a men's basketball media contract, the development of a 68 field men's championship, and conference realignments on the horizon, this an opportune time to make this next change in the evolution of the NCAA Division I Board of Directors. If ever there was a time for full representation on the Board, now is it. With growth comes complexity and having more of the key stakeholders at the table is not just preferable, it is a necessity.

QUOTES FROM MYLES BRAND regarding the importance of presidential leadership:

"For the NCAA to accomplish its goals, it must work in tandem with many internal and external constituents. No partnership is of greater importance than that with college and university CEOs. They are the decision-makers on college campuses, and the NCAA has charged them with taking control of intercollegiate athletics." **Myles Brand, The NCAA News, *Presidential Voice Gives CEOs Final Say in Athletics Discussions*, June 7, 2004.**

"Reform -- specifically those measures that protect the collegiate model -- is an ongoing concern. Reform also requires presidential leadership -- not only national leadership, but campus-based leadership. Intercollegiate athletics plays a highly visible role on America's university and college campuses. It can be a force for the good, especially when it complements the campus' academic mission and when it provides a point of common pride for the campus and local community.

College and university presidents and chancellors are the keys to success. They have displayed the vision and leadership necessary to navigate the most recent reform journey, and the NCAA will rely on their leadership once again as our next mission begins.

Will presidents, at least a critical mass of presidents, rise to the occasion and take control? My strong expectation is that they will. As stewards of their universities -- and of intercollegiate athletics as an integrated part of those universities -- presidents have the obligation to see the larger picture. I am optimistic that the same presidential leadership we have seen emerge over the last two decades will continue to be evident over the next two, and well beyond." **Myles Brand, The NCAA News, *Presidential Leadership a Proven Ingredient in Reform Success*, January 17, 2005.**

December 19, 2011

Dr. Judy Genshaft
Chair
NCAA Division I Board of Directors
University of South Florida
4202 E. Fowler Avenue
Tampa, FL 33620

Dr. Mark Emmert
President
NCAA
PO Box 6222
Indianapolis, IN 46206-622

Dear Drs. Genshaft and Emmert:

Over the course of the past few months representatives from the Football Championship and Division I Subdivision conferences have met to discuss intercollegiate athletics reform. While there is general support for the effort and an understanding of the desire to work efficiently, the number of override petitions reflects a significant frustration on the part of our Chief Executive Officers.

The expedited process that has recently been utilized to craft and pass legislation has served to heighten our concern over the lack of membership inclusion. Twelve of the 20 FCS/DI conferences are not represented on one of the Presidential Retreat Working Groups and 13 of the 20 are not represented on the NCAA Division I Board of Directors. This means over 40% of the Division I membership has not been actively involved in the development of, and acting upon, the most important legislation in recent memory.

While the Presidential Advisory Group does allow for input into the process, its involvement is limited and does not provide a feeling of true equity for those conferences not represented on the Board. It is for these reasons that the Football Championship and Division I Subdivisions formally request that the NCAA Board of Directors immediately allow for each Division I conference to have a permanent seat on the Division I Board. We understand and accept the interest in a majority for the Football Bowl Subdivision members, and would not object to a weighted voting system similar to that used in other bodies with full representation.

At this important juncture in the history of the NCAA, it is critical that all members are engaged in the process and that voices are heard. We believe that an efficient legislative process can still be accommodated, and with more buy-in, if all conferences are represented on the Board.

Thank you for your consideration and best wishes for a joyous holiday season.

Sincerely,

Kyle B. Kallander
Chair, Football Championship Subdivision

Bernadette V. McGlade
Chair, Division I Subdivision

KBK:ms
cc: Collegiate Commissioners Association
William Meehan, Chair, NCAA Presidential Advisory Group
S. David Berst, NCAA
Jackie Campbell, NCAA

DRAFT
(as of 1/06/2012)

Report of the Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group January 5, 2012, Conference Call

The Well-Being Working Group reviewed all override requests submitted by the Division I membership regarding legislative Proposal Nos. 2011-96 -- "Miscellaneous Expense Allowance" and 2011-97 -- Multi-year Grants in Aid". The working group attempted to evaluate the various reasons for overrides and as you will see has attempted to address the issues cited without abandoning the group's original charge. It should be emphasized that the working group remains committed to initiatives that benefit the student-athlete experience and the group believes that both multi-year grants and putting additional educationally related expense funds in the hands of current student-athletes who receive either full grants-in-aid or partial awards is fully appropriate. In that spirit, the following comments and recommendations from the working group are being submitted to the Division I Board of Directors for consideration during its January 14, 2012, meeting.

Review of Override Process. Both Proposal No. 2011-96 and 97 received more than 75 override requests (160 for Proposal No. 2011-96 and 82 for Proposal No. 2011-97), which now requires that this legislation be reconsidered by the Board of Directors at its next regularly scheduled meeting on January 14, 2012. In addition, since Proposal No. 2011-96 received more than 125 override requests, the Board's legislation regarding the $2000 miscellaneous expense allowance was suspended on December 19, 2011, pending reconsideration by the Board of Directors or the outcome of an on-line, one-vote per institution and conference override vote by the Division I active membership.

The Board of Directors is authorized under NCAA legislation to take one of the following courses regarding each proposal at its January meeting: (1) It may rescind its adoption of the legislation; (2) It may take no further action and proceed to an on-line, one-vote per institution and conference vote (a 62.50 percent majority of those voting would be required to override the Board's action to adopt the legislation); or (3) it may modify the proposal, which would render the original legislation moot and replace it with the modification. A modification would subject the new version of the legislation to a new 60-day override period.

Please note that the following recommendations assume that the Board does not wish to rescind its original adoption of either Proposal Nos. 2011-96 or 97. .

1. Recommended Board Action Regarding Proposal No. 2011-97 -- "Multi-year Grants."

a. The Board should reaffirm its original action to adopt Proposal No. 2011-97, which would result in an on-line override vote by Division I active member institutions and conferences in February.

Rationale: The concerns expressed in the override process were not unanticipated when the Board acted in October 2011, and sufficient time has elapsed since the original Board action for institutions to better plan for the implementation of the legislation before upcoming signing periods in February and April. Also, action to modify the proposal by, for example, delaying implementation for a year could result in a group of November 2011, prospects who signed National Letters that included multi-year grants and a group of February and April 2012 signees who would not be permitted to receive multi-year awards.

2. Recommended Board Actions Regarding Proposal No. 2011-96 -- Miscellaneous Expense Allowance."

- **The Board should modify Proposal No. 2011-96 as follows:**

  - **The portion of Proposal No. 2011-96 that provided that all non-athletics financial aid will no longer count toward team limits should be rescinded**.

    Rationale: This portion of the legislation led to numerous complaints regarding impact on Title IX compliance, "stockpiling" and other possible inequities among sports. Elimination of this provision will clarify the impact on budgets and gender if accepted along with either of the following two forms of a "miscellaneous expense allowance".

  - **The Board should adopt one of the following models in combination with the change to equivalency grants described above.** The first is the clearest, the second offers more flexibility for the institution to establish institutional or conference policies.

    1. Increase the "denominator" of all full and equivalency (value) "grants-in–aid" in effect by $2000 (not to exceed the institution's cost of attendance).

Rationale: This is the clearest approach that would have a maximum budget impact $2000, multiplied by the total number of full and equivalency (value) athletics grants-in-aid awarded by the institution. This action would increase the value of each full grant-in-aid by $2000 and would permit allocation of new funds among equivalency grant recipients and sports as determined by the institution.

OR

2. Maintain the value of a full grant-in-aid at its current level, and establish an "exempt" category of miscellaneous expense funds that are designated on team squad lists for use at the institution's discretion to award up to $2000 (not to exceed cost of attendance) for full grant recipients, as well as to provide up to the proportionate amount of applicable funds to any or all equivalency grant recipients.

   Rationale: This option could have the same budget impact as No. 1 above if fully allocated (i.e. $2000 multiplied by the total number of full and equivalency (value) grants, but provides the institution more discretion to consider individual awards and whether such "exempt" aid will or will not be included. This option does not increase the value of a full grant-in aid as currently defined by NCAA rules.

The Well-being working group believes, therefore, that a modified version of the "miscellaneous expense allowance" legislation should be adopted by the Board, which will render Proposal No. 2011-96 moot and subject the new legislation to a new 60-day override period following the Board's January 14 meeting. The working group believes these recommendations will help address Title IX concerns expressed in override requests and that the new legislation offers the opportunity for the membership to consider more directly whether there is support for increased funding of educational expenses. In addition the working group believes that if this legislation is enacted, data should be collected and evaluated to detect trends or practices that could be detrimental to the interests of student-athletes, sports or fair competition among Division I members.

Committee members.

Beth Bass, Women's Basketball Coaches Association
Percy Bates, University of Michigan,
Eugene Daniels, Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
Judy MacLeod, Conference USA
Phil Martelli, St. Joseph's University
Sidney McPhee, Middle Tennessee State University, chair
Bernard Muir, University of Delaware
Harris Pastides, University of South Carolina
Jack Swarbrick, University of Notre Dame
Holden Thorp, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Ann Weaver Hart, Temple University
Kevin Weiberg, Pac-12 Conference
Scott Bearby, NCAA
David Berst, NCAA
Jackie Campbell, NCAA
Byron Hatch, NCAA
Lynn Holzman, NCAA
Steve Mallonee, NCAA
Kathleen McNeely, NCAA
Todd Petr, NCAA
Kris Richardson, NCAA
Jay Rossello, NCAA
Leeland Zeller, NCAA

Board of Directors Consent Package of Action Items from the
Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Resource Allocation Working Group
January 14, 2012

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. Elimination of foreign tours.

a. Adopt legislation, effective January 14, 2012, for the elimination of institutional foreign tours that occur at any time. Signed contracts dated previous to January 14, 2012 for scheduled institutional foreign tours will be honored.

[Note: Institutions feel a growing pressure to provide a foreign tour opportunity to each student-athlete. As a result, providing a foreign tour has become tied to the recruiting process. Student-athletes are encouraged to use institutional study-abroad programs that are available during these time periods.]

2. Reduction in scholarships – Football and Women's Basketball.

a. Adopt legislation, effective August 1, 2014, to reduce Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) football scholarships from 85 to 80, with proportional decrease in scholarships for the Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) from 63 to 60 equivalencies, with 80 overall counters.

b. Adopt legislation, effective August 1, 2014, to reduce women's basketball scholarships from 15 to 13.

[Note: The proposed scholarship numbers allow for continued success of football and women's basketball programs while providing institutions with the opportunity to reallocate dollars to other initiatives that benefit student-athletes. The proposed scholarship reductions also will allow for athletics talent to be dispersed across more intercollegiate athletics programs.]

3. Appropriate Number of Competitions.

a. That a resolution [Attachment A] be adopted, which specifies:

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

- **That the NCAA Division I Board commission a study to determine the maximum number of contests/dates of competition of the playing season (championship and nonchampionship segment) that is essential to the success of each NCAA sport. In addition, the Working Group recommends that the scope of this study specifically examine how basketball contests are counted.**

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

[Note: It is important for the student-athlete to have the appropriate number of competitions in place that allow them to be successful as athletes, while maximizing the time available for academic success and campus life pursuits.]

4. <u>Maximum Limits on Non-coaching Personnel – Football and Men's Basketball.</u>

a. Adopt legislation, effective August 1, 2013, that limits the number of non-coaching staff members in football and men's basketball.

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

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

[NOTE: The non-coaching personnel limitations do include videographers, strength and conditioning coaches, and operations and administrative personnel. The Collegiate Model—Rules Working Group is asked to work with staff to refine the list of what would be included in the non-coaching staff limits.]

[NOTE: The membership and the Division I Board of Directors have expressed significant concern with the proliferation of non-coaching staff members with sport-specific responsibilities. Dollars spent on these personnel can be allocated to areas that will more directly benefit the student-athlete and better align with enduring values.]

RESOLUTION: MAXIMUM CONTESTS OR DATES OF COMPETITION

Whereas, a basic principle of the NCAA, as set forth in its constitution, is that intercollegiate athletics programs shall be administered in keeping with prudent management and fiscal practices to assure the financial stability necessary for providing student-athletes with adequate opportunities for athletics competition as an integral part of a quality educational experience; and

Whereas, another basic principle of the NCAA, as set forth in its constitution, is that the time required of student-athletes for participation in intercollegiate athletics shall be regulated to minimize interference with their opportunities for acquiring a quality education in a manner consistent with that afforded the general student body; and

Whereas, it is imperative to the success of student-athletes as students and athletes, as well as in other pursuits of life, that the maximum number of contests or dates of competition in their sports provide an opportunity for an appropriate balance of interests; and

Whereas, a thoughtful approach to reviewing the appropriate maximum number of contests or dates of competition in each sport is necessary before any recommendation regarding such maximum numbers may be made;

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Division I Board of Directors commission a study to determine the appropriate maximum number of contests or dates of competition during the playing season that is essential to the success of each NCAA sport and that the study also specifically examine how basketball contests are counted; and

Be It Further Resolved, that, effective immediately, no increase to the current maximum number of contests or dates of competition be considered for any sport until such time as the commissioned study is completed; and

Be It Finally Resolved, that once the study is completed and the appropriate maximum number of contest or dates of competition is established for each sport (whether different from the current maximum or not), no increase to such maximum limits shall be considered for 10 years.

Source: Resource Allocation Working Group

NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model – Rules
January 2012 Report

Guided by the October 2011 resolution adopted by the NCAA Division I Board of Directors (Attachment A), the NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model – Rules (chaired by President Jim Barker, Clemson University and vice chaired by President Steadman Upham, University of Tulsa) continues its discussion regarding a new regulatory culture and review of specific principle-based outcomes and operational bylaws. The group identified some over-arching principles, such as fairness, accountability and integrity, which will guide work within the individual bylaws.

The group identified a framework for a new approach to NCAA rules. Under this construct, all NCAA legislation must tie back to the NCAA enduring values of student-athlete success, the collegiate model, amateurism or equity and must support or advance a constitutional principle. The model will define specific principle-based outcomes in key bylaws, with accompanying operating bylaws that provide further guidance to assist with compliance. The operating bylaws are to be meaningful, enforceable and supportive of student success. Additional guidance will be provided by the national office, conferences and professional organizations (Attachment B). The group also continued its work on a redefined principle of competitive equity to better focus on issues of fairness.

[Note: While the working group has yet to formally approve the drafts of principle-based outcomes and operating bylaws - the plan is for them to do so by the end of January - much work has been completed to date. Drafts of principle-based outcomes have been developed, along with many operating bylaws. As a reminder, the Phase I review includes:

1. *Bylaw 11 (Conduct and Employment of Athletics Personnel).*

2. *Bylaw 12 (Amateurism).*

3. *Bylaw 13 (Recruiting).*

4. *Bylaw 14 (Eligibility: Academic and General Requirements).*

5. *Bylaw 15 (Financial Aid).*

6. *Bylaw 16 (Awards, Benefits and Expenses for Enrolled Student-Athletes).*

7. *Bylaw 22 (Academic Performance Program).]*

Members of the working group are working with identified thought leaders in each bylaw area to prepare completed drafts of principle-based outcomes and operating bylaws for the working group's review prior to wide circulation in early 2012.

Going forward, after the working group completes its review of the drafts, the working group plans to solicit feedback from the membership – including the various committees, councils and cabinets in the Division I governance structure – in early 2012. While the group plans to work as efficiently and move as quickly as possible, the members believe that rewriting the rule book and creating a new regulatory approach requires a thoughtful process to produce quality work.

In addition, the group asks the Board to place a moratorium on new legislation for the 2012-13 legislative cycle (unless part of the presidentially led reform agenda), as well as to ask the NCAA Division I Legislative Council to table proposals in the 2011-12 cycle that could be impacted by the working group's efforts. In order to make the principles-based approach to the rule book successful, the group believes that suspending legislation in 2012-13 and tabling a large majority of the 78 proposals in the current cycle that could be related to the group's charge is necessary to allow the membership time to think more broadly about the rules and the rules-making process.

Finally, the working group agreed there are broader issues related to institutional integrity and the NCAA regulatory culture that require the attention of each of our campuses, conferences and the NCAA. The working group believes it is important for the NCAA to determine the need to regulate behaviors historically not considered within the scope of NCAA rules, and to discuss appropriate NCAA involvement even when behaviors may not be covered by NCAA rules. The working group encouraged NCAA leadership to consider how best to address issues of institutional integrity.

In summary, the Board is asked to:

1. Support the general approach outlined for a new regulatory structure.

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

3. Support the creation of a new group to address issues of institutional integrity.

ATTACHMENT A
SUPPLEMENT NO. 5
DI Presidential Advisory Group 1/12

MEMORANDUM
(Editorial Revision: November 17, 2011)

October 19, 2011

TO: NCAA Division I Board of Directors.

FROM: James Barker, President, Clemson University, chair
Stedman Upham, President, University of Tulsa, vice chair.

SUBJECT: Working Group on Collegiate Model - Rules - Board Endorsement of Resolution.

The Working Group on Collegiate Model - Rules has been charged to review and amend the NCAA Division I Manual to reduce the volume of unenforceable and inconsequential rules that fail to support our enduring values and place emphasis on legislation that is the most strategically important.

It has become clear, in considering the environment in which intercollegiate athletics is conducted, that bold actions are necessary to change the regulatory culture such that NCAA rules are value-based, meaningful, enforceable and supportive of the collegiate model of sport. The development of processes and procedures that ensure new legislation aligns with and addresses our enduring values is of paramount concern.

The working group agreed that concurrent NCAA Division I Board of Directors support for the concepts and direction outlined by the working group is critical to advancing a new regulatory approach to intercollegiate athletics. To that end, we ask for the Board's support and endorsement of the following resolution as we work to do our part to transform intercollegiate athletics.

Resolution:

> "*Whereas*, the working group has concluded that bold actions are necessary to change the regulatory culture in meaningful ways that, in conjunction with an enhanced enforcement structure, will better support the collegiate model by placing appropriate emphasis on the most significant regulations;
>
> "*Whereas*, the working group recognizes the challenges inherent to our current regulatory culture, including the creation of a number of rules that may not be critical to the NCAA's enduring values;
>
> "*Be it therefore resolved*, that the working group shall establish principle-based outcomes that will apply to each operating bylaw, promote the fundamental constitutional principle of each operating bylaw and serve as the basis for legislation of national significance that merits inclusion in the Manual;

"*Be it further resolved*, that the working group shall examine "competitive equity" in terms of fairness to member institutions and student-athletes;

"*Be it further resolved*, that the working group shall work in cooperation with the working group on enforcement to identify an appropriate penalty structure that reinforces the need to adhere to established principles;

"*Be it further resolved*, that the working group shall identify opportunities to increase shared responsibility for rules compliance among those who participate in, lead and administer intercollegiate athletics at the campus, conference and national levels;

"*Be it further resolved*, that the working group shall develop a filtering process to evaluate future proposals to ensure that such legislation is consequential, readily enforceable, promotes our enduring values and further identified principle-based outcomes;

"*Be it further resolved*, that the working group shall encourage NCAA staff to reach out to membership constituents to gather feedback on concepts identified by the working group; and

"*Be it further resolved*, that the working group shall review specific principle-based outcomes and operational bylaws at its December 2011 meeting."

NCAA
New Regulatory Approach

NCAA Enduring Values (Student-Athlete Success/Collegiate Model/Amateurism/Equity)	➢ Our Values.
NCAA Constitutional Principles, including Principles of Fairness of Competition and Competitive Baselines	➢ Reasons to regulate. -
Principle-Based Outcomes and Operating Bylaws	➢ Areas to Regulate (NCAA Bylaws 10-17 and 23). - National regulations, including required institutional procedures.
Additional Operational Guidance	➢ Guidance. - Provided by National office, conferences and professional organizations.

Characteristics.

- Fewer regulations, but focus on most important areas.
- Violations of principle-based outcomes and operating bylaws result in appropriate penalty and consequence.

NCAA Government Relations Report

(December 2011)

1. Congressional Overview.

As the 112th Congress enters the last month of its first session, a number of legislative priorities still remain. During the final weeks of the year, Congress is expected to consider several proposals that would extend the payroll tax cut, extend unemployment insurance benefits for the long-term jobless, patch the alternative minimum tax, and prevent a cut in payments to doctors who treat Medicare patients. Also, with Congress only passing three appropriations bills this year, it is expected that an omnibus bill will be used to pass the nine remaining spending measures.

The upcoming 2012 Presidential and Congressional elections have continued to garner significant attention in Washington, D.C. After more than a dozen Republican Presidential debates, several Republican candidates head into the primary season to challenge President Barack Obama next year. In the halls of Congress, the 2012 election landscape is also taking shape. To date, seventeen House Democrats have announced they will not seek another term, although eight of those individuals are seeking other offices. Most notably, senior Democrats Representative Barney Frank (D-MA), ranking member of the House Financial Services Committee and Representative Charlie Gonzalez (D-TX), Chair, Congressional Hispanic Caucus will not run for reelection. To date, seven House Republicans have announced that they will not seek another term in 2012 but all are expected to run for other offices.

During the last quarter of 2011, Congress has shown significant interest in collegiate athletic issues. Alleged criminal violations by current and former athletic department personnel at membership schools have led to some scrutiny of college athletics and the NCAA. Members of Congress have also shown an interest in a variety of other matters including, pay-for-play, scholarship limitations, medical coverage, sport related head injuries, conference realignment, the Bowl Championship Series, and the academic success of student-athletes. The NCAA Office of Government Relations has worked with NCAA colleagues to address specific concerns expressed by members of Congress and their staffs.

2. Federal Issues.

a. Concussions and Helmet Safety.

On October 19, 2011, the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation convened a hearing to examine concussions in sports and the marketing of sports equipment as "anti-concussion" or "concussion-reducing." Witnesses included Alexis Ball, student and former student-athlete, University of New Mexico; Steven Threet, student and former student-athlete, Arizona State University; Dr. Jeffrey Kutcher, assistant professor, Department of Neurology, University of Michigan and director; Michigan NeuroSport; Dr. Ann McKee, Professor of Neurology and Pathology, Boston University and director, Neuropathology Core, BU Alzheimer's Disease Center; and Mike Oliver, executive director, National Operating Committee on Standards for Athletic Equipment.

The testimony of the witnesses and follow-up questions from the senators in attendance focused on the need for additional science to better diagnose and treat concussions and greater education and awareness to effectively change the culture in sports in respect to head injuries. Also, a great deal of time was spent disputing claims by sports equipment companies that their products prevent or decrease the chances of an athlete suffering a concussion. Committee member Senator Tom Udall (D-NM), who introduced legislation aimed at protecting youth athletes from the dangers of sports-related concussions, identified specific examples of mouth guards, headbands, helmets and dietary supplements being promoted as reducing the chances of concussions.

NCAA Government Relations staff will continue to monitor any next steps stemming from this hearing and track legislative efforts aimed at improving voluntary football helmet standards for youth athletes, increasing the penalties for companies that make false injury prevention claims and requiring elementary and secondary schools to implement standard plans for concussion safety and management.

b. Internet Gambling.

On October 25, 2011, the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade held a hearing entitled "Internet Gambling: Is There a Safe Bet?" The discussion during the hearing centered on what, if any, forms of Internet gaming should Congress allow and how any changes to current law might impact consumers and other stakeholders. A follow-up hearing entitled "Internet Gaming: Regulating in an Online World" was conducted by the same subcommittee on November 18, 2011. The hearing served as an extension of the initial discussion

but also explored the effectiveness of current enforcement efforts in jurisdictions that have legalized online gaming.

While the hearings did not focus on any specific piece of legislation, there were general references to existing legislation, most notably H.R. 2366, the Internet Gambling Prohibition, Poker Consumer Protection, and Strengthening UIGEA Act of 2011. H.R. 2366, which was introduced by Representative Joe Barton (R-TX), would allow for the licensing, regulation, and taxation of Internet poker. Under the proposed Act, wagering on athletic competitions would be prohibited. The hearings did not provide any clarity as to what, if any, actions would be taken to mark-up existing legislation related to online gambling.

The NCAA Office of Government Relations will continue to work with other groups including the professional sports leagues to prevent the passage of any legislation that would allow online wagering on athletic competitions.

c. Sports Wagering.

Representative Frank Pallone, Jr (D-NJ) issued a press release on November 9, 2011, expressing his intent to introduce legislation that would amend the Professional Amateur Sports Protection Act (PASPA) and exclude New Jersey from the prohibition on professional sports gambling. Under the proposed act, New Jersey would be allowed to conduct a lottery, sweepstakes, or other betting scheme on professional sporting events. The legislation would not allow wagering on collegiate competitions.

d. Student-Athlete Welfare Issues.

On November 1, 2011, Representative Bobby Rush (D-IL) convened a roundtable discussion on college athletics and the welfare of student-athletes. Entitled, "Hypocrisy or Hype? The Impacts of Back-Room Deals, Payoffs, and Scandals in American Collegiate Student Athletics," the roundtable was touted as an opportunity for participants to offer their perspectives on the current state of NCAA athletics and recent revelations arising out of significant NCAA infractions and violations. Participants included Congressman Rush; Congressman John Conyers (D-MI); Jeremy Schaap, ESPN; Andy Schwarz, sports economist, OSKR; Derek Samson, assistant managing editor, Rivals.com; Josh Luchs, former NFL agent; Valerie

Hardrick, Mother of Kyle Hardrick (former basketball scholarship athlete at the University of Oklahoma); Joan Jolly (mother of former Hampton University student-athlete); Ramogi Huma, president, National College Players Association, Shane Battier, Memphis Grizzlies Forward (former basketball scholarship athlete at Duke University); Thaddeus Young, Philadelphia 76ers forward (former basketball scholarship athlete at Georgia Tech); Dr. Ellen Staurowsky, professor of sports management, Drexel University; and Warren K. Zola, assistant dean for graduate programs, Boston College.

Among the many issues discussed were the value and duration of athletic scholarships, medical coverage and payment of medical expenses for student-athletes, the right of a student-athlete to retain an agent and legal counsel, rules that prevent student-athletes from negotiating their own marketing deals, and matters related to commercialism and student-athlete likeness.

3. <u>State Issues</u>.

a. New Jersey - Sports Wagering.

On November 8, 2011, the citizens of New Jersey were presented with a nonbinding referendum on the statewide ballot, asking if sports betting should be allowed at the state's racetracks and Atlantic City casinos. The referendum was supported by an overwhelming majority of New Jersey voters and received the support of Governor Chris Christie, who has committed to fighting for sports betting with its passage. Despite the passage of this referendum, a number of substantial hurdles exist before New Jersey can offer wagering opportunities on professional and collegiate athletic competitions. The most significant roadblock is the Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act (PASPA), which prohibits sports betting in all but four states – Nevada, Oregon, Montana, and Delaware, who all had some form of sports betting before PASPA was passed in 1992. It is expected that legislative and legal efforts will be launched to overturn PASPA and allow New Jersey and ultimately other states to legally conduct a sports wagering scheme.

The NCAA will work with the professional sports leagues and other interested groups to protect against any efforts to repeal PASPA. We will continue to monitor

legislation at the state and federal level and educate policymakers on the dangers associated with sports betting.

b. Uniform Athlete Agents Act.

The Uniform Athlete Agents Act (UAAA) is a state model act designed to protect student-athletes and membership institutions from the unscrupulous conduct of some athlete agents. The act establishes uniform athlete agent registration procedures and places limitations on the type of conduct that an athlete agent may engage in when dealing with a student-athlete. In addition, the act imposes criminal, civil and/or administrative penalties against unscrupulous agents.

On November 17, 2011, the NCAA convened a summit on the Uniform Athlete Agents Act (UAAA) in Washington D.C. The summit was an opportunity to bring key stakeholders together to discuss the UAAA, its effectiveness, and what, if any changes need to be made to the model Act. State agencies responsible for administering the UAAA, athlete agents, professional sports leagues, professional sports leagues players' associations, NCAA membership, and the original drafters of the UAAA were represented at this meeting. The need for cooperation between key stakeholders, enhancing enforcement efforts of the UAAA, and additional education about the Act and available resources for student-athletes and membership institutions were highlighted as necessary elements in curbing the improper and often illegal conduct of some athlete agents.

NCAA staff intends to continue this dialogue and outreach to individuals and groups who play a vital role in enforcing the UAAA and protecting student-athletes and NCAA members from the detrimental impact of unscrupulous athlete agents.

c. Higher Education Associations.

NCAA government relations staff continues to build strong relationships with various higher education associations. The American Council on Education (ACE), the Association of American Universities (AAU), the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU), and the National Association of Colleges and University Business Officers (NACUBO) among others, continue to provide guidance and support on issues of common interest. The NCAA government relations staff looks

forward to continuing these mutually beneficial relationships to better formulate and further the NCAA's legislative goals.

Division I Meetings
2012 Annual Convention Meeting Schedule

	Wednesday January 11		Thursday, January 12				Friday, January 13	Saturday, January 14
7	LGC/SAAC Breakfast (7 – 8 a.m.)							
7:30		Conference Meetings (7:30 a.m.–7 p.m.						Joint SAAC/BOD Breakfast (7:30 – 9 a.m.) Indiana A-D
8	**Legislative Council (LGC)** (8 a.m. - 5 p.m.) White River Ballroom - JW		Legislative Council (LGC) (8 – 10 a.m.) White River Ballroom JW			Leadership Council (8 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.) Indiana E		
8:30					Conference Meetings (8:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.)			
9							Status of Presidential Retreat Initiatives (9 a.m. – noon) Indiana A-E	Board of Directors Meeting (9:30 a.m. – 5 p.m.) Indiana E-G
9:30				Assn-wide Programming (9:30 – 11a.m.) Convention Ctr				
10								
10:30								
11				Assn-wide Programming (11:15 – 12:15) Convention Ctr				
11:30								
Noon								BOD Luncheon (12 - 1 p.m.)
12:30				Assn. Luncheon (12:30 – 2 p.m.) 500 Ballroom Convention Ctr				
1								Board of Directors Meeting Continues Indiana E-G
1:30							Executive Committee Meeting (1:30 – 4:30 p.m.) Indiana F-G	
2				Assn-wide Programming (2:15 – 3:45 p.m.) Convention Ctr				
2:30								
3								
3:30			Opening Business Session (4 – 5:30 p.m.) Grand 1-6, JW (Doors open at 3:30)					
4								
4:30								
5								
5:30			Delegates Reception (5:30 – 7 p.m.) Grand 6-10, JW					
6							Honors Celebration (6-8 p.m.) Marriott Ballroom	
6:30								
7								
7:30								
8								
8:30								
9								
10								

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

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

12/19/11:vlm

REPORT OF THE JANUARY 9, 2012, MEETING OF THE NCAA DIVISION I PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY GROUP

ACTION ITEMS.

- None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Report of October 26, 2011, Meeting.** The Presidential Advisory Group (PAG) approved the report of its October 26, 2011, meeting.

2. **Representation on the NCAA Division I Board of Directors.** Several PAG members expressed concern that not all Division I multisport conferences are represented on the Board of Directors. The group suggested that discussion begin between members of the Board of Directors and PAG in order to promote collaboration on this issue.

3. **President's Report.** President Emmert briefly reported on recent activities of the Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Working Groups and participated in PAG's subsequent discussions of that work and the working group recommendations that will be reviewed by the Board during its upcoming meeting.

4. **Update on Presidential Retreat Initiatives.**

   a. NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance. The group was informed that the committee will meet on January 12, 2012, to discuss implementation of the minimum academic standard required for access to postseason competition, as well as the waiver process for the new Academic Performance Program (APP) penalty structure.

   b. Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group. The group was informed that Proposal Nos. 2011-96 – "Miscellaneous Expense Allowance" and 2011-97 – "Multi-year Grants in Aid" received more than 75 requests for an override vote, which now requires this legislation to be reconsidered by the Board of Directors at its next regularly scheduled meeting on January 14, 2012. PAG discussed the working group's proposed modifications to Proposal No. 2011-96 – "Miscellaneous Expense Allowance," which would modify the provisions for the $2,000 miscellaneous expense allowance and rescind the portion of the proposal that provided that all nonathletics financial aid will no longer count toward team limits. The working group also recommended that the Board of Directors reaffirm its original action to adopt Proposal No. 2011-97 – "Multi-year Grants in

Aid," which would result in an online override vote by the Division I active member institutions and conferences.

c. Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Resource Allocation Working Group. The group discussed the Board of Directors Consent Package of Action Items from the Resource Allocation Working Group. Concern was expressed regarding several of the recommendations, particularly the recommendation to eliminate institutional foreign tours.

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

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

5. **Review of Legislative Process and Discussion of Proposals that are of Potential Interest to the Presidential Advisory Group and the Board of Directors.** The group was reminded that during its January meeting, the NCAA Division I Legislative Council generally considers, and ultimately votes on, all legislative proposals being considered in the annual legislative cycle. This year, the Rules Working Group has asked that the Legislative Council table a number of the proposals in this year's legislative cycle until the working group has moved closer to completing its work. The hope is that this will maintain some order to the work being done while also leaving open the opportunity to consider some necessary legislation.

6. **2012 NCAA Convention Schedule.** The PAG members were informed of events of interest at the 2012 NCAA Convention.

7. Future Meeting Dates and Times.

(a) April 25, 2012, Indianapolis, Indiana.

[Note: The Division I Presidential Advisory Group (PAG) will meet with the Division I and FCS commissioners on Wednesday, April 25, 2012, from 8 a.m. – 12 p.m. There will be a joint meeting of the PAG and the Board of Directors on Wednesday, April, 25, 2012, from 1-5 p.m. to review and discuss reports of several of the Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Working Groups. The Board of Directors will convene its regular meeting on Thursday, April 26, 2012.]

(b) August 6, 2102, 3 p.m. (Eastern time), conference call.

(c) Monday, October 29, 2012, Indianapolis, Indiana.

(d) January 14, 2013, 3 p.m. (Eastern time), conference call.

Subcommittee chair: William Meehan, Jacksonville State University
Staff Liaisons: S. David Berst, Division I governance
Jacqueline Campbell, Division I governance

Division I Presidential Advisory Group January 9, 2012, Teleconference	
ATTENDEES	**ABSENTEES**
James Ammons, Florida A&M University, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference	John Hurley, Canisius College, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference
William Beauchamp, University of Portland, West Coast Conference	David Skorton, Cornell University, Ivy league
John Bravman, Bucknell University, Patriot League	
John Broderick, Old Dominion University, Colonial Athletic Association	
David Chicoine, South Dakota State University, Summit League	
Greg Dell'Omo, Robert Morris University, Northeast Conference	

Philip Dubois, University of North Carolina, Charlotte, Atlantic 10 Conference	
Joanne Glasser, Bradley University, Missouri Valley Conference	
Walter Harrison, University of Hartford, America East Conference	
David Hopkins, Wright State University, Horizon League	
Penelope Kyle, Radford University, Bug South Conference	
William Meehan, Jacksonville State University, Ohio Valley Conference	
Ann Millner, Weber State University, Big Sky Conference	
Kenneth Peacock, Appalachian State University, Southern Conference	
Kerry Romesburg, Jacksonville University, Atlantic Sun University	
Randall Webb, Northwestern State University, Southland Conference	
Timothy White, University of California, Riverside, Big West Conference	
George C. Wright, Prairie View A&M University, Southwestern Athletic Conference.	
NCAA staff liaisons participating on the call: David Berst, Jacqueline Campbell	
Other NCAA staff members who participated on the teleconference: Diane Dickman, Mark Emmert, Michelle Hosick, Jim Isch, Kevin Lennon, Jarrett Newby, Wallace Renfro, Greg Shaheen and Naima Stevenson.	