A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association

Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet

Web Conference

Dial-in number: 866-590-5055 June 14, 2012
Access code: 7539037 11 a.m. to 2 p.m. Eastern time

1. Welcome and roll call.

2. Report from the February 7-8, 2012, cabinet meeting. [Supplement No. 1]

3. Report from the NCAA Division I Communications and Coordination Committee teleconference. [Supplement No. 2]

4. Reports from the NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. [Supplement Nos. 3a-b]

5. Report from the NCAA Division I Board of Directors (including the Reports of the NCAA Division I Leadership Council and the NCAA Division I Legislative Council). [Supplement Nos. 4a-c]

   ***Background*:** The cabinet will review legislative actions related to recruiting and athletics personnel proposals and other items of interest.

   ***Anticipated Action*:** None.

6. Enforcement Working Group update. [Supplement No. 5]

   ***Background*:** The cabinet will receive an update of the Enforcement Working Group's efforts and recommendations.

   ***Anticipated Action*:** None. The cabinet will discuss the information presented and provide feedback.

7. Review of concepts and recommendations developed by the Rules Working Group. [Supplement No. 6]

   ***Background*:** The cabinet is being asked to provide feedback to the Rules Working Group regarding concepts and recommendations related to NCAA Bylaws 11 and 13.

   ***Anticipated Action*:** None. The cabinet will discuss the information presented and provide feedback.

8. Other business.

9. Future meetings.

   a. September 20, 2012 – Web Conference.

   b. February 2013 – to be determined.

10. Adjournment.

SUPPLEMENT NO. 1

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I RECRUITING AND ATHLETICS PERSONNEL ISSUES CABINET FEBRUARY 7-8, 2012, MEETING

***KEY ITEMS*.**

1. **Football recruiting issues.** The NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet received an update and summary of football recruiting issues. The cabinet also received an update and overview of the NCAA enforcement services' new football issues group, including the football issues group's six-month strategic plan. The cabinet will continue to monitor trends and issues related to football recruiting. The cabinet recommends that the NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model – Rules carefully and thoughtfully consider whether legislation that applies to nonscholastic activities in men's basketball would appropriately apply to football.

2. **Update on NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model – Enforcement.** The cabinet received a review of the work and recommendations of the Working Group on Collegiate Model – Enforcement. The cabinet members were encouraged to provide feedback from their institutions and conferences related to the concepts once the full report is available to the NCAA membership.

3. **Update on Working Group on Collegiate Model – Rules regarding NCAA Bylaws 11 and 13.** The cabinet received an update on the Working Group on Collegiate Model – Rules regarding the work related to Bylaws 11 and 13. The cabinet discussed items relevant to its work and provided feedback related to the guiding statements/principles and legislative concepts that the working group is considering. Specifically, as it relates to Bylaw 11, the cabinet provided feedback regarding coaching categories, scouting and employment of individuals who are associated with recruited prospective student-athletes as noncoaching staff members. As it relates to Bylaw 13, the cabinet provided feedback regarding recruiting communication and materials, recruiting calendars, official visits and the involvement of coaches with prospective student-athletes in nonscholastic athletics activities. The cabinet noted that a significant portion of recruiting legislation that has been adopted in recent years has primarily been initiated as a result of issues that are of particular concern to basketball and football. Many of those issues are not significantly applicable to the majority of other sports. Careful and thoughtful consideration must be given to whether it is appropriate or necessary to apply the same legislation to all sports in all cases.

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

- **None.**

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

1. **September 13-14, 2011, cabinet meeting report.** The cabinet reviewed its September meeting report and took no action.

2. **Report of the November 30, 2011, NCAA Division I Communications and Coordination Committee teleconference.** The cabinet received the report and took no action.

3. **Report of the November 18-20, 2011, NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee meeting.** The cabinet received the report and took no action.

4. **Review of the cabinet's guiding principles.** The cabinet reviewed its guiding principles and noted that the Working Group on Collegiate Model -- Rules is developing principles that align with the Association's enduring values. Once the working group completes its work, the cabinet will re-evaluate its guiding principles to ensure they are consistent with the principles established by the working group and that they are aligned with the enduring values of the Association.

5. **Review of the NCAA Division I Board of Directors, NCAA Division I Leadership Council and NCAA Division I Legislative Council reports.** The cabinet reviewed legislative actions related to recruiting and athletics personnel proposals and other items of interest from the meetings at the 2012 NCAA Convention and took no action.

6. **Review of 2010-11 legislative cycle proposals in the comment and amendment-to-amendment period.** The cabinet reviewed NCAA Proposal No. 2011-44 and received an update indicating that the NCAA Eligibility Center is continuing to expand the receipt of electronic transcripts from high schools and is moving closer to a process of making transcript requests on behalf of the prospective student-athletes as part of the release given at time of registration. Although concern was noted regarding the potential enforcement application of the legislation, the cabinet continues to support Proposal No. 2011-44.

7. **Update from enforcement services.** The cabinet received an update and summary from enforcement services of its current structure and staff assignments. The staff discussed

recent infractions cases involving athletics personnel and recruiting issues, specifically in regard to the topics that the cabinet discussed during the meeting. The staff also provided an update on current issues related to Bylaws 11.4.2 (Individual Associated with a Prospective Student-Athlete -- Men's Basketball) and 13.11.1.8 (Nonscholastic Practice or Competition -- Men's Basketball).

8. Men's basketball recruiting model and summer access legislation. The cabinet received an update and summary of the recently adopted men's basketball recruiting model and summer access legislation.

9. Football recruiting issues. The cabinet received an update and summary of football recruiting issues. The cabinet also received an update and overview of the enforcement services' new football issues group, including the football issues group's six-month strategic plan. The cabinet will continue to monitor trends and issues related to football recruiting. The cabinet recommends that the Working Group on Collegiate Model – Rules carefully and thoughtfully consider whether legislation that applies to nonscholastic activities in men's basketball would appropriately apply to football.

10. Update on Working Group on Collegiate Model – Enforcement. The cabinet received a review of the work and recommendations of the Working Group on Collegiate Model – Enforcement. The cabinet members were encouraged to provide feedback from their institutions and conferences related to the concepts once the full report to the membership is available.

11. Update on Working Group on Collegiate Model – Rules regarding Bylaws 11 and 13. The cabinet received an update on the Working Group on Collegiate Model – Rules regarding the work related to Bylaws 11 and 13. The cabinet discussed items relevant to its work and provided feedback related to the guiding statements/principles and legislative concepts that the working group is considering. Specifically, as it relates to Bylaw 11, the cabinet provided feedback regarding coaching categories, scouting and employment of individuals who are associated with recruited prospective student-athletes as noncoaching staff members. As it relates to Bylaw 13, the cabinet provided feedback regarding recruiting communication and materials, recruiting calendars, official visits and the involvement of coaches with prospective student-athletes in nonscholastic athletics activities. The cabinet noted that a significant portion of recruiting legislation that has been adopted in recent years has primarily been initiated as a result of issues that are of particular concern to basketball and football. Many of those issues are not significantly

applicable to the majority of other sports. Careful and thoughtful consideration must be given to whether it is appropriate or necessary to apply the same legislation to all sports in all cases.

Cabinet Chair: *Ian McCaw, Baylor University, Big 12 Conference*
Staff Liaison(s): *Leeland Zeller, Academic and Membership Affairs*
Renee Gomila, Enforcement Services
Abigail Grantstein, Enforcement Services
Charnele Kemper, Academic and Membership Affairs
Jen Roe, Academic and Membership Affairs

February 7-8, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Jeff Barber, Liberty University, Big South Conference	Kenneth Anderson, Gonzaga University, West Coast Conference
Scott Brown, University of Connecticut, Big East Conference	Derek Horne, Florida A&M University, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference
Kaitlyn Carew, Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee	
Jana Doggett, Utah State University, Western Athletic Conference	
Michelle Durban, Samford University, Southern Conference	
Gil Grimes, Southeastern Conference (alternate)	
Ursula Gurney, University of Missouri-Kansas City, The Summit League	
Erin Kido, Xavier University, Atlantic-10 Conference	
David Langford, Fairleigh Dickinson University Metropolitan, Northeast Conference	
Bridget Martin, McNeese State University, Southland Conference	
Mike Matthews, Pac-12 Conference	
Ian McCaw, Baylor University, Big 12 Conference	

Dan Radakovich, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlantic Coast Conference	
Shondell Reed, Colgate University, Patriot League	
Allison Sexton, Fairfield University, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	
Robert Stull, University of Texas at El Paso, Conference USA	
Eric Toliver, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Mountain West Conference	
Marcy Weston, Central Michigan University, Mid-American Conference	
Nonie Wiggins, Arkansas State University - Jonesboro, Sun Belt Conference	
Miechelle Willis, The Ohio State University, Big Ten Conference	
Other Participants: Jackie Campbell, Kevin Lennon, Steve Mallonee, Chris Strobel	

SUPPLEMENT NO. 2

REPORT OF
THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
DIVISION I COMMUNICATIONS AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE (CCC)
MAY 11, 2012, CONFERENCE CALL

ACTION ITEMS.

- None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Report of the Committee's November 30, 2011, Conference Call.** The committee approved the report of its November 30, 2011, conference call.

2. **Update on NCAA Presidential Retreat Initiatives.** The committee was reminded of the work completed to date by the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance and several of the Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Working Groups (i.e., Student-Athlete Well Being, Resource Allocation, Enforcement). It was noted that the concept of a miscellaneous expense allowance continues to be supported by the NCAA Division I Board of Directors. The Student-Athlete Well-Being Working group has circulated to the membership and various constituent groups three possible options for this type of educational expense allowance. The working group will evaluate the feedback prior to making a final recommendation to the Board of Directors. The Resource Allocation Working Group essentially has completed its work, with the issues of the appropriate number of contests/competition in each sport and noncoaching personnel limitations being referred to the Rules Working Group in its examination of Bylaws 17 (Playing and Practice Seasons) and 11 (Conduct and Employment of Athletics Personnel). The Enforcement Working Group continues its work in creating a multi-level NCAA rules violation structure, an enhanced penalty structure for NCAA rules infractions and re-establishing a sense of shared responsibility among the interested individuals and entities in intercollegiate athletics.

3. **Rules Working Group Update – Roles of the NCAA Division I Cabinets**. The committee was informed of the extended timeline for the work of the Rules Working Group to allow for coordination with all the presidential working groups and extensive education, outreach and consensus-building within the membership. The extended timeline will allow for comprehensive feedback from the Division I cabinets and other governance groups with areas of expertise. As the cabinets meet in June and September, the chairs are reminded to encourage cabinet members to review the proposed commitments and corresponding concepts with the goal of creating rules that are meaningful, enforceable and supportive of student-athlete success. It was noted that the working group plans to present

recommendations to the Board of Directors in October 2012 or January 2013, depending on membership feedback received through the spring and summer.

Committee Chair: Michael Alden, University of Missouri
Staff Liaison: Jacqueline Campbell, Division I Governance

Division I Communications and Coordination Committee May 11, 2012, Teleconference	
ATTENDEES	ABSENTEES
William Chaves, Eastern Washington University, Administration Cabinet	Mike Alden, University of Missouri, Leadership Council
Sarah Bobert, Marquette University – Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet	Mark Hollis, Michigan State University, Amateurism Cabinet
Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Ivy League, Legislative Council	
Eugene Daniels, Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee	
Herman Holt, University of North Carolina, Asheville, Academic Cabinet	
Ian McCaw, Baylor University, Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet	
Judy Rose, University of North Carolina, Charlotte, Championships/Sports Management Cabinet	
Jacqueline Campbell, NCAA, recording secretary	
Other NCAA staff members who participated on the teleconference: Lynn Holzman, Michelle Hosick, Jobrina Perez, Carol Reep, Kris Richardson, Dave Schnase, Alex Smith, Danielle Teetzel, Katie Willett and Leeland Zeller.	

REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I STUDENT-ATHLETE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) submits the following report from its January 10-14, 2012, meeting.

KEY ITEMS.

1. **Legislative Issues.** The committee reviewed and discussed the override requests submitted by the Division I membership related to the miscellaneous expense allowance and multi-year grants-in-aid. Additionally, the committee reviewed recommendations from the resource allocation working group. Pending board action, the committee will continue to solicit feedback from campus and conference SAACs related to those issues.

2. **Division I Board of Directors Meeting.** The committee met with the Division I Board of Directors and discussed key issues impacting student-athlete well-being, including the miscellaneous expense allowance, multi-year grants-in-aid, foreign tours and other recommendations from the Presidential Working Groups.

ACTION ITEMS.

1. **Legislative Items.**

   - **None.**

2. **Nonlegislative Items.**

   - **None.**

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **NCAA Opening Business Session.** The committee attended the NCAA Opening Business Session and listened to President Mark Emmert's State of the Association address.

2. **NCAA Division I Session.** The committee attended the NCAA Division I Session related to the status of presidential retreat initiatives. Presentations were provided on the status of the initiatives from the Presidential Working Groups, and the committee had the opportunity to contribute comments during discussion periods.

3. **Leadership and Legislative Council Meetings.** The committee met separately with the Leadership and Legislative Councils to discuss current issues related to student-athlete

well-being, including recommendations from the Presidential Working Groups, as well as the committee's top priorities for 2012.

4. **Division I Men's Basketball Committee.** The committee had dinner with the Division I Men's Basketball Committee, and student-athletes provided feedback regarding a sportsmanship initiative in men's basketball.

5. **Guest Speakers.** The committee welcomed speakers from the NCAA staff to discuss issues involving student-athlete well-being, including:

a. Mark Emmert, NCAA president, met with the committee and discussed the progress of the Presidential Working Groups, as well as override requests related to miscellaneous expense allowance and multi-year grants-in-aid. President Emmert also stressed the importance of including the student-athlete voice in the process.

b. Jackie Campbell, director of Division I governance, and Jarrett Newby, NCAA governance intern, reviewed the NCAA governance structure and legislative process. They also provided the committee with an update and answered questions on key legislative proposals.

c. Greg Shaheen, interim executive vice president of championships and alliances, addressed the committee regarding the NCAA media contracts, the FCS football championship, site selections and championship awards. Shaheen also spoke to the committee about sportsmanship initiatives in men's basketball.

d. Rachel Newman-Baker, managing director of enforcement, addressed the committee regarding enforcement restructuring, information development efforts and issues regarding agents and advisors.

e. Monica Woods, associate director of membership and external outreach, spoke to the committee about communication efforts with former student-athletes, presidential and campus leadership, and engaging new, non-athletic audiences to help educate people about the NCAA and foster advocacy on behalf of student-athletes.

6. **Division I SAAC Priorities.** The committee developed future priorities and goals related to its effort to enhance the total student-athlete experience, including increasing

awareness of SAAC and its role, cultivating a community service initiative and enhancing the student-athlete voice.

7. **Chair and vice chair selections.** The committee reviewed the requirements for the positions of committee chair and selected Eugene Daniels, Colorado State University and Mountain West Conference representative, for that position effective January 15, 2012. The committee moved to elect two representatives as co-vice chairs and selected Maddie Salamone, Duke University and Atlantic Coast Conference representative, and Curtis Schickner, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, and America East Conference representative, for those positions effective January 15, 2012.

8. **Cabinet and committee selections.** The committee selected Chris Everett, Western Carolina University and Southern Conference representative, to serve as the SAAC's representative to the Amateurism Cabinet. The committee also selected Lauren Cochlin, University of Wisconsin, Madison, and Big Ten Conference representative as the committee's media chair.

9. **Representative to the International University Sport Federation (FISU).** Scott Krapf, outgoing committee chair, was announced as the American student representative to FISU.

10. **Impermissible Nutritional Supplements.** The committee discussed impermissible nutritional supplements and expressed interest in increasing the education and awareness provided to student-athletes regarding banned and harmful substances.

11. **Updates from selected Division I and Association-wide committees.** The committee was provided an update on selected Division I and Association-wide committees, including the Student-Athletes Reinstatement Committee, Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct Committee, Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, and Olympic Sports Liaison Committee.

12. **Joint Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Meeting.** The committee met jointly with the Division II SAAC and received presentations from representatives of the NCAA office of Inclusion, the College Sports Information Directors of America and Hudson Taylor, assistant wrestling coach at Columbia University and founder of Athlete Ally.

13. Service Team Update. The committee discussed a potential partnership with Samaritan's Feet for future community service initiatives. Emmanuel Ohonm, the founder of Samaritan's Feet, met with the committee to share information about the organization and to talk about the scope of the potential partnership.

14. Association-wide programming. Members of the committee attended association-wide programs during the NCAA Convention, including "Values-Driven Leadership in the 21st Century," "Students First: Giving SA the College Experience They Deserve," "Academic Success and Missed Class Time," and "Social Media: Building and Engaging and Online Community."

15. NCAA Honors Celebration. The committee attended the NCAA Honors Celebration honoring distinguished former student-athletes.

16. Division I SAAC Award of Excellence update. The committee announced that the submission deadline for Division I SAAC Award of Excellence nominees was moved to March 30. The committee will distribute an email to conference SAACs to notify them of the new deadline and remind them that the award is now an annual award.

17. Attendance. Attendance for the January meeting:

Conference	School	Name	Sport	Present
America East Conference	University of Maryland, Baltimore County	Curtis Schickner	Baseball	Yes
Atlantic 10 Conference	University of Rhode Island	Tristany Leikem	Women's' Tennis	Yes
Atlantic Coast Conference	Duke University	Maddie Salamone	Women's Lacrosse	Yes
Atlantic Sun Conference	Stetson University	Carolyn Boyd	Softball	Yes
Big 12 Conference	Baylor University	Logan Roberts	Men's Track and Field	Yes
Big East Conference	University of South Florida	Alex Mendez	Baseball	Yes
Big South	Winthrop	Matthew Horn	Men's Soccer	Yes

Conference	University			
Big Sky Conference	University of Northern Colorado	Natasha Law	Women's Volleyball	Yes
Big Ten Conference	University of Wisconsin, Madison	Lauren Cochlin	Women's Soccer	Yes
Big West Conference	University of California, Irvine	Jacob Yowell	Men's Track and Field	No
Colonial Athletic Conference	Virginia Commonwealth University	Jessica Williams	Women's Track and Field	Yes
Conference USA	Southern Methodist University	Kelvin Beachum	Football	No
Horizon League	Wright State University	Cassandra Lloyd	Indoor Track and Field	Yes
Ivy Group	Cornell University	Ben Swinford	Baseball	Yes
Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	Siena College	Kaitlyn Carew	Women's Swimming	Yes
Mid-American Conference	Eastern Michigan University	Kaitlyn Vincek	Women's Volleyball	Yes
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference	North Carolina A&T State University	Carvell Copeland	Baseball	Yes
Missouri Valley Conference	Illinois State University	Scott Krapf	Men's Track and Field	Yes
Mountain West Conference	Colorado State University	Eugene Daniels	Football	Yes
Northeast Conference	Long Island University-Brooklyn	Nicholas Conklin	Men's Soccer	Yes
Ohio Valley Conference	Jacksonville State University	Chelsea Pelletier	Women's Soccer	Yes

Pacific -12 Conference	Oregon State University	Kevin McShane	Men's Basketball	No
Patriot League	Lafayette College	Doug Prusoff	Lacrosse	Yes
Southeastern Conference	Mississippi State University	DJ Looney	Football	Yes
Southern Conference	Western Carolina University	Chris Everett	Football	Yes
Southland Conference	Northwestern State University	Yaser Elqutub	Football	Yes
Southwestern Athletic Conference	Prairie View A&M University	William Brown	Men's Golf	Yes
The Summit League	Western Illinois University	Brooke Stittleburg	Women's Volleyball	Yes
Sun Belt Conference	University of Arkansas, Little Rock	Rachael Maina	Women's Soccer	Yes
West Coast Conference	St. Mary's College of California	Missy White	Women's Volleyball	Yes
Western Athletic Conference	University of Hawaii	Jessica Stacy	Women's Swimming	Yes
Others:				
Legislative Council	Stanford University	Beth Goode, Senior Woman Administrator/ Senior Associate Athletics Director	Pacific 12 Conference	Yes
Leadership Council	University of Miami (Ohio)	Susan Lipnickey, Faculty Athletic Representative	Mid-American Conference	Yes
Leadership Council	Southern Illinois University at Carbondale	Harold Bardo , Faculty Athletic Respresentative	Missouri Valley Conference	Yes

18. Future Meeting Schedule.

a. March/April 2012, Teleconference.

b. July 19-22, 2012, Carmel, Indiana.

c. August/September 2012, Legislative Webinar.

d. November 2012, Indianapolis, Indiana.

e. January 15-19, 2013, in conjunction with NCAA Convention, Grapevine, Texas.

Committee Chair: Scott Krapf, Illinois State University, Missouri Valley Conference
Committee Vice-Chair: Eugene Daniels, Colorado State University, Mountain West Conference
Staff Liaisons: Katie Willett, Student-Athlete Affairs
Kelly Groddy, Academic and Membership Affairs
Tim Nevius, Enforcement
Brandy Hataway, Academic and Membership Affairs

REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I STUDENT-ATHLETE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 5, 2012, MEETING

The NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) submits the following report from its April 5, 2012, teleconference.

***KEY ITEMS*.**

1. **Enforcement Working Group.** Chris Strobel, director of enforcement, provided the committee with an update on the progress of the enforcement working group and potential changes to the enforcement model, including information related to the potential modification of violation and penalty structures.

2. **Division I SAAC Priorities.** The committee reviewed priorities and goals related to its effort to enhance the total student-athlete experience, including increasing awareness of SAAC and its role, cultivating a community service initiative and enhancing the student-athlete voice. The group discussed its plan to implement the agreed upon priorities over the coming year.

3. **Miscellaneous Expense Allowance.** The committee reviewed and discussed the proposed alternative models for awarding miscellaneous expense allowance. The committee will continue to review and discuss the alternatives and consider the model that affords student-athletes the greatest opportunities.

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. **Legislative Items.**

   - **None.**

2. **Nonlegislative Items.**

   - **None.**

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

1. **Leadership and Legislative Council Meetings.** The committee reviewed agenda items for the upcoming Leadership and Legislative Council Meetings.

2. **Updates from selected Division I and association-wide committees.** The committee received updates from SAAC representatives who serve on selected Division I and Association-wide committees, including the NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet; NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet; NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet; NCAA Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet; NCAA Division I

Championships/Sports Management Cabinet; NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports; NCAA Committee on Women's Athletics; and NCAA Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee.

3. **Presidential Working Group Update**. The committee was updated on the work of the presidential working groups, including the results of the override votes and multi-year financial aid awards.

4. **Division I SAAC Award of Excellence update**. The committee was updated regarding submissions for the Division I SAAC Award of Excellence nominees, which had a deadline of March 30.

5. **Media Team.** The committee received an update regarding the SAAC media team's continued efforts to raise awareness of SAAC through social media and highlight notable SAAC related events or profiles of involved student-athletes on its blog and website. The SAAC received increased attention on Twitter for its use of the "#ourvoice" hash tag and transitioned its Facebook page to enhance communication and interaction with interested audiences.

6. **Attendance.** Attendance for the April teleconference:

Name	Conference	School	Sport	Present
	Missouri Valley Conference			No
Beachum, Kelvin	Conference USA	Southern Methodist University	Football	No
Boyd, Carolyn	Atlantic Sun Conference	Stetson University	Softball	Yes
Brown, William	Southwestern Athletic Conference	Prairie View A&M University	Men's Golf	No
Carew, Kaitlyn	Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	Siena College	Women's Swimming	Yes
Cochlin, Lauren	Big Ten Conference	University of Wisconsin, Madison	Women's Soccer	Yes
Conklin, Nicholas	Northeast Conference	Long Island University-Brooklyn Campus	Men's Soccer	Yes

Name	Conference	School	Sport	Present
Copeland, Carvell	Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference	North Carolina A&T State University	Baseball	Yes
Daniels, Eugene	Mountain West Conference	Colorado State University	Football	Yes
Elqutub, Yaser	Southland Conference	Northwestern State University	Football	Yes
Everett, Chris	Southern Conference	Western Carolina University	Football	Yes
Horn, Matthew	Big South Conference	Winthrop University	Men's Soccer	Yes
Law, Natasha	Big Sky Conference	University of Northern Colorado	Women's Volleyball	Yes
Leikem, Tristany	Atlantic 10 Conference	University of Rhode Island	Women's Tennis	Yes
Lloyd, Cassandra	Horizon League	Wright State University	Indoor Track and Field	No
Looney, DJ	Southeastern Conference	Mississippi State University	Football	No
Maina, Rachael	Sun Belt Conference	University of Arkansas, Little Rock	Women's Soccer	Yes
McShane, Kevin	Pac-12 Conference	Oregon State University	Men's Basketball	Yes
Mendez, Alex	Big East Conference	University of South Florida	Baseball	No
Pelletier, Chelsea	Ohio Valley Conference	Jacksonville State University	Women's Soccer	Yes
Prusoff, Doug	Patriot League	Lafayette College	Lacrosse	Yes
Roberts, Logan	Big 12 Conference	Baylor University	Men's Track and Field	Yes
Salamone, Maddie	Atlantic Coast Conference	Duke University	Women's Lacrosse	Yes
Schickner, Curtis	America East Conference	University of Maryland, Baltimore County	Baseball	Yes

Name	Conference	School	Sport	Present
Stacy, Jessica	Western Athletic Conference	University of Hawaii, Manoa	Women's Swimming	Yes
Stittleburg, Brooke	The Summit League	Western Illinois University	Women's Volleyball	No
Swinford, Ben	The Ivy Group	Cornell University	Baseball	No
Vincek, Kaitlyn	Mid-American Conference	Eastern Michigan University	Women's Volleyball	Yes
White, Missy	West Coast Conference	St. Mary's College of California	Women's Volleyball	No
Williams, Jessica	Colonial Athletic Association	Virginia Commonwealth University	Women's Track and Field	No
Yowell, Jacob	Big West Conference	University of California, Irvine	Men's Track and Field	No

7. Future Meeting Schedule.

a. July 19-22, 2012, Carmel, Indiana.

b. August/September 2012, Webinar.

c. November 2012, Indianapolis, Indiana.

d. January 15-19, 2013, in conjunction with NCAA Convention, Grapevine, Texas.

Committee Chair: *Eugene Daniels, Colorado State University, Mountain West Conference*

Committee Vice-Chairs: *Maddie Salamone, Duke University, Atlantic Coast Conference, and Curtis Schickner, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, America East Conference*

Staff Liaisons: *Katie Willett, Student-Athlete Affairs*
Kelly Groddy, Academic and Membership Affairs
Brandy Hataway, Academic and Membership Affairs
Tim Nevius, Enforcement

SUPPLEMENT NO. 4a

REPORT OF THE APRIL 26, 2012, MEETING OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1. **Report of the January 14, 2012, Board of Directors Meeting. The Board approved the report of its January 14, 2012, meeting.** (Unanimous Voice Vote)

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

   a. **Presidential Retreat Initiatives.** President Emmert noted that while the journey thus far may not have been easy, the membership has made significant progress to date on the various presidential retreat initiatives. It was noted that much work remains, but with the current acknowledgement of the need for greater membership input, the review process moving forward likely will have the membership more engaged and the working groups receiving increased and more thoughtful feedback.

   NCAA/Major League Baseball Discussions. The Board was informed that the NCAA has reengaged in its discussions with Major League Baseball (MLB). The group hopes to develop recommendations for Board review over the next several months regarding:

   (1) The possibility of MLB providing funding to assist with scholarships in college baseball;
   (2) Joint efforts to improve diversity in collegiate and professional baseball;
   (3) The incongruous timing of the MLB draft and the NCAA College World Series;
   (4) Possibility of involvement of professional coaches in summer league play, and
   (5) Possibility of the use of wooden bats in college baseball.

3. **Presidential Retreat Initiatives.**

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

   (1) That the Board amend the effective date of Proposal No. 2011-94 – Eligibility – Freshman Academic Requirements – Eligibility for Financial Aid, Practice and Competition – Core Course Requirements and Initial Eligibility Index to August 1, 2016.

   BOARD ACTION: **The Board agreed to delay the effective date as recommended.** (Unanimous Voice Vote) [See Proposal No. 2012-8.]

(2) That the Board seek membership input on a possible one-year delay in the effective date of Proposal No. 2011-69 – Eligibility – Transfer Regulations – 2-4 and 4-2-4 College Transfers.

BOARD ACTION: The Board defeated the recommendation. [For 1 (Schmidly), Against 16, Abstain 0.]

(3) That the Board approve amendments to the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP) that would amend the transition to the new 930 Academic Progress Rate (APR) benchmark for APP penalties and access to postseason competition for limited-resource institutions [teams in the bottom 15 percent of all Division I member institutions in resources, excluding Football Bowl Subdivison (FBS) institutions].

BOARD ACTION: **The Board approved the amendments as recommended, which included a number of recommendations from the Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Limited-Resource Insititutions Advisory Group that will assist in the ongoing efforts to improve the APR of limited-resource institutions.** (Unanimous Voice Vote)

(4) That the Board approve CAP policies and procedures for the 2012-13 academic year.

BOARD ACTION: **The Board approved the CAP policies and procedures.** (Unanimous Voice Vote)

b. **Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group**. Sidney McPhee, chair of the working group, noted that the working group has distributed various models for a possible miscellaneous expense allowance (MEA) toward total cost of attendance for review and comment by Division I conferences and constituent groups. It also was noted that the working group plans to conduct a focus group meeting of selected financial aid officers, directors of athletics, faculty athletics representatives, compliance officers, student-athlete advisory committee members, senior woman administrators and commissioners in an effort to evaluate the practical and administrative burdens in the implementation of the models, as well as to ensure that gender equity interests are fully addressed. The hope is for the working group to present a final recommendation for Board consideration in August. [Reference Supplement No. 4.]

c. **Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Resource Allocation Working Group**. The Board was informed that the Resource Allocation Working Group has essentially completed its work with the last action taken by the NCAA Division I Presidential

Advisory Group (PAG) to defeat a recommendation to reduce scholarships in Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) football from 63 to 60, with 80 overall counters. It also was noted that the issue of the appropriate number of contests in all sports will be reviewed by the Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Collegiate Model -- Rules Working Group in conjunction with the NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet. The issue of possible limits of noncoaching staff members in the sports of men's and women's basketball and football also will be considered by the Rules Working Group as it evaluates Bylaw 11.

d. **Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Collegiate Model -- Rules Working Group**. James Barker, chair of the working group, reviewed with the Board the working group's activity over the course of the past six months and the expected timeline of its work moving forward. It was noted that at the core of the group's work is the development of principles/values/commitments on which to base the rules. One of the more difficult hurdles to get over will be a shift in focus from competitive equity to fairness in competition when thinking about the rules. The working group continues to reach out to the membership and various constituent groups to seek feedback on a proposed set of changes to the NCAA Constitution and operating bylaws. President Barker noted the importance of presidential engagement in this review process, and more importantly, in the future implementation of any rules changes. [Reference Supplement No. 5.]

e. **Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Collegiate Model -- Enforcement Working Group**. Ed Ray, chair of the working group, updated the Board on the working group's progress with developing new infractions case procedures (including changing the size and composition of the Committee on Infractions), creating a multi-level NCAA rules violation structure and an enhanced penalty structure for NCAA rules infractions. This group plans to present some final recommendations for Board action in August. [Reference Supplement No. 6.]

4. **Report from the Division I Bowl Licensing Task Force**. John Peters, member of the task force, updated the Board on the work of the task force and presented the following recommendations:

a. That the Board approve the following schedule of time periods in which postseason bowl games should be conducted:

Year	Start Date	End Date
2011-12	December 17	January 9

2012-13	December 15	January 8
2013-14	December 21	January 13
2014-15	December 20	January 12
2015-16	December 19	January 11
2016-17	December 17	January 9
2017-18	December 16	January 8
2018-19	December 15	January 8
2019-20	December 21	January 13

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

b. In a scenario in which there are not enough bowl-eligible teams to fill contractual commitments made by conferences/institutions with bowl operators, that the Board affirm that these will be matters between the affected conferences and the bowl operators and not within the purview or obligation of the NCAA to find solutions for the bowl games to be played.

BOARD ACTION: The Board instructed staff to further evaluate this issue to determine whether it is in the best interest of the Association to support the task force's recommendation to potentially allow bowls to go "dark" or to develop a set of parameters under which to provide possible options (e.g., waivers, selection based on academic criteria) to prevent "darkness." (Unanimous Voice Vote)

c. That the legislation adopted by the Board in April 2011, which specifies that no new postseason football bowl game licenses will be issued by the NCAA Football Bowl Licensing Committee for a maximum three-year period, remain in effect. The Board supported the recommendation and took no action to change the legislation currently in effect.

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

a. Report of the April 12, 2012, Meeting of the Leadership Council. Mike Alden, chair of the Division I Leadership Council, reported on the April 12 meeting of the Council. [Reference Supplement No. 11.]

(1) <u>Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Collegiate Model – Rules and Enforcement Working Groups</u>. The Leadership Council received a presentation from both the Rules and Enforcement Working Groups. The Council

commended both working groups on their progress to date and noted its readiness to provide whatever support it can as the groups move forward with their work.

(2) Women's Basketball Recruiting Model. The Leadership Council discussed concepts under consideration by the Leadership Council Women's Basketball Recruiting Subcommittee. The Council encouraged the subcommittee to continue to involve as many stakeholders as possible in the review process as they work toward providing a final recommendation to the Council and Board in October.

(3) Agents. The Agent Subcommittee is continuing its review of a possible Agent Registration Program.

(4) Great West Conference. The Leadership Council voted not to support a request from the Great West Conference to seek a waiver or legislation that would immediately designate the Great West Conference as an active Division I multi-sport conference.

b. Report of the April 16-17, 2012, Meeting of the Division I Legislative Council. Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, chair of the Division I Legislative Council, noted that the Council adopted four proposals as noncontroversial legislation, adopted 18 proposals that support the current deregulation efforts, tabled two proposals that relate to the start of men's basketball preseason practice and left 32 proposals on the table in deference to the work of the Rules Working Group. In addition, the Council:

(1) Voted to adopt Proposal No. 2011- 25 – Amateurism – Exceptions to Amateurism Rule – Prize Money Prior to Full-Time Collegiate Enrollment -- Tennis -- $10,000 Per Year. This proposal specifies that in the sport of tennis, prior to full-time collegiate enrollment, an individual may accept prize money based on his or her place finish or performance in open athletics events, not to exceed $10,000 per calendar year. Further, the proposal specifies that once the individual has reached the $10,000 limit, he or she may receive additional prize money on a per-event basis, provided such prize money does not exceed his or her actual and necessary expenses for participation in the event

(2) Voted to adopt Proposal No. 2011- 54 – Recruiting – Recruiting Calendars – Women's Basketball – July Evaluation and Dead Periods. This proposal specifies that during the time period of July 6-31, the women's basketball recruiting calendar shall consist of, consecutively, a seven-day evaluation period, a 10-day dead period, a seven-day evaluation period and a two-day dead period. It was noted that the Leadership Council Women's Basketball

Recruiting Subcommittee recommended, and the full Council supported, adoption of this proposal.

6. **Transfer of Interpretative Authority**. The Board was reminded of its October 2009 action to approve a Men's Basketball Reform Package intended to prohibit the "funneling of money" from institutions to an individual associated with a prospect. Through the Board's action, a new interpretative process was developed that was intended to provide clear direction to the membership on what constitutes a violation of NCAA rules related to men's basketball. The new process identified automatic violations of NCAA recruiting rules without the opportunity to appeal to the NCAA academic and membership affairs (AMA) staff or the NCAA Division I Legislative Review and Interpretations Committee (LRIC). Since that action, similar legislation relating to nonscholastic events has been introduced and adopted impacting the sports of football and women's basketball; however, the interpretative authority for that legislation was not provided to the enforcement staff. The interpretative authority for that legislation was assumed by the AMA staff. In order to maintain efficiency and to avert potential confusion in the membership, the staff is requesting that the interpretative authority originally given to the enforcement staff for specific men's basketball issues be transferred to the AMA staff, with the provision that the AMA staff maintain the strict liability standard for decisions rendered previously by the enforcement staff. [Reference Supplement No.14.]

   BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the transfer of interpretative authority as recommended and strongly encourages that LRIC adhere to and apply the rationale put forth by the Board October 29, 2009, to ensure that the progress made in the sport of men's basketball is maintained and continues. The transfer of interpretative authority will be effective June 15, 2012. (Unanimous Voice Vote)

7. **Conference/Institutional Networks.** The Board received a brief update on the issue of conference/institutional networks broadcasting programming involving prospective student-athletes. The Board was informed that the current interpretation specifies that it is not permissible for an institution- or conference-branded network to broadcast programming involving prospective student-athletes. The staff recommended that the current interpretation be maintained, as well as the current approach to "news," in order to provide the membership with additional time to review and discuss the issue. No action was taken by the Board.

8. **Update on Review of NCAA Division I Athletics Certification Program.** The Board received an update on the status of the review of the Division I Athletics Certification program and the timeline for review moving forward. The NCAA Division I Athletics

Certification Committee recommended that the Board approve a one-year delay in the implementation of a new certification program, which would include the requirement that all Division I institutions be required to implement the school's athletics certification cycle two and three plans for improvement. [Reference Supplement No. 13.]

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the committee's recommendation for a one-year delay. (Unanimous voice vote) [See Proposal No. 2012-9.]

9. **Division I Committee on Infractions**. The committee requested the Board approve a bylaw revision and the NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet recommended one committee appointment and several reappointments.

a. **Bylaw 32 Revision**. The committee recommended that the Board approve a revision to Bylaw 32.7.1 that would assist in avoiding additional time delays and costs associated with the remanding of a summary disposition report. [Reference Supplement No. 9A.]

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the legislative revision as recommended by the committee. (Unanimous Voice Vote) [See PP-2012-1.]

b. **Appointment**. The Division I Administration Cabinet recommended the Board appoint Greg Christopher, director of athletics, Bowling Green State University, Mid-American Conference, to the committee. [Reference Supplement No. 9B.]

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the appointment of Greg Christopher to the committee. (Unanimous Voice Vote)

c. **Reappointments**. The Division I Administration Cabinet recommended the Board reappoint Roscoe Howard, attorney (public member); Eleanor Myers, faculty athletics representative, Temple University, Atlantic 10 Conference; James O'Fallon, faculty athletics representative, University of Oregon, Pacific-12 Conference, and Rodney Uphoff, law professor, University of Missouri, Big 12 Conference, to the committee. [Reference Supplement No. 9B.]

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

10. **Division I Infractions Appeals Committee**. The Division I Administration Cabinet recommended that the Board reappointment Susan Lipnickey, faculty athletics representative, Miami University (Ohio), Mid-American Conference, and Patricia

Ohlendorf, vice president for legal affairs, University of Texas at Austin, Big 12 Conference. [Reference Supplement No. 10.]

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

11. Governance Transitional Issues.

a. Appointment of new members to the Board of Directors. The Board unanimously approved the following new Board members whose terms begin following the Board's April 2012, meeting:

- Gene Block, chancellor, University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), Pacific-12 Conference.
- John Broderick, president, Old Dominion University, Colonial Athletic Association.
- Rita Cheng, chancellor, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Missouri Valley Conference.
- John Welty, president, California State University, Fresno, Mountain West Conference.

b. Appointments to the NCAA Executive Committee. The Board unanimously approved the appointment of the following Board members to the Executive Committee whose terms begin following the Board's April 2012, meeting:

- Stan Albrecht, president, Utah State University, Western Athletic Conference.
- Guy Bailey, president, Texas Tech University, Big 12 Conference.
- David Hopkins, president, Wright State University, Horizon League.
- Timothy White, chancellor, University of California, Riverside, Big West Conference.

c. Appointments of FCS and Division I members to the Division I cabinets and councils. The Board reviewed the slate of nominees for councils and cabinets submitted by the FCS and Division I conferences. [Reference Supplement No. 16.]

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the FCS and Division I 2012 slate of cabinet and council nominees. (Unanimous Voice Vote)

12. <u>Future Meeting Dates</u>.

a. Thursday, August, 2, 2012, Indianapolis, Indiana.

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

c. Saturday, January 19, 2013, Grapevine, Texas. [In conjunction with the NCAA Convention.]

d. Thursday, May 2, 2013, Indianapolis, Indiana.

e. Thursday, August 8, 2013, Indianapolis, Indiana.

f. Wednesday, October 30, 2013, Indianapolis, Indiana.

g. Saturday, January 18, 2014, San Diego, California. [In conjunction with the NCAA Convention.]

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

Division I Board of Directors April 26, 2012, Meeting	
ATTENDEES	**ABSENTEES**
Stanley Albrecht, Utah State University, Western Athletic Conference	Nathan Hatch, Wake Forest University, Atlantic Coast Conference
Guy Bailey, Texas Tech University, Big 12 Conference	William R. Harvey, Hampton University, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference
James Barker, Clemson University, Atlantic Coast Conference (alternate)	
William Beauchamp, University of Portland, West Coast Conference	
Judy Genshaft, University of South Florida, Big East Conference, chair	
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 (joined via teleconference)	
David Skorton, Cornell University, Ivy League	
Steadman Upham, University of Tulsa, Conference USA	
Timothy White, University of California, Riverside, Big West Conference	

NCAA staff liaisons in attendance: David Berst, Jacqueline Campbell
Future Board members attending as observers: John Broderick, Old Dominion University, Colonial Athletic Association Rita Cheng, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Missouri Valley Conference John Welty, California State University, Fresno, Mountain West Conference
Guests from other Division I governance bodies: Michael Alden, University of Missouri, chair of the Division I Leadership Council Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Ivy League, chair of the Division I Legislative Council Walter Harrison, University of Hartford, chair of the Division I Committee on Academic Performance
Other NCAA staff members in attendance for portions of the meeting: Troy Arthur, Erik Christianson, Joni Comstock, Diane Dickman, Amy Dunham, Mark Emmert, Abe Frank, Bernard Franklin, Lynn Holzman, Michelle Hosick, Jim Isch, Greg Johnson, Kevin Lennon, Mark Lewis, Steve Mallonee, Keith Martin, Kathleen McNeely, Delise O'Meally, Tom Paskus, Todd Petr, Donald Remy, Wallace Renfro, Julie Roe Lach, Ronnie Ramos, Crissy Schluep, Dave Schnase, Jennifer Strawley, Robert Vowels, Bob Williams and Niu Xiaomu.

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

ACTION ITEM.

- None.

INFORMATION ITEMS.

1. **Report of January 12, 2012, Leadership Council Meeting**. The Leadership Council approved the report of its January 12, 2012, meeting.

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

   a. Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group. The Council was informed of the Board of Directors' request that the Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group consider alternative proposals for a miscellaneous expense allowance. The working group developed three alternatives that have been circulated for review and comment. It is anticipated that conferences will discuss these alternatives during their upcoming spring meetings and provide feedback to the working group. The Board is not expected to take further action concerning the matter until at least August for possible implementation for 2013-14.

   b. Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Resource Allocation Working Group. The Council was informed that most of the recommendations of the Resource Allocation Working Group were defeated by the Board of Directors in January. The issue of possible limitations on the number of noncoaching personnel was referred to the Rules Working Group in its review of Bylaw 11. The issue of contest limitations in all sports, as well as other Bylaw 17 topics, will be reviewed by the Rules Working Group in conjunction with the NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet.

   c. Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Collegiate Model -- Rules Working Group. The Council received an update on the progress of the Rules Working Group, and the communication and outreach plans to keep the membership informed and involved in the process. The approach to a new regulatory structure was reviewed with the Council, noting the goal of establishing rules that are meaningful, enforceable and contribute to student-athlete success. The Council was informed of the timeline of the three phases of review and which bylaws would be reviewed in each phase.

d. Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Collegiate Model -- Enforcement Working Group. The Council was informed of the Enforcement Working Group's progress in creating a multi-level NCAA rules violation structure, an enhanced penalty structure, a more efficient process structure and re-establishing a sense of shared responsibility amongst the interested individuals and entities in intercollegiate athletics.

3. **Women's Basketball Recruiting Model.** The Leadership Council Women's Basketball Recruiting Subcommittee informed the Council of the concepts under consideration for a women's basketball recruiting model. The subcommittee noted that its discussions have focused on communication with prospects (e.g., modes, start date, frequency), official visits, event certification, on-campus evaluations and summer access. The subcommittee also has discussed the summer recruiting evaluation period and noted the women's basketball coaches support for reducing the number of days they are off-campus recruiting in July. The current legislative cycle includes a proposal (Proposal No. 2011-54) that would modify the July 6-31 recruiting period to consist of, consecutively, a seven-day evaluation period, a 10-day dead period, a seven-day evaluation period and a two-day dead period. The subcommittee asked that the Council endorse the adoption of Proposal No. 2011-54, which will be considered by the NCAA Division I Legislative Council during its April 16-17 meeting. The Council unanimously endorsed the proposal with an August 1, 2012, effective date. The subcommittee will continue to discuss the concepts under consideration for a women's basketball recruiting model, with plans to seek further input from coaches, the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) and the National Federation of State High School Associations (NFHS).

4. **Update from Leadership Council's Agent Subcommittee.** The Council was updated on the Agent Subcommittee's discussion of a national agent registration program that could serve as a resource for institutions and student-athletes that would assist in the agent/advisor education process. The Council raised a number of questions regarding the proposed program and suggested the subcommittee continue to discuss the elements of the program.

5. **Criteria for Conference Membership in Division I Governance/Championships Structure.** The Leadership Council received a presentation from several representatives of the Great West Conference regarding their request to seek a waiver or legislation that would immediately designate the Great West Conference as an active Division I multi-sport conference.

LEADERSHIP COUNCIL ACTION: **The Leadership Council voted not to support the Great West Conference's request.** (Unanimous Voice Vote.)

6. Report from the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC). Eugene Daniels, chair of the Division I SAAC, presented a report of the committee's priorities for the upcoming year. In the coming year, the Division I SAAC will focus on:

a. Enhancing the student-athlete voice within the Association;

b. It's new community service initiative, a partnership with Samaritan's Feet; and

c. Increasing the overall awareness of SAAC, particularly amongst groups outside of the Association.

7. Update on Review of Division I Athletics Certification Program. The Council was updated on the work of the NCAA Division I Athletics Certification Committee in its review of the athletics certification program. The Council received information on the name and purpose of the new program, as well as system development, organizational changes and the planned request for a one-year delay in the implementation of the new program.

8. New Membership Communication Initiative. The Council was informed of the planned implementation of a membership communication initiative designed to enhance communication between the NCAA national office and the membership. The process will be piloted by individuals in the membership, as well as national office staff members, to ensure the outlined services are operating as designed.

9. Future Meetings.

- October 11, 2012, Indianapolis, Indiana.

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

Division I Leadership Council April 12, 2012, Meeting	
ATTENDEES	**ABSENTEES**
Mike Alden, University of Missouri, Big 12 Conference	Peg Bradley-Doppes, University of Denver, Sun Belt Conference
Sandy Barbour, University of California, Pacific-12 Conference	
Harold Bardo, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Missouri Valley Conference	
Mike Bitter, Stetson University, Atlantic Sun Conference	
Dave Blank, Elon University, Southern Conference	
McKinley Boston, Jr., New Mexico State University, Western Athletic Conference	
Morgan J. Burke, Purdue University, Big Ten Conference	
Janet Cone, University of North Carolina, Asheville, Big South Conference	
Joan Cronan, University of Tennessee, Southeastern Conference	
Eugene Daniels, chair of the Division I SAAC	
Beth Debauche, Ohio Valley Conference	
Peter Fields, Montana State University-Bozeman, Big Sky Conference	
Chet Gladchuk, United States Naval Academy, Patriot League	
Robin Harris, Ivy League	
Jack Hayes, Hofstra University, Colonial Athletic Association	
Amy Huchthausen, America East Conference	
R.C. Johnson, University of Memphis, Conference USA	
Lisa Kelleher, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Mountain West Conference	
Myndee Kay Larsen, Summit League	
Jonathan LeCrone, Horizon League	
Susan Cross Lipnickey, Miami University, Mid-American Conference	

Janet Lucas, University of California, Riverside, Big West Conference	
John Marinatto, Big East Conference	
Clyde McCoy, University of Miami, Atlantic Coast Conference	
John McCutcheon, University of Massachusetts, Atlantic 10 Conference	
Noreen Morris, Northeast Conference	
Derrick Ramsey, Coppin State University, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference	
John Ritschdorff, Marist College, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	
Duer Sharp, Southwestern Athletic Conference	
Ky Snyder, University of San Diego, West Coast Conference	
Bobby Williams, Sam Houston State University, Southland Conference	
NCAA staff liaisons in attendance: David Berst, Jacqueline Campbell, Kevin Lennon	
Other Guests in attendance: Ed Grom, Great West Conference; Cindy Hartmann, Duke University and Women's Basketball Issues Committee; Mike Jacobsen, Utah Valley University; Lenny Kaplan, New Jersey Institute of Technology; Muffet McGraw, University of Notre Dame and Women's Basketball Issues Committee chair; Gwendolyn Packnett, ACE Fellow, and Jennifer Rizzotti, University of Hartford and WBCA.	
Other NCAA staff members who were in attendance for portions of the meeting: Angie Cretors, Diane Dickman, Jennifer Henderson, Lynn Holzman, Michelle Hosick, LuAnn Humphrey, Matt Maher, Steve Mallonee, Rachel Newman, Jobrina Perez, Ronnie Ramos, Donald Remy, Dave, Schnase, Naima Stevenson and Wendy Walters.	

REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 16-17, 2012

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

- None.

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

1. **Report of the January 14 NCAA Division I Board of Directors meeting and the January 12 NCAA Division I Leadership Council meeting.** The NCAA Division I Legislative Council received a report of the January 14 Board of Directors meeting and the January 12 Leadership Council meeting and took no action.

2. **Report of the January 13 NCAA Executive Committee meeting.** The council received a report of the January 13 Executive Committee meeting and took no action.

3. **Litigation update.** Scott Bearby, NCAA managing director of legal affairs and deputy general counsel, provided the update to the council.

4. **Report of the February 6-7 NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet meeting.** The council received the report and took no action.

5. **Report of the February 8-9 NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet meeting.** The council received the report and took no action.

6. R**eport of the February 16-17 NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet meeting.** The council received the report and took no action.

7. **Report of the February 2 NCAA Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet meeting.** The council received the report and took no action.

8. **Report of the February 15 NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet meeting.** The council received the report and took no action.

9. Report of the February 7-8 NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet meeting. The council received the report and took no action.

10. Report of the NCAA Division I Legislative Review and Interpretations Committee. The council approved the official interpretations issued by the Legislative Review and Interpretations Committee as distributed.

11. Report of the March 9 NCAA Division I Legislative Council Subcommittee for Legislative Relief teleconference. The council received the report and took no action.

12. Report of the February 23-24 NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification meeting. The council received the report and took no action. The council expressed support for delaying the initial data collection from all NCAA Division I members to the fall of 2013.

13. Report of the January 10-14 NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee meeting. The council received the report and took no action.

14. Report of the April 10 NCAA Division I Football Championship Subdivision Governance Committee teleconference. The council received the report and took no action.

15. Report of the February 20 NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance meeting. The council received the report and took no action.

16. Report of the February 22 NCAA Committee on Women's Athletics teleconference. The council received the report and took no action.

17. Report of the February 8-9 NCAA Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee. The council received the report and took no action.

18. Legislative Actions. A list of the council's legislative actions may be found in Attachment A and detailed voting results may be found in Attachment B.

[Note: Per NCAA Constitution 5.3.2.2.4.1, legislation adopted by the Legislative Council shall be subject to possible review by the NCAA Division I Board of Directors at its next meeting. At its discretion, the Board of Directors may ratify, amend or defeat legislation adopted by the Legislative Council. Further, per Constitution 5.3.2.2.4.2, the Board of Directors may resurrect a proposal defeated on final review by the Legislative Council and consider the proposal on its merits. The Board of Directors also may amend such a proposal.]

19. Presidential Retreat Working Groups updates. The council received information and engaged in discussions related to the latest meetings and actions taken by the various Presidential Retreat Working Groups. The council offered feedback regarding various commitments and concepts. The feedback, along with feedback compiled from other governance entities and the NCAA membership, will be provided to the appropriate working groups and shared with the membership. No action was taken.

20. Division I Leadership Council Women's Basketball Recruiting Model. The council received a report related to the content and status of the women's basketball recruiting model and took no action.

21. Election of Chair and Vice Chair. Greg Sankey, representative of the Southeastern Conference, was elected to serve as chair of the Legislative Council, effective July 1. Matt Banker, representative of the Ohio Valley Conference, was elected to serve as vice chair of the Legislative Council, effective July 1.

Council Chair: *Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Ivy League*
Council Liaisons: *Lynn Holzman, Academic and Membership Affairs*
Steve Mallonee, Academic and Membership Affairs
Binh Nguyen, Academic and Membership Affairs
Leeland Zeller, Academic and Membership Affairs

April 16-17, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Alicia Alford, Sacred Heart University, Northeast Conference	Brad Hostetter, Atlantic Coast Conference
Matt Banker, Ohio Valley Conference	
Jeff Bolin, Purdue University, Big Ten Conference	
Paul Bowden, George Mason University, Colonial Athletic Conference	
Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Ivy League	
Kim Capriotti, Jacksonville University, Atlantic Sun Conference	
Joseph D'Antonio Jr., Big East Conference	
Meredith Eaker, Liberty University, Big South Conference	
Shaney Fink, University of San Diego, West Coast Conference	
David Flores, Big 12 Conference	
Jean Gee, University of Montana, Big Sky Conference	
Beth Goode, Stanford University, Pac-12 Conference	
Jackie Mynarski, Mid-American Conference (alternate)	
Kathy Heylens, South Dakota State University, Summit League	
Elaine Jacobs, Youngstown State University, Horizon League	
Richard Johnson, Wofford College, Southern Conference	
Scott Connors, Sun Belt Conference (alternate)	
Bill Maher, Canisius College, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	
Cindy Masner, Long Beach State University, Big West Conference	
Stephanie McDonald, Southland Conference	
Kaitlyn McKittrick, Lafayette College, Patriot League	
Mary Mulvenna, America East Conference	
Robert Philippi, Conference USA	
Jill Redmond, Atlantic 10 Conference (alternate)	
Ashley Robinson, Prairie View A&M University, Southwestern Athletic Conference	
Janice Ruggiero, University of New Mexico, Mountain West Conference	
Greg Sankey, Southeastern Conference	
Curtis Schickner, Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee	
Rob Spear, University of Idaho, Western Athletic Conference	
Greg Walter, Missouri Valley Conference	
Quintin Wright, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference	
Other Participants: Scott Bearby, David Berst, Kelly Brooks, Jackie Campbell, Jennifer Henderson, Michelle Hosick, Charnele Kemper, Kevin Lennon, Jobrina Perez, Bill Regan, Kris Richardson, Dave Schnase, Geoff Silver	

ATTACHMENT A

NCAA Division I Legislative Council April 2012 Legislative Actions

1. Modifications of Wording.

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
M-2012-1	AMATEURISM -- FINANCIAL DONATIONS FROM PROFESSIONAL SPORTS ORGANIZATIONS -- RECIPROCAL MARKETING AGREEMENTS	NCAA Division I Legislative Council	Immediate	To clarify that, in sports other than football and men's basketball, an institution's marketing department may enter into a reciprocal contractual relationship with a professional sports organization for the specific purpose of marketing and promoting an institutionally sponsored sport.	Approved.
M-2012-2	FINANCIAL AID -- MAXIMUM INSTITUTIONAL GRANT-IN-AID LIMITATIONS BY SPORT -- EQUIVALENCY COMPUTATIONS -- CALCULATION OF BOOKS -- ENROLLMENT FOR LESS THAN A FULL ACADEMIC YEAR	NCAA Division I Legislative Council	August 1, 2012	To clarify that if a student-athlete is enrolled for less than a full academic year (e.g., one semester, one or two quarters) and receives any portion of a book allowance, the institution must use the amount in the numerator that is proportionate to the number of terms of enrollment ($400 for semester systems, $534 or $267 for quarter systems).	Approved.

2. Proposals Recommended as Emergency or Noncontroversial Legislation.

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2012-4	EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS -- ELIGIBILITY FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS -- INELIGIBILITY FOR USE OF BANNED DRUGS -- MANIPULATION OF DRUG TEST SAMPLE	NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports)	August 1, 2012, for tests occurring on or after August 1, 2012	To increase the penalty for a student-athlete who is involved in a case of clearly observed manipulation of an NCAA drug test sample to the loss of a minimum of two seasons of competition in all sports, as specified.	Supported as noncontroversial legislation. Adopted.

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2012-5	ELIGIBILITY -- INITIAL ELIGIBILITY -- COMMON PROVISIONS -- DIVISION I AND DIVISION II – COLLEGE COURSES AND MULTIPLE HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE	NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet	Immediate	To change the voting line for bylaws related to initial eligibility from federated to common for Division I and Division II, as specified.	Supported as noncontroversial legislation. Adopted.
2012-6	ELIGIBILITY -- FRESHMAN ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS -- ELIGIBILITY FOR FINANCIAL AID, PRACTICE AND COMPETITION -- QUALIFIER -- CORE-COURSE REQUIREMENTS -- EXCEPTION -- INTERNATIONAL PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETE	NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet	August 1, 2015, for student-athletes initially enrolling full time in a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2015*	To specify that a prospective student-athlete whose initial-eligibility certification is based entirely on international credentials shall not be required to complete ten of the required 16 core courses before the start of his or her seventh semester (or the equivalent) of high school.	Supported as noncontroversial legislation. Adopted.
2012-7	ELIGIBILITY -- PROGRESS-TOWARD-DEGREE REQUIREMENTS -- ELIGIBILITY FOR PRACTICE DURING EACH TERM OF THE INITIAL YEAR IN RESIDENCE	NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet	August 1, 2015, for student-athletes initially enrolling full time in a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2015*	To specify that an academic redshirt must successfully complete nine semester or eight quarter hours of academic credit during each applicable regular academic term of his or her initial year in residence in order to be eligible for practice in the immediately subsequent term of his or her initial year in residence.	Supported as noncontroversial legislation. Adopted.

*If the effective date of NCAA Proposal No. 2011-94 is delayed, the effective date of this proposal will also be delayed, consistent with such action.

3. Actions Related to 2010-11 Legislative Cycle Proposals.

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2011-18	PERSONNEL AND RECRUITING -- RECRUITING COORDINATION FUNCTIONS -- TELEPHONE CALLS -- RECEIPT OF CALLS FROM PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES	Southeastern Conference	Immediate	To eliminate the restriction on the receipt of telephone calls from prospective student-athletes (or prospective student-athletes' parents, legal guardians or coaches) that requires such calls to be received by the head coach or one or more of the assistant coaches who count toward the numerical limitations.	Adopted.
2011-24	AMATEURISM -- AMATEUR STATUS -- EXPENSES FROM A SPONSOR FOR PRACTICE OR COMPETITION IN INDIVIDUAL SPORTS PRIOR TO FULL-TIME COLLEGIATE ENROLLMENT	NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet	Immediate	In individual sports, to specify that, prior to full-time collegiate enrollment, an individual may accept up to actual and necessary expenses associated with an athletics event and practice immediately preceding the event, from a sponsor (e.g., neighbor, business) other than an agent, a member institution or a representative of an institution's athletics interests.	Adopted.

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2011-25	AMATEURISM -- EXCEPTIONS TO AMATEURISM RULE -- PRIZE MONEY PRIOR TO FULL-TIME COLLEGIATE ENROLLMENT -- TENNIS -- $10,000 PER YEAR	NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet	Immediate	In tennis, to specify that, prior to full-time collegiate enrollment, an individual may accept prize money based on his or her place finish or performance in open athletics events, not to exceed $10,000 per calendar year; further, to specify that once the individual has reached the $10,000 limit, he or she may receive additional prize money on a per-event basis, provided such prize money does not exceed his or her actual and necessary expenses for participation in the event.	Adopted.
2011-28-A	RECRUITING -- PERMISSIBLE RECRUITERS -- GENERAL EXCEPTIONS -- RELATIVES OF ENROLLED STUDENT-ATHLETES	Southeastern Conference	Immediate	To specify that contacts between a prospective student-athlete or his or her relatives (traditional or nontraditional) or legal guardians and the relatives (traditional or nontraditional) or legal guardians of an enrolled student-athlete that occur on the day of a regularly scheduled home athletics event shall be permissible.	Rendered moot by the adoption of Proposal No. 2011-28-B.

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2011-28-B	RECRUITING -- PERMISSIBLE RECRUITERS -- GENERAL EXCEPTIONS -- ON-CAMPUS CONTACT WITH RELATIVES OF ENROLLED STUDENT-ATHLETES	Big East Conference	Immediate	To specify that on-campus contacts between a prospective student-athlete or his or her relatives (traditional or nontraditional) or legal guardians accompanying the prospective student-athlete and the relatives (traditional or nontraditional) or legal guardians of an enrolled student-athlete shall be permissible.	Adopted.
2011-29-A	RECRUITING -- PERMISSIBLE RECRUITERS -- STUDENT-ATHLETE -- OFF-CAMPUS CONTACTS DURING AN UNOFFICIAL VISIT	Southeastern Conference	Immediate	To specify that off-campus, in-person contacts between enrolled student-athletes and a prospective student-athlete are permissible if such contacts do not occur at the direction of a coaching staff member and the prospective student-athlete has notified the institution that he or she is making an unofficial visit.	Rendered moot by the adoption of Proposal No. 2011-29-B.
2011-29-B	RECRUITING -- PERMISSIBLE RECRUITERS -- STUDENT-ATHLETE -- OFF-CAMPUS CONTACTS	NCAA Division I Legislative Council	Immediate	To specify that off-campus, in-person contact between an enrolled student-athlete and a prospective student-athlete is permissible, provided such contact does not occur at the direction of an institutional staff member.	Adopted.

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2011-32	RECRUITING -- TELEPHONE CALLS -- PERMISSIBLE CALLERS -- EXCEPTIONS -- PRIOR TO COMMITMENT -- COMPLIANCE ADMINISTRATORS	NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet	Immediate	To permit compliance administrators to make telephone calls to or receive telephone calls from a prospective student-athlete (or the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardians) with no limit on the timing or number of such calls, provided the calls relate only to compliance issues.	Adopted.
2011-40	RECRUITING -- OFFICIAL (PAID) VISIT -- ENTERTAINMENT/TICKETS ON OFFICIAL VISIT -- STUDENT HOST -- ENTERTAINMENT ALLOWANCE	Big East Conference	August 1, 2012	To increase, from $30 to $40, the allowance that an institution may provide a student host for each day of a prospective student-athlete's official visit to cover all actual costs of entertaining the student host(s) and the prospective student-athlete; further, to increase, from $15 to $20, the additional allowance an institution may provide the student host per day for each additional prospective student-athlete the host entertains.	Adopted.

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2011-44	RECRUITING -- LETTER-OF-INTENT PROGRAMS, FINANCIAL AID AGREEMENTS -- SUBMISSION OF TRANSCRIPT TO ELIGIBILITY CENTER BEFORE SIGNING	NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet	August 1, 2012	To specify that an institution shall not permit a high school prospective student-athlete (other than a prospective student-athlete who attends a secondary school in a foreign country) to sign a National Letter of Intent or an institution's written offer of athletically related financial aid until the NCAA Eligibility Center has received an official high school transcript for each high school the prospective student-athlete has attended through his or her sixth semester (or equivalent) of enrollment.	Defeated.
2011-48	RECRUITING -- SPORTS CAMPS AND CLINICS -- RECRUITING CONVERSATIONS DURING INSTITUTION'S CAMPS AND CLINICS -- EXCEPTION -- SPORTS OTHER THAN MEN'S BASKETBALL	Big South Conference	Immediate	In sports other than men's basketball, to specify that it is permissible for an institution's coach to engage in recruiting conversations with a prospective student-athlete during the institution's camps or clinics.	Adopted.
2011-53	RECRUITING -- PRECOLLEGE EXPENSES -- DONATION OF ATHLETICS EQUIPMENT -- ELIMINATION OF 30-MILE RADIUS	West Coast Conference	August 1, 2012	To eliminate the restriction that precludes an institution from donating athletics equipment to a bona fide youth organization outside a 30-mile radius of the institution's campus.	Adopted.

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2011-54	RECRUITING -- RECRUITING CALENDARS -- WOMEN'S BASKETBALL -- JULY EVALUATION AND DEAD PERIODS	Atlantic Coast Conference	August 1, 2012	In women's basketball, to specify that during the time period of July 6-31, the recruiting calendar shall consist of, consecutively, a seven-day evaluation period, a 10-day dead period, a seven-day evaluation period and a two-day dead period.	Approved an amendment to change the effective date from immediate to August 1, 2012. Adopted, as amended.
2011-74	FINANCIAL AID -- SUMMER FINANCIAL AID -- ENROLLED STUDENT-ATHLETES -- PROPORTIONALITY RESTRICTION -- EXHAUSTED ELIGIBILITY EXCEPTION	Big 12 Conference	Immediate	To specify that the summer aid proportionality restriction shall not apply to a student-athlete who has exhausted his or her eligibility and is enrolled in course work acceptable toward his or her degree requirements.	Adopted.
2011-77	FINANCIAL AID -- MAXIMUM INSTITUTIONAL GRANT-IN-AID LIMITATIONS BY SPORT -- BASEBALL LIMITATIONS -- MINIMUM EQUIVALENCY VALUE -- EXCEPTION -- FINAL YEAR OF ELIGIBILITY AND NOT PREVIOUSLY AIDED	Big South Conference and Southern Conference	August 1, 2012	In baseball, to specify that an institution may provide less than 25 percent of an equivalency to a student-athlete, provided the student-athlete is in the final year of eligibility and has not previously received athletically related financial aid in baseball.	Adopted.

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2011-79	AWARDS, BENEFITS AND EXPENSES -- EXPENSES FOR STUDENT-ATHLETE'S FRIENDS AND RELATIVES -- PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES -- LIFE-THREATENING INJURY OR ILLNESS -- EXPENSES FOR ANY STUDENT-ATHLETE	NCAA Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet	Immediate	To specify that the institution may pay transportation, housing and meal expenses for any student-athlete to be present in situations in which a student-athlete or a family member or legal guardian of a student-athlete suffers a life-threatening injury or illness, or in the event of a student-athlete's or student-athlete's family member or legal guardian's death.	Adopted.
2011-80-A	AWARDS, BENEFITS AND EXPENSES -- EXPENSES PROVIDED BY THE INSTITUTION FOR PRACTICE AND COMPETITION -- NATIONAL TEAM TRYOUTS -- NOT MORE THAN TWO EVENTS	NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee)	August 1, 2012	To permit an institution to provide actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete to participate in not more than two national team tryout competition events, including events from which participants are selected for another tier of tryout competition or events from which final selections are made for the national team that will participate in the Olympic Games, Pan American Games, World Championships, World Cup or World University Games.	Rendered moot by the adoption of Proposal No. 2011-80-B.

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2011-80-B	AWARDS, BENEFITS AND EXPENSES -- EXPENSES PROVIDED BY THE INSTITUTION FOR PRACTICE AND COMPETITION -- NATIONAL TEAM TRYOUTS -- NOT MORE THAN TWO EVENTS -- IMMEDIATE EFFECTIVE DATE	NCAA Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet	Immediate	To permit an institution to provide actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete to participate in not more than two national team tryout competition events, including events from which participants are selected for another tier of tryout competition or events from which final selections are made for the national team that will participate in the Olympic Games, Pan American Games, World Championships, World Cup or World University Games.	Adopted.
2011-81	AWARDS, BENEFITS AND EXPENSES -- OTHER TRAVEL EXPENSES PROVIDED BY THE INSTITUTION -- CONFERENCE-SPONSORED LIFE SKILLS PROGRAM	Big 12 Conference	Immediate	To permit an institution or conference to pay actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete to attend a conference-sponsored life skills program (e.g., leadership, personal development, conflict resolution).	Adopted.
2011-82	AWARDS, BENEFITS AND EXPENSES -- PROVISION OF EXPENSES BY INDIVIDUALS OR ORGANIZATIONS OTHER THAN THE INSTITUTION -- BENEFITS, GIFTS, AND SERVICES -- MISCELLANEOUS BENEFITS -- FUNDRAISERS FOR STUDENT-ATHLETES OR IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBERS	NCAA Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet	Immediate	To specify that proceeds from fundraisers for student-athletes (or their immediate families) due to extreme circumstances beyond the student-athlete's control (e.g., life-threatening illness, natural disaster) may be given directly to the beneficiaries, with receipt kept on file by the institution, which must include the amount of expenses incurred and the total amount received.	Adopted.

Proposal Number	Title	Source	Effective Date	Intent	Legislative Council Action
2011-84-A	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- MEN'S BASKETBALL -- PRESEASON PRACTICE -- ON-COURT PRACTICE -- ELIMINATION OF 5 P.M. START TIME ON FIRST PERMISSIBLE PRACTICE DATE	NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet (Women's Basketball Issues Committee)	August 1, 2012	In men's basketball, to eliminate the 5 p.m. start time on the first permissible practice date.	On initial consideration, defeated. On reconsideration, tabled.
2011-85	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- MEN'S BASKETBALL -- PRESEASON PRACTICE -- ON-COURT PRACTICE -- 30 DAYS OF COUNTABLE ACTIVITIES WITHIN 40 DAYS PRIOR TO FIRST CONTEST	Big South Conference	August 1, 2012	In men's basketball, to specify that an institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions prior to 5 p.m. on the date that is 40 days prior to the date of the institution's first regular-season contest; further, to specify that an institution shall not engage in more than 30 days of countable athletically related activities prior to its first regular-season contest.	On initial consideration, defeated. On reconsideration, tabled.

NCAA Division I Legislative Council
April 16-17, 2012

ATTACHMENT B

Conference -- Voting Delegate	Conference Type	Voting Weight	Package of LRIC Minutes	M-2012-1	M-2012-2	2012-4 as non-controversial	2012-4	2012-5 as non-controversial	2012-5	2012-6 as non-controversial	2012-6	2012-7 as non-controversial	2012-7	2011-18	2011-24	2011-25	2011-28-B	2011-29-B	2011-32	2011-40
America East -- M. Mulvenna	DI	1.2		Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
Atlantic 10 -- J. Redmond	DI	1.2		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Atlantic Coast -- B. Hostetter*	FBS	3																		
Atlantic Sun -- K. Capriotti	DI	1.2		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Big 12 -- D. Flores	FBS	3		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Big East -- J. F. D'Antonio, Jr	FBS	3		Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Big Sky -- J. Gee	FCS	1.2		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Big South -- M. Eaker	FCS	1.2		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Big Ten -- J. Bolin	FBS	3	APPROVED	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Big West -- C. Masner	DI	1.2		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Colonial Athletic -- P. Bowden	FCS	1.2		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Conference USA -- R. Philippi	FBS	3		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Horizon League -- E. Jacobs	DI	1.2		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ivy Group -- C. Campbell-McGovern	FCS	1.2		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Metro Atlantic Athletic -- W. Maher	DI	1.2		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mid-American -- J. Mynarski	FBS	1.5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mid-Eastern Athletic -- Q. Wright	FCS	1.2		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Missouri Valley -- G. Walter	DI	1.2		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mountain West -- J. Ruggiero	FBS	1.5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northeast -- A. Alford	FCS	1.2		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ohio Valley -- M. Banker	FCS	1.2		Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pac-12 -- B. Goode	FBS	3		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Patriot League -- K. McKittrick	FCS	1.2		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southeastern -- G. Sankey	FBS	3		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southern -- R. Johnson	FCS	1.2		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southland -- S. McDonald	FCS	1.2		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southwestern Athletic -- A. Robinson	FCS	1.2		Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Summit League -- K. Heylens	DI	1.2		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Sun Belt -- S. Connors	FBS	1.5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
West Coast -- S. Fink	DI	1.2		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Western Athletic -- R. Spear	FBS	1.5		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pioneer League -- E. Adkins	FCS	1																		
Missouri Valley Football -- K. Heylens	FCS	1																		
Adopt/Yes (Y)				48	48	41.4	43.8	48	48	48	48	45.6	48	48	44.4	36.6	48	43.8	48	42.9
Defeat/No (N)				0	0	5.4	4.2	0	0	0	0	2.4	0	0	3.6	11.4	0	4.2	0	5.1
Abstain				0	0	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Vote Cast (Blank)				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total				48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48

*** Was unable to attend in-person meeting.**

NCAA Division I Legislative Council
April 16-17, 2012

Conference -- Voting Delegate	Conference Type	Voting Weight	2011-44	2011-46 FCS (override process)	2011-48	2011-53	Amend 2011-54 (effective date)	2011-54 as amended	2011-74	2011-77	2011-79	2011-80-B	2011-81	2011-82	2011-85	2011-84-A	Reconsider 2011-85	Table 2011-85	Reconsider 2011-84-A	Table 2011-84-A
America East -- M. Mulvenna	DI	1.2	A		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Atlantic 10 -- J. Redmond	DI	1.2	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Atlantic Coast -- B. Hostetter*	FBS	3																		
Atlantic Sun -- K. Capriotti	DI	1.2	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Big 12 -- D. Flores	FBS	3	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Big East -- J. F. D'Antonio, Jr	FBS	3	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Big Sky -- J. Gee	FCS	1.2	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Big South -- M. Eaker	FCS	1.2	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Big Ten -- J. Bolin	FBS	3	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Big West -- C. Masner	DI	1.2	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Colonial Athletic -- P. Bowden	FCS	1.2	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
Conference USA -- R. Philippi	FBS	3	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y
Horizon League -- E. Jacobs	DI	1.2	N		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ivy Group -- C. Campbell-McGovern	FCS	1.2	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Metro Atlantic Athletic -- W. Maher	DI	1.2	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Mid-American -- J. Mynarski	FBS	1.5	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Mid-Eastern Athletic -- Q. Wright	FCS	1.2	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Missouri Valley -- G. Walter	DI	1.2	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mountain West -- J. Ruggiero	FBS	1.5	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northeast -- A. Alford	FCS	1.2	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ohio Valley -- M. Banker	FCS	1.2	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pac-12 -- B. Goode	FBS	3	N		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Patriot League -- K. McKittrick	FCS	1.2	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southeastern -- G. Sankey	FBS	3	N		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Southern -- R. Johnson	FCS	1.2	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Southland -- S. McDonald	FCS	1.2	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Southwestern Athletic -- A. Robinson	FCS	1.2	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Summit League -- K. Heylens	DI	1.2	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Sun Belt -- S. Connors	FBS	1.5	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
West Coast -- S. Fink	DI	1.2	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Western Athletic -- R. Spear	FBS	1.5	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pioneer League -- E. Adkins	FCS	1		N																
Missouri Valley Football -- K. Heylens	FCS	1		N																
Adopt/Yes (Y)			12	0	48	39.6	48	48	48	48	46.8	46.8	46.8	48	21	21	39	42.9	40.2	43.2
Defeat/No (N)			35	12	0	8.4	0	0	0	0	1.2	1.2	1.2	0	22	24	9	5.1	7.8	4.8
Abstain			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0
No Vote Cast (Blank)			0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total			48	13	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48

*** Was unable to attend in-person meeting.**

Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Collegiate Model Working Group – Enforcement

Why do this?

- Culture of winning versus integrity.
  - Risk-reward analysis.
- Increase in third-party interference and influence.
- Public and membership distrust of the NCAA's ability to police itself.

Why do this?

- Violations:
  - Current violation structure lacks flexibility.
- Process:
  - Cases take too long and lack transparency.
  - Committee on Infractions' (COI's) workload unreasonable.
- Penalties:
  - Approach to penalties not understood, predictable or strong.
  - More emphasis on head coach responsibility.
- Expectations of shared responsibility unclear.

How we do this…

- Establish multi-level violation structure.
- Overhaul process.
- Develop penalty guidelines.
- Define shared responsibility.

Multi-level Violation Structure

- Four proposed levels:
  - Level I: Severe major (e.g., academic fraud).
  - Level II: Major (e.g., coaching limitations).
  - Level III: Secondary (e.g., limited early contact).
  - Level IV: Limited (e.g., recruiting correspondence).
- Remaining Issues:
  - Refine definitions.
  - More examples needed in report - creating resource library.

Modified Process

- Expanded Committee on Infractions (24).
- Use of 6- to 7-person panels of COI to hear Level I and II cases.
- Inclusion of current/former presidents, current/former directors of athletics and former coaches.
- Redesigned allegations; reference to evidence supporting charges.
- More streamlined approach to processing Level II cases.
- Traditional approach to Level III cases (secondary).
- Conference review of Level IV cases.
- <u>Remaining Issue</u>:
  - Implementation plan for additional COI members.

Penalty Structure

- Use of penalty guidelines for Level I and II cases.
- Use of core penalties:
  - Postseason bans, recruiting restrictions, fines, scholarship restrictions, meaningful probation and show cause orders.
- Aggravating and mitigating circumstances affect severity of penalties.
- Ranges of penalties.
  - Greater predictability and consistency.
- <u>Remaining Issues</u>:
  - Better understanding of how mitigating and aggravating factors apply.
  - Creating resource library with detailed analysis of last two years of cases.

Penalty Structure

LEVEL I	LEVEL II
Significant Aggravation	
Aggravation	Aggravation
Standard	Standard
Mitigation	Mitigation
Significant Mitigation	

Head Coach Responsibility

- If violations occur in coach's program, presumption of coach responsibility.
  - Results in head coach control violation (Bylaw 11.1.2.1).
  - Head coach suspended from 10 to 100 percent of the season.
- Level III (secondary) violations in football, men's and women's basketball.
  - Designated list of intentional Level III violations (serious secondary).
  - Head coach suspended from a contest when staff member commits violation.

President and Athletics Director Accountability

- Findings of Lack of Institutional Control.
  - President's name listed on public infractions report.
  - Athletics director's name listed on public infractions report.
  - Head coach's name listed on public infractions report.

- Failure to Monitor.
  - Athletics director's name listed on public infractions report.

Level I Case Example

- Assistant coach involves agent to recruit prospect; benefits provided by agent and coach knew.
  - Enforcement staff conducts investigation; issues allegations.
  - COI panel hears case; makes findings; decides what aggravation and mitigation exist.
  - COI panel applies penalty guidelines to coach and institution; issues decision in 4 weeks.
    - Standard Level I for institution.
    - Aggravation Level I for assistant coach.
    - Standard Level I for head coach for violating Bylaw 11.1.2.1.

Level I Case Example: Penalties Analysis

- Standard Level I for institution.
  - Postseason ban: 1 to 2 years.
  - Fine: 1 to 3% of total budget for basketball program.
  - Scholarship reduction: 12.5 to 25%.
  - Recruiting restrictions on program: 12.5 to 25%.
  - Probation: 2 to 6 years.
    - Aggravation Level I for assistant coach.
      - 5- to 10-year show cause order; restriction on all athletics duties.
    - Standard Level I for head coach for violating 11.1.2.1
      - 20 to 50% suspension from season.

Effective Date and Implementation

- Adoption August 2012.
- Effective date August 2013.
- Remaining issues:
  - Impact on violations committed after August 1, 2012.
  - Impact on pending cases.
  - Plan for phasing in new COI members and panels.

Shared Responsibility and The Cooperative Principle

– The Cooperative Principle.

- Defining common expectations for all involved in major (Level I or II) infractions matters.
- Roles and responsibilities of institutions, conferences, at-risk coaches and enforcement staff.

2012 Timeline and Next Steps

- January 12: General concepts reported to Board.
- January 30: Working group provided preliminary report to membership.
- February to March: Input from membership and others.
- April 10: Working group revised proposals based on feedback.
- April 26: Interim report to Board and membership. Supportive of recommendations.
- May to June: Continued outreach - conference meetings; seminars.
- July: Working group will revise proposals as needed.

- August 2: Division I Board of Directors meeting. A majority of Enforcement Working Group recommendations have August 2013 effective date but some (e.g. amended rationale of Bylaw 11.1.2.1) have an August 2012 effective date.
- August –TBD: Enforcement Working Group continues to refine, resolve and educate the membership regarding the implementation of recommendations approved/ adopted by the Board.

Enforcement Working Group: Amended Timeline for 2012

Phase I (April 2012)	Detailed informational report on the following items: 1. Multi-tiered violation structure: Specific definitions and examples provided. Effective date –August 1, 2013. (Unless feedback from the membership during spring and summer of 2012 persuades working group to make significant changes to package demanding more time.) 2. Changes to Committee on Infractions process. Most significant change being the panel approach to Committee on Infractions. All other details in April report (e.g., changes designed to expedite process). Effective date –August 1, 2013. (Unless feedback from the membership during spring and summer 2012 persuades working group to make significant changes to package demanding more time.) 3. New penalty structure and guidelines. Details of mitigating and aggravating factors along with proposed penalty matrix included with April report. Effective date August 1, 2013. 4. Accountability. The working group will seek Board action at the August 2, 2012, Board meeting with an immediate effective date for the following accountability recommendations: (1) an amendment to the rationale of NCAA Bylaw 11.1.2.1; (2) endorsement of the suspension of the head coach for designated list of secondary (Level III) violations that occur after August 2, 2012, in the sports of football and men's basketball and possibly other sports; and (3) presidents', directors of athletics' and/ or head coaches' names included with Division I Committee on Infractions public infractions decision reports concerning findings of institutional major (Level I) and institutional control violations, and major (Levels I and II) failure to monitor violations. See April 2012 report for details regarding recommendations. Effective date August 1, 2012.
Phase II (August 2012)	Action items for Board vote in August 2012. Items 1 through 4 above. Informational items: 1. Clearer definition of shared responsibility under cooperative principle in context of enforcement case. 2. Redefinition of institutional control (which may be combined with the work of the Institutional Integrity Working Group).

NCAA/04/18/12/JRL/LWM:ajw

Interim Report

NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model - Enforcement
April 2012

INFORMATIONAL ITEM.

This is the most recent report of the Working Group on Collegiate Model – Enforcement. Since this group's preliminary report to the NCAA Board of Directors in January 2012, extensive outreach efforts have been and continue to be made to solicit feedback from the membership. This feedback has led to some changes in the interim recommendations of the working group from the January preliminary report, and more changes are anticipated for the final report in August as the outreach and feedback continue. At this point, the working group is seeking the Board's endorsement of the concepts being put forth regarding (1) a new violation structure, (2) a new violation processing structure, (3) a new penalty structure, (4) accountability and (5) the concept of shared responsibility.

The working group will use the feedback gathered to refine its proposals for final adoption by the Board in August 2012, with an expected effective date of August 2013. The working group is considering various implementation scenarios to determine the precise implementation date that allows for adequate notice for all members and affected individuals and also ensures that the new structure and processes are fully operational as soon as possible. The working group will consider violation date, discovery date and implementation of the new structure for different scenarios and propose an implementation schedule accordingly. The working group will develop a final effective date schedule and implementation plan for the new violation, process and penalty recommendations for the Board to consider during the August 2, 2012, meeting. The working group will seek Board action at the August 2, 2012, Board meeting with an immediate effective date for the following accountability recommendations (beginning on page 23 of this report): (1) an amendment to the rationale of NCAA Bylaw 11.1.2.1; (2) endorsement of the suspension of the head coach for designated list of secondary (Level III) violations that occur after August 2, 2012, in the sports of football and men's basketball and possibly, other sports; and (3) presidents', directors of athletics' and/ or head coaches' names included with Division I Committee on Infractions public infractions decision reports concerning findings of institutional major (Level I) and institutional control violations, and major (Levels I and II) failure to monitor violations.

A. Background.

History may well observe that 2011 was the year that intercollegiate athletics faced its most difficult challenges. However, 2011 may also be the year remembered as that in which higher education's presidents and chancellors committed to broad structural and environmental changes designed to re-center college sports on a set of enduring values.

Public trust in intercollegiate athletics has eroded and needs to be restored. The loss of trust creates urgency, but this loss of trust is not driving the urgency to make changes. Rather, the driving force is recognition by presidential leadership that the values of intercollegiate athletics have become muddied and need to be brought to the forefront of

the work we do. Significant change is not optional. Through a series of revelations that began with the 2011 New Year and extended through the fall, there has been mounting evidence that the historical management and control structure for intercollegiate athletics, from the development and implementation of national policy to the self-policing of violations, must be re-evaluated and subject to change. Among the most pressing issues are:

- A risk-reward analysis of the intentional violation of national policy that fails to deter violations and that often is based on financial pressure.
- An emphasis on winning that takes prominence over integrity.
- An ever-growing expectation for national policy to codify all behavior and avoid institutional or individual judgment and responsibility.
- An increase in third-party interference with, and influence on, prospective student-athletes, student-athletes and coaches, which is usually based upon money-making potential. Regulation of third-party conduct is difficult because these persons are not NCAA members and not subject to NCAA enforcement actions.
- The public relations impact of celebrity compensation packages for coaches, as well as the rising number of non-coaching personnel within a model that holds the athlete as an amateur.
- The loss of faith in the good intentions of intercollegiate athletics to serve as a co-curricular component of higher education.
- The perception that powerhouse coaches/athletics departments have greater authority than college or university presidents and governing bodies.
- Public distrust of the NCAA's ability to police itself. Membership distrust of the processes used to investigate violations and make decisions with serious consequences for institutions and individuals (coaches and student-athletes).
- The commercialization of intercollegiate athletics that pushes the perception of intercollegiate athletics toward the professional model.

As a result of the threats described above, NCAA President Mark Emmert and more than 50 presidents and chancellors gathered in August 2011 to examine in broad terms how to sustain the collegiate model and restore public trust in college sports and the NCAA. It was clear that presidents were "mad as hell" and resolved to take action. What emerged from the presidential retreat was a call for the transformation of intercollegiate athletics. The presidents identified five significant areas of concern: (1) standards and metrics for the academic success of Division I student-athletes; (2) the allocation of financial resources within intercollegiate rules; (3) the financial well-being of student-athletes; (4) a realigning of how rules governing intercollegiate athletics are determined and an enhanced expectation of shared responsibility at the campus, conference and national levels; and (5) the strong and swift enforcement of those rules that place the greatest emphasis on those violations that, if left unattended, most significantly denigrate the collegiate model.

The presidents emphasized that there are four acknowledged enduring values that are guiding the entirety of their efforts and will be the measures against which all policies and judgments will be tested:

- Student-athlete success is paramount, both academically and athletically.
- The collegiate model must embed the values of higher education, including shared responsibility and accountability; this model should be protected and sustained.
- In the collegiate model of athletics, amateurism is the student-participation model that guides the relationship between students and institutions.
- In the collegiate model of athletics, the guiding principle should be based upon fair opportunities to compete among institutions with similar commitments to inter-collegiate athletics.

The Working Group on Collegiate Model - Enforcement was formed to primarily focus on the fifth concern, along with contributing to a better definition and clearer expectation of shared responsibility (part of the fourth concern). As one of five committees or working groups addressing a broad spectrum of change, this is the interim report to the Board of Directors.

B. Introduction and Brief Overview of Proposed Concepts.

This working group was tasked with creating a multi-level NCAA rules violation structure and an enhanced penalty structure for NCAA rules infractions. This working group also was charged with re-establishing a sense of shared responsibility, among the interested individuals and entities in intercollegiate athletics, for NCAA rules compliance and enforcement. The group undertook this work pursuant to the Association's core purpose of governing competition in a fair, safe, equitable and sportsmanlike manner. The group also acted pursuant to the Association's principle of integrating intercollegiate athletics into higher education to ensure that the educational experience of the student-athlete remains paramount. In addition, the group's work was based upon the Association's enduring values of student-athlete success, the collegiate model, amateurism as a student model and competitive equity.

Finally, in undertaking this task, the group developed the following three guiding principles:

- The Principle of Fairness – Any new violation and penalty structure must be fair to all parties involved in the process and consider the interests of all member institutions that uphold integrity through rules compliance. Appropriate weight should be given to fair process considerations for those culpable for violations or otherwise involved and potential legal implications. In addition, the severity of penalties must have a direct correlation with the significance of the violations as identified by the membership and staff, as well as the NCAA enduring values.

- The Principle of Accountability – The new violation and penalty structures should be designed to hold those institutions, coaches, administrators and student-athletes who violate the rules accountable for their conduct, both at the individual and institutional levels. In addition, both the NCAA staff and membership (coaches, administrators, institutions and conferences) must be held accountable for the fairness of the process and must understand the shared responsibility of accountability to the intercollegiate model, regardless of the direct impact on those involved in violations.

- The Principle of Process Integrity – Any new structures must be designed to ensure effectiveness and efficiency in the process and its results. The new structures must be easily understood, legitimate, timely, respecting of confidentiality while transparent with the process, and sufficiently workable to establish clear and strict guidelines and boundaries.

Based on these guiding principles, the working group has (1) reached a number of conclusions regarding the NCAA's current violation, process and penalty structures, as well as the means by which responsibilities for enforcement efforts are currently shared among interested individuals and entities; (2) developed a series of recommended actions to improve the current structures and definition of shared responsibility for rules enforcement; and (3) identified the anticipated outcomes for each of the proposed actions. In sum:

- The violation structure: The working group believes that the NCAA must adopt a new violation structure. The new structure must appropriately recognize and categorize the varying levels of infractions, from most egregious to least offensive, and must emphasize those infractions that most clearly undermine the fundamental principles on which the rules are based. To address these issues, the working group recommends that the Association adopt a four-level violation structure to achieve this goal. Pursuant to the recommended violation structure, rules infractions will be categorized as Level I (most egregious), Level II (serious), Level III (currently solid secondary violations) and Level IV (minor or technical issues)[1]. The working group anticipates that the proposed four-level structure will provide member institutions and affected individuals with better notice of the alleged infractions, and the level of seriousness assigned the infractions, for which they will be held accountable if NCAA rules are violated. Further, the group anticipates that the proposed structure will better ensure that enforcement efforts are focused on those infractions that clearly violate NCAA enduring values.

[1] The working group continues to discuss alternative designations of the levels of the violations (rather than use the word "Level"), which includes the possibility of severe major (Level I), major (Level II), secondary (Level III) and limited (Level IV). The working group hopes to resolve this issue and provide the recommendation in its August 2012 report to the Board.

- The process: The working group believes that NCAA rules violations must be processed and resolved more efficiently and expeditiously, but that process integrity and fairness must be simultaneously enhanced. More transparency, where appropriate, will enhance the integrity of the process, and will increase the membership's understanding of how and why decisions are made. To address these issues, the working group recommends that the Association adopt new infractions case procedures that increase the size and composition diversity of the existing Committee on Infractions, from which panels of the committee may be assigned to hear the most serious infractions cases, and that other procedures be modified and introduced to more efficiently and fairly hear and resolve allegations of rules infractions. The working group anticipates that the proposed procedural changes will (1) result in a more efficient resolution of alleged rules infractions, (2) allow institutions and affected individuals more control over the means by which cases are heard and ultimately resolved, and (3) increase the overall integrity and the perceived fairness of the process and bring more transparency to more components of the process.

- The penalty structure: The working group believes that strong penalties must be imposed for those rules infractions that clearly violate the NCAA's enduring values. The working group also believes that the current penalty structure does not sufficiently deter serious rules violations. The group further believes that under the current penalty structure, some individuals and institutions have concluded that the risk/severity of NCAA penalties is worth the anticipated benefits and unfair advantages that flow from deliberate NCAA rules violations (the risk-reward analysis). Finally, the group believes that any penalty structure must recognize the efforts of college and university presidents, as those institutional leaders take steps to ensure fair play, rules compliance and accountability on their respective campuses. To address these issues, the group recommends that the Association adopt a set of penalty guidelines for the most serious rules violations. The proposed guidelines will set a range of penalties from which the Committee on Infractions may impose in given situations (along with other available penalties, as appropriate) depending upon the violation level in which the infractions fall.

  The group is considering a set of core penalties for inclusion in the penalty guidelines. The recommended core penalties include those (1) identified by the membership as most effectively deterring serious rules violations, and/or (2) identified by the group as those that have historically best addressed the gravity of the violations involved in infractions cases. The group recognizes that, in addition to possible core penalties, the Committee on Infractions must retain discretion to customize any imposed set of penalties, depending on the facts of each case, to include other penalties outside of those identified as core. Additionally, all penalties currently available to the Committee on Infractions for major violations, and those

available to enforcement staff for secondary violations, will remain. The group is proposing penalty ranges to apply the core penalties in Levels I and II cases. The proposed guidelines aim to find an appropriate balance in recommending any core penalties or penalty ranges to allow the Committee on Infractions sufficient discretion while also assuring stronger and consistently applied penalties. Finally, the guidelines include a framework by which the Committee on Infractions may take into account aggravating and mitigating circumstances, on a case-by-case basis that may affect the overall severity of any penalties to be imposed.

- Accountability of those in charge: The group believes that head coaches must set the tone and culture for rules compliance within sport programs, and any penalty structure must address negligent oversight within a particular sport that undercuts overall institutional and/or Association expectations. To change the culture, head coaches' suspensions, through show cause orders, should occur for the violations of their staff for Levels I and II violations when the coach has not promoted an atmosphere of compliance or monitored his/her staff, as well as in instances in which some Level III violations have occurred. Likewise, presidents and directors of athletics must take responsibility and be accountable for their oversight of the athletics program and for hiring coaches who violate the rules.

- Shared responsibility and institutional integrity: During the course of the group's meetings from September to December 2011, the group agreed that there are issues directly affecting the integrity of intercollegiate athletics that go beyond the scope of the group's charge related to shared responsibility. Nonetheless, the group believes that these issues warrant immediate and focused attention. The group focused on the phrase "institutional integrity" as a larger effort, beyond shared responsibility and institutional control. Institutional integrity is grounded in the notion of establishing universal industry standards and principles for member institutions, conferences, NCAA staff and committees to uphold. Part of this effort should aim to integrate athletics departments into the core of the institution, reaffirming institutional control of all operations.

  The group does not believe that the changes to the enforcement process, detailed in this report, completely solve this problem. While a more effective enforcement model, coupled with the work of the rules working group, are critical steps, reaching a common understanding of what standards should be met to sustain institutional integrity is equally (if not more) important. Institutions must be expected to achieve and sustain standards of excellence. Some of these standards are detailed below; however, with such focused attention surrounding this topic, the group expects the list will be refined. The group recommended at the January 2012 Board of Directors meeting that a separate group (with an extended timeline to 2013) be charged with defining institutional integrity. The enforcement working group's charge to better define shared responsibility should be part of the larger effort to define standards of

institutional integrity. This group is committed to defining shared responsibility as it relates to the process of investigations and other enforcement issues, and will share that work with the institutional integrity group for inclusion in the broader effort.

The enforcement working group recommends that the following be considered by the institutional integrity group:

- Adopting standards that are related to athletics compliance and auditing functions and designed to integrate athletics into the overall university compliance and auditing practices.
  - In considering such standards, the group should consider moving the reporting line of the athletics compliance office outside of the athletics department.
  - Such standards could also expand the role of institutional auditing to include, or at least recognize, institutional control of the athletics programs.
  - Such standards also could require regular audits of NCAA staff and committee decisions.
- Adopting standards that are related to institutional and conference reporting/ transparency.
  - Such standards could, for example, create uniform expectations for conference roles and responsibilities in major infractions investigations.
- Creating standards for achieving presidential and board oversight of athletics departments.
- Developing professional codes of conduct for all involved in intercollegiate athletics.
- Requiring professional training and certification of all Division I staff and coaches, including continuing certification criteria that, if not met, may result in revocation of certification.
- Developing an annual review and sign-off process by which the institution's president certifies that the institution is in full compliance with standards.

C. Narrative Description and Rationale for the Working Group's Recommendations.

1. Violation structure.

The working group examined the current NCAA violation structure. The group believes that the current secondary and major violation structure does not provide

sufficient discretion or flexibility to respond appropriately to either the most serious infractions or intentional violations that are currently labeled secondary. In addition, the group has determined that some current major violations should be handled through a different classification system that allows better delineation between individual and institutional responsibility for the infractions. As a result of these and other considerations, the working group is recommending a move from the current model (secondary/major) to a four-level violation structure.

The proposed violation structure would be composed of the following levels: [Note: See Footnote 1 on page No. 4 regarding the designation of levels.]

- Level I – The most egregious violations.
  - A Level I violation is a violation that seriously undermines or threatens the integrity of any of the NCAA enduring values (student-athlete success, the collegiate model, amateurism as a student model, competitive equity), which will be codified by the rules working group, including any violation that provides or is intended to provide a significant or extensive recruiting, competitive or other advantage, or significant or extensive impermissible benefit. Multiple Level II, III and/or IV violations collectively may be considered a Level I violation. Individual conduct that is unethical may be classified as a Level I violation, even if the underlying institutional violations are not considered Level I.
  - Types of Level I violations include, but are not limited to:
    - Lack of institutional control (LOIC).
    - Significant failure to monitor (FTM) violations (e.g., intentional, negligent disregard).
    - Academic fraud.
    - Compromising an NCAA infractions investigation and/or lying to NCAA investigators.
    - Other unethical-conduct violations.
    - Reckless indifference to or intentional conduct demonstrating lack of head coach control (e.g., multiple Level II and/or Level III violations in the program).
    - Bylaw 11.1.2.1 violation (responsibility of head coach) resulting from underlying Level I violation by individual associated with the sport program.
    - Cash and other benefits intended to secure a prospect's enrollment.
    - Intentional violations or a blatant disregard for rules.
    - Other significant or extensive recruiting violations that provide, or were intended to provide, a significant or extensive advantage.
    - Significant extra benefits provided to enrolled student-athletes.

- Level II – Serious violations that currently fall between major and secondary violations.

  - A Level II violation is a violation that provides or is intended to provide more than a minimal but less than a significant recruiting, competitive or other advantage; or includes more than a minimal but less than a significant impermissible benefit; or involves a pattern of systemic violations in a particular area. Multiple Level III and/or IV violations collectively may be considered a Level II violation. Some limited individual conduct that is unethical or dishonest may be classified as a Level II violation, even if the underlying institutional violations are not considered Level II.

  - Types of Level II violations include, but are not limited to:

    - Systemic violations that do not amount to a lack of institutional control (LOIC) or a significant failure to monitor (FTM).
    - Intentional violations that do not rise to a Level I violation.
    - Bylaw 11.1.2.1 violation (responsibility of head coach) resulting from underlying Level II violation by individual associated with the sport program.
    - Multiple recruiting violations (e.g., high volume of calls, violations related to the same prospect, etc.).
    - Multiple eligibility violations that do not amount to an LOIC or FTM (e.g., improper or lack of certification).
    - Multiple financial aid violations (e.g., improper awarding of aid).
    - Violations that provide more than a minimal, but less than an extensive/significant, advantage or benefit.

- Level III – Violations that provide no more than a minimal advantage or impermissible benefit that warrant NCAA enforcement staff review.

  - A Level III violation is a violation that is isolated or limited in nature; provides no more than a minimal recruiting, competitive or other advantage; and does not include more than a minimal impermissible benefit. Multiple Level IV violations collectively may be considered a Level III violation.

  - Types of Level III violations include, but are not limited to:

    - Inadvertent violations that are isolated or limited in nature.

- Violations that result in no more than a minimal recruiting advantage (e.g., impermissible evaluations and recruiters).
- Most extra-benefit, financial aid, academic eligibility and recruiting violations that are not extensive (e.g., loans, eligibility certification, etc.)

- Level IV – Minor or technical issues that do not rise to the level of a serious violation. (The working group notes that this level may not be necessary, or may not encompass many violations, depending on the adopted work of the rules working group.)

  - A Level IV issue is an action/inaction that is inadvertent and isolated; limited or technical in nature; and results in a negligible, if any, recruiting, competitive or other advantage or negligible, if any, impermissible benefit. Level IV issues will not impact eligibility.

  - Types of Level IV issues include, but are not limited to:

    - Camp brochures.
    - Recruiting correspondence related to size, paper limitations.
    - Institutional promotional activities.
    - No IRL activation prior to official visit.
    - Other minor, paperwork and technical violations.

The proposed multi-level violation structure provides greater flexibility than the current model. Under the proposed multi-level model, infractions may be more appropriately categorized and penalties may be imposed that better reflect the severity of the infraction. In addition, under the proposed system, a member institution may be charged with rules violations at a different level than those with which an individual is charged. For example, under the proposed model, the member institution may be charged with one level of infraction (based upon the underlying nature of the violation), and an affected individual may be charged at a higher level (based upon the underlying violation and then unethical conduct to try to cover up the violation; e.g., if the individual commits a Level III recruiting violation and then lies about it during the investigation). Finally, the four-level violation structure allows the enforcement staff to resolve the lesser infractions cases more efficiently and focus its primary resources on the most serious infractions cases. The end result, the working group believes, is that the proposed violation structure will result in greater accountability for the most serious offenders of NCAA legislation.

2. Process structure.

In order to ensure an effective and efficient enforcement program under the new multi-level violation structure, the group recommends that some changes be made to the NCAA Committee on Infractions process. The working group noted that the commitment and work of the committee has been exemplary despite an increasing workload. The expertise of the committee and value of a peer review model should be retained to hear and decide the most significant allegations of rules violations. However, the working group recommends that the committee be composed of a larger pool of individuals (a minimum of 24 voting members) from which panels will be composed. In addition, the working group recommends that the committee be composed of a more diverse group of persons to decrease individual workload and decrease the timeline for resolving cases.

The proposed committee would include among its members three to four individuals from each of the following categories:

- Current or former university presidents, vice presidents or other senior institutional administrators.
- Current or former directors of athletics.
- Former NCAA coaches.
- Representatives from conference offices.
- University faculty, including, but not limited to, faculty athletics representatives.
- Athletics administrators with compliance experience.
- Members of the general public with legal backgrounds.

The working group believes that greater committee diversity, including ethnic minority and gender diversity, is critically important to strengthen the committee and bring with it important perspectives not currently adequately reflected in the composition of the committee. With respect to former presidents and athletics directors serving on the committee, the working group believes their service on the committee must begin within five years of their retirement date to ensure those individuals are not too far removed from the relevant issues facing collegiate athletics.

In cases involving the most serious allegations of rules violations (Level I), the group recommends that either six or seven committee members be randomly selected from a minimum of three representative groups to hear the cases. Those randomly selected panels will hear cases for a minimum of 12 to 18 months before the panels are dissolved and new panels are created. The chair of the Committee on Infractions will assign an individual to serve as chair of each panel for the life of the panel and would retain the authority to identify substitute panel

members if conflicts arise. In addition, each panel would include an individual, selected by the chair, to serve as the individual responsible for conducting the press conference when the infractions report of the case is released (these individuals would be provided media training by NCAA staff). In cases involving allegations of Level II violations, the group proposes that three-member panels be selected to hear the cases in the same manner as noted above.

The chair of the Committee on Infractions would be selected through the governance process. The working group is currently determining the most effective way to select individuals to serve on the Committee on Infractions, as well as the most effective process for incorporating the additional members to ensure consistency and stability within the committee. The working group is considering phasing in additional Committee on Infractions members over a period of time, which could begin prior to the August 2013 implementation date. In addition, the working group is considering an interview process to screen Committee on Infractions nominees but is still in the process of establishing effective recommendations and modifications to the current process for selecting Committee on Infractions members.

By increasing the overall size of the committee, more committee panels are available to hear cases more efficiently. At the same time, the overall workload of each individual member is significantly reduced. It is expected that members will hear two to three Level I cases per year (if 24 total members), compared to the current approximate 10 to 12 hearings annually, in addition to cases processed via summary disposition. As a result, Level I and Level II violation cases can be scheduled more often and processed more expediently. The working group recommends that hearings for Level I cases be scheduled on a minimum of 10 occasions during a calendar year, and that hearings for Level II cases be scheduled each month.

Additionally, the working group recommends a number of other process modifications, applicable to cases categorized as Level I or II, including the following:

- Allow institutions and involved individuals to petition for a hearing by an expanded Committee on Infractions panel consisting of 11 members in Level I cases of Association-wide import (e.g., matters of first impression, change from previous precedent). The committee has the discretion to grant or deny such a petition or to expand the panel size on its own initiative.

- Increase the availability of written case submissions to the Committee on Infractions, for Level II cases, at the option of the institution and/or affected individuals, with agreement by the enforcement staff, even when there is disagreement on the facts, so that certain matters may be decided without the need for a hearing.

- Maintain some form of the summary disposition process allowing for written case submissions for Level I cases when all issues are agreed upon.

- Explore the development of a new summary disposition process so that the summary disposition report could also be used as the infractions report, with necessary additional comments added by the Committee on Infractions to explain any unique factors or rationale. For summary dispositions in which there is disagreement on the penalties, an expedited hearing will occur. If the committee decides some comment on the case or penalties is necessary, the committee may attach an abbreviated committee statement to the report.

- Redesign the notice of allegations to allow the member institution and/or involved individuals immediate access to the information on which the allegations are based. The enforcement staff would then prepare a position statement and/or document listing remaining issues (e.g., items of disagreement) to facilitate the hearing.

- Introduce the concept of a "Rocket Docket" (an expedited hearing) for Level II cases, at the request of the involved institution and/or involved individuals, whereby responses are due within 30 days of the receipt of the notice of allegations and a hearing is conducted within 30 days of the receipt of the response.

- Introduce the option of decreasing the amount of time between the notice of allegations and the institution's response from 90 to 60 days.

- Introduce the concept of a prehearing conference, with the Committee on Infractions panel chair presiding, in which preliminary issues are resolved prior to the full hearing of the infractions case including, when applicable, any disputes regarding the level at which the allegations have been charged.

- Conduct Level II hearings via videoconference, unless an in-person hearing is requested.

- Use of an online case materials submission system and videoconferencing.

- Introduce time expectations, which are not limits, especially for more complex cases or where additional information is sought by the committee during or

after the hearing, for the preparation of hearing transcripts (two weeks), as well as the issuance of infractions reports (four weeks).

- Add additional staff to support the office of the Committees on Infractions.

The working group believes that the proposed modifications will increase the efficiency with which a current major infractions case is completed. The group anticipates, for example, that the proposed process structure for less serious major infractions cases (now proposed as Level II cases) could decrease the total process timeline under the current system by as much as 50 percent. At the same time, the group believes that the proposed process options will allow institutions and affected individuals greater flexibility in choosing the manner in which the infractions case will be decided and the timeline under which the case may be brought to final resolution.

The working group recognizes that a larger Committee on Infractions and the use of panels to hear cases could lead to inconsistencies of the findings of violations and imposed penalties among different cases. Accordingly, the working group recommends that the entire Committee on Infractions be required to meet at least twice per year, with at least one in-person meeting, to discuss policy and procedural matters, discuss and review panel case decisions and rationale, and identify current trends in enforcement in order to anticipate new issues. The addition of more staff to support the office of the Committees on Infractions will allow an increased role by the Committee on Infractions staff with respect to committee deliberations and case precedent. Also, the committee staff would be responsible for conducting a comprehensive orientation program for new committee members, as well as routine and continuing education for all committee members. Furthermore, a periodic (e.g., every two years) outside audit of committee decisions could be conducted. Finally, the recommended penalty guidelines discussed below will assist in maintaining consistency with Committee on Infractions decisions, as the committee will be responsible for providing detailed explanations of any deviation from the penalty guidelines.

After consultation with the Infractions Appeals Committee, it does not appear that significant changes will be needed to the appeals process for Level I and Level II cases. However, the workload of the current five-member committee should be monitored with the option of expanding to a committee of 10 individuals, creating two pools of five individuals to hear Level I appeals and three pools of three individuals to hear Level II appeals. Each panel would include an individual to serve as vice-chair for a particular hearing. Other recommended appeal process modifications for Level I and Level II cases, include the following:

- Appeals can be considered via written submission, videoconference or in-person hearings.

- Designation, prior to each Committee on Infractions hearing, of an active committee member to serve as the NCAA membership advocate/ representative during the appeals process (similar to the current Committee on Infractions appeals coordinators). These individuals will attend Committee on Infractions hearings and deliberations, but will not participate, and will be staffed by the office of the Committee on Infractions.

- Introduce time limitations for the preparation of hearing transcripts (two weeks), as well as the issuance of appeals reports (four weeks).

With respect to matters categorized as Level III or IV, the working group recommends the following:

- In situations involving Level III violations, NCAA staff will continue to work with institutions, much the same as under the current secondary violations process, to determine whether infractions have occurred and, if so, the appropriate penalties to be imposed.

- In Level III matters, member institutions would continue to have access to a case precedent database, thereby allowing confirmation that staff-imposed penalties are consistent with those imposed in similar, previously decided situations.

- Appeals of Level III violations will be submitted in writing to a Committee on Infractions panel of three after the staff has reconsidered the appropriateness of the penalty.

- In situations involving Level IV issues, the conference with which the involved institution is associated will work with the institution to determine whether issues need to be addressed and, if so, the appropriate penalties to be imposed, if any. The working group also is exploring the possibility of a Level IV database.

- Any appeal opportunities for Level IV violations and penalties would be within the purview of the conference.

For cases involving multiple levels of violations and cases in which an individual is charged with a different level of violation than the institution, the highest level of violation will dictate the process. For example, if a case involves a coach being charged with a Level I violation and the institution being charged with a Level II violation, the case will be adjudicated using the process for Level I violations.

3. Penalty structure.

The working group examined the current NCAA penalty structure. The working group recognizes the widespread perception that the current penalty model leads to inconsistent and insufficient penalties and does not adequately deter some institutions and individuals from engaging in conduct contrary to the rules. As a result, for cases involving allegations of Level I and II violations, the working group recommends a range of penalties set out in Penalty Guidelines. The goals, in considering the proposed Penalty Guidelines in cases in which the most significant violations are substantiated, are to, among other things (a) provide member institutions (and the individuals associated with the member institutions) with notice of a range of potential penalties in given situations, as well as the factors that will be relied upon to adjust the severity of those penalties; (b) better ensure consistency in applying penalties among and between NCAA member institutions, and provide the Committee on Infractions some latitude to adjust the penalty on a case-by-case basis; (c) through mitigating factors that specifically recognize exemplary cooperation and self-reporting, foster a more expedient enforcement process without compromising the integrity or fairness of the process; (d) recognize and address the need for institutional leadership and responsibility for the overall intercollegiate athletics programs, whereby actions (or failures to act) of persons of authority are taken into account in the assessment of, and ultimately reflected in, the penalties imposed; (e) recognize and address those situations in which a head coach, or others within a program, fosters an environment within the program that is inconsistent with the institution's or Association's compliance expectations; and (f) recognize and respond to the perceived need to impose more severe penalties designed to deter the rule violation risk-reward analysis (for the institution and/or persons associated with the member institutions) and address any unfair advantage from the violation.

The working group incorporated the penalties identified by the NCAA membership, via the Presidential Retreat Survey, as those with the most significant impact on an institution and the most deterrent effect on other institutions and individuals. The working group also reviewed data obtained from previously decided NCAA infractions cases to discern penalty patterns and levels of penalty severity under given circumstances. Based upon all of the available information, including that specifically mentioned, the working group recommends that a number of penalties constitute core penalties and form the basis for the Penalty Guidelines: (a) competition limitations; (b) financial penalties; (c) scholarship limitations; (d) recruiting limitations (for recruiting cases); (e) probation; and (f) when applicable, show cause orders.

The working group is very cognizant of the fact that many institutional penalties have either a direct or indirect impact on student-athletes who may not have been

involved with the violations. Competition limitation (postseason bans) is the penalty with the most direct impact on these student-athletes. Scholarship reductions also have an impact on these student-athletes, but more indirectly. Conversely, postseason bans and scholarship reductions have been identified by the membership as being the most significant types of penalties, having the most deterrent effect and being the most effective penalties to address the advantages gained as a result of significant violations. The working group struggled with this dichotomy but ultimately concluded that protecting the interests of all member institutions by significantly penalizing those institutions that violate the rules is paramount. As a result, postseason bans and scholarship reductions must be utilized in the enforcement process. People (coaches, administrators, student-athletes) comprise institutions and sports programs, and there is no practical way to impose meaningful penalties on an institution without affecting some individuals who may not have had any involvement in or benefitted from the violations for which the institution is responsible. Nevertheless, the working group continues to consider options to offset the impact of institutional penalties on uninvolved student-athletes. In addition to the recommendations being made to speed up the process, which will assist in penalties being imposed more contemporaneously, the working group is exploring other options such as loosening transfer restrictions and the replacement of lost athletics opportunities with possible academic experiences.

Each of the penalties identified above includes varying degrees of severity. The working group believes that the severity of the penalty imposed must correspond with the significance of the rule violation(s) and the institution's and individual's actions before, during and after the investigation. The recommended core penalties are set out below:

a. Penalties that the group is considering for potential use in proposed penalty guidelines.

(1) Competition limitations.

- Limitations are imposed on the institution's participation in postseason play for varying lengths of time (depending upon the severity of the infractions) in given sports.

(2) Financial penalties.

- The institution is required to return revenue received from a given (fact-specific) event or series of events (e.g., revenues received for participation in a tournament, bowl game or televised broadcasts).

- A fine is imposed, the amount of which is based upon the severity of the infractions and a percentage of given economic factors (specific to the institution involved), including the amount of gross revenue (if any) generated from the involved sport.
- A reduction in, or elimination of, NCAA monetary distribution for sports sponsorship and/or grants-in-aid.

(3) Scholarship limitations.

- Limitations are imposed on the availability of athletics scholarships in head count sports [by number or percentage, depending upon the sports involved] for varying lengths of time in given sports. The severity of the numeric/percentage scholarship limitations and the length of time the limitations are imposed will correspond with the severity of the infractions in the case.
- Limitations are imposed on the availability of athletics scholarships in equivalency sports (by percentage) for varying lengths of time in given sports. The severity of the percentage imposed and the length of time the limitations are imposed will correspond with the severity of the infractions in the case.

(4) Recruiting limitations.

- Limitations are imposed upon the number of allowable official paid visits at the institution for varying lengths of time in given sport). The severity of the numeric recruiting limitations and the length of time the limitations are imposed will correspond with the severity of the infraction(s) in the case.
- Limitations are imposed upon the number of, or benefits that can be provided during, unofficial visits at the institution for varying lengths of time in given sports. The severity of the limitations and the length of time the limitations are imposed will correspond with the severity of the infraction(s) in the case.
- Limitations are imposed on the institution's off-campus recruiting efforts for varying lengths of time in given sports. The severity of the limitations and the length of time the limitations are imposed will correspond with the severity of the infraction(s) in the case.
- Limitations are imposed on the institution's other recruiting efforts, including contacts and evaluations, for varying lengths

of time in given sports. The severity of the numeric limitations and the length of time the limitations are imposed will correspond with the severity of the infraction(s) in the case.

(5) Show cause orders (if applicable in a given case).

- Length of show cause restrictions.
- Components of the show cause order (e.g., suspension of coach from games and/or season).
- Option to censure president, director of athletics, faculty athletics representative, etc.

(6) Probation.

- Conditions are imposed with which the institution must comply during a set period of time, the length of which is dependent upon the severity of the infraction(s). The committee has the discretion to determine which of the following should apply in a particular case. The working group recommends that probation include required action by institutional leaders acknowledging the violations and pledging rules compliance moving forward. Any accompanying public announcements would need to be approved by the office of the Committee on Infractions to ensure the appropriate message is being delivered. Many of the responsibilities tied to probation have fallen to the compliance staff of an institution. The working group recommends shifting the burden and responsibility to the president, director of athletics and coaching staff of the involved program. The suggested discretionary conditions include:

    - Submission of compliance reports during the period of probation.
    - Institutional publicity in alumni publications, media guides and recruiting materials of the violations committed, the terms of probation, and penalties imposed.
    - Institution's president shall meet with student-athletes and athletics department staff, and the president and/or director of athletics shall meet with booster groups to personally pledge his or her commitment to NCAA rules compliance and present his or her view of shared responsibility for preserving the integrity of intercollegiate athletics.

- Publicizing institutions on probation on the NCAA website, in Champion magazine and in NCAA championship game programs of the involved sport(s).
- Requiring institutions to provide a public service announcement during televised contests that it is on probation and the reasons for the probation being imposed.
- The implementation of a "monitorship" program by the office of the Committee on Infractions or a private company for institutions on probation in cases where an institution is found to lack institutional control and serious remediation is necessary.

In addition to these core penalties, other potential penalties, as set out in the current Bylaw 19.5.2, would remain available to the Committee on Infractions to impose.

- Vacation of contests and records.
- Public reprimand and censure.
- Full-/partial-season ban for involved sports.
- Disassociation of athletics representatives.
- Requirement that all institutional staff members serving on the NCAA Board of Directors or other committees or cabinets resign those positions and be precluded from serving for a period of time.
- Requirement that the institution relinquish its NCAA voting privileges for a period of time.
- Notification to regional accrediting agency of academic violations or questionable procedures.
- Recommendation by the Committee on Infractions to the Executive Committee that the institution's membership be suspended or terminated.
- Return of individual and team awards to the Association.
- Prohibition against television appearances.[2]
- Other penalties as appropriate.

The working group believes that the proposed Penalty Guidelines should afford the Committee on Infractions a more sophisticated structure by which it may consider certain aggravating and mitigating factors in particular infractions cases. The group recommends that the best means by which the committee may impose a penalty that falls within a more/less

[2] The working group does not believe this is currently a practical penalty; however, due to the uncertain future of television as a medium, it would be shortsighted to remove it as a potential option.

severe range of penalties is if it determines that certain aggravating and/or mitigating circumstances exist in Level I or II cases.

The group continues to refine the lists of aggravating and mitigating factors. The Committee on Infractions will determine the presence and weight of the individual factors in a given case and may balance these factors in the decision-making process. The proposed lists of factors follow:

Aggravating factors.

- Multiple Level I infractions were substantiated in the case.
- Multiple Level I infractions were committed by an at-risk individual.
- The violations were intentional, willful or demonstrated a blatant disregard for NCAA regulations.
- Persons of authority condoned, participated in or demonstrated negligent disregard for the infractions or underlying conduct.
- There is a prior history of Level I or II violations by the institution, sport program(s) or affected individual(s). [Note: Preliminarily, the weighting of prior infractions as an aggravating factor will be based on the proximity in time to the current infractions case. Further, the interim recommendation is that repeat-violator status will be retained as an aggravating factor, but the current enhanced penalties for repeat violator will be folded into the penalty guidelines.]
- The case involved an abuse of a position of trust.
- A pattern/multiple instances of violations were substantiated in the case (e.g., the infractions were not isolated or limited in scope).
- Lack of cooperation by the institution or involved individual during the investigation.
- The committee finds that action(s)/failure(s) to act compromised the investigation of the rule violation(s), whether by involved individual(s) or the institution.
- One or more infractions caused harm to a student-athlete or prospective student-athlete (either in terms of eligibility or otherwise).
- The case included a failure to monitor or lack of institutional control.
- The existence of extraordinary aggravating factors (as determined on a case-by-case basis).

Mitigating factors.

- The institution/affected individual self-detected and self-disclosed the rule violation(s).

- The institution/affected individual admitted the violation (a) prior to the time that the NCAA initiated a formal investigation (greatest weight), (b) prior to the conclusion of the NCAA investigation (some weight) or (c) prior to the NCAA Committee on Infractions hearing (least weight).
- The institution has an established history of self-reporting Level III violations.
- The institution had in place a system of compliance methods that were designed and implemented to ensure rules compliance. The committee finds that those involved met institutional/coaches control standards.
  - The working group is assembling a smaller group of experts to propose a clear definition of institutional control that considers the recent work of the Division 1A Athletics Directors and building on the Principles of Institutional Control document written by the Committee on Infractions in 1996-97. The group also will ensure that representatives from NAAC are involved given the group's leadership in establishing monitoring standards.
- The institution/affected individuals exceeded the expectations of cooperation during and after the investigation of rule violation(s). An institution and affected individual can exceed cooperation expectations while denying some or all of the allegations of wrongdoing against them.
- The violations are isolated or limited in scope.
- The institution accepted responsibility for the violation(s) (e.g., self-imposed actions) in a timely and effective manner.
- The existence of extraordinary mitigating factors (as determined on a case-by-case basis).

b. Classifications of Level I and Level II penalties.

The committee may determine whether the presence of one or more of the aggravating and/or mitigating factors exist and, if so, how those factors affect the classification of the case. As a result, the presence of some aggravating factors and no mitigating factors may elevate the case classification to "aggravation" or "significant aggravation." Conversely, if there are mitigating factors in a case and no aggravating factors, the case classification would be "mitigation" or "significant mitigation."

(See Attachment 1 for Penalty Guidelines Flow Chart.)

Level I	**Level II**
Significant aggravation	
Aggravation	Aggravation
Standard penalty	Standard penalty
Mitigation	Mitigation
Significant mitigation	

Based on the determined case classification, the penalties, as outlined in the penalty matrix, will apply unless extenuating circumstances are found by the committee.

(See Attachment 2 for the Penalty Guideline Matrix and Attachment 3 for penalty case examples.)

4. Accountability.

a. Head coach responsibility.

The working group believes head coaches are in the best position to create a culture of integrity and accountability. The working group examined what changes can be made to encourage coaches to direct their staffs and student-athletes to uphold the rules while also creating strong penalties when coaches fail to meet this responsibility.

The membership has acknowledged through Bylaw 11.1.2.1 that there is a level of responsibility that a head coach has for the administration of his/her program. When there is a failing by the head coach to carry out this responsibility, it is appropriate for there to be a penalty on the program, including the Committee on Infractions directing the institution, through a show cause order, to suspend the head coach from coaching-related activities for a specified period of time.

The working group recognizes that employment decisions related to coaches or any athletics personnel rest solely with our member institutions.

(1) The violation: Change emphasis from knowledge to responsibility for major (Levels I and II) violations.

For Levels I and II violations, Bylaw 11.1.2.1 (Responsibility of Head Coach) is the centerpiece of the working group's

recommendations. Since 2008, there have been 15 cases where a head coach was found to have violated this bylaw for either not promoting an atmosphere of compliance or for not monitoring his/her staff, or both. The rationale for Proposal No. 2004-102 notes that when a serious violation occurs in a program, the head coach is "presumed to have knowledge and, therefore, responsibility" for what happened. Rather than focusing on knowledge, or the presumption of it, the working group proposes that the bylaw be amended to presume only responsibility. The working group proposes that the Board of Directors adopt the amendment at the August 2, 2012, Board of Directors meeting. The amended rationale would then apply to all violations occurring after that date. Accordingly, if something happens in a program, the head coach is presumed responsible (instead of knowledgeable and, therefore, responsible) for not promoting an atmosphere of compliance and/or monitoring his/her staff. If the coach cannot overcome that presumption of responsibility by demonstrably showing what he/she did to both promote an atmosphere of compliance and monitor his/her staff, the coach is presumed responsible under this bylaw and will be charged for not upholding this rule.

[See Attachment 4 for Proposal No. 2004-102 (Bylaw 11.1.2.1).]

(2) The penalty guideline.

Violations of Bylaw 11.1.2.1 are considered either Level I or II as noted in the violation section of the report. The level of the violation will correspond with the underlying violation that occurred in the coach's program. For example, if an assistant coach commits a Level I violation, the Bylaw 11.1.2.1 violation is also Level I (and the same for Level II). The working group is recommending that the penalty guidelines emphasize that violations of this bylaw should result in a show cause order with suspension from contests as one of the show cause requirements. The number of contests involved will depend on the aggravating and mitigating factors present in the case. Thus, the employing institution of a head coach who violates this bylaw will withhold the coach from a certain number of contests pursuant to a show cause order unless the institution wants to appear before the Committee on Infractions in a subsequent hearing and show cause to the committee why the suspension should not be applied. The membership has consistently indicated (in the 2011 Presidential Retreat Survey and during presentations and meetings with

enforcement staff) that the penalty that has the most impact on coaches is suspension. The specific suspension requirements are recommended below:

- For the head coach who commits a Level II violation of this bylaw, his/her employing institution will withhold, pursuant to a show cause order, the coach from five percent (for a mitigated Level II) to 40 percent (for an aggravated Level II) of the institution's next games. The suspensions may include postseason contests and/or carry over to the next season.
- For the head coach who commits a Level I violation of this bylaw, his/her employing institution will withhold, pursuant to a show cause order, the coach from 10 percent (for a significant mitigated Level I) to 100 percent (for a significant aggravated Level I) of the institution's next games. The suspensions may include postseason contests and/or carry over to the next season.

Suspensions are currently a penalty available to the Committee on Infractions, and the committee has directed an institution to impose a suspension for a violation of Bylaw 11.1.2.1 in a previous infractions case and accepted an institutionally imposed suspension in another case. The working group recommends that at the August 2012 meeting, the Board of Directors support a recommitment to the original intent of Bylaw 11.1.2.1 with the clarifying amendment to the rationale, with an immediate effective date. The specific penalty guidelines for 11.1.2.1 violations would be effective August 1, 2013, or before as described in the introduction section, along with the other penalty guidelines. In the interim, the working group notes that the appropriate penalty for Bylaw 11.1.2.1 violations will be decided by the Committee on Infractions.

(3) Level III violations (currently secondary violations).

The American Football Coaches Association (AFCA) approached the enforcement staff and Committee on Infractions in the summer of 2010 requesting that suspensions be imposed for what the AFCA members deemed serious secondary violations. Since acting on that request, the enforcement staff has directed the institution to suspend five assistant football coaches for committing secondary violations. The working group proposes that suspension of head football coaches also occur when their staff

members commit these serious secondary violations. The working group currently is seeking feedback from the membership and the AFCA to evaluate which secondary violations (Level III) should warrant this penalty.

In 2009, the Board of Directors passed legislative reform to address issues in the men's basketball recruiting environment. A component of that reform included a head coach suspension by the institution at the direction of the enforcement staff from a contest when he or his staff committed specifically identified secondary violations. The working group currently is seeking feedback from the membership and the National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC) to identify the types of Level III violations (currently secondary) that should result in suspension of the head coach, even if the violations are committed by assistant coaches or other members of the staff.

The working group proposes that the list of identified violations for both sports be examined and expanded as appropriate to address what are presumed to be intentional secondary recruiting violations that undermine the integrity of the sports, which are believed to have the biggest issues. The point is that head coaches can set the tone, and if a coaching staff member knows that the head coach will be suspended for acts of the staff members, there is a greater incentive for the head coach to set clear expectations of full compliance and for the staff to comply.

The working group seeks Board endorsement at the August 2012 meeting of the institutionally imposed suspensions at the direction of the enforcement staff for all violations occurring after August 2, 2012. The working group believes these steps would signal to the membership the important role and responsibility head coaches play in being stewards of intercollegiate athletics prior to the new violation structure and penalty guidelines being adopted.

The working group is supportive of including other sports that have similar problems with compliance with recruiting rules. The working group has discussed the application of the coaching suspensions with the women's basketball coaching community and is examining application to other sports.

In addition, the working group recommends that institutionally imposed suspensions of coaches for designated recruiting violations at the direction of the enforcement staff be publicly

released for Level III violations. Currently, secondary violations (Level III) are not made public. For suspensions to have the desired impact, however, others must know about the consequences of committing violations. In addition, the working group recommends that athletics department staff members' and coaches' violation histories, including Level III violations, be made available to member institutions that request such information. The only exception to making this information available would be for those Level III violations that are self-disclosed by the involved coach.

b. Accountability for presidents and directors of athletics.

In addition to coaches, the working group recognizes the need to address the accountability of an institution's president and/or director of athletics when major violations occur. Currently, and under the proposed Level I and Level II violations, if a president or director of athletics is directly involved in a violation, he or she will be charged with that violation and named in the allegation. There currently is no mechanism, however, to hold those individuals publicly accountable for violations that occur under their watch if they are not directly involved in violations. As a result, the working group believes some minimal level of public accountability for the leaders of an involved institution is appropriate for infractions cases involving a Level I lack of institutional control violation, or a Level I or Level II failure to monitor violation. Specifically, the names of leaders of the involved institution who held the positions at the time the violations occurred should be printed at the top of the public infractions report upon release. It is recommended that the persons identified in the public infractions report include the following:

(1) President of institution (for lack of institutional control cases).

(2) Director of athletics (for lack of control and failure to monitor cases).

(3) Head coaches of involved sports (for any violations involving the coach's program).

If appropriate, and when determined that the chair of the board or other board members had involvement in the violation(s), it would be at the discretion of the Committee on Infractions to include the name of the chair of the board on the public infractions report.

In addition, printing these names on the infractions report creates a record of names of individuals who: (1) oversaw the institution, the athletics department and specific sport programs at the time an institutional control or failure to monitor violation occurred; and (2) oversaw a sport program at the time a Level I and/or Level II violation occurred in that program. Therefore, even after leaving the involved institution, individuals could be held accountable for the violation that occurred while he/she was responsible for leading the institution, athletics department or sport program. Because of this, it would be possible for an institution to determine (through a database maintained by the NCAA) when and if a violation occurred under a specific individual's leadership prior to hiring that individual.

The above accountability measures would be effective August 2, 2012, for all violations occurring after that date.

5. Shared responsibility specific to compliance efforts and investigations.

Rules compliance cannot be achieved unless all of the interested parties (a) assume responsibility for identified roles in the compliance and enforcement processes over which they have control; (b) are held accountable for those deficiencies in the compliance and enforcement processes for which they have responsibility; and (c) are recognized, in a tangible and meaningful way, if the identified compliance and enforcement expectations are effectively met or exceeded. To address these needs, the working group recommends that the concept of shared responsibility be better defined and specific expectations be identified for given roles within the compliance and enforcement processes.

- For example, this working group recognizes that there is a lack of uniform expectations for conference office involvement related to enforcement issues. Similarly, institutional involvement in NCAA investigations varies widely. Some institutions exercise passive involvement in investigations, some purposefully participate minimally and others earnestly try to uncover the full facts, regardless of the impact. The working group believes that it must establish clear expectations for conference involvement in the enforcement process and for institutional cooperation in an investigation. The group is considering the best means of recognizing, within the new penalty structure, those situations in which institutional and individual action(s) exceed these specified expectations of cooperation. In addition, the group is considering the tools that will assist conferences and institutions in meeting or exceeding the specified expectations, including, for example, educational programs/training for compliance officers and national whistle-blower arrangements.

The working group intends to provide a final report on this issue to the Board in August 2012.

D. Desired Outcomes.

Ultimately, the working group wants those involved in intercollegiate athletics to believe that upholding the rules is paramount and violators will be dealt with swiftly, judiciously and seriously. Similarly, the working group aims to contribute to the larger effort by university presidents to restore public trust in intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of higher education rather than a stand-alone revenue stream.

The specific outcomes the working group expects from the changes to the violation, process and penalty structures are noted below:

1. Violation structure.

   A new violation structure that appropriately categorizes the severity of infractions and allows for different levels of accountability for institutions and individuals.

2. Process structure.

   a. A much faster mode for processing violations that delivers expediency without compromising process integrity or fairness.

      - Clear metrics for every stage of processing a case.

   b. Clear understanding of what aspects of enforcement and student-athlete reinstatement cases can be more transparent and corresponding transparency where appropriate.

3. Penalty structure.

   a. Strong penalties that are predictable, deter the risk-reward analysis and address any unfair advantage.

   b. Clear definition of institutional control.

      - Rewards/incentives for effective compliance programs.
      - Rewards/incentives for strong institutional action to address wrong-doing.

   c. Rewards/incentives for individuals acknowledging violations.

4. Accountability.

   a. Increased accountability for head coaches.

   b. Public accountability for presidents and directors of athletics.

5. Shared responsibility.

   a. Strengthened support for institutional leadership.

   b. Clear definition of shared responsibility and resulting expectations of individuals, institutions, conferences and the national office staff.

Findings of Violations

- Committee on Infractions determines violations.
- Committee on Infractions determines the level for each violation.

Determination of Circumstances

- Committee on Infractions reviews any proposed aggravating and mitigating circumstances for both the institution and involved individual.
- Committee on Infractions slots the institution's and the individual's case into the penalty guidelines based on the committee's determination on the aggravating or mitigating circumstances.

Application of Penalty Guidelines

- Committee on Infractions determines penalty from the range of penalties in the guideline for that particulcar slotting.
- Committee on Infractions has the option to deviate from the range in this slot if the committee articulates specific extenuating circumstances.

Proposed Penalty Matrix
(WORKING DRAFT)
Version No. 3 (January 30, 2012)

Violation Level I	**Violation Level II**	**Competition Penalties: Postseason Ban *Competition penalties may be used singularly or in combination**		
Significant Aggravation		3(+) years		
Aggravation		2 to 3 years		
Standard		1 to 2 years		
Mitigation	Aggravation	0 to 1 year		
Significant Mitigation	Standard	0		
	Mitigation	0		
Violation Level I	**Violation Level II**	**Financial Penalties: Fine (Percent of total budget for sport program)**	**Financial Penalties: Negate revenue from sport program for years in which violations occurred**	**Financial Penalties: Reduce or eliminate NCAA monetary distribution for sports sponsorhip and/or grants-in-aid**
Significant Aggravation		3 to 5% (+)	Impose this penalty if greater than percent of budget fine.	Alternative financial penalty.
Aggravation		2 to 4%	Impose this penalty if greater than percent of budget fine.	Alternative financial penalty.
Standard		1 to 3%		Alternative financial penalty.
Mitigation	Aggravation	0 to 1%		Alternative financial penalty.
Significant Mitigation	Standard	0 to .5%		Alternative financial penalty.
	Mitigation	0 to .25%		Alternative financial penalty.
Violation Level I	**Violation Level II**	**Scholarship Reductions of Involved Sport(s) Program(s)**		
Significant Aggravation		37.5 to 50% (+)	(Reduction taken at first available opportunity.)	
Aggravation		25 to 37.5%		
Standard		12.5 to 25%		
Mitigation	Aggravation	0 to 12.5%		
Significant Mitigation	Standard	0 to 5%		
	Mitigation	0 to 2.5%		

Proposed Penalty Matrix
(WORKING DRAFT)
Version No. 3 (January 30, 2012)

Violation Level I	**Violation Level II**	**Show-Cause Order**	**Restrictions**	
Significant Aggravation		10 (+) years	All athletically related duties	
Aggravation		5 to 10 years	All athletically related duties	
Standard		2 to 5 years	All athletically related duties	
Mitigation	Aggravation	1 to 3 years	All athletically related duties	
Significant Mitigation	Standard	1 to 2 years	All or partial coaching and recruiting duties (including game suspensions)	
	Mitigation	0 to 1 year	All or partial coaching and recruiting duties (including game suspensions)	
Violation Level I	**Violation Level II**	**Head Coach Restrictions (game suspensions via show cause for 11.1.2.1)**		
Significant Aggravation		60 to 100%		
Aggravation		40 to 75%		
Standard		20 to 50%		
Mitigation	Aggravation	15 to 40%		
Significant Mitigation	Standard	10 to 30%		
	Mitigation	5 to 20%		
Violation Level I	**Violation Level II**	**Recruiting Restrictions**		
Significant Aggravation		37.5 to 50% (+)		
Aggravation		25 to 37.5%		
Standard		12.5 to 25 %		
Mitigation	Aggravation	0 to 12.5%		
Significant Mitigation	Standard	0 to 5%		
	Mitigation	0 to 2.5%		
Violation Level I	**Violation Level II**	**Probation**		
Significant Aggravation		6 to 10 (+) years		
Aggravation		4 to 8 years		
Standard		2 to 6 years		
Mitigation	Aggravation	1 to 4 years		
Significant Mitigation	Standard	0 to 2 years		
	Mitigation	0 to 1 year		
NCAA/01/30/12/CSS:ajw				

Penalty Structure Examples
Version Three

Institution A

Summary of violations: This case involved violations of impermissible benefits and financial aid; ineligible participation; unethical conduct; and lack of institutional control in the softball and men's and women's tennis programs.

Specific violations:

- Ineligible participation and impermissible benefits – softball (Level I).
  - Former head softball coach permitted ineligible student-athlete to compete and receive impermissible expenses and athletically related aid.
- Impermissible benefits – tennis (Level I).
  - Former head tennis coach provided extra benefits and athletically related aid to five student-athletes, provided a recruiting inducement to two student-athletes, and provided 15 student-athletes with other benefits totaling $12,900.
- Unethical conduct – former head softball and tennis coach (Level I).
- Lack of institutional control – tennis and softball (Level I).
- Impermissible financial aid – men's tennis (Level III).
  - Institution over-awarded athletically related equivalency grants by .13 in men's tennis.

New penalty structure classification:

1. Sublevel classification - Level I.

2. Factors for institution.

   a. Aggravating.
      (1) Lack of institutional control.
   b. Mitigating.
      (2) Acknowledged violations prior to hearing.

3. Factors for involved individuals (former head softball and tennis coaches).

   a. Aggravating.
      (1) Unethical conduct.
      (2) Multiple Level I violations by head coaches.

4. New penalty structure conclusion.

   Assume for the sake of argument that there is one aggravating factor and one mitigating factor, which would place this institution in the **Standard** sublevel. For the two coaches, assume that there are no mitigating factors and two aggravating factors resulting in **Aggravation** sublevel.

Institution A: Imposed penalties vs. new penalty structure.

	Competition	Financial	Scholarship	Recruiting	Show Cause	Probation
Imposed Penalties	The institution self-imposed the following: Men's and women's tennis programs suspended from all competition for the spring 2007, fall 2007 and spring 2008 semesters. WSB: Not eligible to participate in 2009 postseason competition.	None.	The institution self-imposed the following: MTE: Total number of grants-in-aid reduced by one for both the 2008-09 and 2009-10 academic years. (22% cut.) WTE: Total number of grants-in-aid was reduced by one for both the 2008-09 and 2009-10 academic years. (12.5% cut.)	None.	4 years for former head tennis coach. 3 years for former head softball coach	4 years. Vacate all wins in which the ineligible softball and tennis student-athletes competed, and vacation of wins must be reflected in public records, etc.
New Penalty Structure (Standard for institution) (Aggravation for former head coaches)	1-2 year postseason ban. (MTE, WTE, WSB)	1-3% of the total budget per sport program. (Assuming WTE has a $1 million budget, this would be a fine of $10,000 to $30,000.)	12.5 to 25% reduction per sport. (Reductions would be greater than what was imposed. So, softball's 12 grants would be reduced by 1.5 to 3 grants for two years; WTE's 8 grants would be reduced by 1 to 2 grants per year for two years; MTE has 4.5 equivalencies and so there would be a reduction of .56 to 1.125 equivalency grants for two years.)	Not applicable.	Show cause of 5-10 years for the former head coaches.	2-6 years. Vacation of wins as noted above.

<u>Institution B</u>

Summary of violations: Violations in the men's basketball program regarding impermissible inducements and benefits involving representatives of the institution's athletics interests. Violations also occurred in the football program regarding academic fraud involving two former graduate assistant football coaches and impermissible inducements to prospective two-year college transfers.

Specific violations:

- Unethical conduct – former football graduate assistant (Level I).
  - Graduate assistant coach committed academic fraud with two junior college prospective student-athletes, which allowed the student-athletes to compete on the football team.
- Impermissible inducements - football (Level I).
  - Football staff provided impermissible assistance to seven prospective student-athletes.

- Impermissible benefits – men's basketball (Level I).
  - A representative of the institution's athletics interests provided two students-athletes various impermissible benefits totaling more than $5,000, including transportation, gifts, lodging, assistance in purchasing vehicles, cash, meals and other impermissible benefits.
- Multiple secondary violations (Level III).
  - Impermissible benefits in men's basketball, women's basketball and football.
- Lack of institutional control (Level I).

New Penalty Structure Classification:

1. Sublevel classification - Level I.

2. Factors for institution.

   a. Aggravating.
      (1) Lack of institutional control.

   b. Mitigating.
      (1) Institutional self-report.
      (2) Admission of violation prior to hearing.

3. Factors for involved individuals (former graduate assistant football coach).

   a. Aggravating.
      (1) Unethical conduct.

4. New penalty structure conclusion.

   Assume for the sake of argument that there is one aggravating factor and two mitigating factors, which would place this institution in the **Mitigation** sublevel of the penalty guidelines. There is only one aggravating factor and no mitigating factors for the former graduate assistant coach resulting in the **Aggravation** sublevel.

Institution B: Imposed penalties vs. new penalty structure.

	Competition	Financial	Scholarship	Recruiting	Show Cause	Probation
Imposed Penalties	None.	None.	FB: Reduce initial grants-in-aid in the sport of football by 3 for both 2007-08 and 2008-09 academic years. (limited to 22 each year from 25, a 12% cut). MBB: Shall not award more than 12 grants-in-aid during 2007-08 and 2008-09. (8% cut).	Limited the number of two-year college transfer football student-athletes to 3 for the 2005 and 2006 seasons. Reduced by 8 the number of official paid visits over the period of 2006-07 to 2007-08 academic years. (33% cut).	3-year show cause for former football graduate assistant coach.	3 years. Representative of the institution's athletics interests disassociated for four years.
New Penalty Structure (Mitigation for institution) (Aggravation for former graduate assistant coach)	0-1 year post-season ban for involved sports (MFB, MBB).	0-1% total budget. (Assuming FB has a $15 million budget, this would be a fine of $0 to $150,000. Assuming MBB has a budget of $5 million, this would be a fine of $0 to $50,000.)	0-12.5% scholarship reductions. (FB's 85 grants would be cut by 0 to 11 per year. MBB's 13 grants would be reduced by 0 to 2 per year.)	0-12.5% reduction in all recruiting activity. (This would apply to both football and men's basketball.)	5-10 years to graduate assistant FB coach.	1-4 years probation. Disassociation of representative as above.

<u>Institution C</u>

Summary of violations: Exceeding coaching staff limitations; playing and practice season violations; unethical conduct involving a former graduate assistant coach; failure to monitor.

Specific violations:

- Exceeding coaching staff limitations - football (Level II).
  - Program exceeded the permissible limit on the number of coaches by five when five quality control staff members engaged in on- and off-field coaching activities.
- Playing and practice season violations - football (Level II).
  - Football staff members monitored and conducted voluntary summer workouts, conducted impermissible activities outside of the playing season, required student-athletes to participate in summer conditioning activities for disciplinary purposes, and exceeded time limited for countable athletically related activities.
- Unethical conduct – former football graduate assistant (Level II).
  - Former graduate assistant failed to deport himself in accordance with the recognized standards of honesty and sportsmanship when he provided false information to the institution and enforcement staff.

- Failure to monitor - football (Level II).
  - Head coach and athletics department failed to monitor the duties of the quality control staff, the former graduate assistant coach and the limits for athletically related activities.

New Penalty Structure Classification:

1. Sublevel classification - Level II.

2. Factors.

   a. Aggravating.
      (1) Failure to monitor.
      (2) Unethical conduct.

   b. Mitigating.
      (1) Self-detection and self-disclosure of the violation.
      (2) Met institutional control standards.

3. Factors for involved individuals (former graduate assistant football coach).

   a. Aggravating.
      (1) Unethical conduct.

4. New penalty structure conclusion.

   Assume for the sake of argument that two aggravating factors and two mitigating factors would place this institution in the **Standard** sublevel of the penalty guidelines. There is only one aggravating factor and no mitigating factors for the former graduate assistant football coach, resulting in the **Aggravation** sublevel.

Institution C: Imposed penalties vs. new penalty structure.

	Competition	Financial	Scholarship	Recruiting	Show Cause	Probation
Imposed Penalties	Decrease in FB CARA by 130 hours beginning in June 2010 and ending no later than the conclusion of the 2011-12 year.	None.	None..	None.	None.	3 years.
New Penalty Structure (Standard for institution) (Aggravation for former graduate assistant coach)	0 years postseason ban.	0-.5% total budget. (Assuming FB has a $15 million budget, this would be a fine of $0 to $75,000.)	0-5% scholarship reductions. (FB's 85 grants would be cut by 0 to 4 per year.)	0-5% reduction in all recruiting activity. (This would apply to football.)	1-4 years to FB graduate assistant coach.	0-2 years.

Institution D

Summary of violations: Impermissible benefits; impermissible inducements; impermissible financial assistance to prospective student-athletes; failing to follow procedures for reporting banned drug use; impermissible tryout; impermissible contact; unethical conduct by the former head coach and three former assistant coaches; academic fraud; lack of institutional control.

Specific violations:

- Extra benefits– men's basketball (Level I).
  - Head coach (with some assistance from an assistant coach) provided $20,000 in extra benefits to one student-athlete. Also, head coach (with some assistance from an assistant coach) provided $10,000 in extra benefits to a second student-athlete.
- Recruiting inducements – men's basketball (Level I).
  - Head coach (with assistance from some assistant coaches) provided recruiting inducements to three prospective student-athletes (PSAs):
    - PSA No. 1 - $275.
    - PSA No. 2 - $2,100.
    - PSA No. 3 - $900.
  - Head coach donated $28,000, and secured another $87,000 in booster donations, to elite AAU basketball teams.
- Impermissible tryouts - men's basketball (Level II).
- Failure to follow banned drug procedures - men's basketball (Level I).
- Miscellaneous extra benefits - men's basketball (Level I).
- Miscellaneous recruiting inducements - men's basketball (Level I).
- Impermissible booster contact with PSA - men's basketball (Level I).
- Academic fraud in football - (Level I).
  - Tutor wrote papers for three football student-athletes.
- Unethical conduct - head coach - men's basketball (Level I).
  - Knowing involvement in serious violations. Asking a student-athlete and his mother to lie for him. Forging bank records and documents related to the mother and impersonating the student-athlete's father in an attempt to cover up. Asking other student-athletes and coaches to lie and suggest dead student-athlete was drug dealer with rolls of money. Lying to the institution and enforcement staff.
- Unethical conduct - assistant coaches - men's basketball (Level I).
- Lack of institutional control.
  - Failure to detect violations and head coach failed to create and maintain an atmosphere of compliance.

New penalty structure classification:

1. Sublevel classification - Level I.

2. Factors for institution.

   a. Aggravating.
      (1) Multiple level I violations.
      (2) Failure to monitor.
      (3) Repeat-violator status.
      (4) Persons of authority have demonstrated negligent disregard for the violations.
      (5) Academic fraud.

   b. Mitigating.
      (1) Institutional self-report.
      (2) Admission of violations prior to hearing.

3. Factors for involved individuals (former head and graduate assistant football coaches).

   a. Aggravating.
      (1) Unethical conduct.
      (2) Multiple Level I violations.

4. New penalty structure conclusion.

   Assume for the sake of argument that five aggravating factors and two mitigating factors would place this institution in the **Significant Aggravation** sublevel of the penalty guidelines. There are two aggravating factors and no mitigating factors for the former head football coach resulting in the **Significant Aggravation** sublevel.

Institution D: Imposed penalties vs. new penalty structure.

	Competition	Financial	Scholarship	Recruiting	Show Cause	Probation
Imposed Penalties	1 year – Postseason ban. 1 year – Schedule limited to conference games only. Granted transfer releases to all SAs on MBB team.	Forfeiture of share of revenue from the 2003-04 Big 12 tournament equaling $212, 500. (Assuming MBB has a budget of $5 million, this would be 4.25% of budget.)	13 to 9 for 2004-05 (30% reduction). 13 to 12 for 2005-06 (8% reduction).	Reduce expense paid visits from 12 to 8 in 2004-05 (33% cut) and 12 to 9 during both 2005-06 (25% cut) and 2006-07 (25% cut) recruiting years. Contact days reduced by five for each contact period from Sept. 2004 to April 2006. Reduce number of MBB coaches allowed to recruit off campus from three to two for the 2004-05 and 2005-06 seasons (33% cut).	10 year – Head coach. 8 year – Assistant coach. 5 year – Assistant coach. 5 year – Assistant coach.	5 years.
New Penalty Structure (Significant aggravation for institution) (Significant Aggravation for institutional staff)	3+ years postseason ban. 0-100% full-season ban for MBB (Optional penalty, not core.)	3-5% of the total budget per sport program. (Assuming MBB has a $5 million budget, this would be a fine of $150,000 to $250,000.)	37.5 to 50(+) % reduction per sport. In other words, a reduction from13 grants to 5-7+ grants.	37.5-50(+) % reduction in all MBB recruiting activity.	Show-cause of 10+ years on each involved institutional staff member.	6-10 + years probation.

2004-102 PERSONNEL -- CONDUCT OF ATHLETICS PERSONNEL -- RESPONSIBILITY OF HEAD COACH

Status: Adopted – Final.

Intent: To define the responsibilities of a head coach with regard to compliance with NCAA rules.

Bylaws: Amend 11.1.2 by adding new 11.1.2.1, as follows:

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

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

Source: NCAA Division I Board of Directors [Management Council (Committee on Infractions)].

Effective Date: Immediate.

Proposal Category: Amendment.

Topical Area: Personnel.

Rationale: The head coach has an obligation to promote a culture of compliance among the entire team, including assistant coaches, other staff and student-athletes. The head coach must monitor the activities of assistant coaches and staff to determine if they are acting in compliance with NCAA rules. Too often, when assistant coaches or other administrators involved with the program are involved in serious violations, head coaches profess ignorance regarding such violations while indicating such responsibilities were entrusted to their assistants. A head coach should be presumed to have knowledge and, therefore, responsibility for the actions of those individuals associated with his or her team whom the coach directly or indirectly supervises. However, a violation of the proposed bylaw will occur only in major-infractions cases, similar to institutional control allegations, or in very serious secondary cases. This proposal does not imply that every violation by a staff member or student-athlete involved in the head coach's program will be considered a lack of control on the part of the head coach. There is a rebuttable presumption that exists when situations indicate that the head coach has set a proper tone of compliance. Under such circumstances, the head coach would not be charged with a lack of control for activities that may result in NCAA rules violations.

Estimated Budget Impact: None.

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

History

Mar 08, 2004: Submit; Submitted for consideration.

Apr 19, 2004: Mgmt Council 1st Review, Approved

Jan 09, 2005: Mgmt Council 1st Review; Gave initial approval and circulated the proposal for membership comment. (Unanimous Voice Vote)

Jan 11, 2005: Comment Period; Start of Comment Period

Mar 14, 2005: Comment Period; End of Comment Period; (Official Comment Totals: Support = 37, Oppose = 2, Abstain = 0)

Apr 11, 2005: Mgmt Council 2nd Review; Gave final approval and forwarded the proposal to the Board for approval. (Unanimous Voice Vote)

Apr 28, 2005: Adopted, Pending Possible Board Review, Adopted; Adopted the proposal. (Unanimous Voice Vote)

Apr 28, 2005: Adopted, Override Period; Start of Override Period

Jun 23, 2005: Adopted, Override Period; End of Override Period

Jun 23, 2005: Adopted; Adopted - Final

References

Legislative References		
Div.	**Number**	**Title**
I	11.1.2	Responsibility for Violations of NCAA Regulations.
I	11.1.2.1	Responsibility of Head Coach.

Other
Proposals: 0
Interpretations: 0
Educational Column: 0
Legislative Relief Waivers: 0

SUPPLEMENT NO. 6

NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model - Rules
Timeline and Items of Focus Overview

Time Period and Key Dates	Items of Focus
Now through April 20, 2012	Outreach with membership to collect feedback on Commitments and concepts. Specific items: • Commitments. • NCAA Bylaw 11 (athletics personnel). • Bylaw 13 (recruiting). • Bylaw 16 (awards, benefits and expenses).
April 12, 2012 (10 to 11:30 a.m.) NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model - Rules Teleconference	• Provide summary of feedback received on Commitments, Bylaws 11 (athletics personnel), 13 (recruiting) and 16 (awards, benefits and expenses). • Review initial draft of concepts for Bylaws 12 (amateurism) and 14 (eligibility). • Review initial action plans for Bylaws 15 (financial aid) and 17 (playing and practice seasons).
April 26, 2012 NCAA Division I Board of Directors Meeting	*Progress report; no legislative action anticipated.*
May 3, 2012 (9:30 to 11 a.m.) Rules Working Group Teleconference	• Key insights on Commitments, Bylaws 11 (athletics personnel), 13 (recruiting) and 16 (awards, benefits and expenses): • Finalize concepts to be sent to membership for feedback on Bylaws 12 (amateurism) and 14 (eligibility). • Update on academic fraud and incentives.
May 7 through June 22, 2012 • Conference Meetings • Governance Meetings • NCAA Regional Rules Seminars	Additional outreach on concepts in Bylaws 11 (athletics personnel), 13 (recruiting) and 16 (awards, benefits and expenses) that require additional discussion. Outreach with membership to collect feedback on: • Bylaw 12 (amateurism). • Bylaw 14 (eligibility).
July 12-13, 2012 Rules Working Group Meeting	• Review re-written bylaws and draft legislative proposals related to Bylaws 11 (athletics personnel), 13 (recruiting) and 16 (awards, benefits and expenses). • Key insights on Bylaws 12 (amateurism) and 14 (eligibility) and other items sent to the membership for feedback. • Finalize plans for Bylaws 15 (financial aid) and 17 (playing and practice seasons) reviews after receiving cabinet input.
August 2, 2012 NCAA Division I Board of Directors Meeting	*Progress report; no legislative action anticipated.*
Fall Governance Meetings	Continued outreach and communication.
**October 30 Board of Directors Meeting* *OR* *January 19, 2013 Board of Directors Meeting*	*Legislative action anticipated on Rules Working Group recommendations for Commitments and Bylaws 11 (athletics personnel), 12 (amateurism), 13 (recruiting), 14 (eligibility) and 16 (awards, benefits and expenses).*
TBD Board of Directors Meeting	*Legislative action anticipated on Bylaws 15 (financial aid) and 17 (playing and practice seasons).*

**Fall/winter Rules Working Group meeting to review re-written bylaws and draft legislative proposals related to Bylaws 12 (amateurism) and 14 (eligibility).*

NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model – Rules

The Commitment to Fair Competition

Bylaws of the Association shall be designed to promote the opportunity for institutions and eligible student-athletes to engage in fair competition. The concept of fair competition requires that all member institutions compete within the framework of the collegiate model of athletics where athletics competition is an integral part of the student-athlete's effort to acquire a degree in higher education. Areas to be regulated include but are not limited to personnel, eligibility and amateurism, recruiting, financial aid, the length of playing and practice seasons and the number of institutional competitions per sport. Fair competition does not support rules or regulations that prevent or reduce the advantages that arise from a student-athlete's level of talent or an institution's financial or other natural advantages.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CONFIDENTIAL
ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE
ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT

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

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

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

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

CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE 2

Elements of the Collegiate Model

2.1 ENACTMENT OF BYLAWS

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

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

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

2.2 THE COMMITMENT TO AMATEURISM

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

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

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

2.3 THE COMMITMENT TO FAIR COMPETITION

Alternative 1:

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

Alternative 2:

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

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

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

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

2.4 THE COMMITMENT TO INTEGRITY AND SPORTSMANSHIP

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

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

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

2.5 THE COMMITMENT TO INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL AND COMPLIANCE

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

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

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

2.6 THE COMMITMENT TO STUDENT-ATHLETE WELL-BEING

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

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

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

2.7 THE COMMITMENT TO SOUND ACADEMIC STANDARDS

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

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

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

2.8 THE COMMITMENT TO RESPONSIBLE RECRUITING STANDARDS

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

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

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

2.9 THE COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

Working Group on the Collegiate Model – Rules

NCAA Bylaw 11

Concept	Consensus
No. 1: Eliminate regulations governing contractual agreements and compensation from sources outside institution.	**Yes.**
No. 2: Eliminate regulations defining recruiting coordination functions that must be performed by head or assistant coaches.	**Yes.**
No. 3: Eliminate annual certification requirement applicable to coaches involved in off-campus recruiting.	**No.** • Will help to ensure that coaches are knowledgeable of the rules. • Is a helpful learning tool for new coaches.
No. 4-a: Eliminate regulations governing scouting of opponents and permit live, in-person scouting.	**No.** • Prefer the second option.
No. 4-b: Prohibit all live, in-person scouting in all sports, while retaining the current exceptions in NCAA Bylaw 11.6.1 through Bylaw 11.6.4.	**Yes.**
No. 5-a: Eliminate coaching categories.	**No.** • Varying levels of support were expressed for each topic in this concept area.
No. 5-b-(1): Exclude graduate assistant coaches as countable coaches in all sports provide certain criteria met.	
No. 5-b-(2): Permit additional countable coaches in FBS.	
No. 5-c-(1): Eliminate volunteer coaching category.	
No. 5-c-(2): Permit one additional countable coach in sports that allow volunteer coach.	
No. 5-c-(3): Permit more than one additional countable coach in sports with multiple volunteer coaches.	
No. 5-d: Establish numbers of noncoaching staff who may be involved in supporting football or basketball programs in any capacity.	

No. 5-e: Establish criteria for determining a countable coach (eliminates temporary consultants and noncoaching staff members legislation). No. 5-f: Maintain current number of strength and conditioning coaches in FBS (5).	
No. 6: Prohibit employment of coaches who remain employed in coaching prospects who participate on nonscholastic teams/clubs.	**No.** • Concerns with limiting opportunities for professional development and income.
No. 7-a: Prohibit employment of individuals associated with prospects in noncoaching categories in all sports. No. 7-b: Prohibit employment of individuals associated with prospects in noncoaching categories in certain sports.	**No.** • Noted that the rule may not be necessary in all sports. **No.** • Uncertainty around which sports this rule should apply to other than men's basketball.
No. 8: Eliminate restrictions governing number of off-campus recruiters at any one time (the baton rule).	**Yes.**

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

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

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

Name:

Institution/Conference/Organization:

Title:

Date:

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

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

Points to Consider:

1. Reduces administrative burden for compliance staff.

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

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

Points to Consider:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Question:

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

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

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

Points to Consider:

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

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

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

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

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

Points to Consider:

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

2. Intent of original legislation was cost savings.

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

Questions:

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

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

Concept No. 5: Eliminate coaching categories.

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

Points to Consider:

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

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

3. Eliminates the volunteer coach category.

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

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Points to Consider:

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

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

Question:

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

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

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

Points to Consider:

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

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

Points to Consider:

1. Not of national significance.

2. Presents enforcement challenges.

3. Would reduce unnecessary compliance monitoring.

Question:

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

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

NCAA Working Group on the Collegiate Model – Rules

Noncoaching Staff Limits for Men's and Women's Basketball and Football
Draft Concepts Discussion Document

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

Name:

Institution/Conference/Organization:

Title:

Date:

Concept No. 1: Extend the current prohibition of individuals associated with a prospect (IAWP) from being employed by institutions to work in noncoaching positions in men's basketball to women's basketball and football. [See NCAA Bylaw 11.4.2.]

Rationale: Will ensure individuals employed as noncoaching staff members are hired to serve their primary purpose, which is to provide administrative support for the sport program and coaching staff, rather than based on their relationship to or connections with prospective student-athletes.

Points to Consider:

- Eliminates any real or perceived recruiting advantage that may accrue to institutions as a result of hiring specific individuals as noncoaching staff members.

- This concept is being discussed for all sports by the Rules Working Group. (Bylaw 11 – Concept No. 7).

Questions:

1. Do you support this concept? ◯ Yes ◯ No

2. Why or why not?

Concept No. 2: Require that noncoaching staff members with sport-specific responsibilities in football and men's and women's basketball have no previous professional or collegiate coaching experience as a head or assistant coach.

Rationale: Through previous surveys and feedback, the membership has indicated noncoaching staff positions are primarily viewed as entry-level positions that offer professional development opportunities for individuals who want to pursue a future coaching career. This requirement is consistent with that philosophy and will help ensure that these positions are being filled by the individuals these positions were intended to serve.

Points to Consider:

- Eliminates any real or perceived competitive advantage that may accrue to institutions as a result of hiring individuals that have coaching experience as noncoaching staff members.

- Requirement would not apply to noncoaching staff members without sport-specific responsibilities (e.g., assistant or associate athletics director with legitimate department-wide responsibilities).

- Similar to NCAA Proposal No. 2011-14 for bowl subdivision football graduate assistant coaches, currently tabled until the Rules Working Group has completed its charge.

Questions:

1. Do you support this concept? ○ Yes ○ No

2. Why or why not?

Concept No. 3: Place limits on the number of noncoaching staff members in the bench area during competition in men's and women's basketball and football.

Rationale: While the membership has expressed concerns regarding the placement of numerical restrictions on institutions employing noncoaching staff due to difficulty in interpreting, monitoring and enforcing any such type of legislation, placing a numerical limit on these positions during competition is enforceable and easy to monitor. Further, this concept addresses the concern regarding the proliferation of "suits on bench" during competition.

Points to Consider:

- Reduces competitive equity concerns regarding noncoaching staff members providing instruction to student-athletes during competition.

- Legislation would need to clearly define bench/sideline area.

- Individuals not included in bench limit would not be permitted to have communication or contact with coaches or student-athletes during the competition.

  - **Men's and Women's Basketball – Three**

    Points to Consider:

    - Limit in basketball is based on the NCAA championship restriction of 22 individuals permitted in the bench area. The championship restriction assumes a team will have 15 student-athletes, four coaches and three additional institutional personnel.

    - Teams that compete in the NCAA championship are already familiar with applying this restriction during post-season competition.

    - Limit of three would exempt any medical personnel or athletic trainers.

    - The three noncoaching staff members would be chosen at the institution's discretion.

    - Similar to concept outlined in Proposal No. 2011-22, currently tabled until the Rules Working Group has completed its charge.

- **Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) – 15**

  Points to Consider:

  - FBS postseason policy permits 60 nonuniformed personnel in the team bench area that includes coaching and medical staffs, managers, and other designated team personnel directly involved in administering the conduct of the game.
  - Limit of 15 would exempt any medical personnel or athletic trainers.
  - The 15 noncoaching staff members would be chosen at the institution's discretion.

- **NCAA Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) – 10**

  Points to Consider:

  - FCS postseason policy permits 30 coaches and those individuals in working capacities who have performed these duties throughout the regular season and includes coaches who will be working in the press box during the game.
  - Limit of 10 would exempt any medical personnel or athletic trainers.
  - The 10 noncoaching staff members would be chosen at the institution's discretion.

Questions:

1. Do you support the concept of bench limits? ○ Yes ○ No

2. Why or why not?

3. Do you support the limit of three for men's and women's basketball? ○ Yes ○ No

   3a. If not, what should the limit be and why?

4. Do you support the limit of 15 for FBS football? ◯ Yes ◯ No

   4a. If not, what should the limit be and why?

5. Do you support the limit of 10 for FCS football? ◯ Yes ◯ No

   5a. If not, what should the limit be and why?

<u>Concept 4</u>: Combination of all three concepts.

Questions:

1. Do you support a combination of all three concepts, prohibition of IAWP employment, no professional or previous coaching experience and bench limit restrictions, to limit the number of noncoaching staff members?

   ○ Yes ○ No

2. Why or why not?

Working Group on the Collegiate Model – Rules

NCAA Bylaw 13

Concept	Consensus
No.1-a: Once a National Letter of Intent (NLI) or other commitment is signed, no longer considered a prospective student-athlete for purposes of applying recruiting rules.	**Yes.**
No. 1-b: Another date?	• Consider date financial deposit is made for nonscholarship prospective student-athletes.
No. 2-a: Establish earlier date (June 15 at the completion of the prospective student-athlete's sophomore year) in which communication and contact may begin.	• Yes and should be same for all sports.
No. 2-b: Other date?	• June 15 may be too early.
No. 3: Eliminate restrictions governing modes and restrictions (numerical limitations) on recruiting communication.	**Yes.**
No. 4-a: Develop more flexible recruiting calendars based on a specified number of recruiting days, with specified dead periods and recruiting periods.	**Yes.**
No. 4-b-(1): No limitations on number of recruiting opportunities per prospective student-athlete?	• Not supportive of no limit on number.
No. 4-b-(2): Maintain limit of seven recruiting opportunities per prospective student-athlete, but eliminate distinction between contacts and evaluations.	**Yes.**
No. 5: Eliminate legislation related to publishing/providing admissions, graduation rates and NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate data, banned drug list and initial-eligibility standards to prospective student-athletes.	**Yes.**
No. 6-a: Eliminate printed recruiting material rules entirely.	**Yes.**
No. 6-b: Prohibit sending or providing prospective student-athletes any recruiting materials other than general correspondence.	

No. 7: Eliminate restrictions related to general advertising or promotional materials designed to solicit enrollment of prospective student-athletes, while maintaining prohibitions against personalized promotions.	**Yes.**
No. 8-a: Reduce restrictions governing official visits while requiring institutions to address such issues through written policies. No. 8-b: Necessary conference office oversight.	General support for some deregulation but not complete deregulation. • Need regulations related to time, entertainment and cost restrictions. • Support allowing institutions to pay for parents/relatives.
No. 9-a: Eliminate all recruiting publicity regulations.	**Not supportive.**
No. 9-b: Eliminate all recruiting publicity regulations after prospective student-athlete commits to an institution.	**Yes.**
No. 9-c: Maintain prohibition against media presence during recruiting contacts and visits.	**Yes.**
No. 10-a: Eliminate all regulations related to involvement of an institution and institutional staff members in high school all-star games.	• Membership is split. • Some support given potential revenue source. • Others are concerned with recruiting advantages.
No. 10-a-(1): Eliminate all regulations related to involvement of an institution and institutional staff members in high school all-star games other than involvement of institutional staff members in the selection process for high school all-star games.	
No. 10-a-(2): Establish limit on number of high school all-star games an institution may host?	
No. 10-d-(3): Establish limit on number of high school all-star games institutional staff members may be involved in.	
No. 11-a: Expand on-campus evaluations to all sports.	**Yes.**

No. 11-a-(1): Establish limits on who can participate in the on-campus evaluations and the time period as to when they may occur.	**Yes.**
No. 12-a: Modify the camps and clinics legislation	Yes – general support for some deregulation.
No. 12-b: Eliminate camps and clinics legislation related to the employment of current student-athletes.	• Supportive of student-athletes working camps.
No. 12-c: Eliminate camps and clinics legislation related to the employment of prospective student-athletes.	• Supportive of prospective student-athletes working camps only after they have committed to institution or signed NLI.
No. 12-d: Eliminate legislation restricting employment and participation of football prospective student-athletes, who are high school seniors, in institutional camps and clinics.	• Membership is split.

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

NCAA Bylaw 13 (Recruiting)
Concepts Discussion Document

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

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

Name:

Institution/Conference/Organization:

Title:

Date:

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

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

Points to Consider:

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

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

Point to Consider:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

Points to Consider:

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

Question:

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

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

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

Points to Consider:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

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

Points to Consider:

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

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

Question:

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

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

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

Points to Consider:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

Points to Consider:

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

- Would reduce compliance monitoring.

Question:

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

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

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

Points to Consider:

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

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

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

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

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

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

Points to Consider:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

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

Points to Consider:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Points to Consider:

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

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

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

- Division II has a similar rule.

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

Points to Consider:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NCAA Bylaw 13 Recruiting Calendar and Recruiting Person Day Models

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

Name:

Institution/Conference/Organization:

Title:

Date:

Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

Baseball

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Women's Bowling

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

Cross Country/Track and Field

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Women's Equestrian

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

Fencing

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

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

Field Hockey

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Golf

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

Gymnastics

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

Ice Hockey

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

Men's Lacrosse

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Women's Lacrosse

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rifle

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

Women's Rowing

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

Women's Rugby

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

Men's Volleyball

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

Women's Volleyball and Sand Volleyball

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Skiing

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

Soccer

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

Softball

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

   - Thanksgiving Day through January 1 ◯ Yes ◯ No

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

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

Swimming and Diving

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

Tennis

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

Water Polo

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

Wrestling

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

or

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

Recruiting Calendar Recommendation:

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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