



MINUTES
CCACA IN-PERSON MEETING
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2005 ~ 10:00 a.m. - Noon (Eastern)

Participants: Amy Huchthausen, America East; Shane Lyons (co-chair) and Lindsey Babcock, ACC; Steve Sturek, Atlantic Sun; Jacqueline Campbell, Atlantic 10; Ron Loghry, Big Sky; Lori Ebihara (co-chair) and Mary Ellen Enigk (recording secretary), Big 12; Amy Haworth, Mia Brickhouse and Jason DeAngelis, Big East; Carol Iwaoka, Jennifer Heppel and Chad Hawley, Big Ten; Erica Satterfield, Big West; Jeff Schemmel and Charolette Hunt; Conference USA; Stephanie Jarvis and Duane Lightfoot, Horizon; Carolyn Campbell-McGovern and Mary Mulvenna, Ivy; Barbara Church, Metro Atlantic Athletic; Sonja Stills, Mid-Eastern Athletic; Patty Viverito and Sarah Weier, Missouri Valley; Carolayne Henry and Anthony Archbald, Mountain West; Corrinne Wright, Northeast; Ron Barker, Erik Price and Mike Mathews, Pac-10; Joanna Kreps, Patriot; Greg Sankey, Gil Grimes, Torie Johnson and Edgar Gantt, SEC; Jennifer Henderson, Sun Belt; Gloria Nevarez, West Coast; Patrick Hairston, WAC.

[While discussions and actions were conducted at various times during the meeting, they are contained within the topic areas for ease of reference.]

1. Approval of Minutes from the January 6, 2005 CCACA Conference Call.
[Supplement No. 1]

➤ **ACTION:** The minutes were approved.

2. In-Person Meeting Schedule and Location.

Shane sought feedback from the group regarding the timing of this meeting (weekend vs. weekday travel) and the meeting location (hotel vs. national office). The group agreed that a weekday meeting that does not require weekend travel would be preferred. There did not seem to be a strong preference for the meeting location; however, if the meeting is held at the national office, the group would like transportation to the national office on the last day since most people depart directly for the airport subsequent to the meeting and have to carry their luggage to the national office.

3. CCACA Governance Subcommittee Update. [Supplement Nos. 2 and 3]

Carol Iwaoka provided a report of the January 14 CCACA Governance Subcommittee conference call. She noted that the subcommittee had an in-depth discussion on the merits of the current October initial/April final legislative cycle, specifically the apparent confusion in the membership that that intent of the “one cycle voting” is to determine whether to move proposals along for comment during initial review, and not necessarily vote on the proposals’ merit. The subcommittee recommended that the CCACA provide feedback on a possible October initial/January final cycle.

Patty Viverito expressed concerns about eliminating the comment period for all proposals since some may warrant the two step process; however, she would be fine with final votes in January for proposals that may not need the comment period.

- **ACTION:** The group agreed to recommend an October initial/January final legislative cycle and noted that the July 15 submission deadline for proposed legislation should remain in effect. The chair agreed to present the group's recommendation to the NCAA staff during the afternoon meeting.

4. Proposal No. 2003-24 (Financial Aid – Terms and Conditions – Period of Award).

The group discussed Proposal No. 2003-24, which is scheduled for an April 2005 vote.

5. Proposal No. 2004-60 (Eligibility–Validity of Amateur Status–International SAs).

The group continued its discussion of Proposal No. 2004-60.

- **ACTION:** It was the strong sentiment of the group that an international student-athlete “clearinghouse” is necessary. Pat Hairston agreed to share the group's position on Proposal 2004-60 to the Amateurism Subcommittee of the A/E/C Cabinet during its February meeting.

6. Administrative Review Subcommittee Waivers. [Supplement No. 4]

The group addressed the Management Council's recent discussion regarding the administration of ARS waivers, specifically the shift of “obvious” waivers to the conference office to be processed. Lori Ebihara noted that the Management Council agreed that selected ARS waivers could be processed similar to Incidental Expense Waivers.

- **ACTION:** In the event the Management Council approves this directive, the group recommends that the NCAA staff create an easier means to search for previously approved ARS waivers, compared to the current system in place for Incidental Expense Waivers.

Erica Satterfield informed the group that the A/E/C Cabinet may be recommending that the management of selected eligibility waivers also shift to conference offices. The group expressed serious concerns with this potential directive.

7. Summer Bridge Program.

Shane Lyons sought feedback from the group regarding how conferences are advising institutions of what criteria should be implemented to meet the Summer Bridge Program standards. It was the sense of the group that conference offices have not been engaged in this process and institutions are solely responsible for determining the criteria.

The group also discussed how conferences intend to provide “sunshine” on the process. It was the sense of the group that oversight will be left to the discretion of each institution.

8. Off-Campus Room and Board.

Carol Iwaoka requested feedback from the group regarding off-campus room and board stipends and whether they should be the same as the on-campus average or whether institutions should

determine the amount based on the figure used for all students. Lori Ebihara explained that student-athletes who live off-campus appear to be “short-changed” if the institution does not have an off-campus published rate, of which most institutions do not. She informed the group that she plans to discuss this issue with Financial Aid Subcommittee of the A/E/C Cabinet.

9. Institutional Recruiting Policies.

Jennifer Heppel sought feedback regarding the “enforcement” of institutional recruiting policies, specifically how conferences may be addressing deficiencies in the written policies and/or reviewing institutional violations of those policies. It was the sense of the group that conference offices are simply filing the policies and procedures, and are only requiring institutions to submit annual reports if changes are made. The group also agreed that the CEOs’ signatures should be required whenever there are changes made to the policies and procedures and upon re-submission to conference offices.

10. Off-Campus Practice Activities.

Erica Satterfield sought feedback from the group regarding off-campus practice activities (e.g. retreats, team bonding activities, etc.) that appear to be becoming more prevalent on campuses, specifically how other conferences are advising institutions concerning such activities (i.e. countable hours). If such activities take place during the playing season, individuals expressed concerns with regard to how coaches are counting the time commitment in the weekly/hourly limitations.

➤ **ACTION:** The group agreed to forward this issue to LRIC for further review.

11. Signing of Financial Aid Agreements. [Supplement No. 5]

Mary Ellen Enigk sought additional feedback on the December 15, 2004 staff interpretation that addresses the signing of financial aid agreements and whether individuals have identified any potential unintended consequences of this interpretation. Jennifer Heppel expressed her concern that this may open the door for prospective student-athletes who intend on graduating from high school at mid year to sign financial aid agreements during their junior year in high school. No additional concerns were shared.

12. Athletics Certification.

Shane Lyons planned to share his concerns that some institutions will not be required to have a peer reviewer on campus to review compliance, based on the institution’s report to the Committee on Athletics Certification. Due to time constraints, Shane referred this matter to the March 2 conference call.

13. Submitting Interpretations to LRIC.

During the November 3 conference call, Carolayne Henry expressed concern regarding the staff’s discretion in sending interpretive issues to LRIC.

- **FOLLOW-UP:** Shane Lyons informed the group that he discussed this matter with Brad Hostetter and was assured that this will not happen in the future; however, Shane requested that individuals notify him if they encounter any resistance from the staff when submitting issues to LRIC.

14. NCAA Regional Rules Compliance Seminars.

At the request of Loretta Lamar (NAACC), the group was encouraged to e-mail recommendations for 2005 Regional Seminar round table discussions topics to Lori Ebihara.

15. Other Business:

- **Certification of Events.**

Carolyn Campbell-McGovern informed the group that the Ivy League will continue to manage a list of April certified events on its web site and will place a link to the information from the Pac-10 Web site. Consistent with last year, she requested the assistance of various conferences to obtain information from state high school associations.

- **J3 Football Clinics.**

Carolayne Henry informed the group that the Mountain West Conference has been contacted by J3 Football regarding coaches' participation in J3 Football Clinics, scheduled to take place in April and May 2005. J3 Football has assured her that they are in compliance with NCAA Bylaw 13.13.2.3.2.1; however, the NCAA staff confirmed that they have not spoken to this company, nor made any determination on whether coaches may participate. Carolayne shared some information on J3 Football and informed the group that the Mountain West is currently not permitting its coach's to participate inasmuch as the clinics do not appear to meet the criteria set forth in Bylaw 13.13.2.3.2.1. She noted that Anthony Archbald will update the group as they continue to communicate with J3 Football.

16. Future Conference Calls.

March 2, April 6 and May 4, 2005 at 11:00 a.m. (CT).

17. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at noon (ET).



**MINUTES
CCACA CONFERENCE CALL**

Thursday, January 6, 2005 ~ 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. CT

Participants: Amy Huchthausen, America East; Shane Lyons (co-chair) and Lindsey Babcock, ACC; Steve Sturek, Atlantic Sun; Jamie Braunwarth, Atlantic 10; Lori Ebihara (co-chair) and Mary Ellen Enigk (recording secretary), Big 12; Stan Wilcox, Big East; Dawn Turner, Big South; Carol Iwaoka, Jennifer Heppel and Chad Hawley, Big Ten; Erica Satterfield, Big West; Jeff Schemmel, Conference USA; Carolyn Campbell-McGovern and Mary Mulvenna, Ivy; Barbara Church and Rachelle Held, Metro Atlantic Athletic; Sonja Stills, Mid-Eastern Athletic; Sarah Weier, Missouri Valley; Anthony Archbald, Mountain West; Corrinne Wright, Northeast; Erik Price and Mike Mathews, Pac-10; Joanna Kreps and Sarah Adams, Patriot; Gil Grimes, Torie Johnson and Edgar Gantt, SEC; Doug King, Southern; LaRon Black, Southland; Jennifer Henderson, Sun Belt; Carol Rivers, West Coast.

1. Approval of Minutes from the December 1, 2004 CCACA Conference Call.

➤ **ACTION:** The minutes were approved.

2. Student-Athlete Health Insurance.

Corrine Wright sought feedback regarding the application of Bylaw 16.4.2 including whether Bylaw 16.4.1-(a) should be changed to coincide with the new legislation. Specifically, she expressed concerns regarding that fact that institutions are not permitted to finance general health insurance benefits to student-athletes pursuant to Bylaw 16.4.2, yet may provide athletics medical insurance under Bylaw 16.4.1-(a).

The group agreed that this is an issue that would have to be addressed legislatively in order to allow institutions to provide general medical health insurance. It was noted, however, that institutions may consider utilizing the SAOF or SAF for this purpose.

3. Directors of Basketball Operations.

The group discussed the on-going issue regarding directors of basketball operations and their involvement in practice activities. In addition, concerns were expressed that these individuals are also involved in contacting prospects by telephone and correspondence, which provides an apparent recruiting advantage. The group agreed that despite the NCAA interpretations that have been provided, this matter is still an issue that needs to be addressed further. It was also noted that this issue is not only specific to the sport of basketball, but is impacting other sports as well.

➤ **ACTION:** The group agreed to forward this matter to the recruiting subcommittee of the A/E/C Cabinet for further review.

4. Proposal 2003-23.

Carolyn Campbell-McGovern provided a followed-up to an email she distributed to the group on January 5, which addressed several interpretive matters relative to Proposal 2003-23. Carolyn expressed her concern that, based on these interpretations, if this proposal is adopted it could essentially render all equivalency limits meaningless over time. No additional discussion ensued on this matter.

5. In-Person Meeting.

The in-person meeting is scheduled for February 7 – 8, 2005 in Indianapolis, IN.

5. Adjournment.

The call was adjourned at 12:00 p.m. (CT).



DATE: January 26, 2005
TO: CCACA
FROM: CCACA Governance Subcommittee
SUBJECT: Review of Governance Issues for February 7 Meeting

The subcommittee met by teleconference on January 18 to identify issues for review and discussion during the upcoming February 7 meeting. The complete report is attached. In summary, the issues include:

1. **Governance materials.** Requesting the staff to organize all legislative publications by topical order, number proposals sequentially, and include a cross index in numerical order to facilitate locating proposals.
2. **Educational materials/summaries/guidance.**
 - Suggest CCACA identify and request NCAA staff to prepare educational summaries for select proposals (e.g., 2004-40; compare/contrast various NABC/WBCA alternatives, etc.). Should also seek clarification from NCAA staff regarding the timing/ability to respond to such requests.
 - Request more guidance regarding “what to expect”/protocol during legislative review at Management Council meetings (this may be tied to clarifying the purpose of the initial review).
 - Receive the NCAA Legislative Review Subcommittee’s report in November rather than December. (Note: The October/January cycle described below might facilitate this.)
3. **Legislative cycle**
 - Purpose of initial review. The CCACA should discuss both its current understanding, and also the desired outcomes, of the initial review of legislative proposals (“real” votes on the merits of the proposal vs. “no harm in moving forward for comment”). (NOTE: The results of a survey will be shared at the meeting)
 - October-January cycle considerations. Recommends the CCACA engage in further discussion of a revised legislative cycle that would result in a legislative review in October (thus eliminating the need to define “initial vote”) and final action in January. The Legislative Review Subcommittee would identify those proposals ripe for one-read/final vote in January and those major policy or controversial proposals that would benefit from two reads and membership comment and held for final vote in April.

- Clarify amendment/alternative proposals process. Request further clarification regarding the amendment vs. submitting alternatives between August through the end of the October Management Council meeting

NOTE: The subcommittee did not address the following during its teleconference, but it may be helpful for the CCACA to discuss the purpose of amendment periods, the merits of restricting scopes, and how the current “rules of amendment” factor into a January final vote cycle.

4. Comments on current NCAA Convention schedule/program

- **Saturday - Division I Legislative Review.** 1) Information received regarding the order of review of proposals differed from what transpired at the session and most found it difficult to follow; 2) an agenda would be helpful; 3) continued lack of meaningful dialogue/substantive debate of proposals.

The following was not discussed on the call, but recommend CCACA discuss interpretations on proposed legislation. Some expectation that “official” interpretations would be provided at this session and concerns that an internal document circulated among CCACA membership was instead distributed to the Division I membership.

- **Monday – Division I Issues.** For the most part did not find the session of significant benefit to stay over until Monday.

REPORT OF CCACA GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

January 18, 2005 Teleconference

Participating: Lori Ebihara (Big 12); Carol Iwaoka (Big Ten); Shane Lyons (ACC); Carolyn Campbell-McGovern (Ivy), Stan Wilcox (Big East). Carolayne Henry (Mt. West) and Amy Hutchthausen (America East) were unable to participate.

The CCACA Governance submitted met by teleconference to discuss and recommend the following for the full group's review during its February 7 meeting in Indianapolis:

1. Legislative publications.

- A. Topical order.** Re-request proposals be arranged in topical/bylaw order throughout all phases of the legislative cycle (Initial POPL, Div I Notice, etc.) to facilitate conference review and preparation of legislative issues to its membership.
- B. Sequential numbering.** Proposals be numbered sequentially, and to renumber as necessary in subsequent publications to retain sequential order when additional amendments/alternatives are submitted.
- C. Cross index.** Provide a cross index listing page numbers of proposals based on numerical order.

2. Educational materials/summaries/guidance

- A. Requests to NCAA staff.** CCACA may wish to identify select legislative items for which the NCAA staff would provide educational summaries outlining pros/cons or distinctions among "conflicting proposals".

Rationale: It appears some conferences may have individually submitted similar requests to the NCAA staff for such items, and was informed there were no additional plans to distribute materials to facilitate the membership's understanding of particular proposals (e.g., 2004-40 A, B,C; NABC/WBCA proposals and various "alternatives"). It was also recognized that further discussion with NCAA staff was needed to clarify whether time sensitivity to respond to such requests is based on where those proposals are in the cycle ("initial" vs. final review of proposals).

- B. NCAA Legislative Review Subcommittee report.** Considered the report very helpful, and ideally would prefer to receive information prior to December. Most conferences are straw polling its membership in late November.
- C. What to expect at the Management Council meeting.** While recognizing it is impossible to know exactly what will transpire, more guidance regarding what to expect/order of review at Management Council meetings would be helpful. This should become clearer once the purpose of the initial review is defined (voting to initially approve vs. to initially comment).

3. Legislative cycle

A. Purpose of initial review

- The CCACA should discuss both its current understanding, and also the desired outcomes, of the initial review of legislative proposals (“real” votes on the merits of the proposal vs. “no harm in moving forward for comment”). There appears to be some confusion that the intention of “one cycle voting” is to determine whether to move proposals along for comment during initial review, and not necessarily vote on their merits. However, there is a sense that most are straw polling their membership for positions based on the latter and a previous understanding that during its initial review, the Management Council would be reconciling conflicting proposals. It was also reported that it is a challenge for conference staff to maintain the attention span of its members from October through a “real vote” in April. Some reported that conference legislative review after January would be limited to “new” information rather than re-tallying on all the items.

B. October-January cycle considerations. The subcommittee provided the following reaction to a possible October initial/January final cycle, and recommends the CCACA engage in further discussion during its February 7 meeting:

- **January final**

May increase membership participation/result in more meaningful debate of proposals at Convention. Participation (or lack thereof) by the membership at the January Convention is described as “no vote/no voice/no need to go” mentality. There is also the “no stake in the initial vote” for attendees to engage in the type of dialogue envisioned at the Legislative Review sessions. Final voting in January may draw more people and result in more meaningful dialogue at the Convention.

Provides more time for the membership to implement time sensitive legislation (e.g., those with budget implications, recruiting legislation); prepare coaches certification exams; incorporate changes into the NCAA Manual. An October/January cycle also could facilitate conference review of legislation during fall through January, which appears to be the most opportune timeframe to capture the membership’s attention on proposals.

Cabinet meeting schedules would be minimally impacted: June submission of proposals; September reaction; February fine tuning. However, cabinets may not have an opportunity to respond to ManCo actions taken in October prior to a final vote in January. Ideally, this would be minimized by avoiding introduction of “new” legislation at this stage.

Concerns:

- There should still be a way for the membership to “fine tune” or tweak proposals for unintended consequences between January to April, thus retaining one of the original purposes of the “two-reads, one-vote” cycle.
- Preparedness of membership to register final votes in January, or offer positions during initial review in October.

A possible format to address the above issues:

June: Submission deadline would be moved up to permit an earlier publication of IPOPL in July/early August. June cabinet meeting dates might need to be adjusted to accommodate this.

September: Cabinets provide reaction, amendments/alternatives to proposals.

October: Legislative Review Subcommittee identifies its initial reactions, pros/cons on proposals, and possible amendments or alternatives from cabinets, conferences, or for ManCo to sponsor. ManCo provides reaction to LRS, but does not take “action” to initially approve or oppose.

A concern about “real” initial voting on the merits of legislation in October is the ability for campuses to focus on legislation so early during the fall term. A legislative review vs. initial voting in October could alleviate some of that pressure. Shifting the focus to identifying issues could evolve into the type of educational summaries conferences find helpful to prepare its membership for the Convention vote. (The December LRS process would essentially occur in October).

November-December: Conferences prepare for vote in January. LRS may also refine its positions during this time to identify proposals that are ripe for final voting in January (noncontroversial, those that appear to have strong approval/opposition), and those major policy or highly controversial issues that would benefit from additional membership comment and be held for final review and action in April.

January: Possible NCAA Convention schedule:
Friday: ManCo evening session.
Sat /Sun: CCA and Conference meetings
Sat/Sun: Town hall legislative review meeting.
Sunday p.m. Management Council legislative session.
Monday a.m. Management Council legislative session
Monday p.m. NCAA Board meeting

February: Cabinets provide reaction to proposals, respond to referrals, etc., back to ManCo for April voting.

April Management Council finalizes current cycle proposals, issues clarifications, etc. Board takes final action.

May-June: Conference meetings to develop new proposals.

C. Clarify amendments vs. alternatives. Requested further clarification regarding whether the period between August 15 through 5 p.m. of the last day of the October Management Council meeting is an “alternative proposal” vs. “first amendment” period.

4. Comments on current NCAA Convention schedule/program

A. Saturday - Division I Legislative Review.

- 1) Preparing for the session. The order of review of proposals previously emailed to the CCACA differed from the actual meeting itself and most found it difficult to follow.
- 2) Providing an agenda would be helpful.
- 3) Lack of meaningful dialogue/substantive debate of proposals. Attendance primarily conference staff, compliance coordinators, and Management Council representatives rather than “membership” per se. Related to “no vote/no voice/no stake in the initial vote” issues above. Some ManCo reps did not feel the sessions added to their review of issues during the Management Council meeting on Sunday.

B. Monday – Division I Issues. For the most part did not find the session of significant benefit to stay over until Monday.

Excerpt from the January 2005 MC/BOD Joint Report

- a. *Administrative Review Subcommittee (ARS). [Reference MC Supplement No. 11.]*

MC ACTIONS:

(1) *Received a report and referred the following recommendations back to ARS to determine if a less bureaucratic alternative (e.g., policy changes) can be developed to address and accommodate the proposed recommendations. (Unanimous Voice Vote.)*

- **Conference Administered Waivers.** *A legislative amendment to NCAA Bylaw 5.4.1.4 (administrative review subcommittee of the management council) to specify that an institution's conference office may provide relief from specific legislation that has been previously approved by the Management Council, or a committee designated by the Management Council, without submitting a formal waiver request to the national office. If the Management Council is not supportive of this proposal as noncontroversial, the subcommittee requests that it be considered as part of the 2005-06 legislative cycle.*
- **Official Visits (Bylaw 13.7.6.1).** *A legislative amendment to Bylaw 13.7.6.1 (general restrictions) to permit institutions to provide reasonable transportation and the allotted complimentary tickets for home contests that have been relocated due to the home facility's inoperable conditions (e.g., construction or facility repairs), which result in the facility being unavailable for safe use.*
- **Seating of Immediate Family Members with Life Threatening Injury/Illness.** *A legislative amendment to permit institutions to provide reasonable seating accommodations for the parents and immediate family members of enrolled student-athletes who have medically documented life threatening injuries or illnesses.*

Timing of Signing Institutional or Conference Letters of Intent or Financial Aid Agreements. (I/II)

Date Issued: Dec 15, 2004**Type:** Staff Interpretation**Item Ref:** 1**Interpretation:**

The membership services staff determined that a prospect who will enroll at any time during a particular academic year, including midyear, may sign an institutional or conference letter of intent or financial aid agreement at any time after the applicable NLI signing periods for that academic year have expired. For example, for a prospective student-athlete in a sport other than football or basketball who will enroll in January 2006, the NLI signing periods applicable to the 2005-06 academic year will have expired as of August 2, 2005. Therefore, because the NLI periods applicable to his or her academic year of enrollment will have expired, it continues to be permissible for such a prospect to sign an institutional or conference letter of intent or financial aid agreement at any time up to and including enrollment in January 2006. The staff noted that a 4-4 transfer prospective student-athlete may sign an institutional or conference letter of intent or financial aid agreement at any time because such a prospect is not eligible to sign a NLI. [Reference(s): Divisions I and II Bylaws 13.10 (letter-of-intent programs, financial aid agreements) 13.10.1 (general restrictions); a 2/21/96 staff interpretation, item a; and a 11/1/91 staff interpretation, item a, which has been archived]