

MINUTES CCACA In-Person Meeting January 29, 2007: Indianapolis, IN

Participants:

Anthony Archbald & Brandy Ingles, WAC; Stephanie Jarvis, Horizon League; Kelly Webb, West Coast; Jaynee Nadolski, Big Sky; Joanna Kreps & Kaitlyn Cerco, Patriot League; Myndee Larsen, Mid-Con; Dawn Turner, Big South; Sonja Stills & Raynoid Dedeaux, MEAC; Cory Lima, SWAC; Steve Sturek, Atlantic Sun; Shequra Dickerson & Kathleen Batterson, CAA; Christie Koester, Carol Iwaoka, Chad Hawley & Greg Walker, Big 10; Erica Satterfield, Big West; Mary Ellen Enigk & Lori Ebihara, Big 12; Shane Lyons & Eric Wood, ACC; Marianne Clancy, Gil Grimes & Greg Sankey, SEC; Jason DeAngelis, Jennifer Condaras, & Joseph D'Antonio, Big East; Barbara Church, MAAC; Rachelle Held, NEC; Erik Price, Ron Barker & Mike Matthews, Pac-10; Kathy Keene, Sun Belt; Mary Mulvenna & Patty Viverito, MVC; Carolyn Campbell-McGovern & Megan McHugo, Ivy Group; Katie Willett, America East; Lisa Danner & Carolayne Henry, Mountain West; Charolette Hunt & Rob Philippi, CUSA; Jackie Campbell & Nicole Undercuffler, Atlantic 10.

1. Approval of Minutes from January conference call:

- minutes were approved.

2. Strength & Conditioning Personnel

Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Ivy Group, noted that NCAA Staff says that such personnel must be institutional staff members, but she cannot find anything about it in the rules. She noted that a consultant must be a "countable coach," but that weight and strength coaches are an *exception* to countable coaches. She believes institutions should be able to have as many of these types of coaches as it wants. Campbell-McGovern would like to bring this issue to the LRIC, because the Committee has more authority that the Staff on issues like this.

A vote was taken—ALL in favor, none opposed, to bring this to LRIC attention.

3. NCAA Coaches Certification Review

Jackie Campbell, Atlantic 10, and Shane Lyons, ACC, are part of a subgroup [including Lindsay Babcock, Mary Mulvenna, Mary Ellen Enigk, and Chad Hawley], that reviewed the coaches' certification test, and went through all questions and evaluated the responses that had been given in the past. They solicited requests on how to improve the test, and planned on discussing their review with NCAA Staff. They found that page numbers in the outline was helpful, but specifically, it was troubling to the group that the index has been removed from the manual, as it makes it more difficult to find the correct answers when operating under time constraints. The subgroup will request the Staff reinsert the index for this year, and maintain BOTH a hard copy and an online manual in the future. Kathleen Batterson, CCA, requested that a directory of NCAA Staff also be available online.

4. Post-Season Certification

Joseph D'Antonio and Jennifer Condaras, Big East, have received many questions on whether credits must be "degree applicable," in order to certify SAs for post-season competition. They were curious as to whether others were having similar questions.

5. Game Day Simulations

Mike Matthews, Pac-10, gave a presentation regarding Bylaw 13.6.6.9 and what exactly qualifies as a "game day simulation." He explained that the rule is that prospects cannot be on the field, and cannot travel on the bus to the game site, but noted that there are

questions about whether walking to the stadium, having a pre-game meal, or being present for locker room speeches qualifies as a game-day simulation. Matthews thought that to draw the line, the activity would have to "celebritize" the PSA's visit to campus. Patty Viverito, MVC, noted that the official visit should avoid entitlements, but that gameday issues were still up for debate. Greg Sankey, SEC, noted that if we stop pre-game walks, there will then be a debate about WHEN the walk begins. He felt it would be helpful to have a common approach among the conferences. The group commented on its conference practices. For example, the Big 12 does not allow PSA to participate in walk-to-stadium and the ACC doesn't allow anything in front of the public. Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Ivy Group, questioned whether these rules would apply to all sports. Specifically, she inquired whether a cross country recruit could ride the team bus to a meet. Sankey noted that the bussing situation is more about whether there are police escorts, but thought that if a cross country PSA cannot ride the bus to help out the football problem, that is ok. *Matthews* summarized the if there is some feeling that the bus ride is celebritized, then it is probably not ok, and the conferences should use this baseline reasoning if the issue arises.

6. Pre-Game Activities Associated with Official Visits

Joseph D'Antonio, Big East, inquired with the group if there was any difference between an official visit and an unofficial visit, and the pre-game activities that occur. It was agreed that there is no difference, and that for the time being, Staff should not be involved in this issue.

7. CCACA/NCAA Advisory Committee

Carolayne Henry, MWC, noted that a group of CCACA members met with NCAA Staff to discuss the communication problems that were arising between the CCACA and Staff, and to improve the filtering of information. [Those present at this meeting also included Greg Sankey, Chad Hawley, and Anthony Archbald.] It was agreed that the advisory committee would act as a "go-between" for the CCACA and Staff regarding issues of national significance and major policy issues. It has become bothersome to many that the CCACA listserve is supposed to be relied upon, with no direct response from the Staff members. Some conferences' Staff contacts have not been readily available to give interpretations, and it would be nice if there was another way to get the answers. This committee will work to determine what is an issue of "national significance" and will use the CCACA list-serve to communicate developments on those issues. It was also expressed by the group that these are not new issues, and that someone needs to be held accountable for communicating with the CCACA. This issue will be added to the agenda for the CCACA/NCAA Forum.

Those members on the Advisory Committee will be Carolayne Henry, Mike Matthews, Jackie Campbell, Shane Lyons, and Carolyn Campbell-McGovern.

8. Former NCAA Guide to Rules Compliances Publications

Lori Ebihara, Big 12, noted that there used to publications in eligibility, financial aid, and recruiting, and that the AEC has asked that Staff do more to bring back these guides. She requested input from the group on what would be most helpful (online, during Regional Rules Seminars?). There were some conference who used these guides, and would support their return, while others never had used them before. Carol Iwaoka, Big 10, suggested that we reevaluate the publications issued by the NCAA and how they are used by conference offices and institutions. A big issue is that institutions probably don't even know they used to exist.

9. NCAA Governance & Conference Meeting Schedules

Carol Iwaoka, Big 10, and Jackie Campbell, Atlantic 10, inquired about when conferences were having their meetings, since the new governance structure may affect these schedules. It was noted that many conferences schedule their meetings around the Management Council meetings. Mike Matthews, Pac-10, said that if there was no change to the legislative deadlines, then they probably would not change their meetings, and Patty Viverito, MVC, agreed.

10. 17.1.5.2.2: Skill Instruction

Eric Wood, ACC, expressed his desire for consistency in when skill instruction is permitted throughout the year. He requested an editorial revision to make skill instruction permissible at the conclusion of each semester (rather than at the end of the academic year).

11. Sale & Distribution of Items Bearing Names/Pictures of SAs

Joseph D'Antonio, Big East, explained that he had been having issues with the sale of SA photos. It is permissible, but the legislation and interpretations out there restrict it in an unclear manner. Apparently, it is permissible for the institution to sell the photos and to use a 3rd party to assist in the sale. The problem arises when 3rd parties are profiting on a per photo basis. Mary Ellen Enigk, Big 12, believed that the rationale of paying a fee to 3rd parties is to pay the overhead and operating costs, and not to give them a chance to profit per photograph sold. [This issue was also discussed with NCAA Staff at the CCACA/NCAA Forum.]

12. LRIC Interpretive Process & NCAA Proposal Review

Carol Iwaoka, Big 10, directed the attention of the group to Attachment B, and summarized the LRIC Interpretive process, and reviewed specific proposals that have been debated. Specifically, she clarified the following:

2006-39: the "logo" used must be the registered trademark of the institution (and not sport specific)

2006-43: the intent of this legislation was to allow power-point presentations, and as such, they CAN include edited portions from a highlight video.

2006-51: institutions are NOT precluded from having camps outside of the specifications of the adopted legislation.

13. Other Business

Rachelle Held, NEC, had an assistant basketball coach, during an away game, request that the host institution add a prospect to the pass list. She noted that this is a violation, and inquired as to whether anyone else had processed such violations. Jackie Campbell, Atlantic 10, noted that if the home institution does this, it is like an unofficial visit to that institution.



MINUTES CCACA-NCAA FORUM January 29-30, 2007 ~ Indianapolis, IN

CCACA Participants:

Anthony Archbald & Brandy Ingles, WAC; Stephanie Jarvis, Horizon League; Kelly Webb, West Coast; Jaynee Nadolski, Big Sky; Joanna Kreps & Kaitlyn Cerco, Patriot League; Myndee Larsen, Mid-Con; Dawn Turner, Big South; Sonja Stills & Raynoid Dedeaux, MEAC; Cory Lima, SWAC; Steve Sturek, Atlantic Sun; Shequra Dickerson & Kathleen Batterson, CAA; Christie Koester, Carol Iwaoka, Chad Hawley & Greg Walker, Big 10; Erica Satterfield, Big West; Mary Ellen Enigk & Lori Ebihara, Big 12; Shane Lyons & Eric Wood, ACC; Marianne Clancy, Gil Grimes & Greg Sankey, SEC; Jason DeAngelis, Jennifer Condaras, & Joseph D'Antonio, Big East; Barbara Church, MAAC; Rachelle Held, NEC; Erik Price, Ron Barker & Mike Matthews, Pac-10; Kathy Keene, Sun Belt; Mary Mulvenna & Patty Viverito, MVC; Carolyn Campbell-McGovern & Megan McHugo, Ivy Group; Katie Willett, America East; Lisa Danner & Carolayne Henry, Mountain West; Charolette Hunt & Rob Philippi, CUSA; Jackie Campbell & Nicole Undercuffler, Atlantic 10; Dell Robinson, Mid-American;

MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 2007

MINUTES

OPENING REMARKS: Brad Hostetter, NCAA

- public and media relations staff meeting will be Tuesday
- noted there will be changes within Membership Services during the next year
- will also update group on development of Eligibility Center

Anthony Archbald, WAC, opened up the floor on issues from this morning's CCACA meeting:

- *Barbara Church, MAAC*, expressed her concerns regarding the conference contact program, especially from a Mid-Major Conference
- Stephanie Jarvis, Horizon League, suggested bringing back a primary and secondary conference contact
- *Hostetter*, *NCAA*, noted that NCAA staff needs to acknowledge receipt of questions within 24 hours;
 - The NCAA had experimented with a back-up system in the past, and found that it is difficult to administer and that the back-up was not more available than the primary;
 - Would rather have ILT people be on call for Division I conferences (to reach them, dial 6003 and ask for ILT person on back-up duty)
- *Jarvis*, requested that such a back-up system not go through the 6003 line because there is often a 30 minute waiting time
- *Erik Price*, *Pac-10*, is satisfied with his conference contact and is shocked that some conferences do not get the same treatment. He feels that this is a management issue and the importance of the conference contact has been under-valued by the NCAA.
- *Jarvis*, speaking from a "mid-major" conference perspective, is frustrated that her conference contact had less experience than her on-campus compliance people.
- *Hostetter*, appreciated each comment and noted that there is a great deal of support from the National Office staff members.
- Erica Satterfield, confirmed that any specific concerns be sent to Brad Hostetter.

Kevin Lennon, NCAA, later spoke in regard to the Conference Contact program. Candidly, there are more resource challenges because there are more contact responsibilities on the side of the NCAA, as well as on the conference office side. He ensured that there is a level of support at Senior Management, and good training of good people. You should expect that your contact is responsive. Brad will ask senior level interpreters to contact each conference office to discuss ways in which we can make the system better, and will bring the suggestions to the advisory committee.

AMATEURISM CERTIFICATION PROCESS

Bill Saum, NCAA, introduced the NCAA Amateurism Certification staff—Robin Hale, Jobrina Perez, Jennifer Henderson, Dan Calandro, Maritza Jones

- AMATEURISM/ELIGIBILTY CENTER: this team will stay together throughout the transition until the new team is put in place.
- Emphasized the need for "Shared Responsibility & Cooperation"--> as we work through the process in the coming months (April 7), we need to work together.
- Process: will reflect the desire to have consistency in how we determine the amateur status
- [please see the power point presentation/handout on the Amateurism Certification Process]
- Clarified that financial aid is NOT contingent upon certification

Jennifer Henderson, NCAA, walked through the registration process and handed out a sample questionnaire in a PDF file.

- April 7, 2007--> first date for final certification (so no prospect has been able to request final certification yet)
- Demonstrated to the group how the certification questionnaire works through a sample on-line registration
- Prospects CAN receive assistance with the questionnaire from parents or coaches;

Shane Lyons, ACC, asked how we can know how many times a PSA has changed his/her answers. *Henderson* responded that it is internal, but that upon enrollment, the NCAA will share the info it has with the institution.

Mary Mulvenna, MVC, does not want an institution to sign a kid and then find out later his amateurism status is jeopardized. She asked why there can't be an extra column alerting any interested institution to the student's certification status?

Henderson responded that if a PSA is under review and you want to know why, you can get to the PDF file.

Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Ivy Group, asked how we know what the conditions are and when someone is under review. Henderson noted that an answer that triggers deeper investigation would cause PSA to be placed "under review." If there are no problems with it, the PSA will be considered "preliminarily certified" until after April 7, when final certification will occur.

Shane Lyons, ACC, asked what percent of these teams have been "under review," and whether there are any trends to be aware of. *Henderson* replied that 10% have gone under review during the first few months.

Maritza Jones, NCAA, described the main questions/topics that are asked. [See handout].

- **4 areas that are NOT covered by the amateurism process and still handled by Compliance Administrators on campus include:
 - o 1) employment
 - o 2) promotional activities
 - o 3) educational expenses from an individual other than PSA's parents
 - o 4) preferential treatment based on athletics participation or reputation
- **"Gap-Time" will occur between April 7 and enrollment; (or October 1 for winter/spring enrollees).

Carol Iwaoka, Big 10, asked that if there is new information, whether it must be shared with the NCAA staff, and what meets the standard of "new" information? If so, then the NCAA can review the case again, and if the PSA is on the IRL, s/he will be notified.

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE PROGRAM

APPT team includes *Carol Reep*, and *Katie Eurek*, *NCAA*. [*Please see powerpoint/handout for details on presentation*].

Joseph D'Antonio, Big East, inquired as to whether academic support service is still required, and Reap confirmed that it is. D'Antonio also expressed concerns that 1) the on-campus compliance people are overwhelmed with the amount of complexity required to process this (and thereby, we are eliminating good people from the profession); and 2) if a team is penalized four hours of practice time and is required to change that into academic studies, how does that improve APR?

- *Erik Price, Pac-10*, responded that he believes that the number of compliance people will *increase* due to the growth of the profession. He also asked what is the current anticipation about potential lawsuits because of the disparate impact of these penalties?
 - Kevin Lennon, NCAA, noted that there is a set formula to view comparison between athletic department academic performance versus that of the student body as a whole. This is to address why the APR is the way it is, and the analysis will also implement a waiver process which acknowledges this.

Rachelle Held, NEC, asked whether conference offices are made aware if a member institution files a waiver.

Mary Mulvenna, MVC, requested clarification on what qualifies as "other," and whether it includes financial hardship, harassment, etc.

Greg Sankey, SEC, also requested clarification on a few issues. Eurek, NCAA, confirmed that once the NCAA has reviewed all of information and created a report, and if through that process, errors are found, then the committee will take it under consideration, but the institution will not be subject to an audit the next year. It was also confirmed that the media should not be given a number other than the final number, and any other APR in between is just a work in progress. Eurek noted that if there were a significant number of errors during one year, it would not be the intent that the institution be subject to another audit. She noted that with a certain GSR, the APR can be predicted for certain squads, but that there is no intent that the same institution is always a part of the process.

Lori Ebihara, Big 12, asked for more information regarding audits and whether there is a certain time of year that they are likely to occur. Eurek noted that the schools which would be subject to the data review will be notified early enough to avoid the "busy" period, but that the process is what it is, and there is a commitment to the release of the information in the spring.

GOVERNANCE & NCAA PRESIDENTIAL TASK FORCE

Beth DeBauche, NCAA, summarized what happened at the Management Council and Board of Directors Meetings:

- o new voting process worked fairly well
- o 37/97 proposals heading to ManCo and possibly the Board for consideration
- o last year, there was a great deal of change from January through April; this encouraged us to make use of comment period;
- o Board of Directors: adopted 37/40 proposals;
- o There is a need for a new Vice Chair of the ManCo
- A Male Practice Players Survey has been sent out to Division I Membership; the deadline is February 16, 2007; only one person from each campus should respond.
- <u>Governance Subcommittee</u>: how can this structure ensure that Board of Directors gets the info it needs?
 - Board is over-managing and under-leading, which creates vicious cycle
 - The ultimate recommendation is to make sure Board has an appropriate leadership role and that they will be able to delegate to the Division I Membership;
 - So, ultimately, we want people who serve in governance to have a voice.
 - o <u>RECOMMENDATION</u>: Leave the Board in similar configuration as it is now—but develop 2 bodies: [*Please see handout/powerpoint*].
 - 1) Legislative Council--> has more of a conference-perspective focus
 - meeting schedule like ManCo—follows legislative process;
 - assume some of responsibilities of LRS, and LRIC:
 - 2) <u>Leadership Council</u>--> has more of a <u>national</u> focus
 - 3 meetings/year, contingent on issues discussed by Board;
 - Both would have 31 members, with weighted voting
 - Have 6 cabinets
 - Official Notice deadline changed to Dec. 1

Carol Iwaoka, Big 10, inquired as to when a conference would have to submit any modification to proposals?

- *DeBauche, NCAA*, responded that the amendment period is in the fall, and then there is another short period thereafter where conference (if received feedback from Legislative Council) could tweak legislation;

David Berst, NCAA

- ought to encourage Board of Directros to delegate some of its responsibility to the Legislative Council (ex: proposals with no budgetary impact) for final action
- BoD will the act on any agenda item it receives, but it has relied too heavily on conferences' staked out positions
- This is a better way to provide info to BoD and it is more meaningful to those involved in governance.

Iwaoka asked whether the two councils would ever meet at the same time? And whether the Bod would meet in Nov. and Jan? The Board will meet as it now does.

Patty Viverito, *MVC*, noted that it was discussed NOT to have Leadership Council meet at the same time as Legislative.

Dawn Turner, Big South, asked where the SAAC falls in this new system and DeBauche confirmed that their role will stay the same, and that overall, it will be more satisfying to those who serve on these cabinets and councils.

Iwaoka, wondered that to the extent there are issues out of leadership council, will there be double dealing on these major policy issues? Feels there are concerns regarding breach of protocol.

- *DeBauche* feels that the Legislative Council will have clearly defined roles. The Leadership Council will not have as strictly a defined role.

PENDING LEGISLATION & LEGISLATIVE UPDATES FROM NCAA CONVENTION

Leeland Zeller, NCAA

- [please see handout/powerpoint presentation]
- ADOPTED PROPOSALS:
 - 0 2006-18
 - 0 2006-31
 - 0 2006-39
 - Can't preprint any other info, but can handwrite it!
 - Sport-specific logos OK, as long as there is only one.
 - 0 2006-43
 - would be ok to have music on highlight portion of video
 - 0 2006-44
 - 0 2006-48
 - 0 2006-51
 - 0 2006-52
 - 0 2006-53
 - 0 2006-56
 - 0 2006-77
 - 0 2006-79
 - o 2006-88 (2006-121 re: women's soccer *may* be viewed as non-controversial legislation)
 - 0 2006-106
 - 0 2006-124
- PENDING PROPOSALS
 - o 2006-17A
 - o 2006-17B
 - 0 2006-22
 - 0 2006-38
 - 0 2006-40
 - 2006-402006-45
 - o 2006-46A
 - *Iwaoka-->* wanted to flush out any misinterpretations
 - Sankey--> seems like there is at least an opportunity to get PSAs into the clearinghouse; one step closer to combating the delays;
 - 0 2006-58

- 0 2006-60
- o 2006-63A
- o 2006-63B
- o 2006-65A
- o 2006-65B
- 0 2006-71
- 0 2006-75
- 2006-812006-82
- 0 2006-89

SECONDARY VIOLATION REPORTING PROCESS

Chris Strobel, NCAA

- [please see handout]
- online reporting system: getting ready to START developing this!
- Noted that some Level II violations require restitution, but not all restitution violations are Level II—he encouraged the group to check the chart!

TUESDAY, JANUARY 30, 2007

STUDENT-ATHLETE REINSTATEMENT

Jennifer Strawley, NCAA; Carol Iwaoka, Big Ten [Chair of Reinstatement Committee], Liz Perry, NCAA, Danielle Teetzel, NCAA

Jennifer Strawley, NCAA

- General Reinstatement Philosophy
 - o Look for mitigation to decrease the penalties and give some relief
 - **Who** is responsible for the violation? This has become the main question asked:
 - President/Chancellor Letters: when provide relief due to institutional error
 - SA: willful act or negligence
 - o Could violation have been avoided?
 - o Totality of the facts
- When NOT giving relief:
 - o Academic fraud
 - Amateurism
- Policies:
 - Put in language that it takes approximately one month to get an extension, so your institutions don't wait until the last minute to request reinstatement.
- Tennis & Amateurism example:
 - Enrolled SA competes in summer and fillsout amateurism reimbursement form
 - Problem is that money is based on place-finish
 - SA acting permissibly; all were provided relief if completed the form
- Assistance can be provided by Conference Offices

Carol Iwaoka, Big Ten

- Requested that CCACA give feedback on the process and the paper-trail involved in a reinstatement case;
 - o Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Ivy Group, noted that every situation is different (medical hardships, appeals), and that it would help if institution knew what amount of documentation would help their case.
 - Joseph D'Antonio, Big East, noted that eliminating paperwork is advantageous, but that we don't want to jeopardize case by trying to minimize it.
 - o *Carolayne Henry, MWC*, noted that creating a checklist of documents necessary would be helpful.

Iwaoka, Big Ten, opened discussion regarding Medical Hardship Waivers:

- Two Issues:
 - o 1) Changing line to 30% of competition (from 20%)
 - *Iwaoka* would appreciate feedback on the proposal
 - Misdiagnosis and failure to diagnose: would take longer with the 30%
 - Jarvis, Horizon League, noted that they have had problems when the doctor is retired or has passed away since treating SA;
 - Lyons, ACC, noted that it is his conference's philosophy NOT to prevent its members from forwarding a 50% [of competition] hardship waiver to the NCAA because they do not want to get into an adversarial role with the institutions;
 - o 2) How hardships play into extension of 5-yr clock:
 - D'Antonio, Big East, noted that to eliminate a time constraint on the staff is a good thing, BUT we also need to ensure integrity on conference level;
 - *Henry, MWC*, disagreed. She doesn't feel that medical hardship waivers should be applied the same way across the board;
 - Mary Ellen Enigk, Big 12, asked that if a conference has already approved it, does NCAA even look at the documentation?
 - Strawley, NCAA, noted that only time is when the waiver is granted and no competition occurred; technically, that is an extension and a hardship waiver should not have been filed in the first place.
- Straw Poll on whether conferences grant extensions for 6th year if grant hardship waivers:
 - ENDORSE [CONFERENCES GRANTING EXTENSTIONS]
 - 11
 - OPPOSE
 - 14

ELIGIBILITY CENTER

Kevin Lennon, Diane Dickman, Todd Leyden, NCAA

- Center itself can be seamless: ALL of initial eligibility functions can be streamlined
- cost savings back to institutions
- improve messaging back to SAs regarding their initial interface with the NCAA

- Eligibility Center: some of those jobs are provided by Membership Services Staff, transitioning into the LLC, and many are done by ACT; also new positions will be created.

Todd Leyden, new President of NCAA Eligibility Center

- wants to respond in a helpful way to this group and SAs
- Progress:
 - o process of putting together a leadership team
 - o planned November transition
 - o will NOT be ACT reconstituted within NCAA
 - o will be contacting this group within the next 90 days

HIGH SCHOOL REVIEW

Jennifer Strawley, NCAA

[Please see Handout for total update].

- HS can enter review process in 1 of 3 ways:
 - o 1) If HS using it for first time
 - o 2) Periodic review of high schools (random sampling)
 - o 3) HS where there has been some level of irregularity reported to clearinghouse/NCAA staff
 - ex: large increase in GPA; repeated courses; transfer during 4th year;
- Process of Review: **Is HS accredited?
 - How do they play their sports? (ex: within HS federation)
 - o 1) curriculum & instruction
 - o 2) methods of assessment
 - o 3) core course quantity, length of instruction, concurrent instruction
 - o 4) quality control & integrity (mission statement)
 - o 5) instructors
 - o 6) enrollment
 - Once info gathered—either will clear or NOT clear a school (could be cleared with conditions)
 - HS review group serves as appellate body (made up of secondary school community and NCAA)

Carol Reep, NCAA

- have developed outreach possibilities/partnerships to strengthen NCAA ability to review High Schools:
 - o 1) NAIS—review independent and non-traditional schools
 - o 2) State Departments of Education
 - o 3) Curriculum providers/entities
 - o 4) ACRO
 - o 5) curriculum experts
- Website:
 - Ncaa.org -> media & press room--> current issues--> non-traditional list of HS
- Sankey, SEC, asked where correspondence providers fit into discussion?
 - o *Reep* responded that curriculum experts have been reviewing this type of distance learning;
 - o *Sankey* inquired about whether there has been any discussion about improprieties in these correspondence courses?

o *Strawley* noted that the NCAA is tracking this, but it is still at the beginning stages; will implement throughout all levels at NCAA.

PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETE REVIEW PROCESS

Lori Williams, NCAA

[Please review 3 handouts distributed during session].

Lisa Mills. NCAA

[Please see case study handout]

AGENTS, GAMBLING, & AMATEURISM

Deena Garner, Sandy Parrot, NCAA

[Please see handout/powerpoint presentation distributed during meeting].

- Basketball certification process review
- New website= <u>www.dontbetonit.org</u>
- Sports Wagering Newsletter
- Sports Wagering Toolkit
- Encouraged the group to contact the AGA office if you want a presentation by the AGA during one of the Regional Rules Seminar.

MEDIA RELATIONS AND INFORMATION SHARING

Brad Hostetter & Eric Christensen, NCAA

- *Eric Christensen, NCAA*, explained the recent high profile Clemson situation where misstatements had become public and how the NCAA, ACC and University issued joint statements clarifying the record, given that it was such a unique situation.
 - NCAA has started "For The Record" feature on its website, where the National Office is being more proactive about erroneous media reports and correcting them through its website.
- *Brad Hostetter*, *NCAA*, added that in order to improve the reputation of intercollegiate athletics as a whole, he thought it was important for this group to know what the media relations side of the NCAA is up to.
- Any Comments/thoughts?
 - D'Antonio, Big East, noted that he has had situations where the SIDs are being contacted by Eric and his staff, and he wondered whether this type of call could be joint between SIDs and Compliance to make sure everyone is on the same page. He felt that this has been a positive thing.
 - Christensen--> appreciated the input and said that if a particular situation arises, they do try to let the institution and conference office know ahead of time.
 - O Lyons, ACC, noted that the Clemson situation was a great collaborative effort. Also recognized that some local SC newspapers speculated that there was an extra benefit situation with this SA being the guardian of his younger brother. These later misstatements spread like wild-fire throughout the media, but with the communication between the NCAA and ACC, it was taken care of in a timely manner and the erroneous stories were corrected.

- o *Sankey, SEC,* inquired about the freedom of information requests and whether any internal conversations have been occurring.
 - *Christensen* responded that they get these requests quite often from the membership. The general advice given is to check with own general counsel to see what the law is in your state.
 - Sankey clarified that the SEC has institutions which were told by their own state attorney general's office to release the information.
 - Hostetter noted that he told an institution it did not need to submit a
 violation if they released information about the recruitment of a
 prospect if they followed their own state law.
 - *Sankey* noted that it is a new approach going on in the SEC where they are receiving requests about recruiting correspondence.
 - *Christensen* agreed that this is a growing trend, and requested that the conference offices try to keep the NCAA apprised of any of these situations.

ATHLETIC CERTIFICATION

Julie Cromer & Amy Huchthausen, NCAA [Please see handout included in packet].

Amy Huchthausen, NCAA

- Summarized the background of the program
 - Just finishing the 2nd Cycle
 - 10 Groups of Schools (on 9 right now)
 - Timeline—everyone in same class goes through together (orientation video conferences)
 - Self-Study Report: all online
 - Measurable Standards Documents is of importance to this group--(enclosed on Page 3 of handout)
- 3rd Cycle Issues:
 - o Class 1—Fall, 2008
 - Committee has been preparing for this cycle—revising operating principles, self-study instrument, measurable standards documents, and changes to the general philosophy;
 - Greg Sankey and Gloria Nevarez are on this committee;
 - o Institutions go through this once every 10 years.
 - Next meeting is scheduled for February, 2007, to revise measurable standards; hopefully this will be finalized by April, 2007
 - Will then release schedule this spring, and will try to accommodate conferences by ensuring that no more than two institutions in the same conference are going through the certification at the same time.
 - O Committee itself has been broken up into 4 subgroups (Jackie Campbell, Lori Ebihara, Rob Phillippi, Shane Lyons)
 - Lori Ebihara, Big 12 thanked the group for participating in the survey regarding compliance reviews. She explained how they evaluated the results and looked at potential trends among this group. She noted that everyone is using the NCAA resources on some level. She also invited a veteran and a newer member of the group to get involved to share the work and acquire some ownership in this process.

- Lyons, ACC, said that one main goal among the group is to establish uniformity and consistency as much as possible when updating the standards, while keeping in mind how different institutions are from each other.
- Conference offices are not appropriate entities to review academic support services and that an external entity must include at least some on-campus personnel.
 Conferences were advised to expect some guidance from the NCAA in the coming months
- It was agreed that some consistent guidelines need to be issued, also noting how this type of review compares with a compliance review.
- It IS a requirement that the person involved in the certification cannot have any responsibilities within the athletic department.
- Conference offices can be more involved in this process by:
 - o Reviewing self-study reports coming from institutions
 - O Getting out in field and serving as pure observers (she encouraged the group to submit applications)

INTERPRETIVE ISSUES

Bo Kerin, NCAA

- Invited an open forum regarding some hot topics:
 - o 1) sale of SA photos
 - whenever a SA is used for promotional activity, must meet 12.5.1.1
 - in particular, (e)—that all money derived from project go directly to member, conference, or non-profit organization;
 - can contract out with a 3rd party, for a fee, to sell (like renting a booth)
 - can 3rd party earn fee based on percent of sales?
 - ILT agreed that legislation PRECLUDES this arrangement.
 - *Enigk, Big 12,* requested clarification on "Percentage of Sales" and whether a "flat rate" is permissible. If it is solely operational costs, what is the distinction?
 - *Kerin-->* group will continue to discuss these issues, with regard to a "flat rate fee" and will issue a clarification to this interpretation.
 - 2) recent educational column on limits on #s/duties and participation of noncoaching staff members in practice
 - This ED Column has NOTHING to do with male practice players

Brad Hostetter, NCAA noted that a blanket waiver for water polo has been granted in all 3 divisions and will be posted on LSDBi; he emphasized that he still wants to limit the missed class time.

ADJOURNMENT: 11:50 a.m.

Next CCACA Conference Call has been scheduled for WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 2007, AT 12P.M. EASTERN TIME.