

CCA Compliance Administrators
Teleconference
January 16, 2002

Those participating: Tracy Shoemake, America East; Jill Deese, Shane Lyons, Atlantic Coast; Steve Sturek, Atlantic Sun; Jerome Rodgers, Lindsey Van Houten, Stan Wilcox, Big East; Ellen Ferris, Big Sky; Amy Haworth, Big South; Jennifer Heppel, Carol Iwaoka, Karen Toole, Big Ten; Lori Ebihara, Big Twelve; Erica Satterfield, Big West; Noreen Morris, Conference USA; Stephanie Jarvis, Horizon; Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Ivy; Chad Hawley, Mid-Continent; Amy Huchthausen, Missouri Valley; Corrinne Wright, Northeast; Lee Moses, Ohio Valley; Ron Barker, Mike Matthews, Pacific-10; Beth DeBauche, Southeastern; Gil Grimes, Southern; Beth Chapman, Southland; Helen Grant, Sun Belt; Pat Hairston, Western Athletic.

1. Tennis – Anonymous Letters. Julie Roe and Bill Saum joined the call to give an update on the anonymous letters received by various conferences relating to the amateurism status of tennis student-athletes who may have received benefits for participation in USTA and WTA events. Bill Saum stated that the letters contained three concerns, the first of which is that certain student-athletes received money while participating as amateurs in these events. Saum explained that in 1998, the NCAA staff interacted with the USTA, and it was explained that student-athletes could receive actual and necessary expenses but could not receive money based on placed finish. The system that was implemented requires participants to fill out a form and check either an amateur or professional box. If the amateur box is checked, then the funds “earned” by a participant are not given directly to an individual, but are placed in an amateur pool from which expenses are paid. Expenses are received based on a formula that calculates expenses on a daily basis in which funds are received based on the days in which an athlete participated. Saum also stated that the amounts on the websites from which the information in the letters was generated lists the amount of money that could have been won (or that was placed into the amateur pool), but it has yet to be determined if the student-athletes listed received impermissible expenses or money based on place finish. However, it is more difficult to determine the vulnerability of student-athletes who participated in international tournaments, because they do not use the same system, and each tournament is different. Each international tournament participant must be taken on a case by case basis. It is important to determine which international tournament a student-athlete participated in and what expenses were received.

The second concern listed in the letter was that some conferences and schools were paying expense money for student-athletes to participate in these tournaments. It was agreed that this was a clear violation.

The third concern in the letter was that institutions should be looking at all ATP tournament levels in determining whether money has been received based on place finish. It was suggested that only the challenger level is being scrutinized.

Bill Saum stated that the NCAA staff will send out a memorandum listing the steps that institutions should take in determining the eligibility of student-athletes involved in these tournaments. At a minimum it was suggested that institutions should interview student-athletes involved to determine which tournaments they participated in, where the individual placed in the tournament, whether the amateur box was checked, and how much money the athlete received.

Julie Roe gave a summary of the reinstatement consequences for student-athletes. She said that as a result of a reinstatement directive that different consequences result for student-athletes that received money based on place finish prior to January 1, 1998, and those who received money after that date. Prior to January 1, 1998, student-athletes who received money based on place finish that was less than the expenses incurred did not have to repay the money received, but had a 10% withholding penalty. After January 1, 1998, the money must be repayed regardless, but there is no withholding penalty.

Bill Saum issued a final warning concerning the sport of swimming. The NCAA staff is currently working with FINA, and it is believed that there are current student-athletes who have received prize money based on place finish from this organization. The staff is trying to make a determination as to which student-athletes have received impermissible benefits. FINA sponsors competitions in the Americas, Asia, and Europe, and information can be obtained at FINA.org.

2. November 27, 2001 NCAA/CCACA meeting follow up. Lynn Holzman and Delise O’Meally joined the conference call to discuss some membership services initiatives resulting from the NCAA/CCACA meeting in November. Lynn communicated that the membership services staff will engage in a training session this month, which will detail “what it means to be a conference contact.” The training will emphasize communicating when the staff member is out of the office, the acknowledgement of receipt of email and telephone calls within 24 hours, and the publicizing of the institutional phone line (6003). Another initiative the staff will undertake is assisting conferences with the identification of “hot topics” and major issues that are in the forefront of discussions on the national level.

Lynn gave the group a description of the new conference contact back-up system, which will be in place by February. The new system will be a telephone based system, in which the interpretations leadership team will have a staff member on call for the purpose of assisting conferences, whose contact is not available. Conference compliance administrators should call the 6003 number and identify themselves to the operator and say that their membership services contact is unavailable. At that point, the operator will route the call to the ILT staff member who is on call. It was asked that conferences provide feedback on how this system is working, once it is initiated. Additionally, Lynn stated that conferences should notify their contacts or the ILT member on call when an issue is an emergency, so that appropriate action can be

CCACA Minutes
January 16, 2002
Page 3 – Item 2

taken in a timely manner. Finally, it was stated that CCACA members should notify Kevin Lennon, Lynn Holzman, or Delise O’Meally when any customer service issue arises.

3. Coaches Certification Tests. Lynn Holzman stated that the membership services staff has received feedback that the coaches’ certification test should include new legislation that will be included for the first time in the new manual. However, that would mean that conference offices would not receive the test until the end of April (after the Board of Directors meeting). The CCACA group agreed to get feedback from their institutions, and this issue will be discussed at the February meeting.
4. NCAA/CCACA February Meeting. Some issues were discussed regarding the upcoming February meeting in Indianapolis. Bond, Schoeneck, & King will have a presentation of its compliance software before the ten o’clock CCACA meeting. The time and room number will be forwarded via email.
The president of the National Association of Athletics Compliance Coordinators made a request to attend the NCAA/CCACA meeting in order to track relevant issues in the area of compliance. The CCACA did not favor granting the request because there are members of NAACC who are also members of the CCACA, and are therefore able to communicate the information received not only to NAACC, but also to institutions whose compliance directors constitute the membership of NAACC. There was also a concern that granting such a request would open attendance to any outside organization, which would change the cooperative nature of the meeting. However, the CCACA agreed that it would be willing to revisit this issue at a time when the CCACA does not have members on the governing board of NAACC.
5. Proposal 2001-107. Mike Matthews expressed a concern raised by the Pacific-10 conference that this legislation could be subject to abuse by boosters. A number of CCACA members stated that their conference members did not have a problem with institutional staff members entertaining student-athletes at restaurants, but agreed that allowing boosters this type of access could be problematic. The group was encouraged to forward these concerns to Amy Folan at membership services. It was also suggested that an amendment could be proposed to eliminate boosters from this legislation. Those who supported such an amendment were encouraged to ask their conference championships/competition cabinet members to support such an amendment.

CCACA Minutes
January 16, 2002
Page 4– Item 6

6. Other Business.

- a. CCACA/NAACC seminar roundtables. Noreen Morris reported that the CCACA/NAACC roundtable discussions will again be a feature of the NCAA regional compliance seminars. CCACA members were asked to survey their membership on potential topics for the roundtables.
 - b. Bylaw 12.5.1.7. The CCACA agreed that bylaw 12.5.1.7 should not be interpreted so strictly as to only allow student-athlete names, pictures, and institutional affiliations in the staff identification section of a camp brochure.
7. Next Meeting. The next CCACA meeting will be the February 11 in person meeting at 10:00 a.m. at the Hyatt Regency Indianapolis.