



CCACA Conference call minutes

Wed., January 8, 2003
9:05–10:05 a.m. PT

Participants: Tracy Shoemake, America East (co-chair); Amy Huchthausen, ACC; Steve Sturek, Sherri Booker, Atlantic Sun; Liz Kane, Kelly Gust, Atlantic 10; Stan Wilcox, Big East; Dawn Turner, Big South; Carol Iwaoka, Chad Hawley, Big Ten; Lori Ebihara, Big 12; Erica Satterfield, Big West; Noreen Morris, Myra Fishback, C-USA; Stephanie Jarvis, Horizon; Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Nathan Fry, Ivy; Barbara Church, Tim Wuorinen, MAAC; Angie Torain, Mid-Continent; Sonja Stills, MEAC; Patty Viverito, Sarah Weier, Missouri Valley; Corinne Wright, Northeast; Mike Matthews (co-chair), Erik Price, Pac-10; Dan Trump, Shonna Brown, Patriot; Greg Sankey, SEC; Beth Chapman, Southland; Helen Grant, Sun Belt; Gloria Nevarez, WCC; Alice, Wonderland.

1. Approval of minutes of November 18, 2002, meeting

The minutes were approved without dissent.

2. On ManCo's plate

NCAA Division I Assistant Chief of Staff Beth DeBauche reviewed items on the Management Council's January meeting agenda, including:

- Expected action on Proposals 2002-103 and 2002-104.
- Presentations on financial aid deregulation proposals, the proposed football out-of-season conditioning model, and recommendations from the playing and practice seasons subcommittee regarding student-athlete time demands.
- Discussions about incentives/disincentives related to student-athlete academic performance.
- A step forward with the Student-Athlete Opportunity Fund.
- Recommendations regarding insurance for student-athletes.

3. News about student-athlete reinstatement

It was agreed to postpone discussion of this topic until the next call.

4. The CCACA as interpreter

Iwaoka proposed the CCACA serve as the body which could preliminarily review requests for interps of legislative proposals and forward those requests to LRIS. Matthews believed that the number of requests of LRIS to interpret proposals had declined in recent years as the membership's disconnection to the legislative process had increased. Wilcox suggested that if there was a return to printing official notices of proposed legislation, the notice could include these interpretations. Campbell-McGovern expressed a desire that the NCAA staff circulate to the CCACA interps it provides to the membership about legislative proposals. Shoemake agreed to ask the NCAA staff about the volume of interpretative requests that both the staff and LRIS were receiving about proposals

and suggest that such staff interps be circulated to the CCACA.

5. NAACC/CCACA Roundtable Topics for 2003 NCAA Regional Seminar sessions

Wright, Jarvis, and Torain agreed to work with Morris to develop topics for the roundtable sessions to be held at the 2003 NCAA Compliance Seminar. Morris identified the implementation of the academic reform proposals as one topic and welcomed the group to forward other to her.

6. Future conference calls

The next conference call is February 5. The time is 9 Pacific/10 Mountain/11 Central, 12 Eastern. Future calls will be held March 5, April 2, and May 14.

7. NLI and deferred admission

Matthews discussed a recent National Letter of Intent entanglement that two institutions in the Pac-10 were experiencing. At issue was deferring enrollment: must it be in writing, with whom can the suggestion originate, and when must the decision be made? Matthews said he would circulate the response from the NLI team.

[And, as an FYI, here is the email we sent to all of our institutions:

Here's an scenario we've been through recently, along with an interp from the NLI folks, that we think merits sharing.

A football prospect signs a NLI for the 2002-03 academic year with Institution X in February 2002.

After discussion with the coaches of Institution X, he does not enroll in F02 as scheduled, and plans to enroll in Sp03 (a tactic otherwise known as "grayshirting.") Before the Sp03 term, however, he changes his mind and wants to enroll at Institution Y (another NLI member institution) during the 2002-03 academic year.

The prospect has a written offer of admission to Institution X for F02 and has nothing in writing from Institution X to defer his admission.

Here's NLI Rule 7-a-(2), taken from the NLI issued by an institution and signed by a prospect:

If I am eligible for admission, but the institution named in this document defers admission to a subsequent term, this NLI shall be rendered null and void. However, if I defer my admission, the NLI remains binding.

So how does NLI Rule 7-a-(2) work here? Who has deferred admission, the prospect or the institution? Does the decision to defer enrollment have to originate and rest entirely with the PSA? Does it matter when any discussion or decision about deferring enrollment occurs (i.e., before or after the prospect signs the NLI)? And what constitutes "deferring admission" from an institution's point of

view?

Eugene Byrd, the administrator of the NLI program, told me that this scenario was presented to the NLI Steering Committee this past weekend. In addition, Eugene told me that he had located a past interp about deferring enrollment: Deferral of enrollment must be a formal act, not merely a suggestion from an institution that a prospect enroll at a later time, and that formal act is determined by the institution. Eugene assumes (logically) that this formal act by the institution would be in writing. In addition, this rule and interp apply regardless of which side (the prospect or the institution) raises the issue of deferring enrollment. Nor does it matter when discussion about grayshirting occurs.

So the bottom line is that if the prospect in our example above doesn't enroll as planned, the NLI with Institution X remains valid, unless there is written notice from Institution X that the prospect's admission was deferred.

Two other notes:

- The prospect in this scenario has two options to reduce the NLI penalties that will ensue if he enrolls fulltime at Institution Y: (1) Get a Qualified Release Agreement from Institution X and/or appeal for full relief due to extenuating circumstances from the NLI Steering Committee or (2) Do not enroll fulltime during the 2002-03 academic year and ask Institution X for financial aid in F03; if it has none available, the NLI becomes null and void.
- As you know, the NLI program operates independently of NCAA rules and very few NCAA rules apply to the NLI program. NLI Rule 9 specifies that once a prospect signs a NLI with an institution, all other NLI-member institutions shall cease recruiting that prospect. While a violation of an NCAA rule would not result from recruiting a prospect who has signed a NLI with another institution, institutions which do not abide by this rule (or any other NLI rule) could face disciplinary action from the NLI Steering Committee.]