



MINUTES
CCACA CONFERENCE CALL
Wednesday, January 6, 2010 ~ 12:00p.m. ET

Participants:

Lindsey Babcock, ACC; Steve Sturek, Atlantic Sun; Joseph D'Antonio, Jennifer Condaras, Kenny Schank, BIG EAST; Ed Pasque, Jill Redman, Atlantic 10; Jaynee Nadolski, Big Sky; Carol Iwaoka, Kerry Kenny, Big Ten; Keri Boyce, Big 12; Erica Montebaro, Big West; Marissa Biggins, Colonial; Rob Philippi, Callie Hubbell, Conference USA; Mike Sharpe, Great West; Stephanie Jarvis, Christine Halstead, Horizon; Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Megan McHugo, Ivy League; Joe McCleese, MAAC; Jackie Mynarski, Corrine Patterson, MAC; Patty Viverito, Mary Mulvenna, Missouri Valley; Gary Walenga, Mountain West; Joyce Bell, Northeast; Mike Matthews, Erik Price, Pac-10; Doug King, Southern; Stephanie McDonald, Southland; Greg Walter, Summit; Sarah Wilhelmi, West Coast; Anthony Archibald, WAC.

1. INAAC.

D'Antonio provided the group with today's INAAC.

2. Review of Agenda

No additions or changes to the agenda.

3. Approval of the December 2, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Minutes were unanimously approved.

4. 2009-10 Division I Legislative Cycle

D'Antonio stated that he had a few clarifications from the previous conference call regarding questions associated with the upcoming Legislative Council meeting. Specifically, D'Antonio indicated that he has received clarification from the AMA staff regarding the questions on changing proposals, effective dates, etc. Pursuant to Constitution Article 5.3.2.2.1.1, the Legislative Council may amend a proposal by the three-fourths majority vote (75%) of the Legislative Council members present and voting. Therefore, ANY change or modification to a proposal at the January Legislative Council meeting (including changing a proposal's effective date) would require a three-fourths majority vote (75%).

D'Antonio also informed the group that a member of the Legislative Council may request to split a proposal to allow for a separate vote on sections of a proposal. All that is needed for a split to occur is a motion and a second.

D'Antonio and Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Ivy, also clarified for the group that FCS conferences will always take a separate vote when applicable for football proposals.

D'Antonio informed the group that the information regarding voting on the consent packages should be sent out by the NCAA by the end of the

week. He noted that any legislation that includes alternative proposals will not be included in the consent packages. Finally, D'Antonio noted that alternative proposals will be reviewed together.

There was a general discussion on a few of the current and override proposals. It was also noted that the FAQ document surrounding the Basketball Focus Group (BFG) proposals and the November 4, 2009 interpretation should be available prior to the Convention.

5. 2010 CCACA In-Person Meeting

D'Antonio indicated that the preparations for the upcoming meeting are going well. The numbers for the meeting look good and an email will be going out later in the day that includes the RSVP list. D'Antonio requested that each person review the spreadsheet to make sure his/her information is correct. Please forward any corrections to D'Antonio. D'Antonio also requested that each person bring the \$40 charge for the dinner to the meeting. Cash and checks (made payable to the BIG EAST Conference) will be accepted. D'Antonio indicated that an official invoice for the dinner charge could be created if necessary.

6. Other Business

A request was made to ask the NCAA to repost the regional rules seminar power point presentations. D'Antonio indicated that he has had discussions with Lynn Holzman , NCAA, and was told that the NCAA has concerns that some of the power point presentations could contain outdated information. D'Antonio stated that he would reach out to Holzman again and request the information be reposted to include the answer versions.

7. CCACA Conference Call Trivia

D'Antonio reviewed the rules and regulations of "conference call trivia" and asked the question of the day.

8. Adjournment.



MINUTES
CCACA IN-PERSON MEETING
Thursday-Friday, January 28-29, 2010

Participants:

Brian Barrio, America East; Lindsey Babcock, ACC; Ed Pasque, Jill Redmond, Atlantic 10; Joseph D'Antonio, Jennifer Condaras, Kenny Schank, BIG EAST; Carol Iwaoka, Chad Hawley, Kerry Kenny, Big Ten; Lori Ebihara, Keri Boyce, Big 12; Erica Monteabaro, Big West; Kathleen Batterson, Colonial; Rob Philippi, Callie Hubbell, Conference USA; Mike Sharpe, Great West; Stephanie Jarvis, Brandy Ingles, Horizon; Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Megan McHugo, Ivy; Barbara Church, Metro Atlantic; Jackie Mynarski, MAC; Mary Mulvenna, Missouri Valley; Carolayne Henry, Gary Walenga, Mountain West; Joyce Bell, Northeast; Matt Banker, Ohio Valley; Mike Matthews, Erik Price, Pac-10; Patrick Muffley, Patriot League; Greg Sankey, Gil Grimes, SEC; Stephanie McDonald, Southland; Dominic Giabrone, Sunbelt; Ashley Robinson, SWAC; Sarah Wilhelmi, West Coast; Anthony Archbald, WAC;

1. **INAAC.**
D'Antonio provided the group with today's INAAC.
2. **Review of Agenda**
Sankey, SEC, will be providing an update from CCA meeting
Babcock, ACC, added NCAA Proposals 2009-31 and 2009-33 to the list on agenda item 8
3. **Approval of the January 6, 2010 Conference Call Minutes**
Minutes were unanimously approved.
4. **Topics for us to discuss on Friday with Brad Hostetter and Leeland Zeller regarding AMA matters**
 - A. Archiving of interpretations
 - B. Specific pieces of legislation
 - C. Coaches exam
 - D. NCAA Communications
 - E. Cabinet reports
5. **Topics for us to discuss on Friday with LuAnn Humphrey regarding BFG**
 - A. FAQ document- camp employment
 - B. Contract dates
6. **Coaches' Certification Exam CCACA Subcommittee Update**
Babcock, ACC, updated the group on the subcommittee's work. Babcock indicated that there are several suggestions that have been made numerous times. Specifically, removing or renaming the "all sports" option on the test and allowing the subcommittee to review new questions created from recently adopted legislation. Babcock requested that the entire CCACA group create new questions and send them to her within the next few weeks. Conferences could use their own pieces of legislation that got adopted as a basis for new questions.

The group also discussed the validity of the test and whether it really is worthwhile to administer it each year. The consensus was that the NCAA would not take the test away entirely, but they should consider only asking questions that are relevant to recruiting.

7. Issues and Concerns Related to Recently Adopted Legislation or Legislation that is Being Sent Out for Comment

A. 2009-18 and 2009-43- Matthews, Pac-10, requested feedback on whether a blanket waiver/SLR waiver should be submitted to bump up the effective dates. The consensus of the group was to let the effective dates remain where they are.

B. 2009-100- Bell, Northeast, requested feedback on moving the grandfather date for contracts. There was discussion that the broader issue is a legal analysis. NCAA legal counsel/BFG make the decision on previously written contracts.

C. 2009-51- Hawley, Big Ten, asked if anyone is getting feedback on a potential override for this proposal. Babcock, ACC, responded that she has heard that lacrosse and field hockey coaches trying to find a way to continue with their camps but have someone else run them. The coaches would only collect 49% of the profits.

D. 2009-44- McHugo, Ivy, expressed a concern with outside individuals being involved in the production. The group agreed that an outside entity could create the publication per 13.4.2.2. There was other discussion on admissions videos and how they would be affected by the legislation. It was decided to run these questions by Zeller, NCAA.

E. 2009-48- Boyce, Big 12, asked for clarification on the 28 NLI limit. Sankey confirmed that it is a signing limit and not a sending limit. The 29th NLI is valid, but the institution would have a violation and would have to decide which NLIs to submit to conference office. The legislation does not invalidate the NLI. Susan Peal, NCAA, and her staff will need to discuss this. Sankey, SEC, also confirmed that this legislation limit does not include mid-year signees.

F. 2009-15- Boyce, Big 12, requested feedback on what is permissible. Nothing appears to have changed with regard to instructing student-athletes. Montebaro, Big West, suggested an educational column should be written specific to the meetings aspect of the legislation. Boyce shared with the group the Big 12's document and offered to revise it and forward it to the group for comments.

G. Immediate Effective Dates and Override Periods- Iwaoka , Big Ten, addressed the need to be more mindful of effective dates when drafting future legislation. Over 50% of adopted proposals have an immediate effective date. There was discussion on proposal 2009-51B and the potential for an override. D'Antonio, BIG EAST, confirmed that if over 100 override votes are submitted, the legislation does not remain in effect. If over 30 votes are submitted, the legislation does remain in effect. Sankey, SEC, expressed concern that the number of votes to send the membership to the Convention (30 votes) is too low. The group agreed to take a harder look at effective dates and give more consideration to the impact they will have. The group also noted that this message should be carried forward to each cabinet representatives.

H. Additional items– Babcock, ACC, asked if anyone was going to be affected by the head coach in waiting legislation. Only two conferences actually have someone currently designated (ACC and Big 12). Both conferences expressed concern and their interest in grandfathering those coaches who have contracts prior to the BIG EAST proposal. D’Antonio indicated that the BIG EAST’s intent was for the legislation to be applicable to both current coaches in waiting as well as coaches that might receive that designation in the future.

Babcock asked for clarification on proposal 2009–33 and whether non-coaching staff members are included. The proposal only references bylaws associated with countable coaches making phone calls. The sponsor of the legislation indicated it was their intent to include those individuals. Zeller, NCAA, will take it to the Legislative Council for a modification of wording.

8. 2010–11 NCAA Division I Legislative Cycle– Looking Ahead

D’Antonio, BIG EAST, suggested to the group that only essential pieces of legislation be brought forward in the upcoming legislative cycle. The cabinets are going to have many items being forwarded from their reviews. Sankey, SEC, indicated that there will need to be a directive from the Commissioners and that the coaches will also need to be on board with this strategy.

9. Partial Deregulation of NCAA Bylaw 13.10.5

Sankey, SEC, suggested that the NCAA allow a prospect’s visit to be publicized. Rivals.com has all the information already out there for the public to see.

10. Conference Discussions Associated with Solutions to Early Recruiting Concerns

Sankey, SEC, indicated that several coaches groups are engaged in discussions on issues associated with early recruitment. Sankey requested feedback on whether conferences are having these discussions as well. About 75% of the group acknowledged such discussions.

11. Compliance Risk in Academic Support Functions

Philippi, Conference USA, introduced a document to the group that identifies compliance risk with academic support. The document was presented at N4A and should be finalized by the end of April. The software used for the instrument was Management 360. Philippi will forward the document via the list serve.

12. Partial Archiving of Interpretations

Hawley, Big Ten, introduced the concept of partially archiving interpretations to show exactly which part of an interpretation is no longer relevant. Hawley suggested a color coding system be implemented. The group agreed to present the issue to Hostetter and Zeller, NCAA. Wilhelmi, West Coast, also requested this same process for educational columns.

13. NCAA Communication

Montebaro, Big West, expressed a concern with how inconsistent communication is from the NCAA to conference offices. Would prefer to be able to designate who is to receive which type of correspondence (e.g., secondary violations, major infractions, reinstatement cases). Additionally, the information that should be posted on the

NCAA website is not always complete. It varies among the different cabinets. The group discussed the NCAA collaborative zone, which is supposed to rectify the issue. Matthews, Pac-10, indicated that some of the material is sent password protected, and it is not clear as to who should be permitted to receive the password. The group agreed to bring this up with Hostetter and Leeland, NCAA.

14. CCACA/Eligibility Center Subcommittee

D'Antonio, BIG EAST, updated the group on the subcommittee's work thus far. D'Antonio commented that the group has not been as productive as it needs to be. D'Antonio also introduced a new concept that will take the place of the subcommittee. There will be 2 advisory groups (10-12 people in each) consisting of conference and institutional personnel at both the Division I and II levels. D'Antonio requested that anyone interested should send Joey an email. D'Antonio will clarify how institutional nominees will be sought. The group agreed that there needs to be a cross representation on the advisory panels. The Eligibility Center is requesting ideas on how to help the conference contact program. A few individuals commented on how successful the conference contact program has been for them.

15. NCAA Student-Athlete Reinstatement Update

Iwaoka, Big Ten, updated the group on the last committee meeting. Per the handout provided by Iwaoka:

- a. #3- Committee has developed a guideline for prize money.
- b. #7- When there is an institutional error, the conference office will be copied on the correspondence from the committee.
- c. #13- Urgent cases- Committee requested NCAA SAR staff provide reports to conference offices on urgent requests from institutions
- d. #5- Committee requested feedback on extension of 5-year clock for mid-year enrollees who participate in two term sports (e.g., basketball student-athlete enrolls in January and wishes to extend one term to complete season). Committee has agreed to direct staff to approve a one term exception (5 ½ year clock). No one from the group had any objections.

Iwaoka next discussed issues associated with reinstating men's basketball student-athletes under the new BFG initiatives. There will be a shift from mitigation based on student-athlete culpability or responsibility to whether a student-athlete knew or should have known the standard. Reinstatement will begin with the student-athlete being permanent ineligible. With regard to handlers, a few key issues to consider are:

- a. BFG indicates it is highly unlikely the student-athlete is unaware of what is going on.
- b. Institutions will make a choice between retaining an IAWP on its staff or the student-athlete being ineligible at that institution. Noted that the prospect could be eligible elsewhere (just not at the institution that employs an IAWP).
- c. Institution's decision can be appealed by the prospective student-athlete

16. Conference Administered Waivers

Condaras, BIG EAST, requested feedback on processing conference administered waivers (e.g., hardship, medical absence). Specifically regarding transfers and which

conference should process which waivers. The group agreed that the conference in which the student-athlete's school is a member at the time of the issue should process the waiver. Flexibility can be provided for special circumstances.

17. Amateurism Clearinghouse

D'Antonio, BIG EAST, updated the group on his conversation with Geoff Silver, NCAA Eligibility Center. D'Antonio reported that Silver is getting up to speed on the pertinent issues. Sankey, SEC, emphasized the sensitivity on timing of decisions. The group agreed that timing is still a large issue. There was also a question raised as to whether the baseball questionnaires would be provided to all prospective student-athletes this year or just the elite.

18. NCAA Regional Compliance Seminars

D'Antonio, BIG EAST, provided an update on the PowerPoint presentations. D'Antonio indicated that the NCAA is working on a solution to make this information available. The concern is that some of the information can be pulled and used against the membership in lawsuits. The NCAA will honor a conference/institutional request for such information. D'Antonio will inform everyone of who to email in the meantime.

19. SAOF Update

D'Antonio, BIG EAST, informed the group that he and Sankey, SEC, are working on an issue that was reviewed at the January CCA meeting. Specifically, the use of SAOF to pay for a mini term (e.g., J-term) as long as the financial aid is not counted with the other aid provided throughout the academic year. Barrio, America East, asked if Bylaw 16.11.1.3 will be updated to reflect this change. D'Antonio responded that it is unlikely and the change would simply be reflected in the CCA minutes.

20. Eligibility Reporting

Wilhelmi, West Coast, asked which conferences require eligibility forms from their member institutions. The responses varied among the conferences, so Wilhelmi will send out a survey via the list serve to ask more detailed questions.

21. NCAA Proposal 2008-78

Mulvenna, Missouri Valley, requested feedback from the group as to how strict we need to be with this legislation. There was an educational column that was circulated on the CCACA list serve in October 2009 that should help. Mulvenna indicated that she is asking on behalf of Jaynee Nadolski, Big Sky and that Nadolski received a different interpretation from the NCAA.

22. Coaching Club Teams

McHugo, Ivy, requested feedback on the application of the miles restriction. Specifically, ownership (does not coach) vs. coaching a team within the club- how to apply the radius. The group agreed that the restriction only applies to that team.

23. Council and Cabinet Reappointments

Ebihara, Big 12, wanted clarification on whether the diversity requirements filter down to the subdivision. D'Antonio confirmed that it does. Ebihara reported that ethnic, minority women count twice.

24. Other Business

D'Antonio, BIG EAST, requested feedback on whether the group wanted to continue with the in-person meeting. There was no objection to continuing with the meeting. The consensus of the group was that the meeting has value and the change in format has been very positive for the CCACA. D'Antonio indicated that over the next few months he will begin to research locations, etc. for next year's meeting. There was discussion of rotating the meeting between Chicago and Dallas. Anyone with other suggestions agreed to email or call D'Antonio.

25. Next CCACA Conference Call

D'Antonio reminded the group that the February 3, 2010 conference call had been cancelled

The next conference call will take place on Wednesday, March 3, 2010.

26. Discussion with Brad Hostetter and Leeland Zeller, NCAA

A. Coaches exam. The following suggestions were presented:

- a. Rename all sports option
- b. Password protect printing option
- c. Revise the test to only include portions of Bylaw 13
- d. Correct the glitch dealing with answers changing when the answers are officially submitted
- e. Allow CCACA subcommittee to review new questions

Hostetter, NCAA, suggested changing the priority of suggestions to:

- Revise the test to only include portions of Bylaw 13
- Allow CCACA subcommittee to review new questions
- Rename all sports option

There was also discussion on not requiring the test every year. Hostetter suggested that topic should be presented to the Recruiting Cabinet. The concern was also raised that if a particular question has a high percentage of correct responses, the NCAA chooses to wait on changing the wording in the question. It was noted that Jeremiah Carter, NCAA, is the staff liaison for the Recruiting Cabinet.

- B. NCAA Communications. The question was raised as to how information from the NCAA is funneled down to the conferences. The conference office staffs would like to designate who should receive what correspondence (e.g., secondary violations, waivers, reinstatement cases). Some of this information is disseminated via email and some via regular mail. The online waiver program should be functioning late winter.
- C. Posting of materials from Cabinets/Committees. Hostetter confirmed that they are still working on the collaboration zone to help with the issue of information being posted inconsistently among the different groups.
- D. Legislation.

- a. 2009–51B. The question was raised as to whether the interpretations defining ownership of an institutional camp/clinic can be applied. Zeller, NCAA, confirmed that the interpretation is valid and applicable and can be utilized as long as the situation meets the parameters of the legislation (e.g., this other individual is truly running the camp for the coach). Questions were raised about multi-year contracts and how they come into play with this legislation. Humphrey, NCAA, indicated that the circumstances surrounding the signing of a multi-year contract will be reviewed. She noted the BFG would not look favorably on a situation where the institution signs a 10 year deal the day before the deadline and does not consult the NCAA first.
 - b. 2009–44. Zeller confirmed that only computer generated presentations must be produced by the institution. Outside entities may produce material per Bylaw 13.4.2.1 Zeller also confirmed that admissions offices could have general recruiting language in the audio/video materials. The question was raised as to whether or not coaches could use the admissions materials. Zeller indicated he would have to follow up on that.
 - c. 2009–44. The legislation only addresses limit and number of coaches. Consequently, only coaches can call after May 1st. There will be a modification of wording in April consistent with the intent of the legislation (e.g., to include non-coaching staff members). A question was raised about how this proposal affects service academies. Zeller confirmed that this proposal does not affect service academies because they already have an exception for this.
 - d. 2009–15. Zeller reminded the group that the legislation did not change anything with regard to recruiting activities (e.g., evaluate PSA film). The Big 12 staff will circulate the document to the CCACA group and will follow up with the final version with their conference contact.
 - e. D’Antonio informed Hostetter and Zeller that each of the conference offices is going to pay closer attention to effective dates when drafting legislation to help identify issues associated with the dates chosen. D’Antonio also indicated that the CCACA group had discussed whether 30 override votes was too low of a number to direct the membership to the Convention.
- E. Partial archiving of Interpretations. The group expressed a concern with archived interpretations. Specifically that there needs to be a distinction on archived interpretations to identify if part of all of the interpretation is no longer applicable. The idea of color coding was shared with Hostetter and Zeller. Hostetter agreed that the staff could do a better job of pulling out the good parts of archived interpretations. Hostetter suggested that they use a “going forward” approach because there are too many archived interpretations to capture at this point. Recently, they have had situations where a new interpretation was posted to bring back the good part of an archived interpretation. The group liked this concept and requested that the NCAA include the history in the new interpretation to make it easier to follow the legislative trail. Zeller responded that the old interpretation date is included in the reference line and the new interpretation is

referenced in the archived interpretation. A question was raised as to how a new interpretation affects a confirmation date. Zeller responded that it is more of a matter for determinations when part of the old interpretation is re-issued. The question that remains is did you know about it as of the date of the original interpretation? The group also provided a few suggestions on improving LSDBi. Hostetter confirmed for the group that each person can select their own defaults when searching on LSDBi.

- F. Hostetter provided an update on the Amateurism Certification area within the Eligibility Center. Specifically, he stated that Geoff Silver, NCAA, will be heading up that area now and will be reviewing the mission of the ACP program. There have been many internal discussions and will ACP likely re-center their mission.
- G. Regional Rules Seminars. Hostetter reminded the group that the regional rules seminars will be held in Indianapolis May 17–21 and Dallas June 14–18. He also stated that there will be meeting space available at both sites. The space is free, but there would be a charge for food, audio visual, etc. The session descriptions have been posted. There will be another major infractions symposium again this year. The advanced track will run Wednesday afternoon through the day on Thursday. Please forward any nominations for the program to Lynn Holzman, NCAA, as soon as possible.
- H. Technology. Hostetter reported that the education on demand videos will be used for rules education. Individuals may have to watch video for certain regional rules sessions. Any feedback on videos should go to Holzman. Online waivers will be rolled out in May/June. The staff has been working on this project for about 2 years. There will be a session at the seminars. When completed, the online waiver option can be accessed through case management (login) on LSDBi.
- I. Compliance Form Project. Hostetter indicated that the staff is moving toward online forms. They should be available to view in July 2010, but they will not yet be ready for online completion capabilities until some point in the future.
- J. Athletic Certification Team. Hostetter informed the group that the revisions from the legislation will not be in the 2009–10 self-study instrument of handbook, but they will be in the 2010–11 edition.

27. Discussion with LuAnn Humphrey, NCAA

Questions were raised regarding camp/clinic employment. Specifically, question #12 on the FAQ document. Employment is permissible only if the individual is not tied to a prospect. Former student-athletes are permitted to work if they are employees of the institution. Current student-athletes can work if all student-athletes have the opportunity to work. In situations where a current student is also a high school coach, you still must look to see if there is a prospect relationship. If the current student is tied to a prospect, the individual would be precluded from working. If proposal 2009–102 passes, there is legitimate concern for situations where a coach leaves for military duty, that there will not be enough staff to work the camps. Humphrey noted that no specific proposal has been presented as an alternate.

There is a concern with limiting the ability to allow individuals to benefit financially. A question was raised regarding the appropriate qualifications an individual should have to work camps. The effective date of the legislation is 9/1/10. The interpretations that have been posted are currently in effect.

The groups asked who the people are that are getting the money. Humphrey responded that these people are handlers, family members and high school coaches. These individuals getting money is seen as a recruiting inducement. A question was raised regarding the permissibility of junior college coaches working camps. Humphrey responded that it is permissible. It is not about the classification of the coach. It all comes down to whether the person has a relationship with a prospect. Division II and III coaches and student-athletes may be a viable option.

Proposal 2009-56 is codifying the established rules with recruiting services. One of the issues is that non-scholastic individuals working with recruiting services are making lots of money, but they are not providing a service. The NCAA is more than willing to share information on scouting services and offer a guideline of things to look for. The NCAA is welcoming information/questions from the membership and scouting services. If anyone has any questions about a particular individual/service, please contact Kelly Irwin. Her email is kirwin@ncaa.org. A few things to look for are any variations in price and the website. The group wanted to know how to advise their institutions when issues and/or questions do arise. Humphrey suggested having them contact BFG directly. To date, the BFG has not had that much communication directly from institutions. Humphrey indicated that everyone is most likely still working through the "trust" issue. Humphrey stated that it would be best for each conference to decide how to advise its institutions. If the conferences can deflect the "101" questions, that would be helpful to Humphrey and her staff.

The group next discussed the issue with contracts. Specifically, the language of "may be" honored with regard to contracts that have already been signed. Humphrey indicated that with multi-year contracts, Hostetter, Mallonee and herself would evaluate the contract for the institution and then take it to legal counsel.

The Cabinets will be reviewing the issue of eliminating summer recruiting. This issue is also on BFG's radar. Humphrey noted that BFG does not want to become a legislative entity, but they do have valuable data to help those individuals making the decisions. Humphrey indicated that she did not believe eliminating the summer period is the right way to proceed. The coaches do need a large scale evaluating opportunity at some point during the year. Humphrey reminded the group that BFG is part of the enforcement staff. When an issue is brought to them or if a question is raised, BFG could have the responsibility to investigate. In the future, Humphrey would like to see a focus group created to include conference and institutional staff members. The group could help smooth the path for more positive relationships. The BFG is also establishing relationships with the media, agents, professionals and non-scholastic team individuals. BFG is open to having a conversation with anyone willing to help. Humphrey indicated that the media has been very receptive to having discussions. Any avenues for education are helpful. The BFG does not want coaches to be only source of education for the media.

A question was raised regarding concerns with the coaches' money. Humphrey responded that there is a concern. Some handlers will not allow a prospect to take a visit until the handler has a deposit into his account. Former student-athletes, boosters, coaches are all a part of the concern. The numbers can be significant at the agent level.

Another hot issue right now is video people following prospects around on recruiting trips, etc. The lure is the "movie rights".

The funneling of money is moving forward to official and unofficial visits. Institutions will be receiving letters requesting information about a prospect after the prospect has made an unofficial visit. The institution will be required to document who attended the visit, how it was paid, etc. Conference offices will be copied on these letters. Humphrey indicated that it was okay for conferences to advise their institutions that these letters would be coming. The letter will be addressed to the Athletic Director. The group asked if they could see a generic version of this letter. Humphrey responded that she will get one to D'Antonio, BIG EAST, to circulate to the group [D'Antonio emailed this letter to CCACA group 2/9/10].

28. Adjournment