



MINUTES
CCACA CONFERENCE CALL
Wednesday, January 5, 2011 ~ 12:00p.m. ET

Participants:

Brian Barrio, America East; Lindsey Babcock, Shamaree Brown, Seth Barwick, ACC; Steve Sturek, Atlantic Sun; Jill Redmond, Atlantic 10; Joseph D'Antonio, Jennifer Condaras, Kenny Schank, BIG EAST; Jaynee Nadolski, Ann Morrison, Big Sky; Sherika McLean, Big South; Jennifer Heppel, Kerry Kenny, Big Ten; Keri Boyce, Big Twelve; Erica Montebaro, Big West; Kathleen Batterson, M.L. Morgan, Colonial; Mike Sharpe, Great West; Stephanie Jarvis, Christine Halstead, Horizon; Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Megan McHugo, Ivy League; Barbara Church, Metro Atlantic; Jackie Mynarski, Korinth Patterson, MAC; Quintin Wright,, Mid-Eastern; Mary Mulvenna, Missouri Valley; Marlon Edge, Mountain West; Kelly Webb, Northeast; Matt Banker, Ohio Valley; Mike Matthews, Ron Barker, Erik Price, Pac-10; Quinton Smith, Patriot League; Gil Grimes, SEC; Matt Boyer, Summit League; Edgar Gantt, SWAC; Dominick Giambrone, Sun Belt; Sarah Wilhelmi, West Coast; Matt Burgemeister, Ben Butler, WAC;

1. INAAC.

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

2. Review of Agenda

One addition- Definition of Fully Registered with the Eligibility Center, Kelly Webb, Northeast.

3. Approval of the December 3, 2010 Conference Call Minutes

Minutes were unanimously approved.

4. University Athlete Recruiting Service

Lindsey Babcock, ACC, updated the group with information on University Athlete. Babcock referred to the email she sent out on 12/16/10. This service, which mainly works with volleyball, was determined to be a recruiting service when the legislation changed. University Athlete attempted to make changes to fit within the legislation and was under the impression that its services were now permissible. Mary Mulvenna, Missouri Valley, reminded the group that LRIC did determine University Athlete to be a recruiting service.

University Athlete sells packets to coaches for events. It has been determined that if the coach attends the event, it is permissible to purchase the packet for that event. If the coach does not attend the event, University Athlete would be considered a recruiting service and it would not be permissible for coaches to purchase the packet for that event. Since there is still not consensus as to how to proceed forward, D'Antonio suggested to put this topic on the agenda for the in-person meeting.

A question was raised as to how many conferences conduct the research to determine if a service is permissible. A few conferences indicated that they assist institutions when requested or when there is a disagreement between schools as to whether the service is permissible.

5. 2010–11 Legislative Cycle

D’Antonio asked if anyone wanted to discuss a particular proposal in the current cycle. There were no discussions on specific proposals. Sarah Wilhelmi, WCC, indicated that there were a large number of proposals that got passed in October as non-controversial/emergency legislation. Wilhelmi asked for clarification on 2010–113. Specifically Wilhelmi asked if this was going to mean that any event that is sponsored by an international governing body is impermissible. Mike Matthews, Pac-10, responded that this piece of legislation was sponsored by the Basketball Issues Committee. The purpose seems to be to close a loop hole.

Mike Sharpe, Great West, asked the group for feedback on proposal 2010–100. This proposal defines a multi-sport conference. D’Antonio responded that all indications show it is moving forward in its entirety.

6. 2011 CCACA In-Person Meeting

D’Antonio provided an update on this year’s in-person meeting. The individuals from the NCAA that will participate on day two of the meeting are Diane Dickman and Alex Smith (provide feedback to the Academic Cabinet); Geoff Silver and Michael Mangarelli (Eligibility Center issues, Conference Contact Program, Amateur Eligibility); and Lynn Holzman and Leeland Zeller (AMA issues). It was requested that Holzman and Zeller be present in the room for all three discussion since many issues seem to touch on AMA matters. D’Antonio indicated that the schedule will be set up for that to happen. Holzman and Zeller will be the third NCAA group on the agenda. D’Antonio also indicated that the first two groups would go for approximately an hour and the remainder of the time would be devoted to Holzman and Zeller. D’Antonio reminded everyone to submit agenda items to him. In addition to the agenda items, the first day will be spent formulating questions for the NCAA staff. D’Antonio expressed appreciation to Ice Miller for once again helping with the costs for the social/dinner. Everyone needs to bring \$40 for the dinner. You can either bring cash/check with you or mail a check to D’Antonio. Checks should be made payable to The BIG EAST Conference.

Erica Monteabaro, Big West, requested that the NCAA AMA Conference Contact Program being added to the agenda.

7. Additional Items

NCAA Eligibility Center– Definition of Fully Registered, Kelly Webb, Northeast.

Webb asked the group for feedback on the NCAA Eligibility Center’s definition of fully registered. Webb indicated that she reviewed information from her predecessor but that is not completely consistent

with what she is being told by the Eligibility Center. The Eligibility Center is indicating that as long as the PSA checks the box for a fee waiver, he/she would be considered fully registered. This is true even if the PSA's high school has not processed that information yet. Matthews, Pac-10, referenced an educational column that addressed fully registered. The group expressed concern with this protocol as there could be abuse. This issue will be placed on the agenda for the in-person meeting.

8. **Next CCAACA Conference Call**
Wednesday, March 2, 2011

9. **Adjournment.**



MINUTES
CCACA IN-PERSON MEETING
Monday–Tuesday, January 24–25, 2011

Participants:

Brian Barrio, America East; Shane Lyons, Lindsey Babcock, Shamaree Brown, ACC; Steve Sturek, Atlantic Sun; Jill Redmond, Atlantic 10; Joseph D’Antonio, Jennifer Condaras, Kenny Schank, BIG EAST; Jennifer Heppel, Chad Hawley, Kerry Kenny, Big Ten; Keri Boyce, Big 12; Erica Montebaro, Big West; Kathleen Batterson, Colonial; Rob Philippi, Callie Hubbell, Conference USA; Mike Sharpe, Great West; Stephanie Jarvis, Christine Halstead, Horizon; Carolyn Campbell–McGovern, Megan McHugo, Ivy; Barbara Church, Metro Atlantic; Mary Mulvenna, Missouri Valley; Marlon Edge, Mountain West; Kelly Webb, Northeast; Matt Banker, Ohio Valley; Mike Matthews, Ron Barker, Erik Price, Pac–10; Quinton Smith, Patriot League; Gil Grimes, SEC; Stephanie McDonald, Southland; Greg Walter, Matt Boyer, Summit; Dominic Giabrone, Sunbelt; Edgar Gantt, SWAC; Sarah Wilhelmi, West Coast; Matt Burgemeister, WAC; Diane Dickman, Lynn Holzman, Michael Mangarelli, Geoff Silver, Alex Smith, Leeland Zeller, NCAA

1. **Welcome and Introductions.**
D’Antonio provided opening remarks and asked everyone to introduce themselves.
2. **INAAC**
D’Antonio provided the group with today’s INAAC.
3. **Review of Agenda**
D’Antonio added compliance reviews.
4. **Approval of the January 5, 2011 Conference Call Minutes**
Minutes were unanimously approved.
5. **Topics for us to discuss on Tuesday with Lynn Holzman and Leeland Zeller regarding AMA matters**
 - A. AMA Staffing Changes/Enforcement/SAR
 - B. Coaches Exam
 - C. Conference Contact Program
 - D. NCAA Proposal 2010–26– Educational Materials
 - E. NCAA Proposal 2010–52– Are reductions included?
 - F. NCAA Proposal 2010–48
 - G. NCAA Official Interpretation– 12/3/82– Hardship Waivers
 - H. University Athlete– Recruiting Service
6. **Topics for us to discuss on Tuesday with Diane Dickman and Alex Smith regarding the reform efforts of the Academic Cabinet (2 Year College Transfer Requirements)**
 - A. Year of Readiness
7. **Topics for us to discuss on Tuesday with Geoff Silver and Michael Mangarelli regarding the Amateurism Clearinghouse and the Eligibility Center**
 - A. Communication during the waiver process

- B. Discussion on ways a PSA can request to be contacted by the EC
- C. Statement of facts process (e.g., EC/AMA/SAR)
- D. Amateurism concerns identified after enrollment
- E. Early Certification– graduation required?– this was resolved through group discussion. The requirement of graduation is predicated on institutional policy.

8. **Coaches' Certification Exam CCACA Subcommittee Update**

Babcock, ACC, updated the group on the subcommittee's work. Babcock indicated that she has been working with Frank Arrendono and Jessica Harbison Weaver at the NCAA, and they have been very receptive to the subcommittee's suggested changes. Babcock is optimistic that the subcommittee will be able to view the test prior to its release to the membership. One of the discussion items this year has been the length and time of the test. Babcock asked for feedback on whether the test should be shortened to 30 questions with an hour to complete it. The group also discussed whether the percentage required to pass the exam should be raised. The group agreed that the percentage will depend on the quality of the questions. One suggestion was to utilize the enforcement staff to determine the focus of the test.

Babcock indicated that AMA will be reviewing the test questions and will be meeting in two weeks. Babcock requested that everyone create 3-5 questions and email them to her within the next week. The NCAA IT staff will make it a priority to resolve some of the bigger issues this year (e.g., "all sports" choice on the exam). Other matters that will be reviewed this year are duplicate questions, bylaw updates, FBS/FCS questions and consistency in the language.

The group also discussed the validity of the test and whether it really is worthwhile to administer it each year. There were many differing opinions on this matter. A few suggestions were to eliminate the test, require it only for the coach's first year, require it for those coaches committing recruiting violations and keep the process as it is. The group agreed that the test does serve as a good rules education tool and can provide the compliance staff with credibility. The questions on the test should only pertain to matters that the coaches need to know while on the road recruiting. The questions pertaining to progress toward degree are not relevant. The group also agreed that discussions need to be held with enforcement to determine the staff's view on the relevance of the test when coaches commit secondary and major violations. D'Antonio offered to reach out to Julie Roe Lach, NCAA.

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

A. 2010-9- Kathleen Batterson, Colonial, asked if anyone had begun drafting contracts and whether or not this group felt each conference should include the same language in the contracts. A few individuals indicated that their general counsels are currently reviewing this matter. The group agreed to keep the language simple. D'Antonio suggested the following statement could suffice as language to be included in contracts:

"follow all NCAA legislation, interpretations and policies related to the use of a student-athlete's name and/or likeness"

A question was raised as to whether the NCAA will be drafting any comments to be used by institutions/conferences. D'Antonio responded that the NCAA would probably not be sending anything out to the membership. Written policies that conference offices must maintain include no gambling advertisements, no alcohol advertisements and no tobacco advertisements. The group agreed that we need to see how NCAA proposal 2010-26 plays out before finalizing any language in the contracts.

B. 2010-110- Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Ivy, asked for feedback as to why this would not be defeated. D'Antonio provided the tally of votes taken during the Legislative Council meeting and indicated that it could be on its way to being defeated. This piece of legislation could have legal issues. Shane Lyons, ACC, indicated that the BOD would listen to Legal Counsel if it suggested leaving in the waiver option.

C. 2010-62, 63, 64- Question was raised as to whether there would be a grandfather clause for a student-athlete that receives an award of this type this year. Lyons, ACC, responded that the aid would be exempt if received next year and that this piece of legislation is effective for everyone who receives such an award next year.

D. 2010-26- NCAA will be providing educational materials for this piece of legislation.

E. 2010-12- A question was raised as to whether this proposal would be put back into the cycle. Lyons, ACC, noted that the BOD voted to table the proposal until its April meeting so that it could discuss potential issues that may arise if the in-person override vote is eliminated.

F. 2010-58C- This piece of legislation took a year and a half to develop, and there are several options as to how this could turn out. The BOD wants the membership to discuss further. There is discussion as to whether or not the Leadership Council should include this matter as part of its overall review of men's basketball recruiting.

G. 2010-48- D'Antonio informed the group that he had a discussion about this proposal with LuAnn Humphrey, NCAA. D'Antonio asked Humphrey if the regulation of these subscriptions was a priority for BFG. Humphrey noted that the regulation of the subscriptions was indeed a priority. D'Antonio, Greg Sankey, SEC, Lyons, Humphrey and Julie Roe Lach, NCAA, plan to have additional conversations about this matter. One suggestion that has arisen is that this proposal could be amended to include subscription limitations. A question was raised as to why a legislative change is actually needed if it is true that a comprehensive list of scouting organizations already exists within enforcement.

H. 2010-109B- There is a concern with the principles of amateurism. D'Antonio indicated that this was an overwhelming vote at the Legislative Council meeting. There are discussions on changing this legislation to only include men's and women's basketball.

I. 2010-52- D'Antonio asked for feedback as to whether the membership should be concerned about the order of conversations as indicated in the legislative Q & A

document. There definitely is some confusion as to how to apply the legislation. D'Antonio indicated that he would reach out to Carolayne Henry, Mountain West, to inquire about revising the interpretation included on the Q&A document. A suggestion was raised to include scholarship reductions to the legislation because it currently reads cancellations only. If the Mountain West wants to keep the narrow focus, Bylaw 14.1.9.1 (C) would need to change.

J. 2010-86- D'Antonio asked the group for feedback on splitting the votes per sport. The rule already exists for softball, but the affect this legislation could have seems to vary significantly among the other sports.

10. Facebook and the evolution of messaging

Sarah Wilhelmi, West Coast Conference, presented statistical information on the forms of communication most often used right now. Wilhelmi suggested a legislative change that would move electronic correspondence from Bylaw 13.4 to 13.1. A definition of electronic correspondence needs to be created along with a time period for when it would be permitted. Other individuals indicated they have had similar conversations with their member institutions. The majority of the group was in favor of changing the electronic correspondence legislation to mirror telephone calls. There is still going to be a debate no matter which direction the legislation goes. It is going to be extremely difficult to find a consensus. The group also agreed that it is important to work with SAAC on this initiative since that group has been very vocal with other similar initiatives.

11. Hardship Waiver criteria and incapacitation for the remainder of the season

Keri Boyce, Big 12, asked for feedback on how other conferences are processing waivers for situations where the student-athlete is cleared for competition after the conclusion of the regular season but prior to the start of post season. The consensus of the group was that all medical letters and/or documentation should indicate that the student-athlete was unable to participate through the remainder of the season, including post season. The group discussed the 12/3/82 official interpretation and agreed that the interpretation either needs to be archived or revised by the NCAA staff. The group decided to include this issue in the discussion with Zeller, NCAA.

12. Bylaw 14.3.5.4- International Student-Athlete Parameters

D'Antonio indicated that this topic would be addressed by Dickman and Smith, NCAA on the second day of the meeting.

13. EA Sports Request

Boyce, Big 12, requested feedback on the letter received from Olin Arnold, Collegiate Licensing Group. No other individuals have received this information. This initiative is a social gaming mechanism for fans that includes the building of teams, stadiums, etc. The group discussed the information in the letter and agreed that there are several issues involved with recruiting, institutional involvement (e.g., use of logo, licensing) and other unintended consequences. This social gaming concept could also have potential legal issues.

14. Division IA Athletic Directors Compliance Task Force

D'Antonio updated the group on the efforts of the task force. The purpose, mission and vision statements are being drafted. This group will continue to push forward

and will have discussions with NCAA staff. D'Antonio will continue to update the CCACA with this group's progress.

15. NAAC / NAAC Convention

D'Antonio reminded the group that this year's NAAC Convention is going to be held June 15-16, 2011 in Orlando at the World Marriott. He noted that although this organization is predominantly institutionally driven, it is worthwhile for conference office folks to become members and be involved. D'Antonio indicated that NAAC values the feedback it gets from the CCACA. There are a few CCACA members that serve on committees. NAAC is re-launching a new design on NAAC Connect.com.

16. Recruiting Services (i.e., University Athlete)

D'Antonio indicated that this topic would be included in the discussion with Holzman and Zeller, NCAA, on the second day of the meeting.

17. Eligibility Center/Definition of "fully registered"

D'Antonio indicated that this topic could be covered with Silver and Mangarelli, NCAA, on the second day of the meeting. Webb responded that she was comfortable with her issue being resolved on the last conference call.

18. AMA Conference Contact Program

Some members of the group expressed concern and frustration with the conference contact program. There was a lengthy discussion on this topic and the views varied greatly among the conference offices. The main concerns appear to be timeliness, quality of responses, other duties/responsibilities, and lack of communication (e.g., contact does not indicate out of office time). There was a suggestion to revisit the level of standards for this program with the NCAA staff. These standards are in writing at the National office and should be reviewed periodically. The conference contact back up program was also discussed. The majority of the group agreed that the back up program needs to be reviewed with the NCAA staff. A question was raised regarding who at the National office reviews the conference contact program evaluation survey results. It was the consensus of the group that the conference contact program is effective and should remain in place. It would become very troubling if every institution and conference office started calling the NCAA hotline for interpretations.

D'Antonio indicated that this topic would be included in the discussions with Holzman and Zeller, NCAA, on the second day of the meeting.

19. Alternative / Modification of Proposals- Timing of updates as communicated by NCAA staff

D'Antonio and Lyons noted that they would update the group on this matter on a future conference call.

20. Submission of transcripts and test scores of JUCO's

This topic will be discussed with Holzman and Zeller, NCAA, on day two of the meeting.

21. Additional Items

D'Antonio added the once in four year compliance review requirement to the agenda. This topic will be placed on a future conference call.

24. Other Business

D'Antonio indicated that a discussion of future in-person meetings will be placed on a future conference call. D'Antonio requested that everyone be prepared to provide feedback on location, timing of the meeting (e.g., date and day(s) of the week), length, etc.

25. Next CCACA Conference Call

The next conference call will take place on Wednesday, March 2, 2011.

26. Discussion with Geoff Silver and Michael Mangarelli, NCAA

Mangarelli provided updates on the Eligibility Center's outreach efforts that were initiated in 2010. Mangarelli also addressed the results of the most recent membership survey. The main concerns were with service, accessibility and transparency. The survey results are extremely helpful in determining changes that need to be made. The new conference contact program was created from the 2009 survey. The intent was to assign amateurism staff to assist with conference issues and attend conference meetings when possible. These individuals can also assist with getting in contact with the appropriate person on academic matters. Mangarelli requested feedback on how the conference contact program is running and another survey will be sent out soon.

Mangarelli indicated that the Eligibility Center is working with an external advisory group. This is another avenue for the membership to provide feedback. There is a 15 member panel including individuals from both Division I and II. This partnership has been very positive and the panel has been able to assist the Eligibility Center with making positive changes. Additionally the Eligibility Center is assigning staff members to 1-2 outside groups (e.g., coaches associations, CCACA) as liaisons.

Mangarelli addressed the delayed piece with NCAA Proposal 2009-22, the pro-team pre-enrollment exception for all sports other than men's ice hockey and skiing. This piece of legislation will not apply to transfer student-athletes. He noted that the prospect's graduation date is significant in the application of the proposal. He noted the most impacted sports are men's soccer, men's track, men's tennis, women's tennis, women's track and golf, and that a prospect's 21st birthday is not as significant in the past. In the sport of men's track, a year in residency is likely with this delayed piece. In the UK, all sports are assigned an initial graduation date. The sport of tennis is frequently an issue because the graduation date gets pushed back. If that happens the one year delay rule will be in effect.

Silver informed the group that the Eligibility Center certifies approximately 100,000 prospects every year. The Eligibility Center is dedicated to providing the best customer service it can. Silver reviewed the penalty handout and indicated the number of penalties for this year was similar to last year. There will likely be a bump in penalties next year. The number of issues regarding competition with pros decreased. These types of issues can drain staff resources. Staff conducts a lot of internet research and there is a large amount of time and resources put into

international amateurism cases. Silver indicated that they now have 4 years of data to review which can help zero in on those countries where they are seeing penalties.

Silver reviewed the countries handout and highlighted some key areas. There are about 9 countries with high volume in the sport of soccer. Silver also provided an update on the College Bound Guide. This document will provide basic academic information for international students and will have more links to country standards as well as detailed information on amateurism.

Lastly, Silver reviewed the Amateurism Certification Process (ACP) handout. This can be a very lengthy process. Silver requested feedback from the group as to how the Eligibility Center can streamline the process. There were a few questions from the group regarding the ACP:

- A. Urgent Request Program– Question was raised as to whether this program still existed for academic certifications. Mangarelli noted that the program still exists and the date for such requests has been expanded to include the last week in July through first week in October. The cases will be prioritized as follows:

- 1.NLI/Athletic Grant in Aid Recipients
- 2.Fall Championship Season participants
- 3.All other PSAs on an IRL

Institutions no longer have to go through their conference offices. Institutions can contact the Eligibility Center directly. Institutions should email or call the institutional line and request urgent case program. Question was raised as to whether this program is necessary for spring enrollees. Mangarelli responded that it is not necessary at this time, and the staff will continue to evaluate the situation each year. If institutions do not have an urgent case that fits into one of the 3 profiles, they can use the conference contact program to have the case processed.

Mangarell indicated that staff members who are conference contacts will be more proactive and will reach out to conference offices. Conferences can still contact staff members that are not their designated liaisons to ask questions, etc.

- B. Statement of Facts– Concern was raised that the process seems fragmented when cases are forwarded from department to department. Although there are NCAA AMA liaisons assigned to ACP cases, those individuals are not usually identified to the institution. Silver responded that they will look into that issue and will determine if that could/should be changed.
- C. 2009–22– Question regarding whether any type of announcement or presentation will be provided at regional rules seminars this year. Mangarelli responded that information has already been sent to select coaches groups (e.g., soccer). Additionally, information will be included in the Eligibility Center electronic newsletter. A question was raised as to what institutions should be doing now to avoid issues. Silver responded with a few suggestions: institutions should begin communication early,

research graduation dates, identify international PSAs, work with coaches and confirm the age of the PSAs (in question) when they will be initially enrolling on their campuses.

- D. Communication During Waiver Process– A concern was raised that there is a lack of communication with institutions during this process. Silver noted the concern and will review the matter with the staff.
- E. 2–4 Transfers Needing to Submit Records– Fact Finding Issue– The group discussed the issue of the testing agencies now charging PSAs for test scores that are 3 years old.

27. Discussion with Diane Dickman and Alex Smith, NCAA

Smith provided an overview as to why the NCAA is reviewing 2–4 transfer standards. This review is part of the NCAA’s continued efforts of academic reform. The other student–athlete standards (e.g., PTD, initial eligibility) have been researched, and these reviews have provided suggestions that have lead to a successful revision of the standards. Information for 2–4 transfers is now available, and it is important to determine why 2–4 transfers are not graduating and/or remaining eligible at the same rate as non–transfer students. The Academic Cabinet has discussed possible concepts to help address the issues and will likely amend these concepts during the February meeting and potentially draft legislative proposals during the June meeting. The number of student–athletes leaving while ineligible has decreased over the last few years.

Dickman informed the group that up to about a year ago, there was not a lot of data for the NCAA to use to make predictions, changes, etc. GPA is the strongest predictor for first year success and graduation at the 4–year school. Physical activity classes are directly proportionate with academic failure. 21% of non–qualifier 2–4 transfers have 12+ physical education classes. That is $\frac{1}{4}$ of the 48 required hours. The membership will see a recommendation related to that. Dickman noted that more core courses equate to greater academic success. The NCA has engaged folks at the junior colleges and there seems to be a successful partnership. The associations working with the NCAA cover 48 of the 50 states: CCCCA (California), NJCAA and NWAAC (Northwest). The biggest concern at the junior college level is whether the NCAA will increase requirements. There was a lot of discussion on the affect of raising the standards for 2–4 transfers and decreasing the overall number of physical education courses permissible to use. A decrease in physical education courses will cause a significant drop in GPA for most of these 2–4 transfers.

The Academic Cabinet is working on concepts that could include an increase in GPA and expansion of the physical education course limit to 2 credits fo all sports. Science could become a new requirement and there is discussion to remove the current 3 semester / 4 quarter attendance requirement. The year of readiness is an alternative plan for those individuals that are not yet where they need to be academically. The proposed year of readiness would be the first year of full–time enrollment at the 2–year school. Competition is not permitted during this year, and the student’s 5–year clock does not begin until after the year of readiness has been completed. There was a lot of discussion on this matter, and the NCAA staff agreed

that much discussion still needs to occur before anything could be implemented. Recruiting implications and monitoring issues will be addressed during the February meeting. The NCAA is confident that these issues can be worked out. The Academic Cabinet is hoping to change these concepts into proposals. The year of readiness is the most important trigger. Dickman indicated that the Cabinet needs to include 4-2-4 in its studies.

There was a lot of feedback from the group.

- A. Many schools either do not offer remediation or are having to cut those courses from their curriculum. Many schools will want remediation courses offered at the junior college level.
- B. It is the junior college's mission/function to offer remediation. The junior colleges are prepared to assist prospective student-athletes with preparing them with these type of courses.
- C. A question was raised as to who was leading the charge for these new initiatives at the junior college level? (e.g., coach, advisor). Dickman responded that the National Athletic Advisors Association (NAAAA) has a branch for junior colleges. Many of the larger athletic programs have provided feedback from advisors.
- D. The 5-year clock does not begin until after the year of readiness has been completed. Question was raised as to what happens when a student is at a junior college for 3 years and does not meet the transfer GPA requirements. Would this individual have to sit out a year at the 4-year school? Dickman responded that the student would have to sit out a year and then would have 2 years to play at the 4-year school. There was also some discussion on whether a student should be permitted to receive athletic aid if he/she does not meet the 2.5 GPA requirement.
- E. A question was raised as to whether a prospective student-athlete has to go through the Eligibility Center. Dickman responded that the NCAA has not worked that out yet, but the inclination is that the prospective student-athlete would have to be certified by the Eligibility Center.
- F. A question was raised as to whether a prospective student-athlete has to declare the year of readiness. What if he/she plays in one contest? Dickman responded that they have not worked through those details yet. The prospective student-athlete would likely declare the year of readiness and that declaration would be posted within the Eligibility Center system for tracking purposes. Who is responsible for entering the declaration? Dickman indicated she was unsure as to who would be responsible for entering the declaration.
- G. A clarification was requested with regard to the maximum number of physical education credits can be used by basketball student-athletes. Basketball student-athletes may use a maximum of two credits. Concerns

were raised again if the cap for all sports on physical education credits goes through.

- H. A question was raised as to whether a prospective student-athlete can transfer after 2.5 years to a 4-year school to be there for spring participation. The Academic Cabinet will address this issue, but the answer is likely no. This would be a fall sports only issue.
- I. The group inquired as to whether this initiative was generated by a directive from the BOD. All academic groups indicated the 2-4 transfer dynamic is an issue and referred the matter to the Academic Cabinet. Lyons, ACC, also responded that the BOD is very in tune with this. There are other initial eligibility concerns out there as well.

Dickman offered to present information at conference meetings taking place this spring and/or summer.

28. Discussion with Lynn Holzman and Leeland Zeller, NCAA

Holzman provided information on the four main initiatives being currently being reviewed at the NCAA.

- A. AMA Review- The NCAA is reviewing key business practices to support the membership. A few examples are regulatory issues, athletic certification and initial eligibility. Holzman requested feedback on what functions or issues in the regulatory structure that create a financial or administrative burden on the membership. What functions that AMA administers/supports that should be done differently? One of the biggest directives right now is cost containment and giving more resources back to the membership.

Regulatory issues- what AMA does to support interpretative matters, CA (software), legislative process, legislative relief, coaches test, conference contact program. Request for feedback will be sent out in March. At the next Legislative Council meeting, there will be a discussion on what the staff's role is within the regulatory process as well as ideas for rules changes. Staff will be reviewing resources. Babcock, ACC, provided the NCAA staff with feedback on the coaches test. Babcock indicated that discussions with Frank Arrendono and Jessica Blair, NCAA, have gone very well and she is optimistic that positive changes can and will be made this year. There has been a lot of progress so far and the IT staff has some of the recommendations on the priority list. The 3 significant suggestions for this year are:

1. Reduce questions to 30 and reduce the allotted time limit to 60 minutes. Higher quality of questions was also discussed.
2. Recruiting exam only (no post-enrollment questions).
3. All sports option. Either remove the option, move it to the bottom of the list and/or require a proctor password for coaches to use that option.

The group shared its concerns with the conference contact program. Some viewed frustration that it is not always a priority and that it can take weeks at a time to get responses. Many of the conference contact liaisons have cabinet/committee responsibilities and other duties. Holzman indicated that providing interpretative support falls under the Constitution and will be reviewed to make sure it is operating as it should. There was a suggestion to increase efforts in advertising the back-up program. Identifying who is the contact for the morning and afternoon shifts would be very helpful. It was confirmed that members of ILT serve as back-ups. Another concern raised was the lack of communication when the contact is out of the office. A question was raised as to who reviews the conference evaluation forms. Holzman responded that Brad Hostetter, NCAA, reviews the forms as well as the contact's supervisor. If you have an issue, it is best to try and work it out directly with your contact. If the issue cannot be resolved, you can contact Hostetter. The group agreed that it is still a great program overall, but the biggest concern is communication.

B. BOD resolution as it relates to legislation

The volume of proposals is being reviewed. There could be changes in sponsorship thresholds and limitations. Need to focus on items of national significance. Feedback will be requested. There could be more legislation passed through as non-controversial/emergency. The NCAA wants the membership to focus on the important issues. There could be an increase in the votes needed to call for an override vote. The number could potentially increase to 1/3 of the membership. Additionally, there could be an electronic mechanism to vote on overrides in the future.

How can AMA be better with the legislative process? The group responded with increasing efforts on Q & A documents and identifying alternative proposals. Another suggestion was to provide more thorough reports from the Cabinet on relevant proposals and the specific bylaws they are responsible for reviewing.

Lyons stated that it would be beneficial to put together a Presidential package for the BOD in August to highlight the important issues they should be focusing on for the current cycle. There is also discussion on having a moratorium on bylaws just revised. The group agreed that it would be helpful to coordinate conference policies for putting forth legislation.

C. Technology - LSDBi Enhancements

The NCAA is working on creating a mid-year manual that would be posted on the website as a PDF. Holzman is also working on the creation of an application for the manual. The staff is continuing its efforts with the manual consistency project. There will be more consistency in the language, structure, etc. Zeller noted there will also be changes to de minimis/restitution issues. There will be a notation in the bylaws to indicate de minimis/restitution (e.g., [D] in bold). Waiver enabling provisions will be moved to the end of those bylaw sections. A long term project includes printing manuals with only the

operating bylaws (e.g., 10–17). Online case management will be released in February. Release 1.0 will include waivers and SAR submissions. All information will be in one place. If materials needed for a waiver are already on file, this information will automatically pre-populate (e.g., transcripts on file with the Eligibility Center). This initiative will include more than just AMA.

The single source sign on will eventually include sports sponsorship. It will be a broader NCAA program that will expand beyond AMA matters. Administrators will continue to receive updates on this.

D. Regional Rules Seminars

Registration opens February 1, 2011. The Tucson seminar will be May 16–20, 2011 and Tampa will be June 6–10, 2011. The grids for the sessions have been posted. Wednesday morning there will be a Division I and II (separated) amateurism summit. Staff from AMA, AGA, EC and SAR will be present. One new item this year will be scheduled round table discussions. They will be topic specific. The discussions will be feedback based and will include best practices/sharing of information. The discussions will be scheduled after topical presentations and will include a member of the staff to help facilitate the discussion. The advanced track will be an option once again. Based on previous feedback, the advanced track will include case studies. In the future, there could be a reduction in the number of days the seminars will be conducted. The staff is also looking at attempts to tie the seminars in with other events (e.g., AGA Gambling Seminar). As part of the cost containment initiative, Indianapolis will be utilized more often for seminars.

Babcock, ACC, requested clarification on the University Athlete (UA) issue. Holzman responded that she is the AVCA liaison. Discussions began back in June or July. There was not a broad communication of the LRIC outcome. Unbeknownst to staff, UA felt it was okay with the changes that had been made. Consequently, the number of subscriptions increased and the service continued to be used. There is a waiver that has been filed and is waiting to be reviewed. Lyons confirmed that the subcommittee has a call later in the week to discuss the waiver. UA does not provide an assessment on prospective student-athletes. Holzman confirmed that a legislative change is needed if the membership wants these type of services to be permissible. Sports other than women's and men's basketball could get more flexible legislation. This was originally a men's basketball matter. It is currently not permissible for a coach to continue using the UA database. There was a question as to the timing of the waiver and subscriptions. Zeller responded that discussions included allowing the waiver to remain in effect until August 1, 2011.

The group agreed to share information on future responses from the NCAA staff.

29. Adjournment