



**MINUTES**  
**CCACA CONFERENCE CALL**  
**Wednesday, January 4, 2012 ~ 12:00p.m. ET**

**Participants:**

Mary Mulvenna, Warren Lane, *America East*; Shamaree Brown, *ACC*; Steve Sturek, *Atlantic Sun*; Ed Pasque, Jill Redmond, *Atlantic 10*; Joseph D'Antonio, Jennifer Condaras, Kenny Schank, *BIG EAST*; Jaynee Nadolski, *Big Sky*; Sherika Montgomery, *Big South*; Jennifer Heppel, Chad Hawley, Kerry Kenny, *Big Ten*; David Flores, Keri Boyce, *Big 12*; Erica Montebardo, Melissa Swaffer, *Big West*; Kathleen Batterson, Vince Pierson, *Colonial*; Rob Philippi, Callie Hubbell, Frank Arrendondo, *Conference USA*; Mike Sharpe, *Great West*; Christine Halstead, *Horizon*; Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Megan McHugo, Matt Singer, *Ivy League*; Barbara Church, Samantha Hegmann, *MAAC*; Jackie Mynarski, *MAC*; Greg Walter, *Missouri Valley*; Marlon Edge, *Mountain West*; Kelly Webb, *Northeast*; Matt Banker, *Ohio Valley*; Mike Matthews, Ron Barker, Erik Price, *Pac-12*; Ginger Fulton, *Patriot League*; Doug King, *Southern*; Stephanie McDonald, Henry Archuleta, *Southland*; Angie Torrain, Matt Boyer, *Summit League*; Edgar Gantt, Kentrell Kearney, *SWAC*; Scott Connors, *Sun Belt*; Sarah Wilhelmi, *West Coast*; Matt Burgemeister, *WAC*;

**1. INAAC.**

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

**2. Review of Agenda**

**3. Approval of the November 30, 2011 Conference Call Minutes**

Minutes were unanimously approved.

**4. 2012 CCACA In-Person Meeting**

D'Antonio referenced the attachment highlighting the schedule for the meeting and requested that all agenda items be sent to him as soon as possible.

D'Antonio also confirmed that Lynn Holzman, Leeland Zeller and Susan Peal, NCAA, will be joining the meeting on the second day. Additionally, D'Antonio is still working with Jennifer Henderson, NCAA, to confirm her attendance.

**5. 2011-12 Legislative Cycle**

D'Antonio asked if anyone had anything to discuss relative to the current legislative cycle. D'Antonio noted that the most significant thing that has occurred in this area since the last call is the list of proposals that has been added to the already existing list of proposals for consideration for the legislative council to table based on the work of the NCAA working groups that were formed. The rules working group added several proposals to the list. There was a brief discussion on how conferences are proceeding with regard to this list. Several individuals indicated that they would be operating as usual for purposes of casting votes on all proposals in the cycle. There was a concern raised by a few Commissioners that do not have individuals from their conferences on all the working groups, that some proposals should not be tabled. Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Ivy League, responded that the legislative council would likely review all of the proposals one at a time and not table them as a group. She indicated that was important that everyone have an opportunity to voice their thoughts on each proposal. Campbell-McGovern also noted that with

regard to the override process, the membership seems to be behind the Presidential working groups' theories and does not want to stand in the way of reform. Some folks on the call indicated that the frustration with the way the BOD voted in October was not so much with the adoption of the multi-year grant and the miscellaneous expense proposals but more with the immediate implementation. If there had been some reaction to delay the implementation of the proposals, there might not have been an override.

**6. NCAA Working Groups**

D'Antonio asked if anyone had anything to discuss relative to the NCAA Working Groups. D'Antonio noted that a copy of the December 7<sup>th</sup> report of the resource allocation working group has been included in the materials. Several issues from the report will likely be addressed by the BOD at the January 14<sup>th</sup> meeting. D'Antonio specifically noted the issues of reduction in scholarships in football and women's basketball, elimination of foreign tours and the numerical restriction on non-coaching staff personnel. The degree to which they deal with these issues is uncertain. The membership could see another miscellaneous expense / multi-year grant scenario where the BOD simply adopts the concepts and the proposals will go out the membership as adopted and the membership is forced to react. The BOD could also take these matters under advisement and continue on with reviewing these issues and sponsor legislation at some point in the future.

**7. Miscellaneous Expense/Multiyear Grants**

D'Antonio asked if anyone had anything to discuss relative to these items. No one brought up any specific matters.

**8. 2012 NCAA Convention**

D'Antonio noted the current status of the two override votes with the miscellaneous expense and multi-year proposals. The miscellaneous expense proposal was stayed given the number of override votes it received. Any amendment the BOD puts forward relative to either of the proposals will simply send the two proposals back to the membership which will start another override period. A question was raised as to when the membership might be notified of the modifications the BOD could be considering. Campbell-McGovern responded that she has not received anything regarding the BOD meeting. Campbell-McGovern will reach out to the NCAA staff and will provide this group with any information she receives. A question was raised regarding the multi-year grant and whether the override votes were cast because of the effective date or if institutions/conferences had an issue with the overall concept of the proposal. Further, if there are issues with the concept are there any conferences putting forward suggestions to the well-being working group or the BOD? There were responses in opposition to both the effective date and the overall concept.

**9. Next Conference Call**

Wednesday, February 29, 2012 at noon EST

**10. Adjournment**



**MINUTES**  
**CCACA IN-PERSON MEETING**  
**Wednesday, January 26-27, 2012 ~ 12:00p.m. ET**

**Participants:**

Mary Mulvena, *America East*; Lindsey Babcock, Shamaree Brown, *ACC*; Steve Sturek, *Atlantic Sun*; Jill Redmond, *Atlantic 10*; Joseph D'Antonio, Jennifer Condaras, Kenny Schank, *BIG EAST*; Jaynee Nadolski, *Big Sky*; Sherika Montgomery, *Big South*; Chad Hawley, Kerry Kenny, *Big Ten*; David Flores, Keri Boyce, *Big 12*; Erica Montebano, *Big West*; Kathleen Batterson, *Colonial*; Rob Philippi, Callie Hubbell, Frank Arrendondo, *Conference USA*; Mike Sharpe, *Great West*; Christine Halstead, *Horizon*; Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Megan McHugo, *Ivy League*; Barbara Church, *MAAC*; Jackie Mynarski, *MAC*; Greg Walter, *Missouri Valley*; Carolayne Henry, Marlon Edge, *Mountain West*; Kelly Webb, *Northeast*; Matt Banker, *Ohio Valley*; Mike Matthews, Ron Barker, Erik Price, *Pac-12*; Ginger Fulton, *Patriot League*; Stephanie McDonald, Henry Archuleta, *Southland*; Angie Torrain, Matt Boyer, *Summit League*; Edgar Gantt, *SWAC*; Scott Connors, *Sun Belt*; Sarah Wilhelmi, *West Coast*; Matt Burgemeister, *WAC*;

**1. INAAC.**

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

**2. Review of Agenda**

Additional Items

A. Sand volleyball- Sarah Wilhelmi, West Coast Conference

**3. Approval of the January 4, 2012 Conference Call Minutes**

Minutes were unanimously approved.

**4. Topics for discussion on Friday with Lynn Holzman and Leeland Zeller, NCAA**

Holzman provided an update on the regional rules seminars. The seminars will be the same as the past few years-- a full week broken out into two segments. The session schedule is now available on the website and registration will begin 2/1/12 for both sites. The advanced track schedule will also remain the same. They will begin Wednesday afternoon and conclude Thursday evening. There will also be a pilot program for new compliance professionals. Similar to the advanced track, these participants will also be nominated by the conference offices. For approximately four hours on both Mondays, there will be panels, presenters, and NAAC members. The NAAC members will facilitate round table discussions and share best practices. Next year the schedule will change. There will be two shorter weeks and will likely run from Tuesday afternoon (full association) through Friday. The NCAA staff has utilized feedback to improve its efforts. On both Wednesdays at the seminar there will be an enforcement experience session. New to the seminar this year is a session on title IX/gender equity issues. In Anaheim, there will be a summit for junior colleges. In Atlanta, there will be an invite only session for limited resource institutions. There will no longer be introduction/advanced sessions. A question was raised as to whether there would be a post Presidential retreat session. Holzman responded that there is not currently a session but that there will be references/discussions during the advanced track sessions.

Holzman informed the group that a technology advisory group is being created to test new ideas and to serve as an ongoing resource. There will be approximately 30 individuals serving, across all three divisions. Holzman also noted that AMA Online version 2.0 will be unveiled in April. A few highlights of this program are:

1. Urgent issues- all case types flagged
2. Home screen- more user defined
3. Multiple student-athlete cases- work in progress
4. Carry-over- conference visibility and access – it is an ncaa.org issue, not AMA
5. CA- moving more to a student-athlete portal/collection of data. Will make it more efficient
6. IPP (institutional performance program)- big project. Was formerly athletic certification

Holzman noted that they are still working on the creation of a smartphone application for the manual. It would look like an eBook. The application will hopefully be ready in early February and will be in a user friendly PDF format (iPhone, kindle, etc.). A question was raised regarding updates. Zeller responded that updates would be available on a quarterly basis. Zeller also noted that there will be a full PDF version of the printed manual. It will be updated to include delayed effective date legislation. It will be searchable and will have a table of contents, similar to online text books. A question was raised about the possibility of having a smart phone application for LSDBi. Zeller responded it could be possible.

- A. Will the rules working group be presenting information to the BOD in April for adoption?**- It is not completely clear as to exactly which issues will be voted on in April.
- B. Men's Basketball Recruiting Model- Communication Restrictions-** The group asked for further clarification on the discrepancies between the language in the legislation and the recruiting model chart. Zeller responded that more focus should be placed on the legislation than on the chart. The legislation was adopted on concepts with the details to be filled in later. The NCAA staff will use questions when drafting legislation. Zeller confirmed that coaches cannot have communication with PSAs or their parents during an event, but it is okay to have electronic correspondence with the parent. A question was also raised regarding a coach's ability to send a video via text once it has been sent to the public (e.g., twitter) and therefore not considered to be created for recruiting purposes. Zeller reminded the group that coaches cannot attach videos to text messages or any other electronic communications.
- C. 2010-58C- Moot-** There is no limit/minimum for the number of hours a PSA must be enrolled. Additionally, there is no requirement to pass the classes. A question was raised regarding internet courses and if they could be used. Zeller responded that preliminarily the answer is yes. A question was raised regarding the 6 hour requirement for financial aid purposes for incoming students and whether those individuals would have an opt out clause. Zeller responded that those individuals would not have that opportunity. A student

would have to be at the institution for one year to get an opt out clause, including mid-year enrollees.

- D. **Summer Access- GPA thresholds-** A question was raised as to whether during the eight week period, if a PSA obtains a 2.2 or greater GPA, does he/she have to continue with school in the next session? Zeller responded that a PSA must meet standard to be eligible next term. The GPA benchmark must be met at the beginning of the term. Zeller also noted that further clarification is forthcoming.
- E. **2011-27- Ancillary Arrangements/Activities-** The group requested the NCAA staff to draft an educational column to clarify what ancillary means. Zeller requested that the group provide him with specific events/activities to illustrate example.
- F. **2011-23- Inclusion of College Placement Services-** The group requested the NCAA staff to draft an educational column to clarify the entities/individuals were intended to be included in this legislation. Where will the line be drawn? The educational column should draw a distinction between and provide clarification on recruiting services, scholarship services and agents. The group expressed concern that legitimate services will get could be precluded as a result of the proposal. Henderson encouraged the group to gather as much data as possible about these organizations.
- G. **Non-Coaching Personnel Limits-** BOD wants feedback from the membership. It appears there will be limits imposed in the future. The concept is going back to the rules working group and will likely not be voted on in April.
- H. **2011-65- Year of Readiness-** Brief discussion about this proposal. The majority of the group is not in support.
- I. **Non-Scholastic BB/FB Hosting Events-** There was a discussion regarding interpretative authority between enforcement and AMA staffs. Zeller indicated that that staff is in the process of discussing whether the interpretation process should be brought back to AMA and appeals to LRIC. There was also a brief discussion on nonscholastic events being hosted at arenas that schools don't control but use for competitions on a regular basis and how coaches are being threatened with suspension from BFG staff. Zeller noted that there will be an editorial change to NCAA Proposal 2011-45. The proposal currently reads that it is impermissible to evaluate at noninstitutional events, camps, etc. The intent was to limit noninstitutional and nonscholastic events.
- J. **Date for Override vote in February-** Discussion- 2/6/12-2/12/12; Voting- 2/13/12-2/17/12 (5PM). Concerns were raised regarding the public's access to comments/votes. Holzman responded that only those individuals that have access/have been provided access can view such information. A question was raised regarding abstentions. The outcome of the override vote is based on the number of votes cast (5/8 majority). Abstentions are not considered votes. The forum for voting is a minimum of 100 votes. A question was raised regarding the override votes effect on FCS schools. Zeller responded that the override applies to all institutions. There is not a separate vote. The only separation is for the scholarship reduction piece.
- K. **How rules changes will affect PSAs that have already signed (multi-year/ MEA)-** Some institutions have provided information to PSAs indicating all institutional aid can be received while others have not provided such information. Zeller responded that these scenarios have to be reviewed on a

case by case basis and encouraged the group to send him examples to review. The Q&A addressing these financial aid issues will continue to be updated.

There was a brief discussion on the \$2000 miscellaneous expense. It appears that the original number one option has gone away. Kerry Kenny, Big Ten, informed the group that his conference is working on a document related to the need-based model. This information will be shared with the group.

- L. **Rules Working Group- Feedback from the Membership-** Holzman and Zeller provided an update on the working groups. The Resource Allocation group was reviewing Bylaw 17. The group's findings have been sent to the Rules Working group. The Well-Being group's \$2000 miscellaneous expense proposal and other issues will be voted on by the BOD in April. The Enforcement and Rules Working groups will be conducting conference calls next week and will eventually have a meeting together. Both committees will have an education outreach liaison. Holzman will serve in that role for the Rules Working group and Laura Wurtz, NCAA, for the Enforcement group. The outreach program wants feedback from the membership and is working on how to receive such feedback, who to target and the best method of communication. There will be a web page that includes an enforcement column, a rules column, history, talking points, timeline and information for meetings. There will be an opportunity for feedback.

Heading into the April meeting, principles will be identified for consideration, such as institutional control and fairness. Operating bylaws will be provide specificity to support principles. Bylaws 15 and 17 will be in phase two. A question was raised as to what general concepts for future legislation might look like and how will they be submitted. Holzman responded that she is not sure at this time. There needs to be serious discussions on effective dates and how legislation will affect other areas such as student-athlete reinstatement. Campbell-McGovern noted the inclusion of implementation plans are very helpful. Holzman once again encouraged feedback and stressed the importance of it.

- M. **NCAA Bylaw 31.3.4.1- AQ Status-** D'Antonio will follow up with Steve Mallonee, NCAA, on AQ issues and will update the group with the outcome.
- N. **Enforcement Working Group- Compliance Reviews-** Compliance reviews are on the radar and will be dealt with from a global standpoint initially and then with specifics.

## 5. **Topics for discussion on Friday with Jennifer Henderson, NCAA**

Henderson reviewed the materials provided at the meeting. The student-athlete reinstatement staff's philosophy is to get the student-athlete back to where he/she was prior to the violation, using repayment and withholding of competitions when appropriate. Henderson encouraged the group to share this philosophy with new compliance professionals. Henderson noted that conferences can assist schools with determining if a violation has occurred, level of violation, reinstatement and associated penalties. There is a guideline document on the NCAA website that includes policies and procedures for student-athlete reinstatement cases that can assist schools throughout the process. The student-athlete reinstatement staff is fine working with conference offices or directly with the institutions. Henderson highlighted the point of contact handout and

informed the group to call the reinstatement direct line when there is a situation that arises after hours or on the weekend. The call will come through the staff's blackberry as an email.

Henderson reminded the group that institutions should research case precedent when working through reinstatement cases. Priority is given based on day/time of pending competition, and staff also considers the timing of when the violation is submitted (e.g., day before competition). Henderson also noted that the reinstatement staff processes approximately 2000 cases a year.

Henderson reminded the group that in order for a student-athlete to fulfill a withholding penalty, he/she must have been otherwise eligible to compete. Competitions must be considered countable toward championship in order to be used. Exhibitions and scrimmages may not be used to fulfill withholding penalty. A student-athlete must also be cleared medically to serve the penalty. This has always been the policy but might not be well known amongst the membership. Although there can be some flexibility with this, a student-athlete who is significantly injured should not use those games to serve withholding penalty. There was a suggestion for the staff to create a best practices document for appeals that institutions can use to work through the process. Henderson noted that the committee wants to hear from the student-athlete during the appeal process, so he/she should be prepared and genuine when participating in the process. No new information can be presented during the appeal process.

Henderson noted the report from the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement that was included in the materials. Specifically, Henderson highlighted a few points from the gambling violations guidelines. Division III has the highest rate of gambling violations. There have been a lot of cases lately involving less profile issues such as tournament brackets and friendly wagers. Effective 8/1/12, for violations involving amounts greater than \$25 will include a withholding penalty. The higher the value, the larger the withholding penalty will be. Mitigating factors will always be considered and such matters are to be reviewed on a case by case basis. These types of issues are most prevalent in the sport of golf.

A question was raised regarding hardship waivers and the conference's ability to process such requests when the student-athlete does not compete during a particular academic year. Henderson reminded the group that a hardship waiver cannot be processed if the student-athlete does not participate in any competitions during the academic year. Henderson also noted that for purposes of an extension of eligibility request, a letter from the conference indicating a waiver would have been granted does not really make a difference. A question was also raised regarding NCAA Proposal 2011-65. Specifically, if the legislation passes can a student-athlete get an extension of eligibility if he/she was granted two hardship waivers. Henderson responded that it is possible and the NCAA staff is still working through some of those issues.

## **6. Topics for discussion on Friday with Susan Peal, NCAA**

Peal provided some NLI statistics:

- Null and Void Reports- 1275 this year
- Null and Void Reports- 1274 last year

Reports this year were due to the NLI office on January 20<sup>th</sup>. A question was raised regarding approved initial eligibility waivers and whether there was a way for that information to be inputted into the NLI database. Peal responded that they are currently working on that. Peal also noted that a high percentage of 2-year transfers were included in the null and void report list. The system is set up to not pull those individuals. Anyone included was not flagged as a 2-year transfer. Peal encouraged everyone to remind their institutions to designate 2-year transfers. A few suggestions were provided to help with that issue such as making that section of the form more prominent and putting a check box in that area of the form to force institutions to properly identify PSAs. Peal noted there are approximately 38,000 signees this year. Peal also informed the group that there will be a new design to the website and to remind everyone to follow the NLI office on twitter.

Peal next reviewed the Eligibility Center information included in supplement 2A of the materials, Mission Critical Priority- Deliver Membership-Defined Value.

- A. Drive Value- lesson administrative burden on conferences and institutions. Want to gain knowledge from the membership. Round table sessions will be conducted at regional rules seminars.
- B. Engage- Peal reported that recent survey results showed that there is a 97% satisfaction rate within the membership.
- C. Enhance- NLI office and institutions are both accountable and have a shared responsibility. Tasks can be added to the portal to help PSAs and institutions. Peal also noted that the urgent certification program is also a shared responsibility
- D. Educate- The Eligibility Center is gathering all policies and procedures and will make them more transparent to the membership. The Eligibility Center is using the portal for its new educational tools. More will be coming out toward the end of March. Peal reminded the group that there is a tutorial on how to use the portal. International issues and amateurism are in the next cycle of education. They will be presented at the regional rules seminars. The Eligibility Center is using digital communication such as twitter and webinars to assist with educational efforts. Those individuals that will be affected by the 2015 legislative changes are freshmen in high school now. The High School Review Staff will be working hard to provide information to high school counselors. Peal noted that the biggest challenge is with secondary schools. One of the educational efforts will be through the Eligibility Center newsletter. Condaras indicated that NAAC is trying to expand its membership to high school administrators and would be interested in partnering with the Eligibility Center with these educational opportunities. There was a suggestion to also target state high school associations and state coaches associations. Peal noted the suggestion and indicated that the

Eligibility Center does currently have communication with these groups.

Peal noted a staffing in the Eligibility Center when there is a gap in support with academic issues. Specifically individuals are contacting their amateurism conference contact to assist with academic matters. Peal requested that all academic issues be taken to the academic staff members. There currently is not a conference contact program on the academic side. Conferences and institutions can use anyone on the academic side. There were several individuals that expressed interest in having a contact program for academic matters. Peal responded that the Eligibility Center is establishing a dedicated line for conference offices that will have a higher level of customer service staff. Peal reported that starting June 1, 2012, there will be a consolidated customer service for public calls or “one stop shop” for NCAA, Eligibility Center and AMA.

**7. Coaches’ Certification Exam**

D’Antonio noted that the Legislative Council was shown a mockup of what Bylaw 11 could look like and it appeared that the examination would be eliminated. The Rules Working Group will continue to review this matter and make a recommendation to the BOD. The group agreed to wait on forming a subcommittee to address issues associated with the exam. If the exam is eliminated, there could be educational efforts that the membership will be required to conduct. The group was also in favor of submitting a letter to support the elimination of the exam. Frank Arrendondo, Conference USA, volunteered to lead this effort. The letter would also advocate for allowing institutions to use discretion for creating educational opportunities to take the place of the exam.

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

**A. Proposal 2011-99**

Erica Montebaro, Big West, shared concerns that there are conflicts in the men’s basketball recruiting model chart and the language in the legislation. Specifically, regarding contact and electronic communication with parents during and after an event. Montebaro also noted potential issues associated with sending videos from smart phones. It would appear that coaches could send a video to the public (e.g., twitter) and then send it to a PSA. The group shared the concern with the new culture of adopting concepts and filling in the blanks with legislation after the fact.

**B. Proposal 2011-23**

Matt Burgemeister, WAC, asked the group for feedback on whether legitimate college placement services would get caught up on part B of the proposal and therefore be impermissible. These types of companies are addressed in other areas of the legislation as being permissible. The group agreed that it was not intended for this legislation to preclude the use of such services.

**C. Proposal 2011-27**

Burgemeister requested feedback on the application of ancillary activities. The group discussed whether such activities are only permissible if conducted outside of the arena.

**9. Issues and Concerns Related to Matters Addressed and Discussed at the January 14, 2012 Meeting of the Division I Board of Directors**

**A. Multi-Year Grants in Aid- February 2012 Override Vote**

Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Ivy League, noted that the BOD's feeling is this was the right thing to do. The BOD is sensitive to the fact that it will not look good if it is overridden. Campbell-McGovern also noted that there was no discussion on separating the multi-year component from the former student-athlete piece.

**B. Miscellaneous Expense Allowance**

The implementation will be delayed until fall 2013. A few national concerns are stock piling of student-athletes and title IX implications. The working group is reviewing a new model of Bylaw 15 that will address countable/non-countable aid. There does not appear to be any support for option 1 or 2. There is a need based option and the Big Ten office is working on a document to clarify this option and will share with the group.

**C. Noncoaching Staff Members- MBB and FB**

BOD wants to have limitations on the number of non-coaching personnel in these sports. The BOD will be asking the membership for feedback, not the working group. There was not anything specific on this in the re-write of Bylaw 11. All potential concepts are still being considered. In addition to the personnel limitations, the new bylaw 11 could remove position definitions (e.g., volunteer coach). The group had a lengthy discussion as to which departmental staff members should count within the established limitation (e.g., secretaries, marketing). The Athletic Directors want support on this through the legislation to help them manage their own campuses. A question was raised as to whether conferences should implement their own restrictions on non-coaching personnel numbers. The group agreed that it would be difficult for conferences to have to make these decisions.

**D. 2012-13 Legislative Cycle- Moratorium**

There will be a moratorium on new legislative concepts during the 2012-13 academic year. The only proposals that could be reviewed will come from the working groups. There is also a possibility that women's basketball could be granted summer access next year.

**E. Proposal 2011-65- What is next?**

The BOD tabled this proposal and sent it back to CAP. CAP is recommending that the year of readiness be pulled back and further reviewed. The Academic Cabinet was in favor of this proposal.

**F. Summer Access to MBB Student-Athletes- Is Proposal 2010-58-C now moot?**

Discussion was held as to whether 2010-58C will become moot. The components in the proposal associated with enrollment in a specific number of hours and multiple sessions appear to be going away. The group expressed concern with student-athletes paying their own summer living expenses if the requirement for enrollment goes away. D'Antonio noted the similar issues in the Boise State infractions case.

**G. On-Campus Evaluations (OCE)- MBB PSAs**

This could lead to a monitoring concern for compliance offices and a heightened concern with medical liabilities with injuries occurring during on campus evaluations (OCE).

**H. Maximum Contests / Dates of Competition Limits- What Should We Expect from the "Study"?**

There was very little discussion about this at the BOD meeting. Chad Hawley, Big Ten, noted that the BOD will commission a study. The rules working group is discussing principle based outcomes. They are reviewing topic by topic instead of bylaw to bylaw. The working group will be soliciting comments from the membership. This new concept essentially means that the rules in place should be an extension of the principles.

**I. What is the Status of Potentially New NCAA Working Group to Address Institutional Integrity and Shared Responsibility?**

Presentation included the role of auditing within an institution. Could become part of the NCAA audits. Still in the infancy stages.

**10. NCAA Working Groups- Issue, Questions and Concerns Regarding the Next Steps**

**A. Well-Being Working Group**

**B. Working Group on Collegiate Model- Rules Changes**

**C. Transforming Intercollegiate Athletics Collegiate Model Working Group- Enforcement**

There was not a formal update on this working group. The most egregious violations will be dealt with quickly and appropriately. The Committee on Infractions could increase to 24 members. The increase will help the committee be more efficient. The NCAA is looking to hire a new managing director for the committee.

**11. The Role of the Conference Compliance Profession When the Work of the Rules Working Group has Concluded**

Erik Price, Pac-12, noted that discussions regarding rules will change if we shift to adopting legislation based on principles. The group agreed and expressed concern with the uncertainty of how the membership will vote on and be informed of legislative changes in the future.

**12. Potential Impact that the Work of the Enforcement Working Group Could Have on Conference Offices**

The group agreed that this new dynamic could require more involvement from conferences, especially with enforcement matters. The NCAA staff needs to be mindful of this impact and the potential extra burden that will be placed on

conference offices. A concern was raised regarding whether there would be more regulation passed on to the conferences.

- 13. Non-Scholastic Basketball- Football/Event Hosting Scenarios- Clarifying the Roles of BFG and AMA in Issuing Interpretations and Providing Guidance**  
The consensus of the group was that the NCAA needs to provide guidance as to how to proceed with this. Several coaches have been threatened by the NCAA enforcement staff of having to serve game suspensions if particular events are held on or off of their campuses. The event must be scholastic and run by the appropriate organization. There needs to be clarification as to whether football and women's basketball will be handled the same way as men's basketball. It would be helpful if the NCAA could produce a list of who to send questions to in this area (e.g., AMA, BFG).
- 14. How do Conference Offices Manage the Reporting/Monitoring of Secondary Infractions**  
Sarah Wilhelmi, West Coast, asked for feedback on the following areas. There were a variety of responses regarding programs in place, submission requirements and monitoring. The most comprehensive program in place is in the MAC (Contact Jackie Mynarski for more information).

  - A.Submission Requirements / Deadlines**
  - B.Documentation Requirements (Conference Forms, Admonishment Letters, etc.)**
  - C.Quarterly Submission to NCAA**
  - D.Membership Reporting / Review**
  - E.Conference Sanctions for Secondary Violations**
  - F.Technology Best Practices (Database Management Systems)**
- 15. Conference Office Involvement in Major Infractions**  
Wilhelmi asked for feedback regarding conference office participation with a major infractions case. Most individuals responded that it varied from school to school. The NCAA enforcement staff has indicated that they want to make sure conference offices are involved or at least informed of the situation.

  - A.Conference Philosophy (Investigative or Supportive)**
  - B.Investigation Practices**
  - C.Campus Communication (Campus to Conference)**
  - D.NCAA Committee on Infractions**
    - a. Who from the Conference is Involved?
    - b. How is the Conference Involved- if at all?
    - c. "Conference Action" (Who decides? How is it determined?)
  - E.Sanctions**
    - a. Conference Sanctions (What? Who imposes? When? How?)
    - b. NCAA Sanctions (Conference Involvement- Forfeitures, Vacating Wins, Conference Awards)
- 16. The Future of Compliance Reviews per Bylaw 22.2.1.2 Relative to the New Athletics Certification Program**  
D'Antonio reminded everyone that compliance reviews will no longer be a part of athletic certification. There was a brief discussion as to whether the NCAA

enforcement staff will take into consideration if an institution has participated in a recent compliance review.

**A.Are Conferences Still Conducting Compliance Reviews?**

Several individuals responded that their conferences are still conducting reviews.

**B.Are Conferences Currently Requiring Audits?**

There were a few individuals that indicated they are requiring audits. Compliance is the foundation of integrity for the entire institution. A question was raised as to whether an institution's compliance program should be monitored with the rest of the campus and possibly become a part of an institutional audit.

**17. How are Conferences Planning to Deal with the APP Penalty of Postseason Competition Ineligibility as it Relates to Conference Tournaments as well as AQ Spots?**

D'Antonio noted that the BIG EAST is having preliminary discussions on whether to limit a team's ability to play in conference tournament. Policies would have to be developed if the winner is not able to fulfill the AQ spot. There was a lengthy discussion regarding Bylaw 31.3.4.1 and how it is impacted with the new APP penalty of postseason competition. The consensus of the group was that a conference could lose its AQ status if it allows a team that is ineligible for postseason to compete in its championship. The group agreed that conference policies must include parameters addressing participation and revenue. Subsequent to the meeting, D'Antonio confirmed with Steve Mallonee, NCAA, that there is an NCAA memo which documents that a conference could create a policy that would allow an institution subject to an APR postseason restriction to participate in and win a conference tournament / championship while still allowing a conference to send one of its institutions to an NCAA championship using its AQ spot. The memo confirms that the above-stated arrangement is permissible as long the conference had set forth this policy / exception when it filed its yearly AQ application form for the particular sport in question with the NCAA.

**18. Communication with PSAs on Days of Competition**

See 8A

**19. Video "Not Created for Recruiting Purposes" and the Application of Such Video to "Video Texts" and "Twitvids"**

See 8A

**20. NAAC Convention**

D'Antonio reminded the group that 2012 NAAC Convention will take place June 24-26 in Dallas, TX. D'Antonio noted that the Convention and Planning committee has done a good job the last couple of years with putting together quality sessions and presenters. Jennifer Condaras, BIG EAST, also noted that the convention scholarship release will be going out very soon. The scholarship is for individuals attending the convention for the first time. Recipients must be NAAC members but the scholarship can also be used to pay for membership dues.

**21. 2013 CCACA In-Person Meeting**

**A. Format**

D'Antonio asked for feedback on the format of the meeting and whether the group wanted to continue with this set up moving forward. The group agreed that having the extra half day is essential. There was a brief discussion of having a full day's meeting with the NCAA staff. No official decisions were made with regard to format. A few individuals asked about increasing the payment for dinner to allow an opportunity to have beverages available during the meeting. D'Antonio responded that he will look into that but typically such services are very expensive.

**22. Other Business**

**A. Sand Volleyball Issue**

Wilhelmi indicated that there had been some amateurism concerns regarding sand volleyball. Specifically, the Eligibility Center was considering sand volleyball and traditional volleyball as two separate sports. Wilhelmi noted that the issue has been resolved and the sports are now considered the same for amateurism purposes.

**B. Quadrangular Track Meets**

Wilhelmi asked for feedback regarding quadrangular track meets and the ability to re-score the results with non-participants after the conclusion of the meet. The group agreed that such an arrangement is not permissible.

**23. Adjournment**