



**MINUTES
CCACA CONFERENCE CALL**

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 3 ~ 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. CT

Participants: Amy Huchthausen and Matt Jarret, America East; Shane Lyons (co-chair) and Lindsey Babcock (recording secretary), ACC; Steve Sturek, Atlantic Sun; Jackie Campbell, Atlantic 10; Ron Loghry, Big Sky; Carol Iwaoka and Jennifer Heppel, Big Ten; Stephanie Jarvis, Horizon; Carolyn Campbell-McGovern and Mary Mulvenna, Ivy; Angie Torain, Mid-Continent; Sonja Stills and Alex Robinson, Mid-Eastern Athletic; Sarah Weier and Patty Viverito, Missouri Valley; Carolayne Henry and Anthony Archbald, Mountain West; Corrinne Wright, Northeast; Erik Price and Ron Barker, Pac-10; Greg Sankey, Gil Grimes and Torie Johnson, SEC; Doug King, Southern; Jennifer Henderson, Sun Belt; Gloria Nevarez, West Coast.

1. Approval of minutes of October 6 CCACA conference call.

- **ACTION:** Jennifer Heppel noted a change to Item #5, which was sent to Mary Ellen previously.

2. Amateurism Status of International Student-Athletes.

Overall the group was supportive of 2004-60 but recognize that there could be concern over cost. Suggestions were made regarding each institution paying for the service of the staff to certify an international prospect as well as having the prospect pay a fee themselves. The group was concerned that the cost issue may cause the proposal to not be approved. It was agreed to continue to have discussions with the NCAA staff regarding this matter and to request that it be placed on the agenda for the in-person February meeting. It was also requested that the AGA staff be present.

4. Open Gyms.

The group was not comfortable defining “occasional practice players”, however, it was agreed that an occasional practice player is different from an occasional meal. The group felt that “occasional” is not a regular occurrence and should be left up to each institution to define.

5. Hot Topics.

Gill Grimes voiced concerns over the timeliness of “Hot Topics” and responses from staff. The group agreed that the staff needs to provide “Hot Topics” 6 – 8 weeks prior to the relevant time in order to aid the institutional compliance staff in educating their coaches. Shane Lyons agreed to discuss the group’s concern with staff and add it to the February in-person meeting agenda.

6. Future Conference Calls and In-Person Meeting.

The next conference call is scheduled for December 1st and noted that the Wednesday January 5th call will be changed to Wednesday, January 6th. The in-person meeting is scheduled for February 7 – 8, 2004 in Indianapolis, IN.

7. Other Business: Submitting Interpretation Requests to LRIC.

Carolyn Henry expressed concern regarding the staff's discretion in sending interpretive issues to LRIC. The group agreed that the staff should not have the authority to refuse to send an issue to the committee. It was also stated that it takes too long for issues to be heard by the committee. Shane Lyons will discuss this issue with staff and add it to the February in-person meeting agenda, along with the discussion on Hot Topics.

11. Adjournment.

The call was adjourned at 12:00 p.m. (CT).



MINUTES
CCACA CONFERENCE CALL
Conference Call to Discuss Recruiting Task Force Issues
Thursday, November 4, 2004 ~ 11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. CT

NOTE: The sense of the call is noted in the shaded boxes that appear throughout this document.

Participants: Shane Lyons (co-chair) and Lindsey Babcock, ACC; Steve Sturek, Atlantic Sun; Jackie Campbell and Jamie Braunwarth, Atlantic 10; Lori Ebihara (co-chair) and Mary Ellen Enigk (recording secretary), Big 12; Stan Wilcox, Big East; Carol Iwaoka, Jennifer Heppel and Chad Hawley, Big Ten; Erica Satterfield, Big West; Kathleen Batterson, Colonial; Jeff Schemmel, Conference USA; Carolyn Campbell-McGovern and Mary Mulvenna, Ivy; Shonna Brown, Mid-American; Sonja Stills, Mid-Eastern Athletic; Patty Viverito and Sarah Weier, Missouri Valley; Carolayne Henry and Anthony Archbald, Mountain West; Corrinne Wright, Northeast; Mike Matthews, Erik Price and Ron Barker, Pac-10; Greg Sankey, Gil Grimes, Torie Johnson and Edgar Gantt, SEC; Doug King, Southern; LaRon Black, Southland; Pat Hairston, WAC; Steve Mallonee and Delise O’Meally, NCAA.

1. Purpose of the call and the group’s desired outcome.

It was noted that the purpose of the call was for the CCACA and the NCAA staff to come to an agreement on the application of the new recruiting legislation.

2. Update on October 18-19 Management Council and October 28 NCAA Board of Director Meetings.

Delise O’Meally provided an update on the October 18-19 Management Council meeting, specifically the discussion that ensued with regard to the work of the NCAA Task Force on Recruiting. It was noted that this matter was originally placed on the Management Council’s agenda in order for the group to discuss the issue in broad context and to address the interpretive questions that the staff was receiving on this matter. Delise noted that the Management Council particularly addressed the September 15 email that was distributed by the Membership Services staff which addressed several questions raised by the CCACA group. The Management Council subsequently agreed that this issue should be managed at the staff’s discretion and should also be reviewed by the Board of Directors.

Steve Mallonee noted that the Board of Directors briefly discussed this matter during its October 28 meeting and the group agreed that institutions should simply operate under the philosophy of “do unto prospective student-athletes, as you would do unto prospective students.”

3. Review of September 1 CCACA teleconference and the September 15 Membership Services Staff response on issues that were forwarded to the staff based on the discussion that took place on September 1 and through additional correspondence.

a. Use of Nonpersonalized recruiting aids during the recruiting visit.

Background:

CCACA (via Lyons): I think we know that nothing can include the names of the prospects. This issue surrounds the matter of “sense of entitlement”. I think the CCACA agreed that you may not decorate the hotel rooms with streamers and balloons even though those sort of things are not

personalized. Now the questions have come whether the institution may decorate the locker room, conference rooms etc. for the prospects, understanding that NO names will be used. There have been differing opinions from staff on this matter. Some say yes and others say no. I'm of the opinion that the facilities should look the same as it always does throughout the year and by decorating is going outside the intent of what the task force was try to accomplish.

NCAA: We agreed that the Recruiting Task Force's intent was not to preclude nonpersonalized recruiting aids. In fact they were fairly specific in their discussions to those items that may carry the prospect's name, picture or other identifiable elements and were really geared toward creating the sense of entitlement. I realize some on the CCACA also believe that nonpersonalized aids also create that sense of entitlement and if you, as a group want to come out in a more stringent manner on this issue, that is certainly understandable. We also discussed the issue of using these nonpersonalized aids in the hotel room and whether that would in effect "upgrade" a standard room. We believe the Recruiting Task Force's intent was to preclude institutions from arranging lodging in which the accommodations were different/better than that which a regular hotel guest would receive. The examples initially used were Jacuzzis and the like. We therefore drew a distinction between items that upgrade the accommodations and those that serve a decorative purpose. Granted this does still leave room for some interpretation but the hope is that using a reasonable person's standard, the membership will understand those items that actually provide better accommodation versus those that merely make the room look different. In this regard, we believe balloons and streamers are decorative in nature however, the consensus was that special sheets and towels (e.g., with institutional logo etc) not only decorate the room but may also provide better accommodations and thus should be impermissible.

Outcome:

The group recognized that this issue surrounds the matter of “sense of entitlement”. There was agreement within the group that anything provided or displayed during a prospect’s recruiting visit should not be personalized and that institutions should not decorate prospects’ lodging with streamers, balloons, fruit baskets or other “decorations” even if such items are not personalized. Further, there was agreement that institutions should not do anything out of the ordinary to facilities for purposes of a recruiting visit. The CCACA group agreed that this position is consistent with the intent of the legislation.

a. Standard Meals.

Background:

CCACA: Other issues that have arisen related to the task force’s proposals relate to meals. The CCACA attempted to define what “standard” meant by saying the meals have to be comparable to meals eaten at training table and/or meals eaten while on the road. Given that we have now received responses that teams may normally eat at a five star restaurant on the road such as Ruth Chris, Morton’s etc. Some are saying these are fine because it meets the test but others are saying that it is not because this goes beyond “Standard”. I think the task force was trying to get at excessive types of meals (e.g., two steaks, three lobsters at Morton’s) So I guess the question is whether these sort of establishments are fine for recruiting purposes as long as the they only have a appetizer, entrée and desert? Does the staff believe there should be difference if the team NORMALLY does not eat at this sort of restaurant? Is there a different standard for different

sport? Such as the golf team may eat at country clubs because they do that on the road, can the FB and MBB take prospects to a country club and eat. I think the gist of this issue is trying to define standard and what restaurants may be used and if different restaurant apply to different sports.

NCAA: We struggled with the idea of using restaurant classifications as a measure of the type of meal a prospect may receive for the simple reason that those classifications are subjective, related to the locale and may change fairly frequently. We believe that the intent of the recruiting task force was to eliminate the extravagant meals and try to align those meals more closely to that which the prospective student-athlete would experience on campus. Obviously there have been several suggestions on how these meals should be measured e.g., dollar limit, similar to campus, similar to away from home dining. With what we know to be the intent that the official visit appropriate represent "life on campus" and in the absence of specific direction from the Recruiting Task Force, we believe those meals should be similar to campus meals including training table meals. Additionally, we don't believe there needs to be sports specificity in this regard, arguably institutional budgets will dictate. Therefore we view the training table meal standard as an upper limit for all sports, even though golf or tennis student-athletes may not enjoy a training table meal on a regular basis (or ever...) we felt it was appropriate to allow prospects in those sports to receive a meal consistent with that upper level standard.

Outcome:

The group agreed with the staff's position that the intent of the Recruiting Task Force was to eliminate the extravagant meals and try to align those meals more closely to that which the prospective student-athlete would experience on campus (e.g. training table meals). Therefore, the group agreed that determining a "standard meal" should be left up to the discretion of each institution, understanding that providing multiple entrees to a prospect should be considered excessive.

In addition, the group addressed concerns of institutions creating a certain ambiance for a meal during a prospects official visit (i.e. exclusive table, access to exclusive restaurants) and agreed that making special arrangements for such meals should constitute excessive entertainment.

b. Standard lodging.

Background:

NCAA: We believe the Recruiting Task Force's intent was to preclude institutions from arranging lodging in which the accommodations were different/better than that which a regular hotel guest would receive. The examples initially used were Jacuzzis and the like.

Outcome:

The group agreed that standard lodging should fall under one of the following three categories:

- 1) Consistent with where prospective students stay generally when visiting the institution.
- 2) Consistent with the institution's lodging for away-from-home contests.
- 3) Consistent with where visiting teams stay while at the institution.
- 4) On campus.

It was noted that such options will be provided to institutions to utilize at their discretion; however if it becomes problematic, the staff agreed revisit the matter at that time.

d. **Official visit transportation, types of vehicles that can be utilized.**

Background:

NCAA: On the issue of around campus, I would say there is a different standard for transportation once they get to campus (with the exception that none of transportation should be outside institutional parameters). I just think the proposal is clear that when transporting around campus, it's the same mode as for other groups or personal vehicles. If the institution uses 15-person vans for tours and athletics wants to use a 15-person van that is their vehicle, I am not troubled. I just think it should be the same type of transportation (with the same bare bones amenities - no DVD's, TV's, etc), regardless of who owns it.

CCACA: The group generally believes the intent of Proposal 2004-94 was to control the type of vehicles being used to transport PSAs around the campus once the visit has begun. In fact, that's what the actual language says. The airport-to-campus leg is really a different matter (for which expenses can be paid by an athletic department) and NCAA 13.6.2.4 is unchanged by the new recruiting reforms. We would underscore that luxury or special vehicles of any kind can't be used in such a shuttle system.

BIG TEN: The only other item that I'd like discussed that perhaps we should update/change the language of 2004-94 so that it reflects the interps from the NCAA staff. Specifically, staff has said standard, athletics vehicles (e.g., 15-person van) can be used to transport PSAs around campus, regardless of whether or not that vehicle is used to transport prospects in general. This makes sense to me, but is not reflective of the language of the proposal.

C-USA: My institutions would like an interpretation regarding the use of institutional or athletic department golf carts for transportation around campus during the visit. The consensus is that the admissions office does not use golf carts to transport prospective students in general but if the golf carts are not specialized with accessories, would it be permissible to use them to transport PSAs on visits?

Outcome:

Personal Vehicles: The group addressed coaches' use of personal vehicles that are categorized as extravagant or luxury and agreed that as long as it can be demonstrated that such a vehicle is the coach's "every day" vehicle, then it should be permissible for him/her

to transport prospects in that vehicle during an official visit. However, the group also agreed that coaches should not be permitted to make special arrangements for the use of such extravagant or luxury vehicles (i.e. rent, borrow or purchase) for the sole purpose of transporting a prospect during an official visit.

Rental Cars: The group agreed that coaches should be permitted to rent cars for purposes of transporting a prospect during an official visit, provided the rental car is a standard rental (i.e. standard mid-size car) and not upgraded to a “premium” vehicle or similar (i.e. sports car, Humvee, luxury car, etc.).

15-Passenger Vans, buses and Golf Carts: The group agreed that it should be permissible for institutions to transport prospects around campus in 15-passenger vans or golf carts regardless of whether they are used by prospective students in general, and provided the transportation is standard and not decorated or up-graded.

c. Hosting duties.

Background:

CCACA: Agreed to forward a recommendation to the NCAA staff requesting a definition of host/hostesses duties. Most agreed with one conference’s staff position which draws a distinction between athletics groups/student workers that perform administrative tasks in which little to no contact with prospects occurs versus tasks which require more interaction. The latter being considered tasks that would qualify an individual as a host and subject to 2004-96. Examples of administrative tasks include, but are not limited to, stuffing envelopes, collecting unofficial visit meal money, handing out complimentary admissions. Provided these tasks occur under conditions in which little to no interaction with prospects occur, it would be permissible for an athletics group to fill these positions (voluntary or paid). However, any task that involves hosting, entertaining, escorting, etc. must be performed by an individual designated in a manner consistent with the institution's policy for hosting prospective students generally.

NCAA: The staff agreed to draw the line between administrative responsibilities (e.g., stuffing envelopes, collecting unofficial visit money, handing out complimentary admissions) and tasks that require more interaction with prospects (e.g., entertaining, escorting, etc.) This is consistent with the position taken by most on the conference call. We will issue an interpretation confirming this distinction between administrative responsibilities and hosting responsibilities as it relates to student hosts.

Outcome:

The group agreed with the staff’s position to draw the line between administrative responsibilities (e.g., stuffing envelopes, collecting unofficial visit money, handing out complimentary admissions) and tasks that require more interaction with prospects (e.g., entertaining, escorting, etc.).

d. Athletics department providing funds to the office that now houses the hosting group.

Background:

CCACA:

1. Can the athletics department provide funds to the office that is now housing these groups?
2. Can the hostess where uniforms that are required to be worn by the athletic hostess if that is not the case for other hosts of the institution?
3. Can the athletics department request specific hosts from the pool of host or does it have to be done on a random basis?

NCAA: We were not troubled by the fact that athletics may fund the overall university host program provided this funding in no way compromises university oversight of the program. Athletics should remain completely uninvolved in the managing and operation of the program.

Outcome:

The group agreed that it should not be permissible for athletics departments to fund student-host groups that are housed within the Admissions Office (or other office on campus). However, there was consensus that if the Admissions (or other) Office charges all departments on campus for the use of student-hosts (i.e. "bill for service"), the athletics department may pay such a fee consistent with institutional policy.

e. Athletics department requesting specific hosts from the pool of hosts.

Background:

NCAA: We think the legislation is clear in that it requires the use of such hosts pursuant to institutional policy, so we would default to institutional policy in this regard.

Outcome:

The group agreed with the staff's position that institutional policy should determine whether athletics departments are permitted to select specific hosts from a pool of hosts. It was noted that if other departments on campus (i.e. engineering, chemistry, etc.) request specific hosts for prospective students generally, then it should be permissible for athletics departments to operate consistently.

f. Student managers participating in some types of hosting activities.

Background:

NCAA: This is one in which we would solicit further input from the CCACA group. The issue is whether we should consider student-employees to be "students" or "employees" for the purposes of this legislation. Our group was largely split, seeing both sides of the issue. Stan Wilcox' position was compelling in that if an individual is truly a manager and performs manager duties

we shouldn't care whether he/she also plays a small role in the official visit process. However it is difficult to draw the line between those individuals and other possible student-employees within the athletic department and some thought it would be cleaner to apply the rule as it relates to students (i.e., either a student-athlete or part of the official university host program). Please provide some feedback on the direction the CCACA would like to go in this regard.

CCACA (October 6 call): No clear "will" of the group. However, if it is determined that it is permissible to use these individuals, they should not be used in a manner that is inconsistent with the intent of legislation.

Outcome:

There was agreement that student employees (including managers) should not be utilized as student-hosts during the official visit process.

g. Student-athlete being paid to perform hosting duties.

Background:

NCAA: We believe that while some may argue that general student-athlete employment legislation should govern, this type of activity is one that should be considered somewhat incidental to athletics participation (akin to promotional activities/fundraising etc), and therefore should not be considered employment. Further, the fact that, other than being a member of the official university host group, an individual must be a student-athlete in order to participate, seems to suggest the potential for employment limited only to student-athletes. In this regard we agreed that a student-athlete may not be paid to perform this function unless the university pays its host groups for their services.

Outcome:

The group agreed that student-athletes should not be compensated for performing the duties of a student host. It was noted that paying student-athletes for such duties has not been "traditionally" done in the past and should be considered incidental to a student-athlete's participation in athletics.

4. Other interpretive issues: Official Visit Policies and Procedures.

Mike Mathews sought feedback from the staff regarding the Conference office's role in reviewing institutions' official visit policies and procedures. Steve Mallonee noted that the Conference office has an obligation to evaluate the policies and procedures upon submission and to notify institutions if any required information is not included. Steve also noted that a demonstrated disregard for the policies and procedures by an institution may become an enforcement issue.

5. Next step.

The NCAA staff will review the recommendations of the CCACA and will develop staff determinations and/or confirmations on each of the aforementioned items. The staff agreed to have the CCACA co-chairs review the information prior to distribution in order to ensure that the staff is reflecting the CCACA recommendations.

6. Adjournment.

The call was adjourned at 12:30 p.m. (CT).