



CCACA Conference call minutes

Wed., September 3, 2003
9:04-10:42 a.m. PT

Participants: Amy Huchthausen, ACC; Steve Sturek, Atlantic Sun; Liz Kane, Atlantic 10; Ron Loghry, Big Sky; Dawn Turner, Big South; Carol Iwaoka, Jennifer Heppel (guest host), Chad Hawley, Big Ten; Lori Ebihara, Mary Ellen Enigk, Big 12; Noreen Morris, Myra Fishback, C-USA; Stephanie Jarvis, Horizon; Barbara Church, MAAC; Angie Torain, Mid-Continent; Patty Viverito, Sarah Weier, Missouri Valley; Carolayne Henry, Mountain West; Corinne Wright, Northeast; Mike Matthews (co-chair), Ron Barker, Pac-10; Dan Trump, Meg Ahrens, Patriot; Greg Sankey, Gil Grimes, SEC; Clark Kent, Smallville; Doug King, Stephanie Ellison, Southern; Beth Chapman, Southland; Helen Grant, Sun Belt; Pat Hairston, WAC.

1. Approval of minutes of August 6, 2003, conference call

◆ **ACTION:** The minutes were approved without dissent.

2. NCAA Coaches' Recruiting Certification Exam

Delise O'Meally of the NCAA staff joined in the discussion of this topic. The group discussed whether or not Proposal 2002-050 (which amended NCAA 11.5.1.1) was meant to give conferences authority to waive policies related to the NCAA Coaches' Recruiting Certification Exam. Specifically: Is there an appeal process to remove or reduce the 30-day waiting period that must occur before a coach can retake the exam?

O'Meally noted that Proposal 2002-050 was only intended to give conferences some leeway in deciding who should proctor the exam. It was not intended to alter other policies related to the exam, such as appeals to the 30-day waiting period. Thus, conferences do not have the authority to grant waivers of the 30-day waiting period.

O'Meally said that the NCAA has waived the 30-day waiting period only in cases involving procedural issues. The example she cited was technical difficulties with taking the on-line version of the test (e.g, a computer or server crash). Other than those limited circumstances, it is the NCAA staff's position that there is no appeal process for the 30-day waiting period. It was O'Meally's belief that ARS could not waive the application of the 30-day grace period because it can only grant relief from application of NCAA bylaws, and this policy is not an NCAA bylaw.

There was no groundswell of support by the CCACA to recommend that an appeal process be added at either the conference or NCAA level.

3. Feedback on basketball event certification and financial disclosure

Jan Gentry of the NCAA staff outlined a number of recommended changes to the basketball financial disclosure forms. She said the recommendations would go to an ad hoc committee of the Men's Basketball Issues Committee in mid-September, with revised forms to follow by the end of September.

Gentry noted the following:

- Information pertaining to advertisers would not be included on the new forms.
- Information requested about complimentary tickets would be pared down.
- Information about 3-on-3 tournaments proved not to be helpful.
- A head coach's signature would be added to Part I of the form.
- More information about transactions (e.g., names and dates) would be requested in Part II.
- The financial disclosure information for teams would be reduced to one page.

Gentry provided responses to the following items raised by the CCACA:

3.1 Apparently, there are several AAU teams that have the same source(s) of funds regardless where they play. Can't these types of teams somehow fill out the paperwork/disclosure forms once with the NCAA and the NCAA can indicate on the website if the paperwork is acceptable? If so, institutions would not have to collect the information and would know where to go to obtain verification that the team is good to play/practice in their facility.

Gentry: On-line registration by teams might be implemented by Summer 2004.

3.2 Institutions want better guidelines regarding what they are expected to do regarding outreach to donors/sponsors. Perhaps some examples of what the staff holds as acceptable practices would help.

Gentry: The staff suggests letters from compliance coordinators and head coaches can help. The staff welcomes other ideas.

3.3 Asking other departments across an institution for information to disclose is very cumbersome and risks privacy/confidentiality issues. Can disclosure just be limited to the athletics department?

Gentry: The staff believes that part of the goal of financial disclosure is to get all units of the institution on the same page.

3.4 Has the disclosure requirement been worthwhile? If asked by an institution, are people (inside and outside the institution) really going to disclose information that is detrimental? Is the NCAA staff obtaining the information that the program is intended to expose? If not, the program does not really make sense, especially since it is very, very cumbersome for institutions to do.

Gentry: The staff believes that the disclosure requirement has been worthwhile and that its value will increase in coming years.

3.5 What is status of video to show to campers at institutional basketball camps? Is the NCAA producing one and if so, will it be ready for summer 2004?

Gentry: The staff believes a video will be available for both institutional and noninstitutional camp use in Summer 2004.

3.6 Gifts to coaches. Suggest NCAA exclude complimentary tickets from this requirement. Comp tickets to coaches are a) a permissible benefit, b) cumbersome to compile for the report, and c) information appears to have limited relevance or usefulness to goals of the disclosure report. The number of tickets can reach 400-500 per season - are we really taking a close look at this amount information for each institution? Other benefits provided to coaches should continue to be reported.

Gentry: Recommendations about easing reporting requirements for comp tickets will be brought forward.

- ◆ **ACTION:** The group agreed without dissent to support elimination of all complimentary ticket reporting, noting that providing complimentary admissions to coaches of prospects is permissible and retaining selective reporting may prove to be more burdensome than full reporting.

3.7 High school basketball teams using institutional facilities. 3-on-3 tournaments involving PSAs and non-prospects should be excluded. Most teams have no "real" coach, limited or no funding, is difficult and cumbersome to obtain information, and information is not of any meaningful value with regards to the goals of the disclosure forms.

Gentry: A recommendation will be made to delete reporting requirements for 3-on-3 tournaments.

3.8 Difficult to get a former head coach to sign the forms. A former coach will not sign a blank set of forms and many institutions are not getting the full set completed until a day or two before the forms are due to the NCAA. It then becomes very difficult to try to find and convince a former coach to sign the forms. There should be a better way to get the verification - although, admittedly, we can't think of any!

Gentry: The staff believes that head coaches are the best individuals to verify the information contained in the disclosure forms, noting that an unethical conduct charge could result if a coach refused to sign the forms. She suggested that information be tracked as the season progresses. Regarding nondisclosure clauses in contracts, Gentry stated that all contracts signed after 2002 must be in compliance with the NCAA's financial disclosure rules.

4. Application of NCAA 15.5.4.1

O'Meally reported that LRIS was reviewing an institution's appeal of an interpretation of NCAA 15.5.4.1. She said the staff sought from the CCACA the answer to this question: is it common understanding that the proper application of NCAA 15.5.4.1 is that if a counter withdraws from the team after fall football practice has begun but before the first game or class (whichever is earlier), the aid cannot be reawarded until the winter quarter or spring semester (and thus may not be award for the fall term)?

- ✓ **FOLLOW-UP:** Matthews sent O'Meally this summary of the position of the CCACA:

The group believed that there may be some confusion among the membership in how the rule is to be applied, given the questions that several of us have fielded over the years. Some members of the CCACA also may disagree with the 1/23/02 LRIS interp that helps establish the starting point for a S-A becoming a counter, believing that room and board provided to a S-A prior to the start of classes should be treated as a practice expense rather than as a component of financial aid.

However, we believe we have replied to questions from our institutions in a manner consistent with the NCAA staff's understanding of the rule: A counter who withdraws from a football team after practice has begun but before the earlier of the first game or first day of classes may have his aid awarded to another S-A no earlier than the following winter quarter or spring semester (and not for the ensuing fall term).

5. Interpretative issues pertaining to new legislation

Iwaoka suggested the group act proactively to secure interpretations about new legislation as early as possible in the legislative process. She added that she would recommend to the NCAA staff that the POPL be organized topically.

- ◆ **ACTION:** Chapman and Morris agreed to serve on a committee to review pending proposals. Shane Lyons and Tracy Shoemake were added to the committee by virtue of their role as members of LRIS, which will also teach them to miss a conference call.
- ✓ **FOLLOW-UP:** If you're interested in serving on this committee, email Mike Matthews <mmatthews@pac-10.org> sooner rather than later so the committee can get going.

6. Proposal 2002-084 redux

Iwaoka noted the Championships/Competition Cabinet may recommend the adoption of a preseason practice model for all fall sports that is similar to the one created for football by Proposal 2002-084. Matthews suggested that such a model would not be needed for women's volleyball, an indoor sport. As an aside, more

than one conference noted it had advised its institutions that S-As who completed an orientation program as part of summer school or summer bridge would still be required to complete the orientation described in NCAA 17.11.2.3-(a).

7. SAOF

Kane suggested that the CCACA create a list of permissible uses of the SAOF, as has been done for the SAFSA. Others were reluctant to follow that path.

Viverito believed there was value to conferences getting in sync about Fund uses before use of the SAOF was reviewed in two years by institutional CEOs. She offered to serve as a clearinghouse for SAOF uses by conferences.

It was noted that some conferences approved all SAOF expenditures individually while others sent Fund dollars to campuses and would not learn details of expenditures until the end of the academic year.

- ◆ **ACTION:** It was agreed to add this topic to the agenda for the February in-person meeting of the CCACA at which time conferences could share their experiences with the SAOF.

8. Financial aid deregulation

Iwaoka noted the Financial Aid Committee would meet next week to determine which package of deregulation proposals had a chance to be adopted by the membership.

- ✓ **FOLLOW-UP:** If you're got feedback on where the committee should focus its efforts (e.g., definition of a counter, increasing permissible aid to cost of attendance limits), ship it off to Carol Iwaoka <ciwaoka@bigten.org>.

9. International student-athlete taxes

Heppel and Matthews believed that the SAOF could not be used to pay for an international S-A's tax liability. Morris noted that an international S-A could get this liability back as a tax refund. Heppel noted that the CCACA had agreed many years ago that the SAFSA could not be used to pay the tax liability for an international S-A. It was also noted that payment of the tax liability created a vicious circle of even more tax liability for the international S-A.

10. Future conference calls

Future calls will be held October 1, November 5, and December 3 at 9 Pacific/10 Mountain/11 Central/12 Eastern. Dial-in number: 888-453-5732; Passcode: 302269.