

A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association

Division I Amateurism Cabinet

Hyatt Regency Indianapolis
Indianapolis

February 16-17, 2012

1. Opening remarks and review of schedule. [Supplement No. 1]
2. Panel Discussion – agent issues. (NCAA and professional coaches, agents and other professionals)
 - a. Pre and post-enrollment agent interaction.
 - b. Sport-specific agent interaction. [Supplement Nos. 2 and 3]
 - c. National agent registration program.
3. Review of September 28-29, 2011 NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet meeting report. [Supplement No. 4]
4. Review of November 30, 2011, NCAA Division I Communications and Coordination Committee report. [Supplement No. 5]
5. NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee update.
6. Guiding principles. [Supplement No. 6] (Marcus Wilson)
7. Legal update. (Naima Stevenson)
8. Enforcement Working Group update. [Supplement No. 7] (Laura Wurtz)

9. Rules Working Group update. (Silver, Lynn Holzman)
 - a. The NCAA Working Group Collegiate Model. [Supplement No. 8]
 - b. NCAA Bylaw 16. [Supplement No. 9]
 - c. NCAA Bylaw 12 discussion. [Supplement No. 10]
 - d. Feedback summary. [Supplement No. 11]
10. NCAA Eligibility Center update. (Geoff Silver)
11. Update on legislation. [Supplement No. 12] (Perez)
12. Uniform Athlete Agent Act update. (Rachel Newman-Baker)
13. Media plan. (Amy Dunham)
 - a. Guiding Principle discussion. [Supplement No. 13] (Marcus Wilson)
 - b. Amateurism Cabinet involvement.
14. News articles. [Supplement No. 14]
15. Summary of key items and takeaways.
16. Other business.
17. Future meeting dates.
 - June 20-21, NCAA national office, Indianapolis
 - September 12-13, NCAA national office, Indianapolis
18. Adjournment.

**Schedule for February 16-17, 2012, Meeting of the
NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet**

Wednesday, February 15**Meeting Room**

Cabinet members arrive in Indianapolis - dinner on your own.

Hotel: Hyatt Regency - Indianapolis
One South Capitol Avenue
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Thursday, February 16 - all activities are at the Hyatt Regency, Indianapolis.

Breakfast	7 a.m. to 8 a.m.	Network
Cabinet meeting	8 a.m. to Noon	Regency AB
Lunch	Noon to 1:30 p.m.	Network
Cabinet meeting	1:30 p.m. to 5 p.m.	Regency AB

Dinner on your own.

Friday, February 17 - all activities are at the Hyatt Regency, Indianapolis.

Breakfast	7 a.m. to 8 a.m.	Network
Cabinet meeting	8 a.m. to Noon.	Regency AB
Lunch	Noon to 1 p.m.	Network

NOTE: There will be no shuttle transportation from the national office to the airport at the conclusion of the meeting. You will be responsible for securing your return transportation to the airport. Taxi service is available from your hotel to the airport.

MEMORANDUM

February 9, 2012

TO: Amateurism Cabinet.

FROM: Janet Calandro
Coordinator of Enforcement

Steve Duffin
Associate Director of Enforcement

Libby Harmon.
Enforcement Intern.

SUBJECT: NCAA Division I Men's Ice Hockey.

Overview.

The following report analyzes and summarizes the participation of men's ice hockey student-athletes at NCAA member institutions, their involvement in professional ice hockey league drafts and the presence of advisors and agents in the draft process. The data for this report was provided by College Hockey, Inc. (CHI).

National Hockey League (NHL) and Canadian Hockey League (CHL).

The NHL has 30 member clubs; 23 in the United States and seven in Canada, and is considered the premier professional ice hockey league in the world. Unlike the National Football League and National Basketball Association drafts, the NHL does not use an "opt-in" model. Specifically, if a player is age 18 by September 15 in the year in which the draft is held, an NHL team can draft the rights to that player. The CHL is represented by three major junior ice hockey leagues for players 16 to 20 years of age: The Ontario Hockey League, 20 teams in Ontario, Michigan and Pennsylvania; The Western Hockey League, 22 teams in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Washington and Oregon; and The Quebec Major Junior Hockey League, 17 teams in Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. The NCAA considers both the NHL and CHL as "professional" hockey leagues as defined in NCAA Bylaws 12.02.4 and 12.2.3.2.4 amateurism legislation. [Note: There is also a Canadian Junior Hockey League (CJHL), an association of leagues and teams (including several from the USA) spanning the majority of Canada, from the Pacific Coast to the Atlantic Coast. The NCAA does not consider the CJHL to be a "professional" league.]

MEMORANDUM

February 9, 2012

Page No. 2

Trends for men's ice hockey student-athletes going from high school directly to professional leagues.

There are no statistics that encompass every player who decides to go straight from high school to professional leagues. It is extremely rare for a high school student-athlete to matriculate straight from high school to the NHL. It is much more common for student-athletes to go straight from high school to the CHL (considered a "professional league" under NCAA bylaws) or play in the CHL while in high school (the CHL ages range from 16 to 20). There are 121 Americans who currently play in the CHL who have no NCAA experience. This means that there are currently 121 Americans who are playing in the CHL who are either still in high school or have graduated high school but are not currently pursuing a college education.

Data on men's ice hockey student-athletes in the NCAA and drafted by NHL and CHL.

- Number of NCAA Division I men's ice hockey student-athletes: 1,543.
- Number of current NCAA Division I men's ice hockey student-athletes drafted by NHL teams: 202 (of that total number, 181 were drafted before they matriculated to college).

Year	Number of NCAA Division I student-athletes drafted by NHL teams
2011	42
2010	55
2009	48
2008	32
2007	22
2006	3
Total	202

- Number of current NCAA Division I student-athletes drafted by CHL/major junior teams as 14- or 15-year olds: 281 (and they currently attend 56 member institutions).
- Number of student-athletes currently playing in the NCAA who have been drafted by a "professional league": 405.

MEMORANDUM

February 9, 2012

Page No. 3

Data on student-athletes leaving college early to play in professional leagues.

- From 2003 through 2011, 193 student-athletes left college early to pursue a professional career.

Year	Number of early departures
2011	17
2010	33
2009	18
2008	24
2007	33
2006	24
2005	16
2004	18
2003	10
TOTAL	193

- Of those student-athletes who left early, 149 are currently playing in the NHL or American Hockey League.

Seasons in NHL vs. years in NCAA (without current NHL players).

NHL seasons	NHL players with 1 year in NCAA	NHL players with 2 years in NCAA	NHL Players with 3 years in NCAA	NHL players with 4 years in NCAA
1	13	26	53	132
2	10	14	23	79
3	4	14	36	63
4	7	8	24	46
5	6	6	16	38
6	0	8	9	23
7	2	8	5	20
8	4	10	7	24
9	4	6	4	16
10	5	6	9	22
11	1	5	11	14
12	0	7	6	11
13	3	1	4	11

MEMORANDUM

February 9, 2012

Page No. 4

NHL seasons	NHL players with 1 year in NCAA	NHL players with 2 years in NCAA	NHL Players with 3 years in NCAA	NHL players with 4 years in NCAA
14	0	2	9	3
15	2	6	5	8
16	1	1	3	5
17	1	6	6	0
18	3	2	0	0
19	0	2	1	0
20	1	0	2	0
21	0	2	0	2
22	0	0	0	0
23	0	0	0	0
24	0	0	0	0
25	0	0	0	0
26	0	1	0	0

The above data indicates that, for all student-athletes who played in the NCAA and appeared in the NHL (i.e., includes only those student-athletes who have retired or are no longer in the NHL), the statistics are as follows:

- 53.87 percent played four years in the NCAA.
- 24.37 percent played three years in the NCAA.
- 14.75 percent played two years in the NCAA.
- 7.01 percent played one year in the NCAA.

[Note: The average NHL career lasts less than five years.]

Involvement of agents/advisors by ice hockey players.

According to CHI, there is really no meaningful data on when an agent/advisor enters the process for student-athletes simply because the age that student-athletes obtain an agent or advisor greatly varies. Anecdotal information from CHI suggests that many young student-athletes (or their parents) obtain an agent/advisor when they are 14 years old, often as a result of the drafts at ages 14 or 15 in the CHL. At the same time, there are also some student-athletes who are drafted by the NHL without an agent/advisor. Most players who are drafted by the CHL and/or the NHL likely have retained some sort of agent/advisor. However, it is unclear whether all student-athletes seek such involvement from an agent/advisor.

MEMORANDUM

February 9, 2012

Page No. 5

Additional data/background.

Number of NCAA member institutions that offer men's ice hockey:

- Division I: 59
- Division II: 6
- Division III: 73

Divisions I and III hold national championships; Division II members compete in either Division I (in the majority of instances) or Division III. Division I programs compete in special men's ice hockey-only conferences that are not connected with their member institution's primary athletics conferences. This will change in the 2013-14 season when the Big Ten Conference starts sponsoring men's ice hockey.

Educational outreach.

Attached is an illustration of the NCAA national office's ongoing efforts to provide student-athletes with information and guidance concerning the decision-making process of transitioning to the professional ranks of ice hockey. This document was widely applauded by the membership as an effective educational tool. The staff continues to seek opportunities and avenues to be proactive in providing meaningful education to both internal and external NCAA constituents.

JC/SD/LH:klk

Attachment



P.O. Box 6222

Indianapolis, Indiana 46206

Telephone: 317/917-6222

Shipping/Overnight Address:

1802 Alonzo Watford Sr. Drive

Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

www.ncaa.org

MEMORANDUM

March 17, 2011

TO: Men's Ice Hockey Student-Athletes with Remaining Eligibility.

FROM: Rachel Newman Baker
Director of Agent, Gambling and Amateurism Activities.

Steve Mallonee
Managing Director of Academic and Membership Affairs/Division I
Governance Liaison.

SUBJECT: Information Regarding the 2011 National Hockey League (NHL)
Draft, Agents, and Tryouts.

We understand that you may have remaining intercollegiate eligibility, but are also eligible to be drafted in the upcoming 2011 National Hockey League (NHL) Draft scheduled for June 24 and 25. To assist you in making the best possible decision, the following document has been developed to help you sort through some of the issues that you, your parents and your institution may confront.

You will attempt to gauge your readiness for competition at the next level through a variety of methods, including tryouts with professional teams and you will undoubtedly rely on a number of individuals to assist in the decision-making process.

At the end of this process, you may in fact reach the conclusion that it is not in the best interest to pursue a professional career at this time, but rather to continue athletics participation at the intercollegiate level while pursuing your academic degree.

Involvement in activities during this process can affect your intercollegiate eligibility. The following information is designed to help you protect your eligibility while you "test the waters."

Key Dates and Information:

NHL Scouting Combine (by invitation only): **May 30 to June 4, 2011**

NHL Draft (St. Paul, Minnesota): **June 24 and 25, 2011**

National Collegiate Athletic Association

An association of more than 1,200 members serving the student-athlete

Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

Frequently Asked Questions:

1. Who is eligible for the NHL Draft?

NHL Collective Bargaining Agreement § 8.4

All players age 18 or older are eligible for claim in the Entry Draft, except:

- (1) a Player on the reserve list of a club, other than as a tryout;
- (2) a Player who has been claimed in two prior Entry Drafts;
- (3) a Player who previously played in the [National Hockey] League and became a free agent pursuant to [the NHL Collective Bargaining] Agreement; a Player age 21 or older who: (A) has not been selected in a previous Entry Draft and (B) played hockey for at least one season in North America when he was age 18, 19, or 20 and shall be eligible to enter the [National Hockey] League as an Unrestricted Free Agent pursuant to [the NHL Collective Bargaining Agreement]; and
- (4) a Player age 22 or older who has not been selected in a previous Entry Draft and shall be eligible to enter the [National Hockey] League as an Unrestricted Free Agent pursuant to [the NHL Collective Bargaining Agreement].

2. What if I was not signed by an NHL team?

A player not signed by his NHL team within two years of being drafted can re-enter the draft, as long as he is 20 years old or younger at the time of the subsequent draft. Players over 20 become unrestricted free agents.

NCAA players are an exception: In most instances, an NCAA student-athlete or someone who becomes an NCAA student-athlete in the sport of men's ice hockey prior to June 1 after being drafted in the NHL Draft will have his contract rights retained by his drafting club until August 15 following the graduation of his college class as long as he remains in school. Even if that drafted student-athlete were to leave school before his class graduates, his drafting club would hold rights to sign him until June 1 of the year four years after he was drafted.

NHL Collective Bargaining Agreement § 8.6(c)(i)-(ii)

If a Player drafted at age 18 or 19 is a bona fide college student at the time of his selection in the Entry Draft, or becomes a bona fide college student prior to the first June 1st following his selection in the Entry Draft, and remains a bona fide college student through

the graduation of his college class, his drafting Club shall retain the exclusive right of negotiation for his services through and including the August 15th following the graduation of his college class....[If he] does not remain a bona fide college student through the graduation of his college class, his drafting Club shall retain exclusive rights for the negotiation of his services until the fourth June 1st following his selection in the Entry Draft.

3. *Can my college coach assist with the arranging and scheduling of a professional team workout/tryout on or off campus during the academic year?*

YES! It would be permissible for a student-athlete's institutional coach to assist in the arranging for a student-athlete to engage in a professional tryout that occurs on or off campus; however, it would not be permissible for a coach to assist in conducting or be present at such workouts/tryouts.

4. *Can NHL teams pay for my private workouts/tryouts?*

YES! You may tryout with an NHL team during the academic year if you are enrolled full-time as long as you do not miss class. You may receive actual and necessary expenses from the NHL team in conjunction with one 48-hour tryout per team. The 48-hour tryout period begins when you arrive at the tryout location. At the completion of the 48-hour period you must depart the location of the tryout immediately in order to receive transportation expenses.

5. *Can I attend the NHL Scouting Combine?*

YES! If you are invited to participate in the scouting combine you may attend and may accept actual and necessary travel, and room and board expenses from the NHL to attend the NHL scouting combine, regardless of the duration of the combine.

6. *Can any other individual (e.g., agent, runner, or "advisor") pay for my private workouts/tryouts with NHL teams?*

NO! Unless an NHL team pays for your expenses in conjunction with a private workout or tryout, you and your family are responsible for paying all expenses associated with any tryouts as they are incurred.

7. *Can I pay for my own private workouts/tryouts with NHL teams?*

YES! A tryout may extend beyond 48 hours if the individual self-finances additional expenses, including return transportation. A self-financed tryout may be for any length of time, provided you don't miss class.

8. *What is an "agent" according to NCAA rules?*

An individual would be considered an "agent" if the individual markets your hockey skills to, or negotiates on your behalf with, any NHL team or other professional teams (e.g., contact NHL teams to discuss your skills, set up tryouts with NHL teams, etc.).

9. *Am I allowed to have any type of agreement with an agent?*

NO! You are not permitted to have a written or oral agreement with an agent, or anyone who is employed by or acting on behalf of an agent or sports agency (i.e., "runner").

10. *What is an "oral agreement" with an agent?*

An oral agreement occurs if you verbally agree to have an agent perform any services (e.g., providing any expenses related to tryouts, arranging disability insurance, etc.) on your behalf OR you have knowledge that an agent is performing such services.

11. *Is an agent allowed to contact teams on my behalf to arrange private workouts or tryouts?*

NO! You cannot have an agent arrange a private workout/tryout with an NHL team.

12. *Can my family members or other individuals who are associated with me as a result of playing hockey (e.g., high school coach, nonscholastic coach, etc.) have an agreement with an agent to perform services on my behalf?*

NO! Family members and other individuals are not permitted to enter into any agreements with an agent on your behalf.

13. *Am I allowed to have an agreement with an agent if it is for future representation?*

NO! You are not permitted to agree to a future representation agreement with an agent.

14. *Is an agent allowed to provide me any benefits?*

NO! You, your family, or your friends are not permitted to receive any benefits from an agent. Examples of material benefits include money, transportation, dinner, clothes, cell phones, jewelry, etc. However, benefits may also include, but are not limited to, activities such as tryout arrangements with a professional team and coordinating tryout schedules.

15. *Am I permitted to have an advisor during this process?*

YES, provided the advisor does not market you to NHL teams. However, it is not permissible for the advisor to contact teams on your behalf to arrange private workouts or tryouts. *(Note: If you receive assistance from an advisor, you must compensate the advisor in an amount equal to the value of the services he or she provides you; furthermore, you may not receive such services at a free or reduced rate without jeopardizing your eligibility, regardless of whether the advisor does not typically charge clients for such services.)*

16. *Can an institution cancel my athletics scholarship if I have an agreement with an agent?*

YES! An institution is permitted to rescind your athletics scholarship if you have an agreement with an agent.

Four Points to Remember:

You will lose your eligibility IF:

1. You agree orally or in writing to be represented by an agent or any individual acting on behalf of the agent [e.g., runner].
2. You accept any benefits from an agent, a prospective agent or any individual acting on behalf of the agent [e.g., runner].
3. If you participate in a tryout with an NHL team that lasts longer than 48 hours, which you have not personally financed.
4. If you tryout with a professional team during the academic year and miss class.

Helpful Tips:

- You should keep your head coach and compliance coordinator informed of all activities during this process.
- Be careful who you associate with during this process. Do it all yourself or work through your head coach. You may receive the assistance of your family members, provided they are not working with any individual who is marketing your athletic ability (e.g., contacting NHL teams).
- If you do not have knowledge of who arranged your tryout, you have a responsibility to find out who did.
- You should remain in school and complete your academic courses while you "test the waters."
- If you have questions regarding this information, please contact the NCAA agent, gambling, and amateurism activities staff at 317/917-6866 or newman@ncaa.org.

NCAA MEMORANDUM

March 17, 2011

Page No. 6

SIGNATURE:

Please sign your name and date below, which confirms that you have reviewed and understand this form and the information contained therein. I understand that if I am found to be in violation of the provisions of any of the information mentioned above, I may be declared ineligible for further intercollegiate competition.

Student-Athlete Signature

Date

Printed Name

Institution

Head Coach

Date

Compliance Officer

Date

RNB/SM:ms

RHPs, four-year colleges dominate Draft

By Spencer Fordin / MLB.com | 06/08/11 7:30 PM ET

Comments

1

0

Like

e-mail

print

NEW YORK -- The Draft is done. Let the development begin.

Major League Baseball's First-Year Player Draft wound its way to completion Wednesday, 50 rounds and 69 hours after it had begun on Monday night. Pittsburgh started a pitching-rich first round by drafting Gerrit Cole, and then teams settled in for the arduous task of restocking their farm systems.

Twenty rounds worth of players went through on Wednesday, many of them destined to fill out the roster of each respective team's lower-level affiliates. And now that the hard part is done, teams can begin negotiating with their draftees in order to get them under contract by the Aug. 15 deadline.



MLB.com wraps the 2011 Draft

MLB.com's Jonathan Mayo gives his thoughts of the 2011 First-Year Player Draft.

06/04/23 Share

Tags: Mayo, Jonathan, MLB Draft

Related Video

Carmine discusses Draft

Cubs Draft recap

Rays enjoy busy 2011 Draft

Cole, regarded as a potential front-line starting pitcher, will give the Pirates their second straight impact pitcher at the top of the Draft. Pittsburgh selected Jameson Taillon with the second overall pick in 2009, and is hoping for better returns on the two prospective aces than it got from first-rounders Danny Moskos and Brad Lincoln.



The Pirates have had the first overall pick three previous times, and they wound up with third baseman Jeff King (1986) and starting pitchers Kris Benson ('96) and Bryan Bullington (2002). Pittsburgh, which hasn't had a winning season since '92, is betting on development from within to take the next step.

The third day of the Draft produced some interesting statistics and trends, some of which were expected. Players from four-year universities continued to dominate, reaching a height (818 players) exceeded only once since 1985. Only 2008 (844 college draftees) outpaced this year's Draft.

The clear casualties, in this case, are players from junior colleges, who represented just 179 of the 1,530 players taken in the First-Year Player Draft. That total is the second lowest -- exceeding 2007 by just two players -- since 1987, and it's less than half of the all-time high (375 in 1994) during that time period.

The number of prep players chosen has remained fairly stable the past few seasons, if also markedly down from its peak in the 1990s. High school players represented 34 percent -- 520 out of 1,530 -- of the players taken this season, the most since logging 36 percent (542 out of 1502) in 2006. For contrast, prep players routinely broke 700 draftees and measured as much as 47 percent of the Draft pool as recently as the mid-90's.

Teams have clearly been coveting right-handed pitchers, accounting for 37.5 percent of the total Draft haul. There were only 218 left-handers drafted, a reflection of the principle of supply and demand.

Catcher was the busiest of the positions on Wednesday, with 63 backstops going in the final 20 rounds. Only one catcher had been selected in the first round, and 135 went over the three-day process. Shortstop was also a busy slot Wednesday, with 47 of the 135 shortstop draftees getting called in the final day.

Vanderbilt set a new SEC record by having 12 players selected, narrowly besting rivals South Carolina (11) and the University of Florida (11). Arizona State and Oklahoma also had 11 players taken, and two other schools (Connecticut and Fresno State) distinguished themselves by having 10 drafted players.

UCLA -- which produced Cole and No. 3 overall pick Trevor Bauer -- finished with nine draftees.

The players, fittingly, came from all over. Maine was the only one of the 50 states that didn't produce a draftee, and three states -- California (284), Florida (146) and Texas (144) -- combined to comprise more than a third of the Draft pool. Thirty-three players of Canadian origin and 21 from Puerto Rico were drafted, and there was one player taken from the Bahamas, Germany, Mexico and Venezuela.

Teams continued to make family connections Wednesday, which saw the sons of prominent players like Bobby Bonilla, Matt Williams and Charlie Leibrandt drafted. Three big league managers -- Mike Scioscia, John Farrell and Bob Geren -- had the honor of seeing their sons drafted to their respective teams.

All three of them, predictably, work in the same discipline as their fathers. Brett Geren and Matthew Scioscia -- drafted by the A's and Angels, respectively -- are catchers. Shane Farrell, taken by Toronto, is a pitcher, just like his father, a former big league starter and pitching coach.

Spencer Fordin is a reporter for MLB.com. This story was not subject to the approval of Major League Baseball or its clubs.

MLB.COM COMMENTS

**REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I AMATEURISM CABINET
SEPTEMBER 28-29, 2011, MEETING**

KEY ITEMS.

1. **National Professional Sports Counseling Panel.** The cabinet continued its comprehensive review of agent activities and other issues that impact elite student-athletes. The cabinet emphasized the importance of providing adequate education about these issues to student-athletes. The cabinet supports the concept of creating a national sports counseling panel that will serve a two-prong purpose: 1) to advise institutions on how to best educate and serve as a resource to elite student-athletes considering a potential professional career, and 2) to advise student-athletes in all sports about their prospects of playing professionally, in addition to other issues that arise in athletes' transition from the collegiate to professional ranks.
2. **National Agent Registration Program.** The cabinet supports the concept of a national agent registration program. The cabinet believes such a program would provide institutions information about agents that would otherwise be unavailable. The cabinet also recognized the value that such a program could provide to the NCAA enforcement staff.
3. **Definition of Amateurism and Guiding Principles for the Amateurism Cabinet.** The cabinet reviewed the definition of "amateurism," in addition to the guiding principles of the cabinet, and decided to update the principles to reflect the realities of today's collegiate model. The cabinet also discussed the criticism that the organization has received as it relates to the fundamental principle of amateurism and wants to strategize effective ways to communicate the principle moving forward.

ACTION ITEMS.

- None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Legislative Informational Items.**
 - a. **Proposal No. 2011-26 – (Amateurism, Recruiting, Eligibility and Awards, Benefits and Expenses – World University Championships).** The cabinet supported this proposal to include the World University Championships in all bylaws that apply to the World University Games.
 - b. **Proposal No. 2011-27 – Amateurism and Executive Regulations – Financial Donations and Advertising and Sponsorship of Intercollegiate Events – Professional Sports Organization.** The cabinet supports Proposal No. 2011-27, which would specify that a professional sports organization may serve as a financial sponsor of an intercollegiate competition event, provided the organization is not publicly identified as such. Additionally, that a professional sports organization may serve as a financial

sponsor of an activity or promotion that is ancillary to the competition event and maybe publicly identified. The proposal would also eliminate the prohibition on professional sports organizations or personnel as acceptable advertisers in conjunction with NCAA championships. The cabinet agreed with the sponsor's rationale.

- c. **Proposal No. 2011-62 – Eligibility – General Eligibility Requirements– Eligibility Form – International Student-Athlete.** The cabinet supported to eliminate the requirement that the eligibility of an international student-athlete shall be certified on an international student-athlete eligibility form. The cabinet believed that the form would be helpful for institutions to use in order to assist in certifying international student-athletes eligibility but did not think it should be a requirement due to the Amateurism Certification Process at the NCAA Eligibility Center.

2. Nonlegislative Informational Items.

- a. **Agent.** The cabinet received an update on the Leadership Council's ongoing review of the definition of an agent and the use of agents and advisors prior to enrollment. The cabinet continued its discussion on how to provide better information to student-athletes who consider transitioning from the collegiate to professional ranks. The cabinet was supportive of two concepts that would promote this: (1) a national professional sports counseling panel, and (2) a national agent registration program. The cabinet will continue to discuss these concepts. Lastly, the NCAA enforcement staff presented data it had compiled regarding the number of underclassmen entering professional drafts and their subsequent retention rate.
- b. **NCAA Eligibility Center Update.** The cabinet received an update from the NCAA Eligibility Center amateurism certification staff including an overview of prospective student-athlete registration data, the number of Bylaw 14 withholding conditions applied, information related to the increasing number of international registrations and the countries that have produced the most violations. The cabinet was provided data illustrating the impact of the new delayed enrollment legislation (i.e., the one-year grace period for all sports other than men's ice hockey and skiing). The Eligibility Center staff also shared with the cabinet several initiatives designed to enable the amateurism staff to identify and process more egregious Bylaw 12 violations.

Cabinet Chair: Mark Hollis, Michigan State University, Big Ten Conference
Staff Liaison(s): Rachel Newman Baker, Enforcement
Angie Cretors, Enforcement
Jobrina Perez, Academic and Membership Affairs
Marcus Wilson, Enforcement

**REPORT OF
THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
DIVISION I COMMUNICATIONS AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE (CCC)
NOVEMBER 30, 2011, CONFERENCE CALL**

ACTION ITEMS.

- None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Report of the Committee's August 16, 2011, Conference Call.** The committee approved the report of its August 16, 2011, conference call.
2. **Key Items from the September 2011, Division I Cabinet and October Legislative Council Meetings.** The committee received a report of the key items from the September 2011, cabinet and October Legislative Council meetings.
 - a. **Administration Cabinet** – During its September meeting, the cabinet reviewed and approved the new online override voting process, which is modeled after the voting session process that occurred during the Division I Business Session at the annual NCAA Convention. The process will allow for a discussion period consistent with the one that occurred prior to the vote on the Convention floor. All active Division I and affiliate members of the Association (e.g., coaches associations) will have the opportunity to participate in the discussion period, as they did when the vote was conducted in person. The discussion period will be followed by the voting period, in which only active Division I members may participate. The online voting process is being used for the first time this fall as Division I conducts an override vote on Proposal No. 2009-100-A.
 - b. **Legislative Council.** During its October meeting, the Legislative Council reviewed proposals in the 2011-12 legislative cycle through three key lenses developed by the Rules Working Group: (1) Is the rule meaningful and of consequence...is it an issue that merits a national regulation or can it simply be addressed by institutions/conferences/coaches associations? Is it really necessary? (2) Is the rule enforceable.. does it present significant challenges either in monitoring compliance as well as proving violations?, and (3) Does the rule support the success of the student-athlete, academically and/or athletically? When developing its initial position on the proposals in the 2011-12 legislative cycle, the Legislative Council indicated an intent to table a number of the proposals that did not appear to meet the test of the three lenses.

3. **Guiding Principles.** Mark Hollis, chair of the Amateurism Cabinet, reported that during discussions at its September meeting, the Amateurism Cabinet noted that a number of the guiding principles established by that cabinet could, and probably should, apply to all Division I cabinets. It was noted that the work of several of the Presidential Retreat Working Groups involve developing principles that align with the Association's enduring values. It was the sense of the group that once the working groups complete their work, the cabinets can reevaluate their guiding principles to ensure they are consistent and align with the enduring values of the Association.
4. **Update on NCAA Presidential Retreat Initiatives.** The committee received an update on actions taken by the Board of Directors during its October meeting, as well as a report regarding plans for the working groups going forward and the involvement of the Division I cabinets and councils.
 - a. **Actions Taken by the Board of Directors.**
 - (1) **NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance.**
 - (a) **Initial-Eligibility Standards.** The Board adopted legislation that would increase initial-eligibility requirements, resulting in more rigorous academic standards for competition than for practice and receipt of athletically related financial aid. The Board approved an increase to the standard for immediate access to competition to a 2.300 grade-point average and an increased sliding scale. Incoming student-athletes will need to earn a test score/grade-point average that is set at approximately one-half standard deviation below the national student body mean. Student-athletes who achieve the current minimum initial-eligibility standard on the test score/grade-point average sliding scale, with at least a minimum 2.000 core course grade-point average, will continue to be eligible for athletically related financial aid during the first year of enrollment and practice during the first regular academic term of enrollment. Student-athletes can earn the opportunity to practice in the second term by passing nine-semester or eight-quarter hours. The Board approved a requirement that prospects successfully complete 10 of the 16 total required core courses before the start of their senior year in high school. Seven of the 10 successfully completed courses must be in English, math and science. These new requirements are effective for students first entering college full time August 1, 2015, or after.

- (b) **Two-Year College Transfer Requirements.** The Board adopted legislation to increase the transferable grade-point average from 2.000 to 2.500; limit the number of physical education activity courses to a total of two; and for nonqualifiers, requiring the completion of a core curriculum (six credits of English, three credits of math and three credits of science). The enhanced two-year college transfer requirements will be effective for student-athletes initially enrolling at a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2012; no student-athlete currently enrolled in a two-year collegiate institution will be impacted. The Board took no action on the proposal related to the Year of Academic Readiness and agreed to leave it in the 2011-12 legislative cycle to be voted on at the January 2012 meeting of the NCAA Division I Legislative Council.
- (c) **Access to Championships and APP Penalty Structure.** The Board approved the implementation schedule for the postseason eligibility standard, as well as a new APR three-level penalty structure. The Board established a 930 APR as a minimum academic standard to participate in Division I postseason competition. This includes a mission filter only in the first year a team fails to meet the benchmark and an improvement filter in the second year and beyond. There will be a transition time period of three years for access to the postseason. The Board also specified that all conferences must adopt a policy regarding teams that do not meet championship academic access standards with respect to automatic qualification for postseason and revenue distribution. The new postseason eligibility structure will take effect in the 2012-13 academic year, with a two-year implementation window before the benchmark moves from 900 to 930.

(2) Student-Athlete Well Being Working Group.

- (a) **Cost of Attendance.** The Board adopted legislation that would permit a Division I student-athlete who has received institutional financial aid equal to the value of a full grant-in-aid (i.e., tuition and fees, room and board and required course-related books) to receive additional athletically related financial aid up to the value of the institution's "cost of attendance," or up to \$2,000, whichever is less. The Board decided not to revisit this amount for three years.
- (b) **Multiyear Grant-in-Aid.** The Board adopted legislation that would permit athletics aid, up to the permissible limits, to be awarded for a period beyond the minimum of one academic year, up to the date the student-athlete exhausts eligibility to compete in all sports.

- (c) **Team Financial Aid Limits.** The Board adopted legislation to provide that only athletically-related aid will be counted toward team limits in equivalency sports.
 - (d) **Eligibility for Aid: Former Student-Athletes.** The Board adopted legislation, effective immediately, to eliminate financial aid eligibility restrictions (five years of aid within a six-year period) to permit institutions to provide athletics aid to former student-athletes who remain at, or return to, the institution to complete their baccalaureate degree requirements.
 - (3) **Rules Working Group.** The Board endorsed a resolution that summarizes the concepts and direction outlined by the working group as they move forward with their evaluation of the rules.
 - b. **Plans Moving Forward.** The committee was informed that the Rules Working Group has developed a communication plan that includes conducting feedback gathering sessions (e.g., teleconferences) with various constituent groups. Following the initial outreach, the working group will focus on gathering feedback on specific principles and or proposals, particularly any that are generated from the group's December meeting. The working group plans to use the February cabinet meetings as an opportunity to gather additional comments on principles/proposals developed specific to bylaws for which the cabinets have oversight responsibility.
5. **Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Update.** Katie Willett, staff liaison to the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC), reported on the committee's November 18-20, 2011, meeting in Indianapolis. It was noted that along with the regular review of legislative proposals, the Division I SAAC discussed the following:
- Text messaging and other forms of communication used in the recruiting process;
 - A division-wide community service project; and
 - An initiative aimed at creating an increased awareness of SAAC and how to better insert the voice of student-athletes at all levels of governance activity (i.e., campus, conference, national).

Committee Chair: Michael Alden, University of Missouri
Staff Liaison: Jacqueline Campbell, Division I Governance

Division I Communication and Coordination Committee November 30, 2011, Teleconference	
ATTENDEES	ABSENTEES
Mike Alden, University of Missouri, Leadership Council	William Chaves, Eastern Washington University, Administration Cabinet
Sarah Bobert, Marquette University – Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet	Scott Krapf, Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Ivy League, Legislative Council	
Herman Holt, University of North Carolina, Asheville, Academic Cabinet	
Mark Hollis, Michigan State University, Amateurism Cabinet	
Ian McCaw, Baylor University, Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet	
Judy Rose, University of North Carolina, Charlotte, Championships/Sports Management Cabinet	
Jacqueline Campbell, NCAA, recording secretary	
Other NCAA staff members who participated on the teleconference: David Berst, Diane Dickman, Angie Cretors, Michelle Hosick, Kevin Lennon, Steve Mallonee, Jarrett Newby, Binh Nguyen, Jobrina Perez, Carol Reep, Kris Richardson, Jennifer Roe, Alex Smith, Sharon Tufano, Katie Willett, Marcus Wilson and Leeland Zeller.	

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR THE AMATEURISM CABINET

1. Student-athletes shall be an integral part of the student-body and their participation should be motivated primarily by education and by the physical, mental and social benefits to be derived.
2. Ensure that legislation reinforces that student participation in intercollegiate athletics is an avocation, and student-athletes should be protected from exploitation.
3. Minimize missed class time; maximize time spent pursuing educational opportunities
4. All commercial activities shall support intercollegiate athletics and be consistent with the values of higher education.
5. Ensure legislation is written in a simple, clear and enforceable manner.
6. Consider the amount of time legislation has been in effect before supporting a legislative change.
7. Consider the impact of proposals on institutional, conference, NCAA and Eligibility Center resources and staff members.
8. Ensure feedback has been solicited from stakeholders.
9. Consider if sport-specific legislation is warranted or if proposed legislation can/should be expanded to other sports.
10. Examine potential unintended consequences when reviewing legislation.



P.O. Box 6222

Indianapolis, Indiana 46206

Telephone: 317/917-6222

Shipping/Overnight Address:

1802 Alonzo Watford Sr. Drive

Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

www.ncaa.org

MEMORANDUM

January 17, 2012

TO: NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet.

FROM: Marcus Wilson
NCAA Associate Director of Enforcement.

SUBJECT: Update on Guiding Principles Discussion with the NCAA Division I
Communications and Coordination Committee.

In its September 2011 meeting, the NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet reviewed the definition of "amateurism" as well as the guiding principles of the cabinet. They indicated a desire to update the principles to reflect the realities of today's collegiate model. In reviewing the principles, the cabinet noted that a number of the guiding principles could, and probably should, apply to all NCAA Division I cabinets.

Thus, on November 30, 2011, Mark Hollis, chair of the Amateurism Cabinet, spoke to the NCAA Division I Communications and Coordination Committee. The committee noted that the work of several of the Presidential Retreat Working Groups involve developing principles that align with the Association's enduring values. It was the sense of the group that once the working groups complete their work, the cabinets can reevaluate their guiding principles to ensure they are consistent and align with the enduring values of the Association.

MMW:mrs

National Collegiate Athletic Association

An association of over 1,200 members serving the student-athlete

Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

Executive Summary - Preliminary Report to the NCAA Membership

NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model - Enforcement
February 2012

[Note: This document is an executive summary of the Preliminary Report to the Membership working draft. The working group's efforts are continuing, and the group expects it will make changes to these proposals based on feedback from the membership and affiliated groups. The group intends to submit proposals to the Division I Board of Directors in April and August 2012 after gaining significant feedback, revising the proposals as warranted and circulating revisions to the extent possible.]

A. Background.

In August 2011, NCAA President Mark Emmert and more than 50 presidents and chancellors gathered to examine in broad terms how to sustain the collegiate model and restore public trust in college sports and the NCAA. The presidents identified five significant areas of concern: (1) standards and metrics for the academic success of Division I student-athletes; (2) the allocation of financial resources within intercollegiate rules; (3) the financial well-being of student-athletes; (4) a realigning of how rules governing intercollegiate athletics are determined and an enhanced expectation of shared responsibility at the campus, conference and national levels; and (5) the strong and swift enforcement of those rules that places the greatest emphasis on those violations that if left unattended most significantly denigrate the collegiate model.

The presidents emphasized that there are four acknowledged enduring values that are guiding the entirety of their efforts and will be the measures against which all policies and judgments will be tested:

- Student-athlete success academically and athletically is paramount.
- The collegiate model, in which athletics is embedded in the values of higher education, including shared responsibility and accountability, should be protected and sustained.
- Amateurism as a student-participation model guides the relationship between students and institutions in the collegiate model of athletics.
- Fair opportunity to compete among institutions of similar commitment to inter-collegiate athletics should guide the administration of the collegiate model.

The Working Group on Collegiate Model - Enforcement was formed to primarily focus on the fifth concern, along with contributing to a better definition and clearer expectation of shared responsibility (part of the fourth concern). As one of five committees or working groups addressing a broad spectrum of change, this is the preliminary report to the membership.

B. Brief Overview of Proposed Changes.

This working group was tasked with creating a multi-level NCAA rules violation structure and an enhanced penalty structure for NCAA rules infractions; and re-establishing a sense of shared responsibility, among the interested individuals and entities in intercollegiate athletics, for NCAA rules compliance and enforcement.

Based on the guiding principles of fairness, accountability and process integrity, the working group has (1) reached a number of conclusions regarding the NCAA's current violation, process and penalty structures, as well as the means by which responsibilities for enforcement efforts are currently shared among interested individuals and entities; (2) developed a series of recommended actions to address noted concerns with the current structures and definition of shared responsibility for rules enforcement; and (3) identified the anticipated outcomes for each of the proposed actions. .

1. Violation structure.

The working group is recommending a move from the current model (secondary/major) to a four-level violation structure. The proposed violation structure would be composed of the following levels:

- Level I – The most egregious violations. A Level I violation is a violation that seriously undermines or threatens the integrity of any of the NCAA enduring values (student-athlete success, the collegiate model, amateurism as a student model, competitive equity), including any violation that provides or is intended to provide a significant or extensive recruiting, competitive or other advantage, or significant or extensive impermissible benefit. Multiple Level II, III and/or IV violations collectively may be considered a Level I violation. Individual conduct that is unethical may be classified as a Level I violation, even if the underlying institutional violations are not considered Level I.
- Level II – Serious violations that currently fall between major and secondary violations. A Level II violation is a violation that provides or is intended to provide a minimal to significant recruiting, competitive or other advantage; or includes a minimal to significant impermissible benefit; or involves a pattern of systemic violations in a particular area. Multiple Level III and/or IV violations collectively may be considered a Level II violation. Some limited individual conduct that is unethical or dishonest may be classified as a Level II violation, even if the underlying institutional violations are not considered Level II.
- Level III – Violations that provide some advantage or impermissible benefit that warrant NCAA enforcement staff review. A Level III violation is a

violation that is isolated or limited in nature; provides no more than a minimal recruiting, competitive or other advantage; and does not include more than a minimal impermissible benefit. Multiple Level IV violations collectively may be considered a Level III violation.

- Level IV – Minor or technical issues that do not rise to the level of a serious violation. (The working group notes that this level may not be necessary, or may include only limited violations, depending on the adopted work of the rules working group.) A Level IV issue is an action/inaction that is inadvertent and isolated; limited or technical in nature; and results in a negligible, if any, recruiting, competitive or other advantage or negligible, if any, impermissible benefit. Level IV issues will not impact eligibility.

2. Process structure.

The working group recommends that the NCAA Committee on Infractions be retained to hear and decide the most significant allegations of rules violations. However, the working group recommends that the committee be composed of a more diverse group of persons (e.g., former university presidents, vice presidents, athletics administrators with compliance experience).

The working group recommends that the committee be composed of a larger pool of individuals (a minimum of 18 but ideally at least 24 voting members) from which panels will be composed. In cases involving the most serious allegations of rules violations (Level I), the group recommends that either six or seven committee members will be randomly selected from each representative group to hear the cases. In cases involving allegations of Level II violations, the group proposes that three-member panels will be selected to hear the cases.

The working group recommends a number of other process modifications, applicable to cases categorized as Level I or Level II, including the following:

- Increase the availability of written case submissions to the Committee on Infractions, at the option of the institution and/or affected individuals, with agreement by the enforcement staff, even when there is disagreement on the facts, so that certain matters may be decided without the need for a full hearing.
- Redesign the notice of allegations to allow the member institution and/or involved individuals immediate access to the information on which the allegations are based and eliminate the need for a staff-prepared case summary, yet allowing for staff rebuttal when necessary.

- Introduce the availability of informally resolved infractions cases in situations in which the involved institution and/or affected individuals do not dispute the allegations or penalties in Level I and Level II cases (as reflected in the Penalty Guidelines), thereby significantly reducing the cost and anticipated timeline in serious infractions cases.
- Introduce the option of decreasing the amount of time between the notice of allegations and the institution's response from 90 to 60 days.
- Introduce the concept of a prehearing conference, with the Committee on Infractions panel chair presiding, in which preliminary issues are resolved prior to the full hearing of the infractions case including, when applicable, any disputes regarding the level at which the allegations have been charged.
- Use of an online case materials submission system and videoconferencing.
- Introduce the concept of NCAA staff-recommended penalties, pursuant to the Penalty Guidelines.
- Increase the availability of an expedited hearing before a Committee on Infractions representative at the request of the involved institution and/or involved individuals.
- Introduce time limitations for the preparation of hearing transcripts (two weeks), as well as the issuance of infractions reports and appeals reports (four weeks).
- Add additional staff to support the office of the Committees on Infractions.

With respect to matters categorized as Level III or Level IV, the working group recommends the following:

- In situations involving Level III violations, NCAA staff will continue to work with institutions, much the same as under the current secondary violations process, to determine whether infractions have occurred and, if so, the appropriate penalties to be imposed.
- In Level III matters, member institutions would continue to have access to a case precedent database, thereby allowing confirmation that staff-imposed penalties are consistent with those imposed in previously decided similar situations.
- In situations involving Level IV issues, the conference with which the involved institution is associated will work with the institution to determine

whether issues need to be addressed and, if so, the appropriate penalties to be imposed, if any. The group anticipates that the conferences will report these actions annually to the NCAA and/or will share information of issues/responses with the other conferences.

3. Penalty structure.

For cases involving allegations of Level I and Level II violations, the working group recommends a range of penalties set out in Penalty Guidelines. The working group recommends that a number of penalties constitute core penalties and form the basis for the Penalty Guidelines. Each of these penalties includes varying degrees of severity. The working group believes that the severity of the penalty imposed must correspond with the significance of the rule violation(s). The recommended core penalties:

- (a) Competition limitations [e.g., limitations imposed on participation in postseason play for varying lengths of time (depending upon the severity of the infractions) in given sport(s)].
- (b) Financial penalties [e.g., return revenue received from a given (fact-specific) event or series of events (e.g., revenues received for participation in tournament, bowl game or televised broadcasts)].
- (c) Scholarship limitations [e.g., limitations of athletics scholarships in head count sports [by number or percentage, depending upon the sport(s) involved] for varying lengths of time in given sport(s)].
- (d) Recruiting limitations [e.g., limitations of the number of allowable official paid visits at the institution for varying lengths of time in given sport(s)].
- (e) Probation.
- (f) Show cause orders (if applicable in a given case).

The working group recommends that the best means by which the committee may impose a penalty that falls within a more/less severe range of penalties is if it determines that certain aggravating and/or mitigating circumstances exist in Level I or II cases. The group continues to refine the lists of aggravating and mitigating factors. The Committee on Infractions will determine the presence and weight of the individual factors in a given case and may balance these factors in the decision-making process.

The committee may determine whether the presence of one or more of the aggravating and/or mitigating factors exist and, if so, how those factors affect the classification of the case. As a result, the presence of some aggravating factors and no mitigating factors may elevate the case classification to "aggravation" or "significant aggravation." Conversely, if there are mitigating factors in a case and no aggravating factors, the case classification would be "mitigation" or "significant mitigation."

4. Shared responsibility specific to compliance efforts and investigations.

The working group recommends that the concept of shared responsibility be better defined and specific expectations be identified for given roles within the compliance and enforcement processes. The working group will provide a final report on this issue to the Board in August 2012.

5. Head coach responsibility.

The working group proposes that the rationale for Proposal No. 2004-102, which is currently Bylaw 11.1.2.1, be amended to presume that the head coach is responsible (instead of knowledgeable and, therefore responsible) for not promoting an atmosphere of compliance and/or monitoring his/her staff. The working group recommends that at the April 2012 meeting, the Board of Directors support a recommitment to the original intent of Bylaw 11.1.2.1 and the addition of clarifying language to the rationale.

The working group is recommending that the penalty guidelines emphasize that Level I and II violations of Bylaw 11.1.2.1 should result in a show cause order with suspension from contests as one of the show cause requirements. The working group recognizes that employment decisions related to coaches or any athletics personnel rest solely with our member institutions. The recommended specific suspension requirements are:

- For the head coach who commits a Standard Level II violation of this bylaw, his/her employing institution will be required to withhold the coach from 10 to 30 percent of the institution's next games. The suspensions may include postseason contests and/or carry over to the next season.
- For the head coach who commits a Standard Level I violation of this bylaw, his/her employing institution will be required to withhold the coach from 20 to 50 percent of the institution's next games. The suspensions may include postseason contests and/or carry over to the next season.

The working group proposes that for Level III violations, a list of identified violations warranting head coach suspension for football, men's basketball and possibly other sports be examined and expanded as appropriate to address what are presumed to be intentional secondary recruiting violations.

D. Desired Outcomes.

The specific outcomes the working group expects from the changes to the violation, process and penalty structures are noted below:

1. Violation structure.

A new violation structure that appropriately categorizes the severity of infractions and allows for different levels of accountability for institutions and individuals.

2. Process structure.

- a. A much faster mode for processing violations that delivers expediency without compromising process integrity or fairness.
 - Clear metrics for every stage of processing a case.
- b. Clear understanding of what aspects of enforcement and student-athlete reinstatement cases can be more transparent and corresponding transparency where appropriate.

3. Penalty structure.

- a. Strong penalties that are predictable, deter the risk-reward analysis and address any unfair advantage.
- b. Clear definition of institutional control.
 - Rewards/incentives for effective compliance programs.
 - Rewards/incentives for strong institutional action to address wrongdoing.
- c. Rewards/incentives for individuals acknowledging violations.
- d. Increased accountability for head coaches.

4. Shared responsibility.

- Strengthened support for institutional leadership.

Clear definition of shared responsibility and resulting expectations of individuals, institutions, conferences and the national office staff.

**Presidential Working Group – Rules – Discussion Document
(February 2012)**

The NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model - Rules has been charged with reviewing and recommending amendments to the NCAA Division I Manual that would reduce the volume of rules that are difficult to enforce and that arguably fail to support the NCAA's enduring values, specifically the collegiate model, student-athlete success, amateurism and competitive equity. It is clear from the working group's numerous discussions, and from the feedback obtained from the membership that there is support to change the regulatory structure in meaningful ways that, in conjunction with an enhanced enforcement structure, will better support the collegiate model by placing appropriate emphasis on the most significant regulations.

In addition to the challenges related to the sheer volume of rules and bureaucracy in the current regulatory environment, the working group notes a historical desire to govern the conduct of intercollegiate athletics in a way that has resulted in a set of rules designed to diminish advantages that may arise for some members as a result of differing financial or other resources. The working group continues to examine whether to regulate through a "one size fits all" approach or otherwise legislate to the lowest common denominator based on resource availability. As a result and in support of a new regulatory approach, the working group is considering the development of guiding statements/principles that will serve as a foundation for a revised set of operating bylaws. The statements/principles will provide high-level guidance and justification for the operating bylaws which will serve to govern day-to-day compliance behavior.

The working group, along with leaders from the membership and the NCAA staff developed a package of concepts related to various operating bylaws on which the group would appreciate your feedback. The package includes a set of guiding statements/principles for each of the bylaws included in phase I of the working group's review. Proposed legislative concepts related to these guiding statements call for the immediate elimination of some rules and the modification and potential elimination of additional rules after discussion and development based on membership feedback. It is important to note that the working group considers these statements/principles and concepts very much in draft and will carefully consider all feedback before sending an initial set of recommendations to the NCAA Division I Board of Directors in April 2012. With that in mind, please consider the following questions during your discussion:

1. Are the guiding statements/principles appropriate for the relevant operating bylaws? Do the statements/principles adequately support the need for operating bylaws in this area? Should any be revised or added?
2. Do you agree with the actions contemplated by the legislative concepts?
3. Is there an appropriate nexus between the proposed guiding statements/principles and the actions contemplated by the legislative concepts?

**NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model -- Rules
Discussion Document -- NCAA Bylaw 16**

NCAA Bylaw 16 Guiding Statements/Principles.

1. Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be conducted in a manner designed to protect and enhance the physical and educational well-being of student-athletes.
2. Student-athletes may receive reasonable honors for their academic and athletic achievements.
3. Student-athletes, their relatives or friends may receive any benefit if it is demonstrated that the same benefit is generally available to the institution's students and their relatives or friends.
4. Student-athletes may receive actual and necessary expenses and benefits associated with a student-athlete's participation in conjunction with practice and competition when representing the institution and outside sports teams/organizations.
5. Institutions and student-athletes may provide other individuals with reasonable ways to support a student-athlete in his or her educational or athletics endeavors.

(Note: Former student-athlete benefits are tied to what a student-athlete may receive.)

Bylaw 16 (Awards, Benefits and Expenses) Concepts.

1. Modify awards legislation to provide institutions, conferences and NCAA discretion to determine who may receive awards and permit a student-athlete to contribute to the purchase of a permissible award.

Rationale.

- Deregulating the legislation related to the timing of a student-athlete's receipt of an award (i.e., during the academic year or during the summer) will create consistency within the legislation. Further, institutions and conferences will have discretion related to the eligibility for such awards (e.g., eligible for competition) and the student-athlete experience is enhanced when a student-athlete is permitted to contribute to an award that he or she may otherwise not be able to receive.

2. Modify the academic counseling/support services legislation to permit the NCAA, institution or conference to provide academic support and career counseling/development services that are determined reasonable and appropriate and necessary for the success of the student-athlete.

Rationale.

- Allows an institution to use discretion in providing academic counseling/support services to its student-athletes while protecting and enhancing the educational well-being of the student-athlete.
3. Modify the medical expenses legislation to permit the NCAA, institution or conference to provide such services and expenses that are determined reasonable and appropriate for the health and well-being of the student-athlete.

Rationale.

- Allows an institution to use discretion in providing medical expenses to its student-athletes and protects and enhances the physical well-being of student-athletes.
4. Eliminate items in the housing legislation related to athletics dormitories and athletics blocks and instead require an institution to have established policies and procedures related to student-athlete housing.

Rationale.

- The current legislation related to the provision of housing expenses has become prescriptive and the fundamental rule which requires an institution to apply the same institutional housing policies for all students addresses how housing policies should be applied. Deregulation of the athletics dormitories and blocks legislation supports the notion that student-athletes should be treated similarly to all students and an institution's policies related to housing blocks should be applied across all students at the institution.
5. Simplify the housing legislation to indicate that housing during a vacation period may be provided when the student-athlete is required to be on campus for practice or competition.

Rationale.

- This modification simplifies the legislation, does not change the outcome of benefits received by the student-athlete and removes the prescriptive nature of the legislation that is addressed by the general rule related to extra benefits.

6. Modify the meals legislation to permit an institution or conference to provide food to student-athletes at any time.

Rationale.

- The elimination of prescriptive legislation related to meals in conjunction with practice, competition, vacation-period expenses, institutional committee service and fruit nuts, and bagels will simplify/deregulate prescriptive meal regulations while at the same time promoting student-athletes' nutritional health and well-being by allowing institutions the autonomy to address the needs of student-athletes.
7. Modify legislation to allow for greater institutional discretion when providing expenses to family members or student-athletes to be present in situations of illness or injury (e.g., remove reference to "life-threatening").

Rationale.

- The modification of this legislation allows an institution to use discretion to provide expenses when illnesses or injuries are not life threatening but affect a student-athlete or member of a student-athlete's family, thereby supporting student-athletes physical and mental well-being while eliminating the administrative burden of requesting legislative relief in these circumstances.
8. Modify legislation to permit complimentary admissions to an institutional awards banquet for any member of a student-athlete's family.

Rationale.

- Creates uniformity and allows institutional discretion in the application of complimentary admissions to an institutional awards banquet to all family members of a student-athlete. Further, deregulation promotes the student-athlete experience by providing greater opportunities for members of a student-athlete's family to share in the student-athlete's success.
9. Modify the team entertainment legislation to permit the NCAA, conference or institution to provide reasonable entertainment in conjunction with practice or competition (e.g., remove restrictions on professional sports tickets, movies).

Rationale.

- Eliminates the need for prescriptive legislation and allows institutions discretion with regard to the entertainment it wishes to provide to student-athletes within the locale of the practice or competition site.
10. Modify legislation related to expenses provided by the institution for practice and competition to permit an institution to provide actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete's participation in practice, competition and when representing the institution in other events (e.g., remove legislation related to departure/return restrictions, practice-weather exceptions, nonsport apparel, retention of athletics equipment and apparel).

Rationale.

- The legislation may be simplified by deregulating many of the prescriptive bylaws and by combining all bylaws related to expenses provided by the institution. Specifically, by having a general rule which states that an institution may provide actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete's participation in required events when representing the institution and in conjunction with practice and competition, including a foreign tour, and any associated fees (e.g., sports organization membership, passport). Simplifying the legislation surrounding the provision of expenses for travel, allows an institution to use discretion when providing expenses, including incidental expense funds in accordance with institutional policies, when the student-athlete is representing the institution, whether that is for competition or other events (e.g., goodwill tours, media appearances, student-athlete advisory committee meetings) provided the travel is adhering to the institution's policies for missed class time.
11. Modify legislation to permit institutional discretion for providing expenses related to national team tryouts and develop general rule to account for receipt of actual and necessary expenses and reasonable benefits associated with Olympic and national team practice and competition.

Rationale.

- This will simplify the current legislation by allowing an institution to use discretion when providing expenses for participation in national team tryouts. Creation of a general rule that allows actual and necessary and reasonable benefits associated with Olympic and National Team practice enhances student-athlete well-being and eliminates the need for prescriptive legislation.

12. Restructuring and reformatting of other sections of Bylaw 16.

Rationale.

- This will promote consistency, ease of use and uniformity in the application of awards, benefits and expenses for enrolled student-athletes.

**NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model – Rules
Discussion Document – NCAA Division I Bylaw 12**

Bylaw 12 Guiding Statements/Principles.

1. Only an amateur student-athlete is eligible for intercollegiate athletics participation in a particular sport (current Bylaw 12.01.1).
2. Member institutions' athletics programs are designed to be an integral part of the educational program. The student-athlete is considered an integral part of the student body, thus maintaining a line of demarcation between student-athletes and professional athletes (derived from current Bylaw 12.01.2).
3. A prospective or enrolled student-athlete shall not be paid for his or her participation in athletics competition.
4. A prospective or enrolled student-athlete shall not be involved with an agent during his or her participation in intercollegiate athletics. A prospective or enrolled student-athlete who has entered into a representation agreement with an agent shall be ineligible for participation. **[Note: Any amendments to agent legislation will occur during Phase II of this effort. The internal working group has discussed options to bring additional flexibility to agent rules (e.g., pre-enrollment advisors).]**
5. *Additional statements/principles will likely need to be added as we work through Phases I and II of Bylaw 12 deregulation (e.g., promotional activities).*

Phase I – Bylaw 12 Concepts.

1. Reorganize legislation to clarify rules that apply pre-collegiate enrollment versus rules that apply to enrolled student-athletes.

Rationale.

- Throughout Bylaw 12, there are many areas where the legislation applies to either prospective or enrolled student-athletes, but not both. For example, a bylaw may be written as a general prohibition against some kind of activity (e.g., competition with professionals), but an exception will follow that makes the activity permissible for one category of a student-athlete (generally for prospective student-athletes). Separating the legislation, where appropriate, to make more clear these legislative differences will result in a more user friendly and understandable Manual.
- 2. Create a uniform definition of "actual and necessary" expenses and eliminate superfluous regulations and interpretations related to such permissible expenses. In individual sports, permit calculation of actual and necessary expenses over a period of time (e.g., calendar year) rather than event-by-event basis.

Rationale.

- Current legislation regarding what is considered actual and necessary expenses is inconsistent. This issue results in confusion by the membership and perceptions of unfairness to prospective and enrolled student-athletes.

3. Streamline rules related to expenses that may be received from outside sources while maintaining the prohibition on receipt of expenses from professional sports organizations, boosters and agents.

Rationale.

- Currently, there are several bylaws addressing the provision of competition-related expenses to prospective and enrolled student-athletes that are overly complicated and bureaucratic. This legislation would be replaced with one bylaw stating that actual and necessary competition-related expenses may be received by a student-athlete from any source other than a professional sports organization (unless within pre-enrollment professional team exception), agent or booster (exception may be appropriate for booster living in locale of prospective student-athlete). This change would allow for earmarked fundraising in both team and individual sports.
4. Permit payment based on performance, including prize money, up to actual and necessary expenses, pre- and post-enrollment, in both team and individual sports from an amateur team or the sponsor of event.

Rationale.

- Current legislation permits payment based on performance from both amateur and professional teams (pre-enrollment only) as well as from a sponsor of an event; therefore, it appears the membership is not concerned with the basis on which the money is received, provided it is from an otherwise permissible source and does not exceed actual and necessary expenses.
5. Expand opportunities for receipt of training expenses.

Rationale.

- Currently, training expenses may only be received from the United States Olympic Committee or appropriate national governing body in the sport. Increased flexibility in the legislation would permit receipt of training expenses from other entities (e.g., regional or provincial programs). This would reduce bureaucracy, confusion and enhance student-athlete well-being.
6. Simplify and streamline legislation related to expenses received for participation in elite events (e.g., Olympic Games).

Rationale.

- Currently, there are over 12 bylaws throughout Bylaw 12 addressing participation in elite events. This legislation will be streamlined and placed together in the Manual.
7. Elimination of other legislation that is duplicative, overbroad or vague.

**NCAA WORKING GROUP ON COLLEGIATE MODEL - RULES
OUTREACH AND EDUCATION**

Timeline Overview

Feedback Loop I (February through April)	Feedback Loop 2 (April through July)
Rules Working Group identifies concepts and issues, feedback timeline, opportunities and mechanisms.	Outcomes of April Board of Directors actions. Rules Working Group identifies concepts and issues, feedback timeline, opportunities and mechanisms.
Direct communication, NCAA News articles, Web page.	Direct communication, NCAA News articles, Web page.
Governance Structure: Council, cabinet and committee meetings.	Governance Structure: Committee meetings.
Conference outreach and feedback.	Conference outreach and feedback.
Other organization, association and group outreach [e.g., faculty and coaches associations].	Other organization, association and group outreach (e.g., National Association of Administrators of Compliance (NAAC), National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics (NACDA), coaches associations).
Individual feedback.	NCAA Regional Rules Seminars.
	Individual feedback.

Outreach Targets

Subject Matter Groups:	Broad-Based Groups (Governance and Others):	Individuals/Others:
- Amateurism: - NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet.	NCAA Division I Legislative Council.	Campus compliance administrators.
- Personnel/Recruiting: - NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet.	NCAA Division I Leadership Council.	Conference compliance administrators.
- Academics: - NCAA Division I Academics Cabinet. - National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics. - FARA. - NCAA Division I-A faculty athletics representatives.	NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.	
- Awards, Benefits and Financial Aid: - NCAA Division I Awards, Expenses, Benefits and Financial Aid Cabinet. - National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators.	NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions.	
- Playing and Practice Seasons - NCAA Division I Championships/Sport Management Cabinet.	NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee.	
- Administrative Matters: - NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet.	NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance.	
	- NAAC. - NACDA.	

Subject Matter Groups:	Broad-Based Groups (Governance and Others):	Individuals/Others:
	- Division IA Athletics Directors Association. - Compliance and Enforcement Task Force - Collegiate Commissioners Association. - Football Bowl Subdivision. - NCAA Football Championship Subdivision/Division I.	
	NCAA Division I Collegiate Commissioners Association Compliance Administrators.	
	National Association of Collegiate Women Athletic Association .	
	Coaches Associations.	
	Conferences.	
	FARA.	

<u>Proposal Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Effective Date</u>	<u>Status</u>
2011-1	AMATEURISM -- EXCEPTION FOR PRIZE MONEY FOR PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES AFTER FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT AT NON-NCAA INSTITUTIONS -- OUTSIDE THE PLAYING SEASON DURING THE SUMMER VACATION	NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet	Immediate	Adopted - Final
2011-23	AMATEURISM -- DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS -- AGENT	NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet	Immediate	Adopted, 60-Day Override Period
2011-24	AMATEURISM -- AMATEUR STATUS -- EXPENSES FROM A SPONSOR FOR PRACTICE OR COMPETITION IN INDIVIDUAL SPORTS PRIOR TO FULL-TIME COLLEGIATE ENROLLMENT	NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet	Immediate	Jan 12, 2012: Leg Council Init Review, Tabled; Tabled until the council's April 2012 meeting, pending the work of the Presidential Retreat Working Groups.
2011-25	AMATEURISM -- EXCEPTIONS TO AMATEURISM RULE -- PRIZE MONEY PRIOR TO FULL-TIME COLLEGIATE ENROLLMENT -- TENNIS -- \$10,000 PER YEAR	NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet	Immediate	Jan 12, 2012: Leg Council Init Review, Tabled; Tabled until the council's April 2012 meeting, pending the work of the Presidential Retreat Working Groups.
2011-26	AMATEURISM, RECRUITING, ELIGIBILITY AND AWARDS, BENEFITS AND EXPENSES -- WORLD UNIVERSITY CHAMPIONSHIPS	NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee)	Immediate	Adopted, 60-Day Override Period
2011-27	AMATEURISM AND EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS -- FINANCIAL DONATIONS AND ADVERTISING AND SPONSORSHIP OF INTERCOLLEGIATE EVENTS -- PROFESSIONAL SPORTS ORGANIZATIONS	NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet	Immediate	Adopted, 60-Day Override Period

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR THE AMATEURISM CABINET

1. Student-athletes shall be an integral part of the student-body and their participation should be motivated primarily by education and by the physical, mental and social benefits to be derived.
2. Ensure that legislation reinforces that student participation in intercollegiate athletics is an avocation, and student-athletes should be protected from exploitation.
3. Minimize missed class time; maximize time spent pursuing educational opportunities
4. All commercial activities shall support intercollegiate athletics and be consistent with the values of higher education.
5. Ensure legislation is written in a simple, clear and enforceable manner.
6. Consider the amount of time legislation has been in effect before supporting a legislative change.
7. Consider the impact of proposals on institutional, conference, NCAA and Eligibility Center resources and staff members.
8. Ensure feedback has been solicited from stakeholders.
9. Consider if sport-specific legislation is warranted or if proposed legislation can/should be expanded to other sports.
10. Examine potential unintended consequences when reviewing legislation.

★ *ESPN The Magazine* catches up with [the 39 players since 2006](#) who were one-and-done in college. The phrase "go back" or "come back" appears a total of five times. "Regret" shows up twice. Absent words from the piece: "wish," "sorry," "degree" and "choice."

Quick studies

We talk to alums of the one-and-done university

*By Morty Ain, Sam Alipour, Anna Katherine Clemmons, Molly Knight and Eddie Matz
ESPN The Magazine*

One and Done

Taking a look at why players choose to leave after one year of college and what they think of the one-year rule

One and Done A version of this story appears in the Nov. 14 issue of *ESPN The Magazine*.

Talking about one-and-dones may seem like a moot point now that an NBA season looks more and more doubtful. (The list of issues to discuss, with the age rule ranked significantly lower than revenue sharing, is presently at a standstill.) But heading into the 2011-12 college hoops season, with star sophomores like Harrison Barnes (UNC) and Jared Sullinger (Ohio State) bucking the trend, we thought we'd ask guys with some insight.

We reached out to all 39 one-and-done players (since 2006, when the age limit was implemented by the NBA) to see what they thought about their decisions and transitions in retrospect.

2006

Shawne Williams, Memphis (F, New York Knicks) "It's really tricky because at the end of the season, we lost to UCLA in a low-scoring game, no one made buckets, and I felt like we should've won the championship that year. It was tough. I wanted to win a national title, so I told everyone I was coming back. But I had lost my brother, and I come from nothing. I took all that into consideration, and I had an opportunity to go get some money. In the NBA, I've felt like a vet at one point, a rookie at one point, and there was no win for me at one point. I never knew I'd have to try out again. But because of my background, a lot of people were scared to touch me. I felt like the odds were against me. But I've grown up a lot. I feel like I've come a long way."

2007

Greg Oden, Ohio State (C, Portland Trail Blazers) "Not winning the championship was actually a big factor. I definitely wanted to win. But another big factor was my partner in crime

for a long time: Mike Conley. He had a chance that not a lot of people would get, and I would have been selfish to tell him not to take it. He was the best player on that team. He ran everything as the point guard. Him not being there would make it a lot tougher to get back (to the championship game). That was a major factor for me. We wanted to win, but you have to take the opportunity to play in the NBA."

Mike Conley, Jr., Ohio State (G, Memphis Grizzlies) "The biggest difference from college and high school to the NBA is the fact that you are your own man, you're a grown man, and you have to make decisions on your own. That's the part I didn't think about as much. You just think about the basketball side of things. But at the end of the day, you're like, 'Man, I gotta manage my bills, I got all these other issues that come with all this money and all the attention, the responsibility of being an NBA player.' It's hard to deal with especially at 19 or 20 years old. Most people don't deal with that until they're 30 or 35 years old, so it's a different kind of world. I had the thought, 'Why didn't I stay in school?' at least 10 or 20 times that first year in the league. I think what got me mentally and physically right was just being able to play. Once I got out there and was able to have fun and not be injured, not be on the sideline watching, it was like what I had dreamed of, what I wanted to be growing up. My motivation to keep getting better and playing well against these great guys. That's what turned it around for me."

Brandan Wright, North Carolina (F, New Jersey Nets) "The age rule was relief because it definitely took a lot of pressure off me being 18 years old and deciding whether to go to the NBA straight out of high school or to college. If a top prospect came to me and asked what he should do as far as the college situation, going to Europe or playing professionally, I think you should just follow your heart. It depends on what type of person you are. If you're not as mature as you need to be, I think you should go to school, learn that maturity, learn how to be on time, go to class and be held accountable. Because if you just jump straight in you'll probably get yourself in a lot of trouble by having a lot of money in your pocket and getting into the wrong situations."

Spencer Hawes, Washington (C, Philadelphia 76ers) "A couple of teams, when I worked out for them, said: We think it'll be in your best interest to go back to school. But at the end of the day, I didn't really ask people, 'Do you think I should go or stay?' I processed it myself. And I was lucky to have my passion drive me to the decision as opposed to a lot of external factors some guys have to consider. There was pressure from teammates to stay, but they respected the decision. They understood. You don't grow up saying, I want to be a college basketball player when I grow up. You want to be Michael Jordan. Guys understood that more than fans and media."

Thaddeus Young, Georgia Tech (F, 76ers) "There were times when I doubted myself and said, 'I don't know if I'm ready for the NBA,' but at the end of the day, that's the decision you have to make. A lot of people have financial situations, a lot of people feel they're ready and a lot of people don't want to go to school. I said I was ready. I think I'm a much better pro player than I was in college. I think my game is made for what I did throughout high school and now at the pro level, which is running and gunning and getting out in transition. At Georgia Tech, we played a lot of half-court basketball and that wasn't really my style of play."

"If you're going to go, make sure you're all in, two feet in, because you can't walk halfway through the door and expect to be all the way in. You can stay outside and do what you're going to do in college, but when you come here, it's a whole different ballgame. It's time to be a professional and it's time to grow up."

Daequan Cook, Ohio State (G, Oklahoma City Thunder) "Mike Conley and Greg Oden were my AAU teammates from the second grade. We grew up together, played together from then on. We never really talked about the age rule, because when it happened we were still really young. We still had a lot of learning, so it didn't really affect us as much. We knew that our goal, our dream was to play in the NBA, we just didn't know how long it would take. So then when we realized we had to go to school, we made the decision to play together at the college level. That helped. I do think LeBron had an effect on them making a rule. There were a lot of guys who probably weren't going to go to college at the time, who wanted to go straight to the pros, and I guess they felt like guys like LeBron should go to college at least a year. There ain't nothing wrong with getting a year of college."

2008

Derrick Rose, Memphis (G, Chicago Bulls) "The biggest adjustment was to the NBA lifestyle - paying bills, taking care of my family, the women coming at you. I'm just being honest. I was 19. I'm glad I had BJ [Armstrong] to prepare me for all that. On the court it was knowing all the play calls, knowing how to talk to your teammates, learning to play through your mistakes. I was lucky -- I was allowed to do that. Other people who came out with me didn't have the same opportunity and it took them a lot longer to get comfortable."

DeAndre Jordan, Texas A&M (C, Los Angeles Clippers) "When I first got my apartment I was 19 and I just sat in there alone and was like 'Who am I gonna hang out with?' In college, the guys you hang out with are your age and they don't really have anything to do after practice besides homework and just stay at the apartment, so I had to get used to staying at home by myself and picking up new hobbies. In the NBA, once practice is over everyone goes their separate ways because some people have families, some people have other issues going on, wives, girlfriends and things like that so you can't hang out with them as much as you hang with your college buddies."

Kevin Love, UCLA (F, Minnesota Timberwolves) "There were people telling me not to go. They didn't say those exact words, but they said, 'Listen, if you come back, you'd be National Player of the Year, you'd take this team to the Final Four again and compete for a national championship.' That was intriguing. But this was a chance to achieve my dream at 19 years old and make an impact on the NBA as quickly as possible. I had to have tunnel vision and make a decision that was in my best interest."

Like with all aspects of life, something that potential one-and-done players should definitely look out for is people in your life that are Yes Men. Ask yourself, who are the people that are challenging you? Who's giving you a different perspective? Who is challenging you and making

you think about the things that you do? Listen to those people. It makes you look at things differently. That's only going to help your decision-making."

Anthony Randolph, LSU (F, Timberwolves) "It was the SEC Tournament, the first game, and I remember one of my family friends coming and telling me that Pat Riley was in the stands. So that let me know a little bit that if I've got one of the most famous guys in the history of the league -- playing, coaching and being in the front office -- there watching my games, then there must be some truth that I've got a chance at being a lottery pick."

J.J. Hickson, North Carolina State (F, Sacramento Kings) "Looking back at it, I think that year was very helpful to me. I learned a lot of things under coach Sidney Lowe. He coached in the league so he runs like a league offense and he coached like a coach in the NBA, so I learned a lot from him. And I gotta say college helped me a lot with my transition. I got bigger, faster, stronger, I learned a lot about the game of basketball."

Kosta Koufos, Ohio State (C, Denver Nuggets) "Being a one-and-done meant living the dream sooner. Being able to play in the NBA, going up against the best athletes in the world -- Kevin Garnett and Shaquille O'Neal and guys that you used to look up to in high school -- it's exciting. When you play with talent like that every day, your skills go to the next level. I would smile after every workout, thanking God for every opportunity He's given me."

Donte Green, Syracuse (F, Kings) "I would stay in school one more year. I love Syracuse, bleed orange, still go back, love the city, love the fans. I would've stayed one more year and been with Jonny [Flynn], Scoop [Jardine] and Rick [Jackson], and all the guys. I think we would've won a national championship for sure. Those guys went far, but I would've gotten them over the hump. Just being able to be young and not have responsibilities ... once you leave college, it's real life out there. You have bills. You have responsibilities. Not saying I wasn't ready, but it would've been nice to have another year to be a kid. That said, I'm still in the league, still getting paid. There are guys from my class, at my position, that are out of the league right now and fighting to get back in. Guys that were drafted ahead of me."

2009

Tyreke Evans, Memphis (G, Kings) "I was talking to my brothers. They were the ones who pretty much helped me with my decision to go to school, so after my season at Memphis, which I thought I had a great year, we sat down and talked: Should I leave or not? We came to an agreement that it was okay for me to leave, a good time. I had a good chance of being a top pick. We sat down as a family and said: Let's do it. And that's what happened. I got drafted No. 4. It was a great moment for me."

DeMar DeRozan, USC (G, Toronto Raptors) "You never know of a guy's situation going into college. Maybe he needs the means to take care of his family. So I've always been against the age rule. It was tough when I found out about it. I think I was 17 at the time and every kid when they were in high school, the first thing they talk about is going pro. I always talked and bragged

about it. I remember before they made the rule, on one of the mock drafts I saw my name listed as top-three, and it was cool. I'd joke around, 'Yeah, I'm going to come out and be a top-three pick.' I didn't know if I was going to come out or not, but it was fun to think about."

B.J. Mullens, Ohio State (C, Thunder) "The rule, it's taking kids' years away from playing in the NBA. If a kid is good enough to play in the NBA at age 17, let him play. You know, the ball isn't going to bounce forever. Guys think they have 15, maybe 10 years of being a superstar player, but the average NBA career is about 4.5 years. You're not getting any younger. Myself, growing up in homeless shelters and 15 different houses, 15 elementary/middle schools, if I see a kid that has a talent like that, I'll tell him to go. If I see a rich, suburb kid, why does he have to go straight to the NBA if he already has money? Get your education, enjoy life."

2010

DeMarcus Cousins, Kentucky (C, Kings) "I was in middle school when the rule came about. When I first learned about it, I had mixed opinions. In a way, it's good because a kid needs that college experience -- to go through those changes and being closer to being an adult and learn that responsibility at the college level. At the same time, I don't believe the rule should be put in place because it's predicting somebody else's life -- you should be able to make your own path because you never know what that person's situation may be at home or with their family. By the end of my first year in college, I was seriously thinking about coming back. I loved playing for Kentucky so it was a tough decision but at the end of the day, I had to do what's best for me and my family."

Xavier Henry, Kansas (G, Grizzlies) "I don't think I can look back with any regrets. I had a good year in the NBA. Unfortunately I got hurt early, which took me out for a while. But if I would have gotten injured in college, I wouldn't even be in the position to make that decision now, so it was a good decision for me. I tried to have as much fun with it as I could."

Eric Bledsoe, Kentucky (G, Clippers) "Yes, I did think I was going to come back. I really did. I thought I'd be there about three years. I wasn't even known before I got to college, and people were still saying that he's just playing behind John Wall, so in the back of your head, you're like, they might be right. But I knew I always played with my heart -- I just try to leave it all out on the court."

Avery Bradley, Texas (G, Boston Celtics) "As a one-and-done guy, people know that you're not experienced. Right when you get to the NBA, people just assume that you don't know as much about the game as other players, which you don't. But if you're a college guy that's done three or four years, you're gonna know a lot about the game. A lot of the Texas fans were excited. But as my rookie season went on and I wasn't playing, they started saying that I should've stayed in school. My whole life I've always been the underdog, so I take that as motivation."

2011

Kyrie Irving, Duke (G, Cleveland Cavaliers) "My father's advice to me was to make the best decision for me. He also knows that I was considering him and my little sister at the time, but make the best decision for me and when I do make the decision don't have any regrets. I can't make such a big decision like that in my life asking, 'what if?' So you know when I made that decision I had to go with it and really put the time in to be the No. 1 pick. The talent is always going to be there regardless of age. I'm only 19 years old and I was fortunate and blessed enough to be the No. 1 pick. It's not going to stop recruiters from recruiting. It didn't stop Coach K from recruiting me. Coach K told me I was a pro right out of high school -- hearing that from a great coach, it still didn't keep him away from recruiting me. He knew that I wanted to go to college and be a part of a great program. It all depends on the kid."

Tristan Thompson, Texas (F, Cavaliers) "No other guys played a factor for me. Not at all. My process was about Tristan Thompson and what he's capable of doing. Obviously you look up to guys like KD, but I'm not Kevin Durant. I'm Tristan Thompson. Cory Joseph is like a brother to me. When it came time for the draft process, I told him to do what was best for him. A pro knows when he's a pro. If you think you're a pro, you're a pro. Don't come back to school because people are telling you you're not ready or you're not going to get drafted in the first round."

Brandon Knight, Kentucky (G, Detroit Pistons) "The biggest pressure not to go came from the Kentucky fans. They want their players to stay and try to build a dynasty. They don't want you to leave. That's a positive, and one of the reasons I love Kentucky."

Tobias Harris, Tennessee (F, Milwaukee Bucks) "Coach Pearl's one of the main reasons I came to Tennessee, so him leaving really did affect my decision. I took a little step back and decided if I should stay or go. I was about 50/50, but I just kept working out and getting better. I worked out with John Lucas in Houston, and he saw a lot of things in me that I didn't get to show NBA scouts during the year."

Cory Joseph, Texas (G, San Antonio Spurs) "I never really had any say in the rule. I would probably leave it how it is right now. I think the one year in college really helped me out. There are some players, like LeBron and maybe John Wall, exceptionally great players, you know, maybe they could have made the leap from high school, but I think that college helped me out a lot. The weight room in college is much different than high school. Just learning different game speeds, coming from high school to college. You just gotta be ready for that next leap -- try to get a step ahead."

Josh Selby, Kansas (G, Grizzlies) "To be honest, I thought the lockout was going to happen, but I thought it would last a month. I didn't think it was going to stop training camps and preseason games. I wasn't able to interact with the coaching staff, the GMs, the trainers -- that's the biggest thing that's messed up this process. No rookies were able to sign anything yet. It's kind of like we're unemployed right now, just doing what we can do, working out. Texting our teammates, meeting up with them when we can, just because we have a little bit of money to fly to work out and spend a little bit of time with the guys."

Editor's Note: The following players declined be interviewed for this article: (2007) Kevin Durant, Javaris Crittenton; (2008) Michael Beasley, OJ Mayo, Eric Gordon, Jerryd Bayless; (2009) Jrue Holiday; (2010) John Wall, Derrick Favors, Daniel Orton, Hassan Whiteside and Tiny Gallon.

Follow ESPN The Magazine on Twitter, @ESPNmag, and like us on Facebook.