

**REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
DIVISION I LEADERSHIP COUNCIL
APRIL 4, 2011, MEETING**

- **ACTION ITEMS.**

Olympic Sports Liaison Committee (OSLC)/National Governing Bodies (NGB) Working Group Recommendations. The Leadership Council received a report from the Council's subcommittee on Olympic sports regarding its review of the OSLC/NGB working group's recommendations related to endangered sports and sports that face challenges to their growth. The subcommittee recommended that the NCAA national office assign to a senior leader the responsibility for creating collaborative strategies to prioritize and sustain Olympics sports within the collegiate structure. The subcommittee noted that designating a senior staff member with specific duties relative to Olympic sports would assist with the growth of Olympic sports at the collegiate level while at the same time acknowledging the importance of college sports to the success of the United States Olympic efforts. The Leadership Council unanimously agreed to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the subcommittee's recommendations. [See Supplement No. 1]

- **INFORMATION ITEMS.**

1. Discussion of Men's Basketball Recruiting Model. The Leadership Council received presentations regarding men's basketball recruiting from two panels of current and former Division I head men's basketball coaches (i.e., Jim Boeheim, Syracuse University; Paul Hewitt, Georgia Tech University; Ron Hunter, Georgia State University; Jeff Jones, American University, and Phil Martelli, Saint Joseph's University), several individuals involved with nonscholastic event operations (Criss Beyers, assistant athletics director at Bloomington High School South, and Rob Kennedy, president of Hoop Group), Jim Haney, the executive director of the NABC, and comments from two Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) members (Scott Krapf, chair, C.J. Williams, men's basketball student-athlete). Among themes/concepts that were shared with the Leadership Council:

- Coaches should have earlier contact with prospective student-athletes and their parents (e.g., earlier phone calls, earlier contact with prospects at their high schools).
- The NCAA should consider permitting official paid visits and on-campus evaluations during a prospect's junior year of high school.
- Coaches would support shortening the July evaluation period if they are provided additional days to evaluate in April.
- The NCAA should consider eliminating the text messaging restrictions.
- Coaches would be supportive of relaxing the rules related to telephone calls, possibly allowing calls earlier and then progressively more often (e.g., start in sophomore year with limited calls, more calls in junior year and unlimited calls during senior year).

- The NCAA should consider eliminating the terms contacts and evaluations, and use recruiting opportunities.
- “Third parties” are a reality in the current recruiting environment. NCAA rules need to allow coaches to enter the recruiting process earlier.
- The NCAA should consider modifying its event certification requirements in order to address some of the concerns regarding nonscholastic events.
- All parties report that coaches and prospects are exhausted by the last week in July.
- Student-athlete well-being should be emphasized when making decisions regarding changes to the men’s basketball recruiting model.

2. Report from the Leadership Council Men’s Basketball Recruiting Subcommittees.

Morgan Burke and Robin Harris, chairs of the two subcommittees, reported the following factors/concepts as critical in the analysis of access to prospects and a more effective use of recruiting time and resources:

- Providing opportunities for earlier access to prospects, their coaches and parents/legal guardians.
- Increasing opportunities for more direct access to prospects, their coaches and/or parents/legal guardians during academic year evaluation periods.
- Providing greater opportunities for greater access to prospects, while maintaining the 130 recruiting days that currently exists.
- Establishing some objective measure of academic readiness/preparedness that must be satisfied before an institution may expend recruiting funds to provide an official visit to a prospect.
- Modifying the current official visit legislation in order to minimize the need for unofficial visits.

The recruiting subcommittees will continue their discussions of men’s basketball recruiting in the upcoming months. The Leadership Council will meet again in July or early August to review the work of both subcommittees with the goal of developing recommendations regarding a new recruiting model to forward to the Board of Directors in October.

3. Report from Division I and Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) Commissioners and Head Men’s Basketball Coaches.

The Leadership Council received a report of recent discussions of men’s basketball recruiting by Division I and FCS commissioners and a head men’s basketball coach from each of those conferences. The following concepts resulted from those discussions:

- There should be more and earlier communication in the recruiting process.
- The rules regarding communication should be simplified.
- The recruiting process should include parents as much as possible.

- There should be a spring evaluation period.
 - The July evaluation period is very valuable
 - High school evaluations should be structured to allow coaches to gather as much information as possible about prospects.
 - Should consider allowing tryouts during official visits.
4. **Men's Basketball Recruiting Model Alternatives.** The Leadership Council received a document outlining men's basketball alternative recruiting models that was developed by conference office administrators with NCAA rules compliance and basketball backgrounds from the Atlantic Coast, Big Ten, Big East, Big 12, Pac-10 and Southeastern Conferences (see Attachment). While the document has not been discussed with the presidents/chancellors of the six conferences, it was offered to the Leadership Council for consideration in its discussions of men's basketball recruiting models.
5. **Status Report from the Subcommittee on Agent Issues.** Rachel Newman, NCAA director of agent, gambling and amateurism activities, noted that the Amateurism Cabinet discussed agent issues during its February meeting and will continue those discussions in June. The subcommittee plans to begin work this summer and will assess whether sport specific legislation is viable.
6. **Report from the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.** Division I SAAC Chair Scott Krapf presented a report of the committee's recent meeting and priorities for the upcoming year.
7. **Future Meetings.**
- a. July, 2011, TBD.
 - b. October, 2011, TBD.

Leadership Council chair: Mike Alden, University of Missouri

Staff Liaisons: S. David Berst, Division I governance
Jacqueline Campbell, Division I governance
Kevin Lennon, academic and membership affairs

Leadership Council Attendance
April 4, 2011, Meeting

Leadership Council members in attendance:

Michael Alden, University of Missouri, Columbia, Big Twelve Conference, chair
Jeffrey Altier, Stetson University, Atlantic Sun Conference
Sandy Barbour, University of California, Berkeley, Pacific-10 Conference
Kathleen Batterson, Colonial Athletic Association (alternate)
Karl Benson, Western Athletic Conference (alternate)
Peg Bradley-Doppes, University of Denver, Sun Belt Conference
Morgan Burke, Purdue University, Big Ten Conference
Janet Cone, University of North Carolina, Asheville, Big South Conference
Joseph D'Antonio, Big East Conference (alternate for portion of meeting)
Tom Duple, Summit League
Peter Fields, Montana State University-Bozeman, Big Sky Conference
Chet Gladchuk, U.S. Naval Academy, Patriot League
Robin Harris, Ivy League
Alan Hauser, Appalachian State University, Southern Conference
R.C. Johnson, University of Memphis, Conference USA
Cynthia K. Jones, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Missouri Valley Conference
Lynn King, University of the Pacific, Big West Conference
Paul Kowalczyk, Colorado State University, Mountain West Conference
Scott Krapf, Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
Jonathan (Jon) LeCrone, Horizon League
Susan Cross Lipnickey, Miami University, Mid-American Conference
John Marinatto, Big East Conference
Charles McClelland, Texas Southern University, Southwestern Athletic Conference
Clyde McCoy, University of Miami, Atlantic Coast Conference
John McCutcheon, University of Massachusetts, Atlantic 10 Conference
Noreen Morris, Northeast Conference
Patrick Nero, America East Conference
John Ritschdorff, Marist College, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference
Greg Sankey, Southeastern Conference (alternate)
Dennis Thomas, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference
Bobby Williams, Sam Houston State University, Southland Conference
Mark Wilson, Tennessee Technological University, Ohio Valley Conference
Jamie Zaninovich, West Coast Conference (alternate)

NCAA primary staff liaisons in attendance:

S. David Berst, NCAA
Jacqueline Campbell, NCAA, recording secretary
Kevin Lennon, NCAA

ADDENDUM

DI Leadership Council 04/11

Page No. 2

Leadership Council members not in attendance:, McKinley Boston, Jr., New Mexico State University, Western Athletic Conference; Joan Cronan, University of Tennessee, Southeastern Conference, and; Jack Hayes, Hofstra University, Colonial Athletic Association

Guests:

Criss Beyers, assistant athletics director, Bloomington High School South
Jim Boeheim, head men's basketball coach, Syracuse University
Jim Haney, executive director, National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC)
Paul Hewitt, former head men's basketball coach, Georgia Tech University
Ron Hunter, head men's basketball coach, Georgia State University
Tom Izzo, head men's basketball coach, Michigan State University
Jeff Jones, head men's basketball coach, American University
Rob Kennedy, president, Hoop Group
Shane Lyons, chair, Division I Legislative Council
Phil Martelli, head men's basketball coach, Saint Joseph's University

NCAA staff members in attendance: Mark Emmert, Bernard Franklin, Ken Hubert, LuAnn Humphrey, Jim Isch, Kevin Lennon, Steve Mallonee, Kayla McCulley, Rachel Newman, Stacey Osburn, Tom Paskus, Donald Remy and Wallace Renfro were also present during portions of the meeting.

Men's Basketball Recruiting Model Alternatives

Background

For more than two decades there have been several attempts to change the structure of the NCAA Division I men's basketball recruiting model. These efforts centered on a perceived need to develop a more educationally sound and healthier environment for the recruitment of prospective student-athletes. Despite numerous reform attempts, the current recruiting structure continues to be filled with challenges. In general, legislative change over the years resulted in the empowerment of third-party influences while contact between NCAA Division I coaches, prospects, and their parents/guardians became increasingly more limited.

In September 2010, a strong majority of conference commissioners voted to recommend to the NCAA Division I Board of Directors that the summer recruiting evaluation period conducted around non-scholastic club basketball tournaments be eliminated. The Board responded by not supporting the immediate elimination of summer recruiting, but noted its intent to sponsor such legislation in the 2011-12 legislative cycle. In the meantime, the Board assigned to the Leadership Council, along with appropriate stakeholders, the responsibility to evaluate and create a new comprehensive recruiting model for men's basketball. The Board also suggested that the Legislative Council not take action on proposals in the 2010-11 legislative cycle that impact the recruiting calendar in men's basketball. Resolution of this issue is expected by August 2011.

A group of conference office administrators with NCAA rules compliance and basketball backgrounds from the Atlantic Coast Conference, Big Ten Conference, Big East Conference, Big 12 Conference, Pac-10 Conference, and Southeastern Conference convened to review the history of NCAA regulation in this area and to review and discuss issues and alternatives related to it. The discussions were held at the direction of the commissioners of the six conferences. The results of the discussions were not vetted with the presidents and chancellors of the conferences and is not being advanced as a proposal of the Group of Six Conferences.

Objectives and consensus

The group focused on developing concepts for change to the current men's basketball recruiting model that would support the following objectives:

1. Empower coaches, prospects, and parents to make the best informed decision in the recruiting process with less reliance on third parties.
2. Allow coaches along with prospects and their parents to better know each other through the recruiting process.
3. Simplify the regulatory burden for athletics departments.
4. Recognize the modern reality of technology and communication.

5. Create a more flexible recruiting structure with increased emphasis on campus access.

Consensus formed around the following components of a package that could be put into place effective with a prospect's junior year of high school to meet these objectives:

- Permit contact with prospects beginning April 15 of the junior year of high school.
- Permit official visits to begin April 15 of the junior year of high school.
- Permit institutions to provide travel expenses for a prospect's parents/legal guardians during official visits.
- Deregulate bylaws to permit institutions and prospects to communicate more frequently using any method (text messaging, phone, email, etc.).
- Explore initiating limited tryouts during official visits using rules that compare to current Division II regulations.

In addition, the group supports Proposal 2010-58-C, but recommends it be referred to the Leadership Council for its review of men's basketball recruiting.

A pair of recruiting calendar alternatives

Two differing approaches emerged related to the specifics of the recruiting calendar and evaluations at non-scholastic events.

Five of the six conferences (ACC, Big East, Big Ten, Big 12, Pac-10) reached general consensus around changes to the recruiting calendar (labeled as Alternative 1, below) that reduces the summer evaluation period while also reinstating a brief evaluation period for non-scholastic events held during two weekends in April.

The SEC offered an alternative (labeled as Alternative 2, below) which focuses the months of April and May on contact rather than evaluation while reducing and eventually eliminating summer evaluations of non-scholastic events.

Alternative 1

Alternative 1 acknowledges that past attempts to regulate the role and influence of the non-scholastic basketball environment in the recruiting process have been largely ineffective. Attempts to change the culture surrounding non-scholastic basketball by limiting coaches' attendance at events has had no effect, and elimination of summer recruiting might produce a similar outcome. Further, some broad opportunity to evaluate at non-scholastic events was needed for all Division I members—not only during the summer, but also in April.

Alternative 1 features the following changes to the recruiting calendar:

- An April evaluation period for certified non-scholastic events would be held on Saturday-Sunday for two weeks beginning two weekends after the Final Four. If those two weekends conflict with SAT/ACT national testing dates, evaluations would be permitted during an alternate weekend in April or May.
- Summer evaluations at certified non-scholastic events would be reduced from 20 days to a 9-day period during the last three weekends (Friday-Sunday) in July.

Limiting the summer evaluation period to weekends would allow coaches to remain on-campus with their team members during the week, an important consideration in the event Proposal 2010-58-C is adopted, providing greater opportunities for summer interaction between coaches and student-athletes.

Elimination of some of the certification requirements for non-scholastic events that have proven to be difficult to verify or enforce would be included in this alternative.

Alternative 1 also features exploring the establishment of a pilot program of evaluation camps held in April and during the summer.

Some of the parameters for these camps (number of camps, number of participants, sites, costs, management, format, college coaches' involvement, etc.) are to be determined. These camps could be modeled on the format used for the NBA Pre-Draft Camp or USA Basketball U16 national team development camp. USA Basketball, through its executive director, expressed strong interest in working on this project (sample structure documents are attached).

Alternative 2

Proponents of Alternative 2 do not believe that reducing the summer evaluation period by several days and adding evaluation opportunities in April effectively changes the status quo—as the overwhelming majority of the commissioners and the NCAA Board of Directors preferred.

Thus, Alternative 2's spring recruiting philosophy is intended to move away from evaluation of athletics skill to in-person recruiting contact with prospects and their family members.

Like Alternative 1, Alternative 2 features earlier contact with prospects (starting in April of the junior year of high school). Both alternatives would permit one contact on the high school campus with a high school junior. Alternative 2 would also allow two contacts at the prospect's home in April and May.

As for the summer, the long-term goal of Alternative 2 is to eliminate evaluations at non-scholastic events, shifting evaluations from non-scholastic events to the evaluation camp model outlined in Alternative 1.

In the near term, Alternative 2 proposes:

- A 9-day period during the last three weekends (Friday-Sunday) in July during which evaluations at certified non-scholastic events may occur. This 9-day period is identical to that proposed in Alternative 1, but it would only exist for a three-year period while the transition to evaluation camps occurs.
- An additional requirement that all certified non-scholastic events include both an evaluation session and a skill-instruction component for all participants.

kw/mm

3/31/2011

Proposed alternatives to basketball recruiting model

Feature	Current	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
Official visits			
Starting point	Senior year of high school	April 15 of junior year of high school	
Travel expenses	Prospect	Prospect and two parents/legal guardians	
Off-campus contact starting point	July 1 after junior year of high school	April 15 of junior year (one contact at PSA's high school)	April 15 of junior year (two contacts at PSA's home, one contact at PSA's high school in months of April and May)
On-campus tryouts	Prohibited	Explore initiating tryouts with the following parameters: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Starting point: April 15 of the junior year of high schoolDuring official visit onlyPre-tryout physical requiredUp to 2 hoursMay including testing and competition with team; only PSAs and S-As may participateTryouts must be closed and unpublicized	
		On-campus or normal practice/competition site	Most frequently used on-campus practice site
Communications with PSAs			
Types	Phone, email, fax only	The forms of communication would not be regulated	
Phone call frequency	<ul style="list-style-type: none">June 15 of sophomore year through July 31 of junior year of high school: 1 per monthAugust 1 prior to senior year of high school: Unlimited during contact period; two per week otherwiseJC and four-year PSAs: One call per week	Starting point: August 1 prior to the junior year of high school The frequency of phone calls would not be regulated	

Feature	Current	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
Recruiting calendar evaluations			
April and May	No evaluations permitted at non-scholastic events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit evaluations at certified non-scholastic events on two weekends (Saturday-Sunday) in late April. Dates would change if conflicts with national testing dates for SAT/ACT occur. • Modify certification requirements for non-scholastic events • Explore creation of evaluation camps as a pilot program. To be determined: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site(s) - Numbers and ages of PSAs - Format - Management - Coaches ability to work camps - Cost 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evaluations permitted in April. Focus of spring recruiting would be on contact.
July	Evaluations permitted at certified non-scholastic events during two 10-day evaluation periods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit evaluations at certified non-scholastic events during a 9-day evaluation period consisting of the last three Fridays-Saturdays-Sundays • Modify certification requirements for non-scholastic events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit evaluations at certified non-scholastic events during a 9-day evaluation period consisting of the last three Fridays-Saturdays-Sundays for a three-year period as a transition to evaluation camps • Modify certification requirements for non-scholastic events to require both an evaluation session and a skill instruction session
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore creation of evaluation camps as a pilot program. To be determined: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site(s) - Numbers and ages of PSAs - Format - Management - Coaches ability to work camps - Cost 	

Illustration of Alternative Evaluation Model in NCAA Division I Men's Basketball and Related Issues

USAB to stage evaluation camps on two-weekends in April (or early May) and three weekends in July.

Invitation-based camps targeting collegiate prospects in the rising Junior and Senior high school classes. Expected participation of 1,000 student-athletes evenly divided between the two class levels (500 rising juniors and 500 rising seniors). Participating camp instructors/coaches and student-athletes would be selected by USAB or other partner organizations. Could include NCAA Division I college coaches with representation balanced so that all institutions have the opportunity to participate.

All expenses of participants would be paid, including travel. NCAA and conferences would underwrite it. No sponsorship or commercial involvement associated with the camps (clean venue concept) to avoid potential turf battles and conflict of interest issues.

Sites would be in proximity to major airport hubs, geographically balanced. Also consider using campus facilities to house athletes and conduct camps. Anticipate five sites with approximately 200 student-athletes assigned to each site.

Camp format would be similar to USAB U16 national team development camp.

Primary focus is basketball but also a limited opportunity for educational and rules messaging.

Camps would be operated as an alternative to other evaluation events but coaches could still participate in evaluation at certified events not part of the camp structure as long as they occur in the permissible evaluation window (two April and three July weekends).

USA BASKETBALL
2011 NATIONAL TEAM TRIALS SCHEDULE

(U16 FIBA Americas Championship)
May 26-30, 2011

U.S. Olympic Training Center-Colorado Springs, CO

SCHEDULE

Wednesday, May 25	Arrival of Lead Clinician, Coaching Staff and Support Staff
Thursday, May 26	Arrival of Athletes and Selection Committee
	12:00-4:00p Registration - Sports Center 2
	SKILLS TRAINING SESSION 1 (Sports Center 2) - closed
	4:30-5:00p Orientation (parents and athletes)
	5:00-6:30p Group 1 - Individual Skills Clinics/Position Work
	Group 2 - Maximum Performance Session – West
Wing	
	6:30-8:00p Group 2 - Individual Skills Clinics/Position Work
	Group 1 - Maximum Performance Session – West
Wing	
Friday, May 27	SKILLS TRAINING SESSION 2 (Sports Center 2) - closed
	8:30-10:00a Group 1 - Individual Skills Clinics/Position Work
	Group 2 - USADA Information Session – West Wing
	10:00-11:30a Group 2 - Individual Skills Clinics/Position Work
	Group 1 - USADA Information Session – West Wing
	SKILLS TRAINING SESSION 3 (Sports Center 2) - closed
	1:00-2:30p Group 1 - Individual Skills Clinics/Position Work
	Group 2 - Recruiting Information Session – West
Wing	
	2:30-4:00p Group 2 - Individual Skills Clinics/Position Work
	Group 1 - Recruiting Information Session – West
Wing	
	TRIALS SESSION 1 (Sports Center 2)
	5:00-6:30p Group 1 - Team Offense & Defense/Scrimmages
	Group 2 - Parent Recruiting Session – West
Wing	
	6:30-8:00p Group 2 - Team Offense & Defense/Scrimmages
	Group 1 - Parent Recruiting Session – West Wing
Saturday, May 28	TRIALS SESSION 2 (Sports Center 2)

8:30-10:00a Group 1 - Position Work/Scrimmages
10:00-11:30a Group 2 - Position Work/Scrimmages

TRIALS SESSION 3 (Sports Center 2)

1:00-2:30p Group 1 - Position Work/Scrimmages
2:30-4:00p Group 2 - Position Work/Scrimmages

TRIALS SESSION 4 (Sports Center 2)

5:00-6:30p Group 1 - Position Work/Scrimmages
6:30-8:00p Group 2 - Position Work/Scrimmages

Sunday, May 29

TRIALS SESSION 5 (Sports Center 2)

9:00-9:15a Stretching/Shooting
9:15-10:45a Scrimmages

TRIALS SESSION 6 (Sports Center 2)

1:45-2:00p Stretching/Shooting
2:00-3:30p Scrimmages

TRIALS SESSION 7 (Sports Center 2)

5:45-6:00p Stretching/Shooting
6:00-7:30p Scrimmages

Monday, May 30

TEAM SESSION (Sports Center 2) - closed

8:30 am Announcement of U16 National Team
9:30-11:00a Team Meeting/Practice

pm Departure of Athletes, Coaches and Committee

Members