Marriott Rivercenter                                      January 14, 2016
Ballroom Salon G, M                                        11 a.m. to 2 p.m.

1. Welcome and introductions. (Alan Cureton)

2. General Information. (Cureton)
   a. Roster. [Supplement No. 1]
   b. 2016 Committee assignments. [Supplement No. 2]

3. Minutes, summaries and agendas. (Cureton)
   a. Summary of fall 2015 Quarterly Meeting. [Supplement No. 3]
   b. Administrative Committee actions. [Supplement Nos. 4a and 4b]
   c. NCAA Board of Governors draft agenda – January 13. [Supplement No. 5]

4. Division III Philosophy Statement and Strategic Positioning Platform. [Supplement Nos. 6a and 6b] (Dan Dutcher)

5. Report of the Division III Strategic Planning and Finance Committee. [Supplement No. 7a] (Jay Lemons/Jeff O’Barr)
   a. 2014-15 Final budget report. [Supplement No. 7b]
   b. 2015-16 Budget-to-actual report. [Supplement No. 7c]
   c. Future projections. [Supplement No. 7d]

6. Management Council report. [Supplement No. 8 will be distributed at the meeting] (Lori Runksmeier/Tracey Ranieri)

7. 2016 NCAA Division III Convention legislation. (Jeff Myers/Sarah Otey)
   a. 2016 NCAA Convention Notice and Program.
   b. Review of proposed legislation:
      • Review of proposals and speaker assignments. [Supplement No. 9]
      • Review of parliamentary and voting issues. [Supplement No. 10]
      • Legislative question and answer guide. [Supplement No. 11]
8. Review 2016 Convention logistics. (Louise McCleary)
   a. Presidents/Chancellors schedule. [Supplement No. 12]
   b. President/Chancellor Engagement program. [Supplement No. 13]
   c. Division III and II Presidential Programming agenda. [Supplement No. 14]
   d. Board of Governors composition session.
   e. Joint PC/MC/SAAC meeting. [Supplement No. 15]
   f. Division III Issues Forum. [Supplement No. 16]
   g. Presidents/Chancellors Issues Forum and Luncheon. [Supplement No. 17]
   h. Division III Business Session. [Supplement No. 18]

9. 2015 GOALS study. (Tom Paskus/Lydia Bell)

10. Division III Health & Safety Summit Executive Summary. [Supplement No. 19] (Dr. Brian Hainline)

11. Division III Presidents and Commissioners Communication Best Practices. [Supplement No. 20] (Tom Foley/Kate Broshears)

12. Division III Identity Initiative. [Supplement No. 21] (Broshears)

13. Governmental relations update. [Supplement No. 22]


15. Future meetings.
      • April 27 – 6 to 9 p.m. – Presidents Council dinner/meeting.
      • April 28 – 8:30 a.m. to noon – Presidents Council meeting.
   b. August 3-4, 2016 – Indianapolis.
      • August 3 – 6 to 9 p.m. – meet with Presidents/Chancellors Advisory Group.
      • August 4 – 8:30 a.m. to noon – Presidents Council meeting.
      • October 26 – 6 to 9 p.m. – Presidents Council dinner/meeting.
      • October 27 – 8:30 a.m. to noon. – Presidents Council meeting.
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  • January 19 – 11 a.m. to 2 p.m. (tentative).

16. Other Business.
  • Recognition of departing members.

17. Adjournment.

@ Denotes key action items.

* Denotes key discussion topics.
Erik Bitterbaum  
President  
State University of New York at Cortland  
[SUNYAC]  
P. O. Box 2000  
32 Stratton Drive  
Cortland, New York  13045  
Phone: 607/753-2201  
FAX: 607/753-5993  
E-Mail: erik.bitterbaum@cortland.edu  
Assistant: Lori Porter  
E-Mail: lori.porter@cortland.edu  
Phone: 607/753-5500  
Term Expiration: January 2016

Alan Cureton [Chair]  
President  
University of Northwestern [Upper Midwest Conference]  
3003 Snelling Avenue North  
St. Paul, MN  55113  
Phone: 651/631-5250  
FAX: 651/631-5129  
Cell: 612/281-0094  
Email: alancureton@unwsp.edu  
Assistant: Rachel Morgan  
Phone: 651/631-5249  
Email: ramorgan@unwsp.edu  
Term Expiration: January 2018

Jeffrey Docking  
President  
Adrian College [Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association]  
Administration Building  
110 South Madison Street  
Adrian, MI  49221-2575  
Phone: 517/264-3167  
FAX:  
Email: jdockings@adrian.edu  
Assistant: Andrea Burt  
Email: aburt@adrian.edu  
Phone: 517/264-3100  
Term Expiration: January 2018

Thomas P. Foley  
President  
Mount Aloysius College [Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference]  
7373 Admiral Peary Highway  
Cresson, PA  16630  
Phone: 814/886-6383  
FAX: 814/886-2978  
Email: tfoley@mtaloys.edu  
Assistant: Carla Nelen  
Email: cnelen@mtaloys.edu  
Term Expiration: January 2018

William J. Fritz  
President  
College of Staten Island [City University of New York Athletic Conference]  
2800 Victory Boulevard  
Staten Island, New York  10314  
Phone: 718/982-2400  
FAX: 718/982-2404  
Email: William.Fritz@csi.cuny.edu  
Assistant: Janet Arata  
Email: janet.arata@csi.cuny.edu  
Assistant: Debbie Mahoney  
Email: Debbie.Mahoney@csi.cuny.edu  
Term Expiration: January 2016

Tori Haring-Smith  
President  
Washington and Jefferson College [Presidents Athletic Conference]  
60 South Lincoln Street  
Washington, PA  15301  
Phone: 724/223-6000  
FAX: 724/250-3329  
Email: tharingsmith@washjeff.edu  
Assistant: Debbie Morris  
Phone: 724/223-6000  
Email: dmorris@washjeff.edu  
Term Expiration: January 2019
Sharon Hirsh
President
Rosemont College [Colonial States Athletic Conference]
1400 Montgomery Avenue
Rosemont, PA 19010
Phone: 610/527-0200
FAX: 610/527-1041
Email: shirsh@rosemont.edu
Assistant: Barb Walsh
Email: bwalsh@rosemont.edu
Term Expiration: January 2019

L. Jay Lemons [Vice Chair]
President
Susquehanna University [Landmark Conference]
514 University Avenue
Selinsgrove, PA 17815
Phone: 570/372-4130
FAX: 570/372-4040
Cell Phone: 570/556-9070
Email: lemonsj@susqu.edu
Assistant: Sharon Pope
Email: popes@susqu.edu
Term Expiration: January 2019

Christopher Howard
President
Hampden-Sydney College [Old Dominion Athletic Conference]
80 College Road
Box 128
Hampden-Sydney, Virginia 23943
Phone: 434/223-6110
FAX: 434/223-6350
Email: choward@hsc.edu
Assistant: Keary Mariannino
Email: kmariannino@hsc.edu
Term Expiration: January 2016

Lex McMillan III
President
Albright College [Middle Atlantic Conference]
P.O. Box 15234
13th and Bern Streets
Reading, PA 19612-5234
Phone: 610/921-7600
FAX: 610/921-7737
Email: lmcmillan@albright.edu
Assistant: Kathy Cafoncelli
Email: kcafoncelli@albright.edu
Assistant: Lana Haufler
Email: lhaufler@albright.edu
Term Expiration: January 2018

Robert Huntington
President
Heidelberg University [Ohio Athletic Conference]
310 East Market Street
Tiffin, Ohio 44883
Phone: 419-448-2202
FAX: 419-448-2126
Email: president@heidelberg.edu
Assistant: Monica Verhoff
Email: mverhoff@heidelberg.edu
Term Expiration: January 2019

Mary Meehan
President
Alverno College [Northern Athletics Conference]
3401 South 39th Street
Milwaukee, WI 53215
Phone: 414/382-6064
FAX: 414/382-6354
Email: mary.meehan@alverno.edu
Assistant: Melinda Kallenberger
Phone: 414/382-6064
Email: melinda.kallenberger@alverno.edu
Expiration: January 2016
Tori Murden McClure  
President  
Spalding University [St. Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference]  
845 South Third Street  
Louisville, Kentucky  40203  
Phone: 502/588-7164  
FAX: 502/992-2404  
Email: tmclure@spalding.edu  
Assistant: Jackie Howard  
Email: jhoward@spalding.edu  
Term Expiration: January 2017

Matthew Shank  
President  
Marymount University (Virginia) [Capital Athletic Conference]  
2807 North Glebe Rd.  
Arlington, Virginia  22207  
Phone: 703/284-1598  
FAX: 703/284-1595  
Email: mshank@marymount.edu  
Assistant: Hilary Phillips  
Email: Hilary.phillips@marymount.edu  
Term Expiration: January 2017

Zorica Pantic  
President  
Wentworth Institute of Technology [The Commonwealth Coast Conference]  
550 Huntington Avenue  
Boston, MA  02115  
Phone: 617/989-4476  
FAX: 617/989-4480  
Cell Phone: 857/991-3695  
Email: panticz@wit.edu  
Assistant: Rebecca Coakley  
Phone: 617/989-4476  
Email: coakleyr1@wit.edu  
Term Expiration: January 2018

Lynn Pasquerella  
President  
Mount Holyoke College [New England Women's and Men's Athletic Conference]  
50 College Street  
South Hadley, MA  01075-1496  
Phone: 413/538-2500  
FAX: 413/538-2391  
Email: commish@mtholyoke.edu  
Assistant: Irasema Perrault  
Phone: 413/538-2185  
Email: iperraul@mtholyoke.edu  
Term Expiration: January 2019

Dennis J. Shields  
Chancellor  
University of Wisconsin, Platteville [Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference]  
1 University Plaza  
Platteville, Wisconsin  53818  
Phone: 608/342-1234  
FAX: 608/342-1270  
Email: shieldsd@uwplatt.edu  
Assistant: Joyce Burkholder  
Email: burkholj@uwplatt.edu  
Term Expiration: January 2017

Dave Wolk  
President  
Castleton University [North Atlantic Conference]  
119 Alumni Drive  
Castleton, VT  05735  
Phone: 802/468-1201  
FAX: 802/468-6470  
Email: dave.wolk@castleton.edu  
Assistant: Rita Geno  
Email: rita.geno@castleton.edu  
Term Expiration: January 2019
Management Council

Lori Runksmeier [Chair]
Director of Athletics
Eastern Connecticut State University [Little East Conference]
83 Windham Street
Willimantic, CT  06226
Phone:  
FAX:  
Cell Phone:  603/340-3292
Email:  runksmeierl@easternct.edu
Assistant:  
Email:  
Term Expiration:  January 2016

Tracey Ranieri [Vice Chair]
Director of Athletics
State University College at Oneonta [SUNYAC]
Alumni Fieldhouse
Room 312, Ravine Parkway
Oneonta, New York  13820
Phone:  607/436-2446
FAX:  607/436-3581
Cell Phone:  607/437-0056
Email:  raniertm@oneonta.edu
Term Expiration:  January 2017

Jeff Myers
Governance Liaison
Director of Academic and Membership Affairs for Division III
E-Mail:  jmyers@ncaa.org
317/917-6870

Sarah Otey
Governance Liaison
Associate Director of Academic and Membership Affairs for Division III
E-Mail:  sotey@ncaa.org
317/917-6721

Brian Burnsed
Assistant Director of Membership Communications
E-Mail:  bburnsed@ncaa.org
317/917-6685

Eric Hartung
Associate Director of Research for Division III
E-Mail:  ehartung@ncaa.org
317/917-6306

Debbie Kresge
Executive Assistant for Division III
E-Mail:  dkresge@ncaa.org
317/917-6907

Debbie Brown
Administrative Assistant for Division III
Email:  dbrown@ncaa.org
317/917-6617

Division III Governance Staff:

Dan Dutcher
Vice President for Division III
E-Mail:  ddutcher@ncaa.org
317/917-6942

Louise McCleary
Director of Division III
E-Mail:  lmccleary@ncaa.org
317/917-6637

Jay Jones
Associate Director of Division III
Email:  jkjones@ncaa.org
317/917-6004

US MAIL ADDRESS
NCAA, P.O. Box 6222  
Indianapolis, IN  46206-6222

OVERNIGHT SHIPPING ADDRESS
NCAA Distribution Center
1802 Alonzo Watford Sr. Drive
Indianapolis, IN  46202
Telephone:  317/917-NCAA (6222)
Facsimile:  317/917-6972

http://documentcenter.ncaa.org/msaa/gov/DIII%20Committee
s/01%20%20Presidents%20Council/Rosters/2014/2014%20P
C%20Roster.doc/dsk/09014015
2016 PRESIDENTS COUNCIL COMMITTEE/SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Cureton, Alan, chair [January 2018]
- Administrative Committee
- Board of Governors
- PC/MC Joint Legislative Steering Committee

Docking, Jeffrey [January 2018]
- Strategic Planning and Finance Committee

Drugovich, Margaret [January 2020]
- Strategic Planning and Finance Committee

Foley, Thomas [January 2018]
- Nominations Subcommittee
- Presidents & Commissioners Communication Strategies Subcommittee

Fritz, William [January 2016]
- Convention-Planning Subcommittee

Haring-Smith, Tori [January 2019]
- PC/MC Joint Legislative Steering Committee

Hirsh, Sharon [January 2019]
- Convention-Planning Subcommittee

Huntington, Robert [January 2019]
- Nominations Subcommittee

Lemons, L. Jay, vice chair [January 2019]
- Administrative Committee
- Board of Governors
- Strategic Planning and Finance Committee, chair

McMillan, Lex [January 2018]
- PC/MC Joint Legislative Steering Committee
- Nominations Subcommittee

Murden McClure, Tori [January 2017]
- Nominations Subcommittee

Nunez, Elsa [January 2020]
- Nominations Subcommittee

Pantic, Zorica [January 2018]
- Nominations Subcommittee
- Infractions Appeals

Pasquerella, Lynn [January 2019]
- NCAA Cardiac Task Force

Shank, Matthew [January 2017]
- Convention-Planning Subcommittee

Shields, Dennis [January 2017]
- Diversity and Inclusion Working Group

Wolk, Dave [January 2019]
- Strategic Planning and Finance Committee

NOTE: Highlight shows new or change in assignment.
NCAA DIVISION III
PRESIDENTS AND MANAGEMENT COUNCILS
SUMMARY OF FALL 2015 QUARTERLY MEETINGS

KEY ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Wagering on Fantasy Games........................................................................................................Page No. 10

Membership....................................................................................................................................Page No. 11

Proposed Legislation – 2016 Convention..................................................................................Page No. 15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTENDEES</th>
<th>ATTENDEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nnenna Akotaobi, Swarthmore College</td>
<td>Alan Cureton, University of Northwestern, chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Cummings-Danson, Skidmore College</td>
<td>Jeff Docking, Adrian College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Davis, Jr., University of Scranton</td>
<td>Thomas Foley, Mount Aloysius College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shantey Hill, St. Joseph’s College</td>
<td>William Fritz, College of Staten Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brit Katz, Millsaps College</td>
<td>Tori Haring-Smith, Washington and Jefferson College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Kimball, California Lutheran University</td>
<td>L. Jay Lemons, Susquehanna University, vice chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Leighton, University of New England</td>
<td>Lex McMillan, Albright College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Millerick, Becker College</td>
<td>Tori Murden McClure, Spalding University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Ragsdale, Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference</td>
<td>Zorica Pantic, Wentworth Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Ranieri, State University College at Oneonta, vice chair</td>
<td>Lynn Pasquerella, Mount Holyoke College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Runksmeier, Eastern Connecticut State University, chair</td>
<td>Tracey Ranieri, State University of New York at Oneonta, MC vice chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Rupert, Wilmington College (Ohio)</td>
<td>L.ori Runksmeier New England College, MC chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime Salcedo, Medaille College</td>
<td>Dennis Shields, University of Wisconsin, Platteville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Small, New Jersey Athletic Conference</td>
<td>Dave Wolk, Castleton State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Soriero, Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Taryn Stromback, Ohio Northern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taryn Stromback, Ohio Northern University</td>
<td>Karen Tompson-Wolfe, Westminster College (Missouri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Van Aken, Thiel College</td>
<td>Troy Van Aken, Thiel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Wansart, Hunter College</td>
<td>Gerald Young, Carleton College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Young, Carleton College</td>
<td>Abby Brown, NCAA, recording secretary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABSENTEES</th>
<th>ABSENTEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stevie Baker-Watson, DePauw University</td>
<td>Eric Bitterbaum, State University of New York at Cortland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Howard, Hampden-Sydney College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Huntington, Heidelberg University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Meehan, Alverno College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>OTHER PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Brown, NCAA, recording secretary</td>
<td>Kate Broshears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Beary, NCAA</td>
<td>Brian Burns, NCAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Burns, NCAA</td>
<td>Dan Dutcher, NCAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Calandro, NCAA</td>
<td>Jessica Duff, NCAA, recording secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Duff, NCAA</td>
<td>Eric Hartung, NCAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Dutcher, NCAA</td>
<td>Jay Jones, NCAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Emmert, NCAA</td>
<td>Louise McCleary, NCAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Hartung, NCAA</td>
<td>Jeff Myers, NCAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Carmichael Jackson, NCAA</td>
<td>Jeff O’Barr, NCAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Jones, NCAA</td>
<td>Sarah Otey, NCAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Luck, NCAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise McCleary, NCAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Myers, NCAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff O’Barr, NCAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **WELCOME AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.**

   October 19 - 20 Management Council. The meeting was called to order at 8:02 a.m. October 19 and 8:05 a.m. October 20, by the chair, Lori Runksmeier. The chair welcomed the Council and reviewed the agenda.

   October 29 Presidents Council teleconference. The teleconference was called to order at 10:02 a.m. Thursday, October 29 by the chair, President Alan Cureton.

2. **REVIEW OF RECORDS OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS.**

   a. **Management Council Meetings – July 20 and 21, 2015.**


      Presidents Council. No action necessary.

   b. **Presidents Council Meeting – August 5 and 6, 2015.**

      Management Council. No action necessary.

      Presidents Council. The Presidents Council approved the summary of its August 5 and 6, 2015, meetings.

   c. **Administrative Committee Actions.**

      Management Council. The Management Council ratified the July 28, August 8, August 18, August 31, September 24 and October 1, 2015, Administrative Committee reports.

      Presidents Council. The Presidents Council ratified the July 28, August 8, August 18, August 31, September 24 and October 1, 2015, Administrative Committee reports.
3. **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AFFECTING DIVISION III.**

   a. Division III Joint Presidents Council/Management Council Committees or Subcommittees.

   (1) **Convention-Planning Subcommittee.**

   (a) **2016 NCAA Convention – Educational Session topics.**

   **Management Council.** The Council noted the following Division III Educational session topics were approved for the 2016 Convention:

   - Student-athlete mental well-being.
   - Integrating athletics throughout your campus: The benefit of strengthening the FAR’s role and relationships.
   - Addressing sexual misconduct in ways that make a difference: Prevention, providing support and ensuring accountability.

   **Presidents Council.** No action was necessary.

   (b) **2016 Convention Schedule – Division III governance-related sessions.**

   **Management Council.** The Council reviewed the subcommittee’s report noting the following governance-related sessions for the 2016 Convention:

   (1) **Chancellors/Presidents Programming.**

   - **Presidents and Chancellors Engagement Programming.** This session is open to all NCAA chancellors and presidents and will take place Thursday, January 14, from 1 to 2:30 p.m. All president and chancellors within their first 12 months will receive a $200 honorarium.

   - **Joint Division II/Division III Presidential Program.** This will be a joint session with Division II on Thursday, January 14, from 2:30 to 4 p.m. President Jeff Docking, Adrian College, will be the Division III moderator. There will be two roundtable topics: Telling your school’s story and the business model of athletics.

   - **Presidents and Chancellors Luncheon and Forum.** This session is open to all Division III presidents and chancellors and will take place Friday, January 15, from 11:30 a.m. to 2 p.m. President Kirk Schulz, chair of the NCAA Board of Governors, will participate in roundtable discussions related to the Board of Governors; and Association-wide issues and their impact on Division III.
(2) **Athletics Direct Report Institute.** This session is closed (attendance by nomination only). Currently there are 60 nominations to fill the 43 open slots. This session will take place Thursday, January 14, from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.

(3) **Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) Programming.**
   - **Special Olympics Unified Experience.** This session is scheduled for Wednesday, January 13, from 3:30 to 5:30 p.m. It is open to all Convention attendees, not just Division III.
   - **Programming for Student-Athletes.** SAAC has identified several sessions that will be most beneficial to Division III student-athletes. To date there are 60 students, beyond National SAAC, that are registered for Convention.

(4) **Issues Forum – Friday, January 15.**
   - **Roundtable topics:** The subcommittee reviewed the draft roundtable topics and provided feedback.
     - Playing and Practice Seasons review.
     - Current Division III compliance hot topics: The subcommittee discussed and made the following recommendations:
       - Camps and clinics.
       - Leadership programming – what is allowed for out-of-season student-athletes?
       - Social Media.
       - Role of strength & conditioning coach and student-athlete only weight rooms.
   - **Town Hall.** The subcommittee reviewed and decided on the following Town Hall topics:
     - Sportsmanship and Game Environment Working Group.
     - Diversity and Inclusion Working Group.
     - Financial Aid Best Practices.
   - **Business Session:** Saturday, January 16. The subcommittee discussed the following format:
     - 8 a.m. – Welcome.
     - 8:15 to 8:30 a.m. – National SAAC It’s On Us update.
     - 8:30 a.m. – Voting on 2016 legislative proposals.

**Presidents Council.** No action was necessary.
(2) **Strategic-Planning and Finance Committee.**

**Management Council.** The Council reviewed the division’s budget report as of September 30, 2015. No action was necessary.

**Presidents Council.** No action was necessary.

(3) **Joint Legislative Steering Subcommittee.**

**Management Council.** The Council reviewed the subcommittee’s report from its July 30 teleconference. No action was necessary.

**Presidents Council.** The Presidents Council reviewed the subcommittee’s report during its August meeting. The Council’s action was noted in the summer 2015 Summary of Actions.

**b. Management Council Subcommittees.**

(1) **Academic Issues Subcommittee.**

- Review of Four-Year Transfers without Participation at Previous Institution.

**Management Council.** The Council noted the subcommittee decided to take no action. Subcommittee members noted that while they are sympathetic to the concept in principle, they believe that adopting legislation is not the proper method for providing relief. The subcommittee also noted that eligibility issues involving multiple-institution transfer student-athletes are circumstances that should be reviewed with additional care. A more appropriate direction is to continue reviewing such instances on a case-by-case basis through the legislative relief waiver process, with guidance from the NCAA Division III Management Council Subcommittee for Legislative Relief.

**Presidents Council.** No action was necessary.

(2) **Subcommittee for Legislative Relief.**

(a) **Approve Combining the NCAA Division III Management Council Academic Issues Subcommittee and the NCAA Division III Management Council Subcommittee for Legislative Relief.**

**Management Council.** The Council approved a recommendation to combine the Academic Issues Subcommittee (AIS) and the Subcommittee for Legislative Relief (SLR). Currently, AIS processes approximately 20 waivers per year, and consequently, the subcommittee
recommended SLR absorb the duties of AIS to streamline and simplify the waiver process for Division III institutions. SLR is still discussing the appropriate composition for the revised subcommittee.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(b) Guideline Recommendation from the Academic Issues Subcommittee (AIS).

Management Council. The Council noted that at the request of AIS, the subcommittee reviewed a four-year transfer proposal which was not fully sponsored. The proposal addressed the eligibility of a 4-4-4 transfer who is not eligible upon transfer to the certifying institution due to an unfulfilled year in residence at a Division I or II institution. The subcommittee agreed that the application of this proposal should be incorporated into the Subcommittee for Legislative Relief Guidelines document.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(3) Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee.


Management Council. The Council received a report that the Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee reviewed the results of the September 2015 Membership Survey on Playing and Practice Seasons, and have begun discussions regarding the related roundtable format for the 2016 Convention Division III Issues Forum. The subcommittee recommended the Issues Forum roundtable discussions focus on the following:

- Potential standardization of contest exemptions across all sports;
- Exploring limitations in the traditional segment (e.g., limits on weekday contests, standard fall start date, and reducing contests or creating a two-period model in baseball and softball); and
- Potential reductions or modifications of the nontraditional segment (e.g., reduce the practice opportunities and replace them with skill instruction and/or strength and conditioning opportunities).

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

c. Division III Committees.

(1) Championships Committee.

(a) Committee Chair.

Management Council. The Council approved the committee’s recommendation that Gerald Young, director of athletics at Carleton College,
serve as chair of the Division III Championships Committee, replacing Monica Severson, associate athletics director/senior woman administrator/head women’s golf coach at Wartburg College, whose term ends after the 2016 NCAA Convention.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(b) **Rowing – Championship Format.**

Management Council. The Council approved, in concept, the committee’s recommendation that the selection of two at-large I Eight boats be expanded to full teams, which would increase the field size to eight full teams for the championships. The Strategic Planning and Finance Committee will review the recommendation.

The current format provides for six full teams (one I Eight boat and one II Eight boat) and two at-large I Eight boats, for a total of eight institutions represented at the championships. This change would create a format and progression for the II Eight boat races that is consistent with that of the I Eight boat races. More notably, an expansion means that all eight institutions have an opportunity to compete for the national championship as a team.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(c) **Allocation of Berths for Team Selection.**

Management Council. The Council approved the committee’s referral to the Membership Committee for feedback to consolidate Pool B and C at-large championship selections berths for team selections.

The number of independent institutions has decreased over time as the number of conference automatic qualifiers (AQs) has increased, thus decreasing the number of Pool B berths. The Men’s and Women’s Tennis Committees, in particular, have recognized some notable concerns in working to select these limited number of Pool B berths. The Championships Committee took no action on the original recommendation from the Men’s and Women’s Tennis Committees.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(d) **Wrestling – Regional Format.**

Management Council. The Council approved, in concept, the committee’s recommendation that regions with 16 or more teams host a two-day regional tournament, effective with 2017 championship. The Strategic Planning and Finance Committee will review the recommendation.
The Wrestling Committee and the coaches association presented student-athlete well-being concerns for the three regions hosting 16 or more teams. In those regions, student-athletes are expected to wrestle eight to nine matches over a 12-hour period. As a result, teams depart the tournament close to midnight and many arrive home in the early hours of the morning. Conversely, for regions hosting fewer than 16 teams, student-athletes wrestle a maximum of six matches over an eight-hour period and are able to enjoy an earlier finish. Current policy states that regions have the option of conducting one- or two-day tournaments. As such, the recommendation serves the best interest of student-athletes by requiring regions hosting 16 or more teams to conduct a two-day tournament.

 Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(e) Wrestling – Committee Composition.

Management Council. The Council approved, in concept, the committee’s recommendation that the committee increase its composition from four to six members, effective September 1, 2016. The Strategic Planning and Finance Committee will review the recommendation.

In 2011, a regional format was established which created six competitive regions resulting in two regions without representation on the four-member committee. The request to add two committee members aligns wrestling with other Division III sport committees by having one committee member assigned to represent each region.

 Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(2) Committee on Infractions.

Management Council. The committee had no formal report. No action was necessary.

 Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(3) Financial Aid Committee.

Management Council. The committee had no formal report. No action was necessary.

 Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(4) Infractions Appeals Committee.

Management Council. The committee had no formal report. No action was necessary.

 Presidents Council. No action was necessary.
Interpretations and Legislative Committee (ILC).

(a) **Convention Proposal Grouping and Voting Method for 2016.**

Management Council. The Council forwarded to the Presidents Council a recommendation that votes for all proposals at the 2016 NCAA Convention be taken using roll-call, regardless of grouping (presidential or general) and approved the voting order. [See Page No. 20]

While Presidents Council is responsible for establishing the proposal voting order as well as the method for conducting those votes, ILC conducts an initial review and makes a recommendation on both issues. Since the electronic voting units and technology permit the recording of all votes in an expeditious manner, the committee agreed that votes for all proposals (presidential and general grouping) should be taken by roll-call as it provides transparency for the membership.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council approved the Management Council’s recommendation.

(b) **Blanket Relief from Application of Bylaw 17.02.1.1(i) and Official Interpretation Dated February 4, 2005 (Item No. 15b).**

Management Council. The Council noted that the Administrative Committee approved this recommendation in its September 24 report. No action was necessary.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(c) **Wagering on Fantasy Games.**

Management Council. The Council received an update from Executive Vice President for Regulatory Affairs, Oliver Luck, and Director of Academic and Membership Affairs, Jennifer Henderson, on the Association’s discussions related to wagering on daily fantasy sports games, such as Fan Duel and Draft Kings. Currently, on-line wagering violates NCAA bylaws, and student-athletes found in violation of the sports wagering bylaws are deemed ineligible. The Council endorsed a recommendation from the Interpretations and Legislation Committee, that the extent of ineligibility for participation in fantasy sports games should be determined by the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement, rather than being confined by the mandatory penalties set forth in Bylaw 10.3.2-(b), which were designed to address more traditional “sports book” wagers. This approach will provide for a more equitable outcome that is consistent with the legislative intent and ensure a reasonable approach while the governance structure determines a more
comprehensive approach to this issue. The committee and the Council also noted the important role of the NCAA and the governance structure in ensuring that such participation is discouraged and proper education is provided.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(5) Membership Committee.

(a) Denial of Sports Sponsorship Waiver Request – NCAA Bylaw 20.11.3.8 (Minimum Contests and Participants).

Management Council. The Council noted the committee reviewed and denied Green Mountain College’s request for a waiver of Bylaw 20.11.3.8 (minimum contests and participants) for the 2014-15 academic year in the sport of cross country. In its decision, the committee noted insufficient mitigation to warrant a waiver of the legislation. This denial places the institution in restricted membership status for 2015-16, rendering it ineligible for NCAA grant and initiative funding, and for NCAA championships participation.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(b) Review of Appeal Material – Membership Process Advancement – Iowa Wesleyan University.

Management Council. The Council upheld the Membership Committee’s recommendation to deny Iowa Wesleyan University’s waiver request of Bylaw 20.11.3 (minimum sports sponsorship), which consequently will require Iowa Wesleyan to repeat year two of the provisional membership process. The committee noted the institution did not successfully sponsor the minimum requirement of five women’s sports, having a deficiency in the sport of women’s golf.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(c) Review of Appeal Material - Rochester Institute of Technology.

Management Council. The Council upheld the committee’s recommendation denying Rochester Institute of Technology’s (RIT) waiver request of Bylaw 20.7.1.1 (Division III application) to permit RIT to provide athletically related financial aid to ice-hockey student-athletes.

In reaching its decision, the committee noted there is not compelling mitigation to grant a waiver of this legislation. The institution is not unique in that the opportunity to receive a waiver does not exist for any Division III institution that did not sponsor a Division I sport and obtain a financial aid waiver prior to January 1, 2004.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.
(7) Nominating Committee.

(a) Governance Committee Appointments.

Management Council. The Council approved the following committee appointments:

- Division III Management Council. Brad Bankston, commissioner, Old Dominion Athletic Conference; Kate Roy, senior woman administrator/associate director of athletics, Lyndon State College.
- Division III Championships Committee. Susan Fumagalli, associate director of athletics, Gettysburg College; Bill Stiles, director of athletics, Alvernia University.
- Division III Financial Aid. Stephanie Bender, director of financial aid, Goucher College; Angel Mason, senior woman administrator/associate director of athletics, Hamilton College; Todd Moravec, director of student financial services, Plattsburgh State University of New York.
- Division III Committee on Infractions. Effel Harper, faculty athletics representative, University of Mary Hardin-Baylor.
- Division III Infractions Appeals Committee. Larry Shank, director of athletics, Muskingum University.
- Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee. Jim Cranmer, assistant director of athletics, St. Mary’s College of Maryland; Gregg Kaye, commissioner, Commonwealth Coast Conference.
- Division III Membership Committee. Keith Cecil, assistant director of athletics, Transylvania University; F. Javier Cevallos, president, Framingham State University (two-year term, eligible to be reappointed to an additional two-year term); Charles Harris, executive vice president, Averett University.
- Division III Nominating Committee. Stephen Briggs, president, Berry College (two-year term, eligible to be reappointed to an additional two-year term); Jennifer Myhe, senior woman administrator/head women’s soccer coach, Anderson University (Indiana).
- Division III Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee. Matthew Burke, director of athletics, Mount Ida College.

All appointments will be effective at the close of the January 2016 NCAA Convention.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(b) General Committee Reappointment.

Management Council. The Council approved the following committee reappointment:
• Division III Financial Aid Committee. Charlyn Robert, associate dean, Nicholas College.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(8) Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC).

• Filming “Your Voice Matters” Video Project.

Management Council. The Council noted that several SAAC members filmed portions of an upcoming video project titled “Your Voice Matters”. The video has been made available to Division III institutions for their on-campus compliance meetings and highlights the benefits of being a Division III student-athlete and how student-athletes nationwide can be a part of the Division III governance process.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(9) Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee.

Management Council. The committee had no formal report. No action was necessary.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

d. Association-Wide Committees.

(1) Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports (CSMAS).

Management Council. The Council reviewed the committee’s report. No action was necessary.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(2) Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct.

Management Council. The Council reviewed the report. No action was necessary.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(3) Committee on Women’s Athletics (CWA).

(a) Selection of the 2015 NCAA Woman of the Year Award Winner.

Management Council. The Council noted the committee reviewed the current process of the NCAA Woman of the Year award and discussed the challenges of comparing the achievements of Division I, II and III female student-athletes in selecting a winner. The committee will revisit
the award process during its February conference call. The Council discussed the process and was in favor of having a “Woman of the Year” in each of the three divisions.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(b) National Association of Collegiate Women Athletics Administrators (NACWAA) and Alliance of Women Coaches (AWC) Funding Update.

Management Council. The Council noted that the Division I membership charged the NCAA national office to implement budget cuts, and as a result, both grant amounts have significantly decreased.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(4) Honors Committee

Management Council. The committee had no formal report. No action was necessary.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(5) Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee (MOIC).

Management Council. The Council reviewed the committee’s report. No action was necessary.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(6) Joint Minority Opportunities and Interest Committee and Committee on Women’s Athletics.

Management Council. The Council reviewed the committee’s report. No action was necessary.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(7) Olympic Sports Liaison Committee (OSLC).

Management Council. The committee had no formal report. No action was necessary.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(8) Playing Rules Oversight Panel.

Management Council. The Council reviewed the committee’s report. No action was necessary.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.
(9) **Postgraduate Scholarship Committee.**

**Management Council.** The Council reviewed the committee’s report. No action was necessary.

**Presidents Council.** No action was necessary.

(10) **Research Committee.**

**Management Council.** The committee had no formal report. No action was necessary.

**Presidents Council.** No action was necessary.

(11) **Walter Byers Scholarship Committee.**

**Management Council.** The committee had no formal report. No action was necessary.

**Presidents Council.** No action was necessary.

4. **PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR THE 2016 CONVENTION.**

a. **Review of Convention Legislation for the 2016 Convention.**

**2016 Division III Convention Proposal Positions.** The Councils reviewed responsibilities associated with Convention proposal speaking assignments and took formal positions on membership-sponsored proposals as presented below.

(1) **Proposal No. 2016-2 – Recruiting – Definitions and Applications and Publicity – Deregulation of Electronic Transmissions.**

**Presidents Council.** The Presidents Council opposes this proposal with same concerns cited by the Management Council.

**Management Council.** The Council opposes this proposal. The Council cited concerns related to the privacy of the recruiting process for prospective student-athletes. Additionally, the Council agreed that communication through social networking sites should remain private in order to keep a professional boundary between coaching staff members and prospective student-athletes. The Council did question, however, whether limiting forms of communication between coaches and prospective student-athletes creates an additional administrative burden for institutions with limited personnel.
ILC. The committee recommended a position of opposition for this proposal. The committee agreed that to keep a professional boundary between coaching staff members and prospective student-athletes, communication through social networking sites should remain private. The committee also was concerned that this proposal could have the unintended consequence of negatively impacting the work life balance of coaches by creating a culture where coaches feel compelled to be more active on social media sites. Lastly, the committee expressed concerns over the deregulation of the publicity legislation and the related impact on prospective student-athlete privacy.

(2) **Proposal No. 2016-3 – Playing and Practice Seasons – Football - Nontraditional Segment.**

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council opposes this proposal with same concerns cited by the Management Council.

Management Council. The Council opposes this proposal, especially with the ongoing playing and practice seasons review, which includes an examination of existing nontraditional segment legislation. The Council also expressed concern over Division III’s ability to appropriately support contact during spring football and noted the CSMAS concern on the increased injury risk associated with this type of spring participation. The Council did note the difference between spring practice opportunities for football compared to other fall sports.

PPSS. The subcommittee recommended a position of opposition to this proposal. The subcommittee stated that it is necessary to move forward with the playing and practice seasons review before amending nontraditional segment legislation.

Championships Committee. The committee did not recommend a position on this proposal, as there is no impact on championships administration.

Football Committee – The committee recommended a position of support for this proposal. The committee noted that establishing a more robust nontraditional spring segment for football aligns it with other fall sports.

CSMAS. The committee recommended a position of opposition to this proposal, citing increasing awareness of the greater risk for concussions and serious injuries with full-contact practices. While the committee did support this proposal last year, the committee reversed its stance. Limiting the number of full-contact practices and drills reduces the risk of student-athletes experiencing major injuries or concussions.

(3) **Proposal No. 2016-4 – Playing and Practice Seasons – Ice Hockey – Off Ice Training.**

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

Management Council. The Council supports this proposal. The proposal would allow institutions additional flexibility in structuring playing seasons; institutions
may choose to begin the ice hockey season earlier while extending winter break, which would allow student-athletes additional time away from the sport during the winter holidays.

PPSS. The subcommittee recommended a position of support for this proposal. The subcommittee stated that this proposal would allow institutions to begin the ice hockey season earlier while extending winter break, which would allow student-athletes additional time away from the sport during the winter holidays.

Championships Committee. The committee did not recommend a position on this proposal, as there is no impact on championships administration.

Men’s Ice Hockey Committee. The committee recommended a position of opposition to this proposal. The committee noted the ongoing playing and practice seasons review by the PPSS and agreed that the current strength and conditioning legislation allows sufficient opportunities for pre-season conditioning. The committee also noted that this appears to be an attempt by coaches to manipulate the playing seasons legislation to allow for a longer break mid-season.

Women’s Ice Hockey Committee. The committee recommended a position of support for this proposal. The committee noted that allowing off-ice conditioning would help prevent injuries during the early weeks of the ice hockey season. The committee acknowledged, however, that a majority of ice hockey teams are already using the maximum 19 weeks and may have difficulty adding off-ice time prior to the current first permissible practice date.

CSMAS. The committee did not recommend a position on this proposal, as there is no significant health and safety impact.


Presidents Council. The Council agreed to discuss this proposal in more detail during its next meeting.

Management Council. The Council supports this proposal. The proposal would allow student-athletes better access to athletic facilities and provide a healthier and safer environment for student-athletes to utilize appropriate equipment. Additionally, allowing student-athletes to use a student-athlete only weight room would decrease facility crowding in general use fitness centers.

PPSS. The subcommittee recommended a position of support for this proposal. The subcommittee stated that the proposal would allow student-athletes better access to athletic facilities and provide a healthier and safer environment for student-athletes to utilize appropriate equipment. Additionally, allowing student-athletes to use a student-athlete only weight room would decrease facility crowding in general use fitness centers.
ILC. The committee recommended a position of support for this proposal. The committee agreed that the proposal would enhance well-being for both student-athletes and the general student body by decreasing facility crowding and allowing student-athlete specific facilities to house equipment specific to student-athletes. With respect to whether the strength and conditioning coach should be able to reserve these facilities for specific workouts, the committee understood the practical benefits of allowing this, but cautioned against creating a culture where student-athletes feel compelled to engage in activities outside the playing season.


Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

Management Council. The Council opposes this proposal. Allowing institutional fundraising events involving athletics ability outside of the declared playing and practice season could result in student-athletes feeling compelled to participate in athletically related activities outside of the season. Requiring the fundraisers to be open to the general public is not sufficient to guard against potential abuse. The Division III philosophy emphasizes a culture wherein student-athletes are encouraged to participate in non-athletics pursuits and the prohibition on athletically related activities outside of the playing season is essential to supporting that aspect of the philosophy.

PPSS. The subcommittee recommended a position of opposition to this proposal. The subcommittee raised concerns that allowing institutions the flexibility to exempt institutional fundraisers involving athletics ability could be abused and result in student-athletes feeling pressured to participate in a fundraiser.

ILC. The committee recommended a position of opposition for this proposal. The committee recognized the intent behind allowing student-athletes to participate in institutional fundraisers involving athletics ability; however, the committee agreed that the application of the proposal could create an environment wherein student-athletes feel compelled to participate in additional athletically related activities outside of the playing and practice season.

(6) Proposal No. 2016-7 – Recruiting – Contacts and Evaluations – Contact Restrictions at Specified Sites – Practice or Competition Site – Exception for On-Campus Contact.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

Management Council. The Council supports this proposal. Allowing on-campus contact with prospective student-athletes prior to competition, provided the competition does not occur on the institution’s campus, would reduce institutional monitoring without negatively impacting prospective student-athletes. Additionally, this proposal may alleviate the financial burden for prospective student-athletes by allowing them to more easily combine official or unofficial visits with travel for competition.
ILC. The committee recommended a position of support for this proposal. The committee agreed that this proposal would reduce the amount of institutional monitoring and alleviate financial burden on prospective student-athletes by allowing prospective student-athletes to more easily combine official or unofficial visits with competition.

Championships Committee. The committee did not recommend a position on this proposal, as there is no impact on championships administration.

(7) **Proposal No. 2016-10 – Division Membership – Division III Membership Requirements – Sports Sponsorship – Minimum Participant Requirements for Golf.**

**Presidents Council.** No action was necessary.

**Management Council.** The Council supports this proposal. Golf is the only sport for which the sport sponsorship requirements are inconsistent with the playing rules. Creating consistency between the playing rules and the sport sponsorship requirements may positively impact women’s golf sponsorship without negatively impacting roster sizes.

**Membership Committee.** The committee recommended a position of support for this proposal. The committee specifically noted the importance of creating consistency between the playing rules and the sport sponsorship requirements. The committee additionally noted the positive impact this proposal may have on women’s golf sponsorship.

**Championships Committee.** The committee recommended a position of support for this proposal, noting the current participation requirement is higher than the number of players that are counted in the team score.

**Men’s Golf Committee.** The committee recommended a position of opposition for this proposal. The committee stated concerns about the impact the change could have on the number of conferences eligible for automatic qualification to the championships, thereby possibly reducing the number of at-large berths for the championship. The committee also noted that meeting minimum participant requirements has never been an issue for men’s golf.

**Women’s Golf Committee.** The committee recommended a position of support for this proposal. The committee noted that the proposal would assist institutions struggling to meet minimum women’s golf sponsorship requirements and would eliminate the need for continuing to address participant requirement issues through the waiver process.

b. **Proposal Groupings.**

**Management Council.** The Council recommended the following proposal grouping and voting order for the 2016 Convention per Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee’s (ILC) recommendation. All votes will be Roll-Call votes.
Presidents Grouping:


2016-3 – Playing and Practice Seasons – Football – Nontraditional Segment.

General Grouping:

2016-4 – Playing and Practice Seasons – Ice Hockey – Off Ice Training.


2016-7 – Recruiting – Contacts and Evaluations – Contact Restrictions at Specified Sites – Practice or Competition Site – Exception for On-Campus Contact.

2016-8 – Championships and Postseason Football Ineligibility for Use of Banned Drugs – Elimination of Reinstatement Requirement.

2016-9 – Executive Regulations – Conference Automatic Qualification Requirements Provisional and Reclassifying Member Institutions.


Presidents Council. The Presidents Council approved the Management Council’s recommendation.

c. Review Administrative Regulations Approved by Management Council.


Management Council. The Council approved in legislative format a proposal to clarify that in a summary disposition case in which the Committee on Infractions accepts the proposed findings but proposes additional penalties, the institution and/or involved individuals may appear before the committee in person, by videoconference or other mode of distance communication, as the committee deems appropriate, to discuss the proposed additional penalties.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.
d. Review Noncontroversial Legislation Approved by the Management Council.

(1) NC-2016-16 – Playing and Practice Seasons – General Playing Season Regulations – Waivers and Conditions of Participation – Mandatory Medical Examination – Permitting Nurse Practitioners to Conduct Mandatory Medical Examination.

Management Council. The Council approved in legislative format a proposal to permit a nurse practitioner whose state regulation allows for health care practice independent of physician supervision to complete the mandatory medical examination without supervision by a physician.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

(2) NC-2016-17 – Committees – Association-Wide Committees – General Committees – Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee - Amending Duties.

Management Council. The Council approved in legislative format a proposal to expand the duties of the Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee to include advocacy and review of issues related to the interests of student-athletes, coaches and administrators who are ethnic minorities, LGBTQ or who have disabilities; and the advocacy and review of NCAA programs and policies that affect and include, but are not limited to, individuals with disabilities and the LGBTQ community.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

e. Review of Modifications of Wording Approved by the Management Council.

• M-2016-2 – Recruiting – Letter of Intent Programs – Exception – Nonbinding Athletics Celebratory Signing Form – Location of Signing and Permissible Attendees at Signing.

Management Council. The Council approved in legislative format a proposal to clarify that celebratory signings may not occur on campus and staff members may not be present. Additionally, to clarify that institutional staff members may be present when a prospective student-athlete signs pre-enrollment forms executed by prospective students in general at that institution, provided no media representatives are present.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

5. DIVISION III INITIATIVES AND UPDATES.


Management Council. The Council reviewed the working group’s reports noting a pilot program, approved by the Administrative Committee (July 28, 2015 report) for the
2015-16 academic year. Division III will provide grants up to $1,860 each for 43 Division III ethnic-minority students to attend the 2016 NCAA Convention and related Division III programming. The Council noted the Division III governance and the Office of Inclusion staff are partnering on this pilot program. At the Convention, the students will be exposed to Division III, its members and the governance process. In addition to the scheduled Division III programming, there will be welcome and debrief meetings. Further, the selected participants will be paired with a Division III administrator to shadow during the Convention. The goal is to build the Division III pipeline in an effort to ultimately diversify the division.

**Presidents Council.** No action was necessary.

b. **Sportsmanship and Game Environment Working Group.**

**Management Council.** The Council reviewed the working group’s reports noting a discussion of a potential certification-based program in the area of fan civility. In addition to discussing the potential framework for a certification program, the working group also discussed areas where it will need to begin securing assistance in order to create such a program. These areas include experts in online teaching technology, experts in fan behavior and experts in service-based training related to bystander intervention or conflict-resolution.

**Presidents Council.** No action was necessary.

c. **Athletics Direct Report Institute.**

**Management Council.** The Council reviewed the Athletics Direct Report (ADR) Institute Planning Team’s report noting that 23 conferences have selected a guaranteed participant and 13 are in the process of confirming. The planning team is in the process of confirming speakers.

**Presidents Council.** No action was necessary.

d. **360 Proof and NASPA Collaborative.**

**Management Council.** The Council received an update on the status of 360 Proof noting that currently there are 183 institutions registered. A booth and Technical Assistance provision is planned for both the 2016 NCAA Convention and the 2016 NASPA Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) Strategies conference. 360 Proof advertisements will be included in the conference program for the NASPA AOD Strategies and Annual Conferences. A 360 Proof brochure remains under development.

**Presidents Council.** No action was necessary.

e. **Division III Identity Initiative.**

**Management Council.** The Council received a status report on the Division III Identity Initiative including an update on the Purchasing Website, social media, branding initiatives and Special Olympics.
Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

f. Technology Users Group.

Management Council. The Council received a report noting that this group will have three teleconferences per year. The group will review content areas such as Compliance Assistant, Single Source Sign-on, statistics and score reporting, Program Hub and pdf fillable forms.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

g. Graduation Rates.

Management Council. The Council received an update on the Graduation Rates report. It was noted that student-athletes rates are higher than the overall student body. The rates were broken out by sport and gender. Division III federal rates are higher than Division I and Division II.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

h. Wagering on Fantasy Games.

Management Council. See Page No. 9, Item 5c.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

i. Governance Scorecard.

Management Council. The Council received a report noting that 73 percent of Division III committee members responded to the 2014-15 governance scorecard, which evaluates committee liaisons. On a five-point scale, committee members rated the liaisons with a 4.59 overall average performance rating.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

j. Feedback from Conference Meetings.

Management Council. The Council reviewed reports from conference meetings. No action was necessary.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

6. ASSOCIATION-WIDE UPDATES AND ISSUES.

a. Board of Governors Update.

Management Council. The Council received an update on the Board of Governors.
b. **Litigation Update.**

Management Council. The Councils received a litigation update. No action was necessary.

c. **Governmental Relations Report.**

Management and Presidents Councils. The Councils accepted the Governmental Relations Report. No action was necessary.

7. **2016 COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS.**

Management Council. The Council members reviewed the current 2015 Committee/Subcommittee assignments noting that if they would like a re-assignment for 2016, they are to notify the governance staff within the next 10 days. Council leadership will then review the updated assignments during an upcoming teleconference.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

8. **OTHER BUSINESS AND OPEN FORUM.**

• Health and Safety Summit.

Management Council. The Council discussed the upcoming Division III Health and Safety Summit regarding the Sport Science Institutes initiatives and their impact on Division III.

Presidents Council. No action was necessary.

9. **ADJOURNAMENT.**

Management Council. The Council meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m. Monday, October 19 and 11 a.m. on Tuesday, October 20.

Presidents Council. The Presidents Council teleconference adjourned at 11:02 a.m. Thursday, October 29.
ACTION ITEM.

- None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. Governance Committee Appointment. The Administrative Committee approved the following committee appointment:

   - Division III Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee. Brian Williams, associate director of athletics, State University of New York at New Paltz (January 1, 2016, vacancy replacing Lorin Huffman).

2. Governance Committee Appointment Extension. The Administrative Committee approved the following committee appointment extension.

   - Division III Committee on Infractions (COI). Dave Cecil, Transylvania University’s Associate Vice President for Financial Aid (extension of term).

   Mr. Cecil’s six-year term on the COI concludes in January 2016. Because most Division III infractions cases involve violations of financial aid legislation, Mr. Cecil’s expertise in Division III financial aid has proven to be an invaluable asset. Currently, the NCAA enforcement staff is processing a large and multi-faceted Division III infractions case that is scheduled to be considered by the COI in a late January 2016 hearing. In that context, we request that the Administrative Committee approve the extension of Mr. Cecil’s service on the COI until the aforementioned case is fully adjudicated.

Committee Chair: Alan Cureton, University of Northwestern
Staff Liaisons: Dan Dutcher, Division III Governance
Jay Jones, Division III Governance
Debbie Kresge, Division III Governance
Louise McCleary, Division III Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October 29, 2015</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Absentees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alan Cureton, University of Northwestern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Lemons, Susquehanna University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Ranieri, State University of New York at Oneonta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Runksmeyer, Eastern Connecticut State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy VanAken, Thiel College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA staff: Dan Dutcher, Jay Jones, Louise McCleary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACTION ITEM.

• None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

• Governance Committee Appointments. The Administrative Committee approved the following committee appointments, effective at the close of the January 2016 NCAA Convention:


  b. Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

    (1) American Southwest Conference – Joseph Weber, men’s soccer, University of Texas at Dallas.
    (2) Centennial Conference – Michael Rubayo, men’s basketball, Swarthmore College.
    (4) Commonwealth Coast Conference – Kyera Bryant, women’s soccer, Eastern Nazarene College.
    (6) Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association – Sean Cain, men’s soccer, Adrian College.
    (7) North Atlantic Conference – Nicole Monick, women’s tennis, Johnson State College.
    (8) Skyline Conference – Christopher Deddo, baseball, State University of New York Maritime College.
    (9) State University of New York Athletic Conference – Zachary Cook, men’s lacrosse, College at Brockport, State University of New York.
    (10) Upper Midwest Athletic Conference – Elissa Pheneger, women’s volleyball, North Central University.

Committee Chair: Alan Cureton, University of Northwestern
Staff Liaisons: Dan Dutcher, Division III Governance
              Jay Jones, Division III Governance
              Debbie Kresge, Division III Governance
              Louise McCleary, Division III Governance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November 18, 2015</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Absentees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alan Cureton, University of Northwestern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Lemons, Susquehanna University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Ranieri, State University of New York at Oneonta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Runksmeier, Eastern Connecticut State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy VanAken, Thiel College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA staff: Dan Dutcher, Jay Jones, Debbie Kresge and Louise McCleary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA

National Collegiate Athletic Association
Board of Governors

January 13, 2016

Texas Ballroom F                           4:30 to 7 p.m.
San Antonio, Texas

1. Welcome and announcements. (President Kirk Schulz)

2. Consent agenda.¹
   a. Approve the October 29, 2015, meeting report.
   b. Approve the NCAA Board of Governors Administrative Subcommittee's recommendation regarding name, composition and scope.
   c. Receive regulatory review update.
   d. Approve in concept: Governors policies and procedures.

3. NCAA President's report. (Possible action) (NCAA President Mark Emmert)

4. Association championships policies. (Possible action) (Donald M. Remy, Oliver Luck, Mark Lewis)

5. NCAA Board of Governors Committee on Structure and Composition's report.

6. Law, policy and governance strategic discussion. (Possible action) (Donald M. Remy)

7. NCAA Board of Governors Finance and Audit Committee report. (Action) (President Daniel Papp)

8. NCAA communications plan update. (Possible action) (Bob Williams)

9. Executive session

10. Adjournment.

¹ Consent agenda items: The Chair has determined that these items are routine or noncontroversial items not requiring discussion or independent action. These items therefore will be presented as one agenda item. Possible action by a member of the Board of Governors: (1) Seek Chair or staff clarification prior to the January meeting; (2) Request that an item be removed for further discussion. (3) Approve all or remaining items in the consent package in one motion.
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DIVISION III PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

Colleges and universities in Division III place the highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and on the successful completion of all students’ academic programs. They seek to establish and maintain an environment in which a student-athlete’s athletics activities are conducted as an integral part of the student-athlete’s educational experience, and an environment that values cultural diversity and gender equity among their student-athletes and athletics staff.

(a) Expect that institutional presidents and chancellors have the ultimate responsibility and final authority for the conduct of the intercollegiate athletics program at the institutional, conference and national governance levels;

(b) Place special importance on the impact of athletics on the participants rather than on the spectators and place greater emphasis on the internal constituency (e.g., students, alumni, institutional personnel) than on the general public and its entertainment needs;

(c) Shall not award financial aid to any student on the basis of athletics leadership, ability, participation or performance;

(d) Primarily focus on intercollegiate athletics as a four-year, undergraduate experience;

(e) Encourage the development of sportsmanship and positive societal attitudes in all constituents, including student-athletes, coaches, administrative personnel and spectators;

(f) Encourage participation by maximizing the number and variety of sport offerings for their students through based-based athletics programs;

(g) Assure that the actions of coaches and administrators exhibit fairness, openness and honesty in their relationships with student-athletes;

(h) Assure that athletics participants are not treated differently from other members of the student body;

(i) Assure that student-athletes are supported in their efforts to meaningfully participate in nonathletic pursuits to enhance their overall educational experience;

(j) Assure that athletics programs support the institution’s educational mission by financing, staffing and controlling the programs through the same general procedures as other departments of the institution. Further, the administration of an institution’s athletics program (e.g., hiring, compensation, professional development, certification of coaches) should be integrated into the campus culture and educational mission;
(k) Assure that athletics recruitment compiles with established institutional policies and procedures applicable to the admission process;

(l) Exercise institutional and/or conference autonomy in the establishment of initial and continuing eligibility standards for student-athletes;

(m) Assure that academic performance of student-athletes is, at a minimum, consistent with that of the general student body;

(n) Assure that admission policies for student-athletes comply with policies and procedures applicable to the general student body.

(o) Provide equitable athletics opportunities for males and females and give equal emphasis to men’s and women’s sports;

(p) Support ethnic and gender diversity for all constituents;

(q) Give primary emphasis to regional in-season competition and conference championships; and

(r) Support student-athletes in their efforts to reach high levels of athletics performance, which may include opportunities for participation in national championships, by providing all teams with adequate facilities, competent coaching and appropriate competitive opportunities.

The purpose of the NCAA is to assist its members in developing the basis for consistent, equitable competition while minimizing infringement on the freedom of individual institutions to determine their own special objectives and programs. The above statement articulates principles that represent a commitment to Division III membership and shall serve as a guide for the preparation of legislation by the division and for planning and implementation of programs by institutions and conferences.
**NCAA Mission**

What the brand wants to accomplish

To govern competition in a fair, safe, equitable and sportsmanlike manner, and to integrate intercollegiate athletics into higher education so that the educational experience of the student-athlete is paramount.

---

**DIVISION III STRATEGIC POSITIONING PLATFORM**

---

**DIII Presidents Council 01/16**

---

**DIII Attributes**

What we stand for

- **Proportion**: appropriate relation of academics with opportunities to pursue athletics and other passions.
- **Comprehensive Learning**: opportunity for broad-based education and success.
- **Passion**: playing for the love of the game, competition, fun and self-improvement.
- **Responsibility**: development of accountability through personal commitment and choices.
- **Sportsmanship**: fair and respectful conduct toward all participants and supporters.
- **Citizenship**: dedication to developing responsible leaders and citizens in our communities.

---

**Audiences**

Who we are addressing

- **Student-Athletes / Parents**
- **DIII Internal Constituencies**
- **General Public / Media**

---

**Audience Benefits**

Key benefits of the DIII experience

- Continue to compete in a highly competitive athletics program and retain the full spectrum of college life.
- Continue to compete in a highly competitive athletics program and retain the full spectrum of college life.
- Focus on academic achievement while graduating with a comprehensive education that builds skills beyond the classroom.
- Access financial aid for college without the obligations of an athletics scholarship.
- Opportunities to play more than one sport.
- Be responsible for your own path, discover potential through opportunities to pursue many interests.

---

**Reasons to Believe**

Supporting features of DIII

1. **Comprehensive educational experience.** Division III institutions develop student-athlete potential through a holistic educational approach that includes rigorous academics, competitive athletics and opportunity to pursue other interests and passions.
2. **Integrated campus environment.** About one-quarter of all students at Division III institutions participate in athletics. Those participating in athletics are integrated into the campus culture and educational missions of their colleges or universities:
   - Student-athletes are subject to admission and academic performance standards consistent with the general student body;
   - Student-athletes are not provided any special housing, services or support from their institution different from other students or student groups;
   - Athletics departments are regulated and managed through the same general procedures and practices as other departments of the institution.
   This integration of athletics allows the student-athletes to take full advantage of the many opportunities of campus life and their entire collegiate experience.
3. **Academic focus.** Student-athletes most often attend a college or university in Division III because of the excellent academic programs, creating a primary focus on learning and achievement of their degree. The division minimizes the conflicts between athletics and academics through shorter playing and practice seasons, the number of contests, no red-shirting or out-of-season organized activities, and a focus on regional in-season and conference play.
4. **Available financial aid.** Three-quarters of all student-athletes in Division III receive some form of grant or non-athletics scholarship. Student-athletes have equal opportunity and access to financial aid as the general student body – but are not awarded aid based on athletics leadership, ability, performance or participation.
5. **Competitive athletics programs.** Student-athletes do not receive any monetary incentive (athletics scholarship) to play sports in college. They play for the love of the game and to push themselves to be their best, creating an intense, competitive athletics environment for all who participate.
6. **National championship opportunities.** Division III has more than 170,000 student-athletes competing annually, with access to 38 different national championships. These competitions provide an opportunity for student-athletes to compete at the highest level and fulfill their athletics potential.
7. **Commitment to athletics participation.** Division III institutions are committed to a broad-based program of athletics because of the educational value of participation for the student-athlete. The division has a higher number and wider variety of athletics opportunities on average than any other division in the NCAA, emphasizing both competitive men’s and women’s sports.
ACTION ITEMS

1. Legislative Items.
   - None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.
   - Allow Funding for Presidents who Serve as Athletics Direct Reports (ADRs) - Division III Conference Grant Program – Tier One [Professional Development, Education and Communication].
     (1) **Recommendation.** Approve the request to allow Tier One spending on presidents and chancellors, who also serve as the athletics direct report, to attend the NCAA Convention.
     (2) **Effective Date.** Immediate.
     (3) **Rationale.** Currently, professional development funding under Tier One is only available for ADRs on an optional basis. The policy specifically notes “vice presidents” within the ADR section. Based on recent reductions in Association-wide funding for presidential attendance at Convention, the commissioners grant subcommittee requested expanding the funding to presidents and chancellors who also serve as ADRs. The committee noted that since some member institutions do not use a vice president as the ADR, this request would allow those institutions equal access to the Tier One funding.
     (4) **Budget Impact.** September 1, 2016.
     (5) **Student-Athlete Impact.** None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

1. Minutes of June 22, 2015, teleconference. The committee approved the report from its June 22, 2015, teleconference.

2. Budget. The committee reviewed the final 2014-15 budget-to-actual, and the 2015-16 budget expenses through November 5, 2015. The committee noted that the 2014-15 budget has an approximate $3.4M year-end surplus. The surplus is higher than the anticipated $2.1M from championship budget saving policy changes. Under-spending in nonchampionships initiatives and more than half a million dollars in Association-wide realized investment gain led to the higher surplus. Even with the surplus, the committee reinforced its support of the membership
dues increase proposal, noting that expenses average 6 to 7 percent annually while revenue is only increasing 2.5 percent annually. Additionally, the dues increase will allow for a restoration of championships per diem ($90 to $95); the reinstatement of a host per diem and increased access for the women’s swimming and diving championship. Currently, the division is forecasted to maintain a balanced budget through 2019-20.

3. **2014-15 Conference Grant Spending Summary.** The committee noted that during 2014-15, Division III distributed a total of $2,478,140 in Strategic Initiative Grant funds to 43 conferences and the Association of Division III Independents. The distribution amount per conference ranged from $44,000 to $86,000, with an average distribution of $56,320. The conference distribution amount is annually calculated with a formula that utilizes the number of member schools within each conference. No unused funds were returned to the NCAA from conference offices this year. Sixteen (16) conferences did not use the full amount of their allocated dollars and have properly presented a plan to rollover the unused amount to use with their 2015-16 grant allocations.

The committee reviewed several requests from the Division III Commissioners Grant subcommittee and took the following actions:

a. **Referred back to the subcommittee a request to allow Tier One spending on operational expenses for Conference Rules Seminars.** Currently, Tier One funding in the area of compliance is limited to travel dollars provided to individuals within a conference to attend Regional or Conference Rules Seminars. Any grant funding for conferences to conduct the NCAA approved Conference Rules Seminars must be drawn from Tier Three funds. The commissioners subcommittee’s request contended that it is reasonable to allow conferences to use Tier One funds to cover other expenses associated with conducting the Conference Rules Seminars (e.g., meals, materials, registration, facility rental, etc.). During the committee’s discussion, it noted that this modification would be more appropriate if the change to Tier One would only be applicable to conferences hosting a Conference Rules Seminar, as well as determining a reasonable maximum funding amount that would be allowed for this purpose. The committee also noted concerns that the request didn’t protect Tier One funding for institutional member travel to the event.

b. **Denied a request to change the faculty athletics representative (FAR) to an optional requirement in Tier One of the conference grant program.** Currently, Tier One has an annual requirement to spend professional development dollars for FARs. The requested modification would have shifted the FAR requirement to an optional allowance under Tier One. The commissioners subcommittee noted that some conferences are struggling to find FARs willing or able to use the professional development dollars. In addition, it was noted that some institutions rotate their FAR designation every year or two, making it difficult and impractical to provide these professional-development dollars. The committee expressed concern that, if approved, FARs would no longer be allocated funds for professional development. Further the committee noted the division’s commitment to maintaining a high level of FAR engagement and professional development opportunities.
c. Denied a request to remove the parenthetical phrase “that handles conference finances directly” from the examples of appropriate third-party reviewers in the Third Party Review form. Currently, within the examples of appropriate third-party reviewers, an institutional member’s business office is listed with the parenthetical notation that the reviewing business office “does not handle conference finances directly.” The commissioners subcommittee’s request noted that there are several layers of administrative review required before cutting a grant check. In addition, the subcommittee noted that these arrangements have back-end checks and balances to avoid improprieties. For this reason, the subcommittee contended that the parenthetical phrasing creates an unnecessary burden to find a reviewer. To avoid fiscal impropriety, the committee noted the importance to maintain the requirement that business offices conducting the third party review cannot directly handle conference finances as noted in the parenthetical notation on the Third Party Review form. The committee further noted that there are several options beyond an institutional business office that can permissibly complete the Third Party Review form.

d. Denied the recommendation to empower the staff to assign a contractor to ascertain how grant funding was used by the Association of Division III Independents in 2014-15 and to outline appropriate Tier One and Tier Two spending allowances for 2015-16. The Association of Division III Independents is unique in that it does not have a typical conference arrangement, or a full-time commissioner. The reporting in years past had been performed by a consultant chosen by the independent institutions. Following the 2014-15 academic year, the Association of Independents failed to submit its Conference Grant Impact Form or provide any details regarding the use of the $44,088 that was distributed to its seven member institutions. In addition, the association did not submit its third-party review form by the October 15 deadline. NCAA staff attempts, via email and telephone, to contact the contractor have gone unanswered. As a result, the 2015-16 Conference Grant funds for the Association of Division III Independents have been held by the NCAA staff and not distributed to those institutions. Due to the unique situation, the staff requested that they be able to secure a contractor to submit last year’s impact and third party forms and oversee this year’s grant spending. However, the committee instead instructed the staff to inform the Association of Division III Independents that grant dollars would continue to be withheld until it submits a report for previous usage and a plan for future use. The committee noted that by withholding the conference grant, it may provide motivation for the independent institutions to hire a new contractor to manage the conference grant dollars.

4. **Athletics Direct Report Institute.** The committee reviewed the agenda for the inaugural Athletics Direct Report Institute during the 2016 NCAA Convention. Staff noted that 90 applications were received for 43 available spots.

5. **Championships Committee Report.** The committee received an overview from the September 14-15, 2015, Championships Committee report noting that there may be several action items, with a financial impact, for the March 2016 committee meeting.
6. **2016 Women’s Basketball Joint Championship.** The committee reviewed a championships budget for the 2016 Women’s basketball joint championship, noting the division has allocated $200,000 for this joint championship.

7. **Division III Initiatives.** Due to time constraints, the committee did not receive an update on the following initiatives.

   a. **Division III Identity Initiative.** The Division III Purchasing Website continues to be managed by Source One Digital. For the 2015-16 year, Division III allocated $500 to each institution, conference, and single sport conference.

   b. **360 Proof.** As 360 Proof has moved into the maintenance phase, the budget has been decreased for 2015-16 to $200,000. The last planned development project for the program is the integration of the updated NIAAA Recommended Strategies Tool. This tool will provide updates to training and other program materials, design costs and web updates.

   c. **Ethnic Minority Students to 2016 Convention.** Division III and the Office of Inclusion partnered on a pilot program to provide up to $1,860 each for 43 Division III ethnic minority students with a strong interest in athletics administration to attend the NCAA Convention and related Division III programming. In addition to the scheduled Division III programming, there will be a welcome and debrief meeting. The goal is to build a Division III pipeline in an effort to ultimately diversify the division.

   d. **Graduation Rate Report.** Staff noted that 146 institutions participated in the voluntary graduation rate reporting. To date, over 200 institutions, representing almost 50% of the membership, have participated in the program over the past six years.

   e. **Diversity and Inclusion Working Group.** The Diversity and Inclusion Working Group will have a presentation at the 2016 NCAA Convention. The working group highlighted existing diversity and inclusion programs and the importance of engaging presidents and ADRs.

   f. **Sportsmanship and Game Environment Working Group.** The working group discussed the development of a certification program to improve fan civility. In addition it discussed areas where it will need to begin securing assistance in order to create such a program. These areas include experts in online teaching technology, experts in fan behavior and experts in service-based training related to bystander intervention or conflict-resolution. The working group believes that a module-based online learning approach would be the most practical way to develop a successful program. The working group will update the membership on its progress with a presentation at the NCAA Convention.
8. **Hot Topics.** Due to time constraints, the committee did not receive an update on the following hot topics.

   a. **2016 proposed legislation.** The division will vote on ten proposals at the 2016 NCAA Convention, three governance-sponsored proposals and seven membership-sponsored proposals.

   b. **Playing and Practice Seasons review.** Based on the survey responses, the Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee agreed to include the following items, as topics of discussion, during the 2016 Convention Issue Forum.

      (1) Standardization of contest exemptions across all sports.

      (2) Establishing limitations in the traditional segment, which may include the following:
          * Limitations on weekday contests.
          * Setting a standard date prior to which no fall preseason activities may occur.
          * Reducing contests or establishing a two-period model in baseball and softball.

      (3) Reducing or modifying the nontraditional segment, which may include:
          * Reducing nontraditional segment practice opportunities.
          * Replacing the existing nontraditional segment with skill instruction and/or strength and conditioning opportunities.

   c. **NCAA Board of Governors composition review.** The NCAA Board of Governors will hold a session during the 2016 NCAA Convention to gather input from the membership on its composition.

9. **Future Meetings.** The Strategic Planning and Finance Committee will hold its in-person meeting Wednesday, March 23 from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m. at the NCAA national office.

10. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 10:59 a.m.

*Committee Chair: Jay Lemons, Susquehanna University*

*Staff Liaisons: Jeff O’Barr, Accounting*
*Dan Dutcher, Division III Governance*
*Eric Hartung, Research*
*Jay Jones, Division III Governance*
*Louise McCleary, Division III Governance*
*Jeff Myers, Academic and Membership Affairs*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November 12, 2015</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>Absentees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Bitterbaum, State University of New York at Cortland</td>
<td>Mary Meehan, Alverno College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Docking, Adrian College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brit Katz, Millsaps College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Lemons, Susquehanna University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candice Poiss Murray, North Eastern Athletic Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Ragsdale, Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Ranieri, State University of New York at Oneonta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Runksmeier, New England College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Rupert, Wilmington College (Ohio)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Jaime Salcedo, Medaille College</td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Severson, Wartburg College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy VanAken, Thiel College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Brian Wigley, Shenandoah University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tbody>
</table>
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### Expenses:

#### Championship Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men's Championships</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>1,821,330</td>
<td>1,891,072</td>
<td>(69,742)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>921,810</td>
<td>1,208,898</td>
<td>(287,088)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>565,530</td>
<td>503,038</td>
<td>62,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>1,550,070</td>
<td>1,701,367</td>
<td>(151,297)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>512,840</td>
<td>591,325</td>
<td>(78,485)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey</td>
<td>337,090</td>
<td>216,002</td>
<td>121,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse</td>
<td>456,280</td>
<td>559,273</td>
<td>(102,993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>1,122,870</td>
<td>1,317,097</td>
<td>(194,227)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>544,160</td>
<td>596,653</td>
<td>(52,493)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>568,220</td>
<td>575,226</td>
<td>(7,006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track, Indoor</td>
<td>413,050</td>
<td>381,953</td>
<td>31,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track, Outdoor</td>
<td>687,650</td>
<td>748,854</td>
<td>(61,204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>238,320</td>
<td>210,626</td>
<td>27,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>310,720</td>
<td>383,313</td>
<td>(72,593)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Men's Championships</td>
<td>10,064,940</td>
<td>10,884,696</td>
<td>819,756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women's Championships</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>988,640</td>
<td>1,072,654</td>
<td>(84,014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>539,870</td>
<td>515,515</td>
<td>24,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey</td>
<td>418,740</td>
<td>468,255</td>
<td>(49,515)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>288,580</td>
<td>348,485</td>
<td>(59,905)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey</td>
<td>265,040</td>
<td>314,667</td>
<td>(49,627)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse</td>
<td>592,290</td>
<td>573,923</td>
<td>18,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>408,400</td>
<td>298,080</td>
<td>110,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>1,191,270</td>
<td>1,214,195</td>
<td>(22,925)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>1,422,520</td>
<td>1,482,738</td>
<td>(60,218)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>550,780</td>
<td>576,973</td>
<td>(6,193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>640,770</td>
<td>660,592</td>
<td>40,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track, Indoor</td>
<td>412,610</td>
<td>388,282</td>
<td>24,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track, Outdoor</td>
<td>730,750</td>
<td>783,030</td>
<td>(52,280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>969,730</td>
<td>986,329</td>
<td>(16,599)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Women's Championships</td>
<td>9,434,990</td>
<td>9,663,718</td>
<td>168,728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Championships Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>19,499,930</td>
<td>20,488,414</td>
<td>(988,484)</td>
<td>19,554,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>20,374,230</td>
<td>21,408,656</td>
<td>(1,034,426)</td>
<td>20,752,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country</td>
<td>372,950</td>
<td>372,950</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>341,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>19,872,880</td>
<td>20,861,364</td>
<td>(988,484)</td>
<td>19,896,269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>25,364,000</th>
<th>27,184,707</th>
<th>1,820,707</th>
<th>26,765,371</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>26,342,000</td>
<td>28,316,136</td>
<td>1,974,136</td>
<td>27,749,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>27,117,000</td>
<td>29,639,760</td>
<td>2,522,760</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revenue:

#### Division III 3.18% Revenue Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>25,364,000</th>
<th>27,184,707</th>
<th>1,820,707</th>
<th>26,765,371</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>26,342,000</td>
<td>28,316,136</td>
<td>1,974,136</td>
<td>27,749,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>27,117,000</td>
<td>29,639,760</td>
<td>2,522,760</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Division III Other Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>322,290</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42,170</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,010</td>
<td>100,010</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>25,364,000</th>
<th>27,184,707</th>
<th>1,820,707</th>
<th>26,765,371</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>27,117,000</td>
<td>29,739,770</td>
<td>2,622,770</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Expenses (continued):

### Non-Championship Expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funds Available for Contingency/Future Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Division III Projected Unallocated Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Add: Previous Year's Fund Balance (Unallocated/Unused Funds)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess Revenue over Expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Add: Event Cancellation Insurance Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWA Enhancement Grant Program (NACWAA/ERS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Division III Initiatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Reporting Honorarium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Working Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division-wide Sportsmanship Initiative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Rules Seminar</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Division III Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The National Collegiate Athletic Association

2014-15 Division III Budget-to-Actual (Thru August 2015)

**FINAL**

http://intra.ncaa.org/sites/gov/DIII_Committees/02_Management_Council/2016_Meetings/January/sup_03b_2014_15_Budget to Actual FINAL at "DIII B to A (NonChamp)" tab
Updated: 1/4/2016 12:30 PM
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### Division III Budget-to-Actual (Thru December 2015)

#### Revenue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division II Expenses</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Year-to-date</th>
<th>Chart</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Year-to-date</th>
<th>Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26,342,000</td>
<td>28,316,136</td>
<td>1,974,136</td>
<td>7,319,004</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>27,117,000</td>
<td>29,639,760</td>
<td>2,522,760</td>
<td>7,441,935</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III Other Revenue</td>
<td>42,170</td>
<td>42,170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>42,170</td>
<td>100,010</td>
<td>100,010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Revenue:** 26,342,000 - 28,358,306 - 2,016,306 - 7,319,004 | **N/A** | 27,117,000 - 29,739,770 - 2,622,770 - 7,441,935 | **N/A** | 28,543,863 - 7,506,310 | **(21,037,553)** | N/A |

#### Expenses:

**Total Women's Championships:** 10,090,290 - 10,361,646 - 272,356 - 685,965 | 48.4% | 5,460,404 - 9,367,083 - 3,906,679 - 685,965 | 47.6% | 10,375,000 - 1,448,707 - 8,926,293 | 44.0% | 20,011,000 - 4,072,000 | **(15,939,000)** | N/A |

**As of December 2015:**

- **Budget:** $20,374,000
- **Actual:** $21,408,656
- **Difference:** $1,034,656
- **Year-to-date:** $4,823,499
- **1,976,233**

#### 2015-16:

- **Budget:** $20,011,000
- **Actual:** $19,668,969
- **Difference:** $342,030
- **Year-to-date:** $3,905,252
- **1,669,727**

#### 2015-16:

- **Budget:** $20,336,000
- **Actual:** $19,993,969
- **Difference:** $342,031
- **Year-to-date:** $4,013,585
- **1,669,727**
## Expenses (continued):

### Non-Championship Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiative Conference Grants</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>2,490,900</td>
<td>2,482,953</td>
<td>7,947</td>
<td>2,482,953</td>
<td>2,490,900</td>
<td>2,478,140</td>
<td>12,761</td>
<td>2,478,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Division III Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>820,000</td>
<td>820,642</td>
<td>(642)</td>
<td>721,334</td>
<td>890,000</td>
<td>834,721</td>
<td>55,279</td>
<td>719,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alliance Matching Grant</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>670,000</td>
<td>542,746</td>
<td>127,254</td>
<td>525,792</td>
<td>600,500</td>
<td>615,230</td>
<td>(15,230)</td>
<td>559,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III Identity Program</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>600,500</td>
<td>401,539</td>
<td>198,961</td>
<td>228,299</td>
<td>600,500</td>
<td>285,998</td>
<td>314,502</td>
<td>84,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Athlete Leadership Conference</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>356,000</td>
<td>342,555</td>
<td>13,445</td>
<td>336,990</td>
<td>356,000</td>
<td>271,929</td>
<td>84,071</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIll-MOAA and DIll-NCC Partnerships</td>
<td>360,496</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,851</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>31,392</td>
<td>18,608</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360 Proof (formerly Drug Education and Research)</td>
<td>481,485</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>637,349</td>
<td>(257,349)</td>
<td>184,340</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>311,192</td>
<td>288,808</td>
<td>180,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR Institute</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>71,410</td>
<td>13,590</td>
<td>59,246</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>79,960</td>
<td>5,040</td>
<td>65,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus-based Student-Athlete Leadership Programs</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>65,653</td>
<td>14,347</td>
<td>22,330</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>61,946</td>
<td>18,054</td>
<td>54,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADR Institute</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Convention</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>50,248</td>
<td>(15,248)</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>44,388</td>
<td>5,612</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III Event Cancellation Insurance</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>109,000</td>
<td>109,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>109,000</td>
<td>109,000</td>
<td>109,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAD3AA Partnership</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>51,967</td>
<td>(967)</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>51,551</td>
<td>(551)</td>
<td>26,712</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New AD and Commissioner Orientation</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>13,250</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-SIDA Partnership</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>43,061</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>39,758</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>39,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>39,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Olympics Partnership</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>27,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWA Enhancement Grant Program (NACWAA/HERS)</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>28,667</td>
<td>(2,667)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>29,699</td>
<td>(3,699)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Reporting Honorarium</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>24,797</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>24,208</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Working Groups</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>20,877</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>8,880</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>24,435</td>
<td>(3,435)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Commissioners Meeting</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>19,136</td>
<td>(4,136)</td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,257</td>
<td>2,243</td>
<td>1,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Spring In-Person SAAC Meeting</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>12,316</td>
<td>22,684</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>18,184</td>
<td>16,816</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Division III Initiatives</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>8,271</td>
<td>211,729</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory/Provisional Membership</td>
<td>494,497</td>
<td>3,789</td>
<td>3,789</td>
<td>(3,789)</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,366</td>
<td>(6,366)</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Championships Expense</td>
<td>6,203,400</td>
<td>5,833,599</td>
<td>369,801</td>
<td>4,769,689</td>
<td>6,203,400</td>
<td>5,379,107</td>
<td>824,293</td>
<td>4,250,687</td>
<td>5,988,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Allocation</td>
<td>1,064,100</td>
<td>1,064,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>354,700</td>
<td>920,000</td>
<td>920,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>306,667</td>
<td>957,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Championships Expenses</td>
<td>7,267,500</td>
<td>6,897,699</td>
<td>369,801</td>
<td>5,124,389</td>
<td>7,123,400</td>
<td>6,299,107</td>
<td>824,293</td>
<td>4,557,354</td>
<td>6,945,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Division III Expenses</td>
<td>28,063,280</td>
<td>28,727,905</td>
<td>(664,625)</td>
<td>27,459,400</td>
<td>26,293,076</td>
<td>1,166,324</td>
<td>8,570,939</td>
<td>28,267,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Excess Revenue over Expense

| (1,721,280) | (369,599) | (342,400) | 3,446,694 | 276,863 | 1,073,480 |
| 18,680,153 | 18,680,153 | 18,310,554 | 18,310,554 | 21,757,248 | 21,757,248 |
| 16,958,783 | 16,958,783 | 17,968,154 | 21,757,248 | 22,034,111 | 22,034,111 |
| 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| 15,885,273 | 15,885,273 | 9,152,486 | 13,198,748 | 12,762,180 | 12,762,180 |
| 602,080 | 602,080 | - | - | - | - |
| 16,487,353 | 16,487,353 | 9,152,486 | 13,198,748 | 12,762,180 | 12,762,180 |

Updated: 1/4/2016 12:28 PM
### Scenario #5

**Assumptions:**
- Game Operations increases by X% each fiscal year based on FY2010-11 thru FY2014-15 average increases.
- Committee expenses increase by X% each fiscal year based on FY2010-11 thru FY2014-15 average increases.
- Team Transportation increase by X% each fiscal year based on cost per traveler analysis for FY2009-10 thru FY2014-15.
- Projection does not include any increase in per diem rate thru 2020-21 and no increase in bracket size due to sport sponsorship increases (access ratios) other than 2015-16 bracket expansion for women's lacrosse (2 teams) and 2017-18 women's swimming and diving improved access ratio.
- $1,100 membership dues increase for institutions and $550 increase for conferences in 2017-18.
- Beginning in FY2017-18, only increase non-championships budget every two years.

**Potential Add-backs:**
- X% Maximum amount needed to fund charter pilot, if there are no buy-backs, but only for 2015-16.
- X% increase per diem to $95 per person in 2017-18.
- X% increase women's swim and dive budget to equate to male access ratio in 2017-18.
- X% Re-introduce host per diem at $30 per person in 2017-18.
- X% increase per diem to $100 per person in 2020-21.
- X% Increase host per diem to $35 per person in 2020-21.

### The National Collegiate Athletic Association

#### Division III Budget Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>YOY</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Projection</td>
<td>Projection</td>
<td>Projection</td>
<td>Projection</td>
<td>Projection</td>
<td>Projection</td>
<td>Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III 3.18% Revenue Allocation (Note 1)</td>
<td>$26,269,000</td>
<td>$27,184,707</td>
<td>$28,316,136</td>
<td>$29,639,760</td>
<td>$26,677,760</td>
<td>$30,395,760</td>
<td>$31,102,760</td>
<td>$31,849,760</td>
<td>$32,639,760</td>
<td>$32,314,760</td>
<td>$34,107,760</td>
<td>$34,573,760</td>
<td>$34,311,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Revenue from Membership Dues Increase</td>
<td>$6,136,089</td>
<td>$7,086,348</td>
<td>$7,557,470</td>
<td>$6,613,089</td>
<td>$6,613,089</td>
<td>$6,613,089</td>
<td>$6,613,089</td>
<td>$6,613,089</td>
<td>$6,613,089</td>
<td>$6,613,089</td>
<td>$6,613,089</td>
<td>$6,613,089</td>
<td>$6,613,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Championship Games (Items 2, 7-11, 13, 15)</td>
<td>$4,469,263</td>
<td>$5,988,000</td>
<td>$6,117,300</td>
<td>$5,703,341</td>
<td>$6,262,000</td>
<td>$6,211,000</td>
<td>$6,923,000</td>
<td>$6,923,000</td>
<td>$7,330,000</td>
<td>$7,330,000</td>
<td>$7,330,000</td>
<td>$7,330,000</td>
<td>$7,330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Championships Overhead Allocation</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Championship Expenses</td>
<td>$18,260,000</td>
<td>$22,300,000</td>
<td>$25,502,000</td>
<td>$28,413,000</td>
<td>$31,379,000</td>
<td>$34,724,000</td>
<td>$37,339,000</td>
<td>$39,955,000</td>
<td>$42,571,000</td>
<td>$45,187,000</td>
<td>$47,803,000</td>
<td>$50,419,000</td>
<td>$52,035,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Expense Increase</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes:
- *Based on new championships policies (10% reduction in travel party, $5 reduction in per diem will right-size per diem allocations by sport).
- *Championships spend was over budget by $359,883 for fiscal year 2013-14.
- *Non-championships spend was budgeted by $309,811 for fiscal year 2013-14.
- Expenses reflect actual balances as of 8/11/15, Revenue are still projected.

#### Additional Revenue from Membership Dues Increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Championship Expenses</td>
<td>$18,260,000</td>
<td>$22,300,000</td>
<td>$25,502,000</td>
<td>$28,413,000</td>
<td>$31,379,000</td>
<td>$34,724,000</td>
<td>$37,339,000</td>
<td>$39,955,000</td>
<td>$42,571,000</td>
<td>$45,187,000</td>
<td>$47,803,000</td>
<td>$50,419,000</td>
<td>$52,035,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Expense Increase</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION III MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

The Division III Management Council conducted its January 13 meeting in San Antonio, Texas. Listed below are specific recommendations for review and consideration by the Presidents Council.

ACTION ITEMS

• 2016 Legislative Proposal No. 2016-2. The Management Council discussed the sponsors’ possible motion to divide Proposal No. 2 (deregulation of electronic transmissions and recruiting publicity). If the sponsors divide sections A&B (social media friending and following) from section C (publicity), the Management Council voted to recommend the Presidents Council still oppose sections A&B, as well as section C.

NO ACTION REQUIRED

The following Management Council actions do not require formal action and are being reported to the Presidents Council for informational purposes only.

1. Conference Strategic Grant Program. The Management Council approved the following recommended policy change from the Strategic Planning and Finance Committee (SPFC) regarding the Conference Strategic Grant Program: Allow Tier One spending on presidents and chancellors who also serve as athletics direct reports to attend the NCAA Convention.

   The Council also requested staff better engage constituent groups who are directly impacted with proposed Division III commissioner recommendations (e.g., optional faculty athletics representative (FAR) funding in Tier One versus the current mandatory requirement) to garner feedback.

2. Financial Aid Reporting Process - Level I Reviews. The Management Council received the Financial Aid Committee’s report that identified 33 Level I reviews this fall, eight more than last year and noted the use of newly created review criteria (i.e., sport outliers). The committee took the following actions: 1.) Voted to take no action on 18 cases; and 2) Voted to forward nine Level I cases to a Level II review, one fewer than last year.
3. **Legislative Interpretation – Student-Athlete Leadership Programming.** The Management Council approved an official interpretation that student-athletes may participate in leadership and other programming involving sports-related information outside the playing and practice season provided the programming is not limited to members of a specific team and participation is voluntary.

4. **Conference Self-Study Guide.** The Membership Committee noted that it will distribute the Conference Self-Study Guide (CSSG) to the Division III commissioners after a final review at its February meeting. Division III commissioners will have until June 2018 to complete the CSSG.

5. **Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) Elections.** The Division III SAAC elected its new officers – Rob Wingert, Stevenson University, will be the chair and Kayla Porter, Frostburg State University, will be the vice-chair. The new Management Council liaison is Greg Woods, Springfield College.

6. **Division III Health and Safety Summit Report.** The Sport Science Institute (SSI) staff provided an update on the October 2015 Division III Health and Safety Summit. Summit participants included presidents, athletics administrators, general counsel/risk management specialists, faculty athletics representatives, coaches, student-athletes and sports medicine personnel from a diverse collection of Division III institutions and conferences. The summit goals were to discuss identified issues and find common ground to build a strategic agenda and best practices. Three priority themes emerged from the summit: 1.) Director of medical services identified at each school, 2.) SSI develop and distribute template protocols for model care, and 3.) Propose the delayed start of fall non-traditional segment (e.g., fall activities for spring sports like baseball and softball).

SSI also provided an update on the following: 1.) Release of a mental health best practices guide; 2.) Release of a cardiac consensus inter-association guideline; 3.) Scheduling of the second football safety summit in February; and 4.) A sexual assault prevention summit in February.

While the Council applauded the efforts of the SSI initiatives, the members expressed concern with a potential lack of resources (e.g., staffing) at many Division III schools necessary to support these initiatives and related best practices. The Council directed staff to discuss with SSI the possible creation of a related advisory group that would provide feedback on how to address the practical realities and financial impact of implementing the proposed SSI initiatives and best practices.
NCAA Division III Proposal No. 2016-1 - NCAA MEMBERSHIP -- DUES OF MEMBERS -- CURRENT ANNUAL DUES -- MEMBERSHIP DUES INCREASE

**Intent:** To establish membership dues as $2,000 for an active institution ($1,100 increase) and $1,000 for member conference offices ($550 increase).

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Strategic Planning and Finance Committee)].

**Effective Date:** September 1, 2017.

**Rationale:** At the 2015 NCAA Convention Issues Forum, the Division III membership indicated significant support for a membership dues increase, provided Division III would retain all additional generated revenue. Membership dues have not increased since 1985. The proposed membership dues increase would be used to offset rising championships travel cost, which are anticipated to result in a budget deficit for the division in coming years.

**Proposed Speakers:**
- PC (move and support) – Jay Lemons
- PC (support) – Tori Murden McClure
### Proposal No. 2016-2 - RECRUITING -- DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS AND PUBLICITY -- DEREGULATION OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Intent:</strong></th>
<th>To specify that any form of electronically transmitted correspondence (e.g., electronic mail, instant messages, text messages or facsimiles), including public or private communication through a social networking site, may be sent to a prospective student-athlete (or the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardians). Additionally, to deregulate the publicity legislation, as specified.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source:</strong></td>
<td>Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and North Coast Athletic Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective Date:</strong></td>
<td>Immediate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong></td>
<td>This proposal seeks to deregulate the existing restrictions on electronic transmissions. There is a growing concern that current legislation regarding electronic transmissions is outdated and lagging behind prospective student-athletes' and coaches' use of technology. Current limitations are inhibiting the exchange of information in the most efficient, cost effective and least intrusive way. Developments in technology have made it easier and less expensive to communicate through the expanded availability and prevalence of mobile communication devices that are multifunctional and often provide options for the user to define his or her communication preferences. Institutions have been permitted to send an unlimited number of emails to prospective student-athletes for several years and no concerns have been raised regarding frequency or intrusion. The proposed deregulation brings athletics in line with campus admissions staff, decreasing burden on coaches and compliance administrators, without increasing burden on prospective student-athletes. Allowing the exchange of public electronic transmissions necessitates simultaneous deregulation of the publicity legislation, based on the reality that public discourse through social media has largely replaced traditional forms of publicity and news media.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Proposed Speakers:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC - Dave Wolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC - Erik Bitterbaum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Governance Position:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidents Council and Management Council – The NCAA Division III Presidents Council and Management Council oppose this proposal. The current electronic transmission restrictions appropriately regulate recruiting communication between coaches and prospective student-athletes from both a privacy and professionalism perspective. Recruiting communications should primarily occur in a private forum and in a medium that represents the appropriate relationship between a coach and a prospective student-athlete. Deregulating the existing restrictions places undue burden on prospective student-athletes and coaches to engage in public communication. Additionally, a deregulation would result in publicity of the prospective student-athlete's personal recruitment process and increased burden on prospective student-athletes to explain recruitment decisions to other collegiate coaches. Allowing this type of communication may result in prospective student-athletes perceiving a more casual, friendly relationship with the coaching staff, which may result in inaccurate expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposal No. 2016-3 - PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- FOOTBALL – NONTRADITIONAL SEGMENT

**Intent:** To establish a 14 day nontraditional segment for football, which shall include the following: (1) An instruction period consisting of four days of limited activity such as classroom sessions, film study, fitness testing, and strength and conditioning sessions; (2) An acclimatization period consisting of three days of helmet only on-field practice; and (3) A general practice period consisting of seven days of full equipment, three of which may include live tackling.

**Source:** Morrisville State College, Randolph-Macon College, Gallaudet University, Trine University, Hardin-Simmons University, Howard Payne University, Buffalo State, State University of New York, Louisiana College, University of Mary Hardin-Baylor, Alfred University, East Texas Baptist University, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire, University of Wisconsin, Stout Emory, Henry College, University of Wisconsin, Lacrosse, Rowan University, University of Wisconsin-River Falls, St. John Fisher College, State University of New York at Cortland and University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh.

**Effective Date:** Immediate.

**Rationale:** Football student-athletes are not currently provided similar opportunities to those afforded other student-athletes with fall/spring championships to develop sport-specific skills during a nontraditional season. The existing provision for strength and conditioning sessions and limited skill instruction does not allow for comprehensive skill development for all players involved in the sport of football. Coaches interpret the current rule in various ways, potentially resulting in widely diverging experiences from campus to campus. As safety concerns related to the sport of football have increased, so has the need for instruction and practice on proper blocking and tackling, the effectiveness of which is minimized without equipment. Further, with the limitations placed on preseason practices during the traditional season, time for skill development and technique work is often marginalized in favor of scheme installation and game preparation. Finally, engaging in football-specific activities without the benefit of protective equipment, as permitted under current legislation, raises concerns about student-athlete safety. This proposal will provide football student-athletes with skill instruction and development opportunities equivalent to student-athletes participating in other sports, while maintaining the health and safety of the student-athletes as a top priority.

### Proposed Speakers:

**Presidents Council** – Thomas Foley and Tori Haring-Smith

**Management Council** – Gerald Young and Chris Kimball

### Governance Position:

**Presidents Council and Management Council** – The NCAA Division III Presidents Council and Management Council oppose this proposal for the following reasons: (1) the NCAA Bylaw 17 (playing and practice seasons) governance review is not yet complete and adopting a proposal that would amend the nontraditional segment legislation would be premature; (2) Many Division III schools may not be appropriately positioned to support a spring contact period in the sport of football from a facilities and personnel perspective; and (3) the Councils agreed with the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sport in its position that this type of spring participation may increase injury risk.
### Proposal No. 2016-4 - PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- ICE HOCKEY -- OFF ICE TRAINING

**Intent:** To permit off ice/dry land training prior to the first permissible practice date while still keeping the 19 week length for the total ice hockey season.

**Source:** Plattsburgh State University of New York, Norwich University, Morrisville State College, Manhattanville College, University of Wisconsin-Superior, State University of New York at Geneseo, State University of New York at Cortland, Nazareth College, State University of New York at Oswego, University of New England, Curry College, Lebanon Valley College, Becker College, Wentworth Institute of Technology, College at Brockport, State University of New York, Buffalo State, State University of New York., Utica College, Elmira College, Becker College, State University of New York at Canton, Northland College, St. Norbert College, Hobart and William Smith Colleges and State University of New York at Potsdam.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2016.

**Rationale:** Allowing institutions to conduct dry-land (off-ice) training beginning after the first Monday in October and within the 19-week season will allow teams to use their entire 19-week season under the supervision of their coaching staff. This proposal will help ensure the safety of the student-athletes during preseason, dry-land (off-ice) training sessions.

**Proposed Speakers:**

MC (support) – Dennis Leighton

**Governance Position:**

Management Council – The NCAA Division III Management Council supports this proposal. The proposal would allow institutions additional flexibility in structuring playing seasons by allowing institutions to begin the ice hockey season earlier while extending winter break. This scheduling flexibility may allow student-athletes additional time away from the sport during the winter holidays.
Proposal No. 2016-5 - PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS -- ATHLETICALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES -- EXCEPTIONS -- RESERVATION OF FACILITY BY CERTIFIED STRENGTH AND CONDITIONING COACH

**Intent:** To permit student-athletes to access a student-athlete only weight room outside of the declared playing and practice season. Additionally, to permit certified strength and conditioning personnel to reserve an institution's athletic facilities during the institution's regular academic year to conduct voluntary workouts for all student-athletes.

**Source:** State University of New York Athletic Conference and New England Women's, Men's Athletic Conference and University Athletic Association

**Effective Date:** Immediate.

**Rationale:** As strength and conditioning techniques evolve, there is an increasing distinction between equipment used for the general student body/faculty/staff and equipment used for student-athletes. This has led to the creation of student-athlete weight rooms on many campuses that are separate from general fitness centers. Current legislation prohibits institutions from reserving athletic facilities for the exclusive use of student-athletes outside the declared playing and practice season. Existing legislation further restricts certified strength and conditioning coaches from reserving any institutional athletic facilities to conduct voluntary workouts. Proposal No. 2011-7-1, an amendment to Proposal No. 2011-7, permitted certified strength and conditioning personnel to conduct voluntary workouts during the regular academic year for student-athletes based in part on the rationale that "the weeks outside of the competitive season are the time to increase cardiovascular endurance, build strength and explosiveness, train for purposes of injury prevention, and become a better athlete so that students are prepared for the sport season." For this same reason, student-athletes should be permitted to access a designated student-athlete weight room and certified strength and conditioning coaches should be permitted to reserve an athletic facility during the regular academic year to conduct voluntary workouts.

**Proposed Speakers:**
- MC (support) – Shantey Hill
- MC (support) – Tracy Ranieri

**Governance Position:**
- Management Council – The NCAA Division III Management Council supports this proposal. This proposal would allow student-athletes better access to athletic facilities and would provide a healthier and safer environment for student-athletes to utilize appropriate equipment. Additionally, allowing student-athletes to use a student-athlete only weight room would decrease facility crowding in general-use fitness centers.
### Proposal No. 2016-6 - PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS -- ATHLETICALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES -- EXCEPTION FOR INSTITUTIONAL FUNDRAISERS INVOLVING ATHLETICS ABILITY

**Intent:** To permit student-athletes to participate in out-of-season institutional fundraising activities involving athletics ability, provided participation in the activity is voluntary and the activity is open to any and all entrants.

**Source:** Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and University Athletic Conference.

**Effective Date:** Immediate.

**Rationale:** The intent of the out-of-season athletically related activities legislation is to prevent coaches from engaging in practice activities with their own student-athletes outside of the playing season. Permitting student-athletes to participate voluntarily in athletically related fundraising activities while out of season does not undermine the purpose of that rule, because there is no intent to assess or monitor the athletics ability of the out-of-season student-athlete. Often, an institution's team will conduct fundraisers that involve athletically related activity that is closely associated with its particular sport. In these cases, student-athletes are precluded from participating in their own institution's fundraiser. Furthermore, out-of-season student-athletes are denied opportunities to network with influential alumni and friends of the college who take part in these fundraising events, as well as to support their fellow classmates, simply because their sport season does not coincide with the scheduled institutional fundraiser.

### Proposed Speakers:

- MC (oppose) – Gail Cummings-Danson
- MC (oppose) – Terry Wansart

### Governance Position:

**Management Council** – The NCAA Division III Management Council opposes this proposal. Allowing institutional fundraising events involving athletics ability outside of the declared playing and practice season could result in student-athletes feeling compelled to participate in athletically related activities outside of the season. Requiring that the fundraisers be open to the general public is not sufficient to guard against potential abuse. The Division III philosophy emphasizes a culture wherein student-athletes are encouraged to participate in non-athletics pursuits and the prohibition on athletically related activities outside of the playing season is essential to supporting that aspect of the Division III philosophy.
### Proposal No. 2016-7 - RECRUITING - CONTACTS AND EVALUATIONS – CONTACT RESTRICTIONS AT SPECIFIED SITES -- PRACTICE OR COMPETITION SITE – EXCEPTION FOR ON-CAMPUS CONTACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Intent:</strong></th>
<th>To permit institutional coaching staff members to have contact with a prospective student-athlete on a day of competition prior to the competition, provided that contact occurs on the institution's campus and the institution's campus is not the competition site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source:</strong></td>
<td>Upper Midwest Athletic Conference, North Coast Athletic Conference, Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and North Atlantic Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective Date:</strong></td>
<td>Immediate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale:** Allowing contact on an institution's campus on the day of competition prior to competition allows prospective student-athletes more flexibility when arranging campus visits in locations to which they may already be traveling for competition. Currently, prospective student-athletes are prohibited from making contact with institutional athletics staff members on a day of competition, prior to competition, even if they are visiting an institution's campus on an official or unofficial visit on a day of competition. This restriction often requires prospective student-athletes to remain in the locale of the institution additional days following competition to visit the campus and meet with athletics staff members, resulting in additional cost and additional missed class time. This proposal would not only offer greater flexibility to prospective student-athletes who wish to meet with athletics staff members while visiting a campus in a locale of a site of competition or enroute to a site of competition, but may also improve recruiting efficiency and potentially result in fewer days away from campus for coaches.

**Proposed Speakers:**
- MC (support) – Terry Rupert
- MC (support) – Nnenna Akotaobi

**Governance Position:**

- **Management Council** – The NCAA Division III Management Council supports this proposal. Allowing on-campus contact with prospective student-athletes prior to competition, provided the competition does not occur on the institution's campus, would reduce institutional monitoring without negatively impacting prospective student-athletes. Additionally, this proposal may alleviate the financial burden for prospective student-athletes by allowing them to more easily combine official or unofficial visits with travel for competition.
Proposal No. 2016-8 - CHAMPIONSHIPS INELIGIBILITY FOR USE OF BANNED DRUGS -- ELIMINATION OF REINSTATEMENT REQUIREMENT

**Intent:** To eliminate the requirement that the eligibility of a student-athlete must be restored by the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee after he or she has fulfilled a drug-testing penalty and has tested negative in accordance with the testing methods authorized by the NCAA Board of Governors.

**Source:** NCAA Division III Management Council (Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2016; for all drug tests administered on or after August 1, 2016.

**Rationale:** Currently, the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee is required to consider reinstatement of a student-athlete's eligibility after the student-athlete has fulfilled the penalty for a positive test and has subsequently tested negative for any banned substance. The reinstatement of student-athletes in such situations has become perfunctory as the committee does not exercise any degree of discretion in the reinstatement request; rather, the committee simply confirms the negative test. Requiring the committee to confirm a negative test administered by Drug Free Sport is unnecessary. This proposal will reduce bureaucracies and increase efficiencies to better streamline the drug testing and eligibility restoration processes.

**Proposed Speakers:**
MC (move and support) - Julie Soriero
MC (support) - Frank Millerick
### Proposal 2016-9 - EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS – CONFERENCE AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS PROVISIONAL AND RECLASSIFYING MEMBER INSTITUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intent:</th>
<th>To specify that institutions in years three and four of the NCAA Division III provisional and reclassifying membership process may count toward the requisite number of conference members necessary to begin the two-year waiting period before a multisport or single-sport conference is eligible for automatic qualification for NCAA championships.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source:</td>
<td>NCAA Division III Management Council (Championships Committee).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date:</td>
<td>September 1, 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale:</td>
<td>Currently, a conference must have seven members that are active Division III institutions to begin the two-year waiting period for automatic qualification. This recommendation would allow a conference to consider its year three or four provisional or reclassifying members as part of the seven, thereby allowing the conference to begin the two-year waiting period earlier than is currently permissible. At the conclusion of the two-year waiting period, the conference would be awarded automatic qualification provided the provisional or reclassifying members that were a part of the conference's requisite seven members are established as active member institutions. In recent years, provisional and reclassifying institutions in years three and four of the membership process were given greater consideration in championships selection policies such that they now count in primary selection criteria. The change was made to encourage active Division III institutions to schedule contests with provisional and reclassifying institutions without being negatively impacted at the time of selections. In the same way, allowing these institutions to count toward the requisite number of conference members is a benefit to both the provisional or reclassifying and the established members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed Speakers:

- MC (move and support) - Chris Ragsdale
- MC (support) - Terry Small
Proposal No. 2016-10 - DIVISION MEMBERSHIP -- DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS -- SPORTS SPONSORSHIP -- MINIMUM PARTICIPANT REQUIREMENTS FOR GOLF

**Intent:** To reduce the minimum number of participants for sports sponsorship in the sport of golf from five to four.

**Source:** Centennial Conference, Landmark Conference, Middle Atlantic Conference and Presidents' Athletic Conference.

**Effective Date:** Immediate.

**Rationale:** Golf, particularly on the women's side, has seen growth in Division III due in part to the Championships Committee waiver permitting institutions to be eligible for championships selection based on contests completed with four participants rather than five. The sport of golf requires four players to complete an 18-hole round to compile a team score. The fifth score is discarded. Golf is the only sport under Bylaw 20.11.3.8 that requires more participants than those needed to complete team scoring. Cross Country requires five participants but scores with seven runners; tennis requires six participants but can play six singles and six different doubles players; and wrestling only requires six participants in the 10 weight classes. This proposal will enable current sponsors to keep the sport viable on their campuses while encouraging possible sponsors to add the sport.

**Proposed Speakers:**
- MC (support) – Brit Katz
- MC (support) – Gerald Young

**Governance Position:**
Management Council – The NCAA Division III Management Council supports this proposal. Golf is the only sport for which the sport sponsorship requirements are inconsistent with the playing rules. Creating consistency between the playing rules and the sport sponsorship requirements may positively impact women's golf sponsorship without negatively impacting roster sizes.
2016 NCAA Convention Division III Business Session
Mootnicity and Related Parliamentary Issues


**General Notes.** The NCAA Division III Presidents Council has identified three proposals of particular interest to Division III chancellors and presidents. These proposals are included in the Presidents Council grouping and will be considered by roll call vote. All motions and votes related to these proposals also must be considered by roll call. Because the Presidents Council designated the proposals for roll call vote, only the Presidents Council may waive this designation and all other motions to change the voting method would be out of order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>Procedural Issues</th>
<th>Mootnicity Issues</th>
<th>Miscellaneous Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 - 1</td>
<td>Roll call vote</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>[NOTE: During its October 2015 meeting, the NCAA Board of Governors took formal action to allow Division III to retain 100% of the proposed membership dues increase.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 - 2</td>
<td>Roll call vote</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>A motion to divide the application of the deregulation of electronic transmissions legislation (sections A and B of Proposal No. 2016-2) and the deregulation of publicity legislation (section C of Proposal No. 2016-2) would be in order. Any motion to divide must be specific and clearly state how the division is to be made. The motion to divide is debatable and requires a simple majority for adoption. If the motion to divide passes, each section of the proposal would be voted on in order (i.e., Sections A and B would be voted on first, followed by Section C). A motion to divide Sections A and B of Proposal No. 2016-2 would be out of order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 - 3</td>
<td>Roll call vote</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Grouping – Proposal Nos. 4-10**

**General Notes.** This grouping contains seven proposals. Each proposal will be considered by roll call vote. All motions and votes related to these proposals also must be considered by roll call. Because the Presidents Council designated the proposals for roll call vote, only the Presidents Council may waive this designation and all other motions to change the voting method would be out of order.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>Procedural Issues</th>
<th>Mootnicity Issues</th>
<th>Miscellaneous Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 - 4</td>
<td>Roll call vote</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 - 5</td>
<td>Roll call vote</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>A motion to divide the application of establishing a student-athlete only weight room (NCAA Bylaw 17.02.1.1.1 (h)) as drafted in Proposal No. 2016-5) and allowing a certified strength and conditioning coach to reserve an institutional athletic facility (Bylaw 17.02.1.1.1 (i)) as drafted in Proposal No. 2016-5) to conduct voluntary workouts would be in order. Any motion to divide must be specific and clearly state how the division is to be made. The motion to divide is undebatable and requires a simple majority for adoption. If the motion to divide passes, each section of the proposal will be voted on separately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 - 6</td>
<td>Roll call vote</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 - 7</td>
<td>Roll call vote</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 - 8</td>
<td>Roll call vote</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 - 9</td>
<td>Roll call vote</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 - 10</td>
<td>Roll call vote</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>A motion to divide the application of the minimum participant requirements for men's golf and women's golf would be in order. Any motion to divide must be specific and clearly state how the division is to be made. The motion to divide is undebatable and requires a simple majority for adoption. If the motion to divide passes, each gender will be voted on separately. If Proposal No. 2016-10 is divided and the minimum participants' requirements for golf are amended for one gender but not the other, the legislation will be updated to reflect that distinction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Notes.

Effective date: A motion for an alternative effective date on the convention floor would violate the principle of "prior notice" and therefore would be out of order. Alternative effective dates must be noted with the submission of the proposal or offered as an amendment-to-amendment.
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Understanding How to Read the 2016 NCAA Convention Division III Official Notice.  

1. How to read the NCAA Division III legislative proposals. When reviewing legislative proposals, it is important to note that:
   
a. The letters and words that appear in italics and strikethrough are letters and words in the current NCAA Division III rule that would be deleted with the adoption of the proposal;

b. The letters and words that appear in bold face and underlined are letters and words that would be added with the adoption of the proposal; and

c. The letters and words that appear in normal text are letters and words in the current Division III rule that would remain unchanged with the adoption of the proposal.

2. What appears in the white pages of the NCAA Division III Official Notice?  

The white pages of the NCAA Division III Official Notice contain the legislative proposals that will be voted on individually at the NCAA Division III business session. Anticipated questions and answers related to each of the proposals appearing in the white pages are contained in this question and answer guide.

3. What is the difference between the presidential grouping and the general grouping of proposals?  

The NCAA Division III Presidents Council has determined that it will focus primarily on those national issues in Division III athletics that prompt widespread concern among Division III chancellors or presidents.

The Presidents Council has identified three proposals that it believes are of particular interest to Division III chancellors or presidents and has included them in the Presidents Council
grouping. The remaining proposals are included in the general grouping. All proposals have been identified by the Presidents Council for a roll-call vote.

4. **What appears in the blue pages of the Official Notice?**

The blue pages of the Official Notice contain three types of legislative proposals. The proposals appearing in the blue pages have already been adopted by the authority of the NCAA Division III Management Council. These proposals have an immediate effective date from the time of adoption. These groups of proposals will be ratified by the NCAA Division III membership during the Division III business session. If a delegate objects to the incorporation of any one of these legislative proposals, that objection should be raised prior to the ratification of the package of proposals. It is preferred that any delegate intending to raise an objection also inform a member of the NCAA academic and membership affairs staff of that intent before the Division III business session. The Division III membership would then vote on the proposal in question via a separate action.

The question and answer document does not address proposals that are included in the blue pages. The blue pages, however, include an "additional information" section with each proposal that provides additional clarification regarding the proposal.

The three types of legislation contained within the blue pages are listed below.

a. *Interpretations to be incorporated in the 2016-17 NCAA Division III Manual.* These interpretations have already been accepted by the membership and the only issue that is before the membership is whether they should be set forth in the Division III Manual.

b. *Noncontroversial legislation adopted by the Management Council.* These proposals constitute all of the noncontroversial legislative changes the Management Council has adopted during the past year. The Management Council is permitted to adopt such legislation, if it is necessary, to promote the normal and orderly administration of the Association's legislation.

c. *Modifications of wording.* These proposals are modifications to current legislation that have been shown to be consistent with the intent of the membership in adopting the current legislation. To approve such a change, the Management Council has determined that sufficient documentation and testimony exists to establish clearly that the original wording of the legislation requires modification to better reflect the original intent.
Questions and Answers
2016 NCAA Convention Division III Legislative Proposals

NCAA Division III Proposal Number 2016-1 (2-1).

Title: NCAA MEMBERSHIP -- DUES OF MEMBERS -- CURRENT ANNUAL DUES -- MEMBERSHIP DUES INCREASE

Effective Date: September 1, 2017.

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Strategic Planning and Finance Committee)].

Intent: To establish annual membership dues as $2,000 for an active institution ($1,100 increase) and $1,000 for member conference offices ($550 increase).

Question No. 1: If this proposal is adopted, will the dues increase be allocated to NCAA Division III in the same manner as other NCAA revenue?

Answer: No. Division III currently receives 3.18% of existing NCAA revenue, including membership dues. The NCAA Board of Governors has voted to allow Division III to retain 100% of the revenue resulting from the Division III dues increase. As a result, Division III will continue to receive 3.18% of the original $900 ($450 for conferences) for membership dues and will also receive 100% of the $1,100 ($550 for conferences) increase.

Question No. 2: If this proposal is adopted, will the revenue from the dues increase be restricted to any specific budget items?

Answer: No. While the dues are not limited to pay for any budget item, the increased revenue will help account for certain championships expenditures.

Question No. 3: How was the $1,100 increase ($550 for conferences) determined?

Answer: The Presidents Council, based on recommendation from the Strategic Planning and Finance Committee, determined that the revenue generated from a $1,100 dues increase ($550 for conferences) was appropriate to offset anticipated championship expenditure increases for Division III in the coming years.
Question No. 4: Does this proposal impact single-sport conferences?

Answer: Yes. As is currently required, a single-sport conference will be required to pay the same annual dues as multisport conferences.

Question No. 5: If this proposal is adopted, when will the dues increase?

Answer: The dues would increase for the 2017-18 academic year. As such, the increased dues would be payable September 1, 2017.

NCAA Division III Proposal Number 2016-2 (2-2).

Title: RECRUITING -- DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS AND PUBLICITY -- DEREGULATION OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSIONS

Effective Date: Immediate.

Source: Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and North Coast Athletic Conference.

Intent: To specify that any form of electronically transmitted correspondence (e.g., email, instant messages, text messages or facsimiles), including public or private communication through a social networking site, may be sent to a prospective student-athlete (or the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardians). Additionally, to deregulate the publicity legislation, as specified.

Question No. 1: Under the current rule, what are the restrictions on electronically transmitted correspondence for athletics departments?

Answer: Currently, electronically transmitted correspondence must be private and direct between the sender and recipient unless the prospective student-athlete has submitted a financial deposit to the institution and it is after May 1 of that prospective student-athlete's senior year in high school. If those conditions are met, then there are not restrictions on electronically transmitted correspondence.

Question No. 2: If this proposal is adopted, how would this proposal amend the restrictions on electronically transmitted correspondence?

Answer: This proposal would eliminate the requirement that electronic communications be private and direct between the sender and recipient. As an example, if this proposal passes, a coaching staff member could
communicate with a prospective student-athlete in a public forum on social media; the coaching staff member could also send an electronic transmission to multiple prospective student-athletes. Because the second part of the proposal deregulates the publicity legislation, the content of the public communications would not be limited.

Question No. 3: Under the current rule, are admissions offices allowed to communicate publicly with a prospective student-athlete?

Answer: Current NCAA recruiting regulations don't impact admissions offices unless the admissions staff is acting on behalf of the athletics department. If an admissions staff is acting on behalf of the athletics department then all NCAA recruiting regulations apply.

Question No. 4: What are the current recruiting restrictions related to publicity for an institution's athletic department on a social media site?

Answer: Currently, an athletics department must follow all restrictions related to publicity of prospective student-athletes when using social media. Prior to a prospective student-athlete's paid acceptance of an institution's written offer of admission or financial aid, the athletics department may only confirm its recruitment of the prospective student-athlete. The athletics department is otherwise prohibited from commenting publicly on the prospective student-athlete.

Question No. 5: Would this proposal allow an institution to post on social media that a prospective student-athlete is coming for an official visit to the institution's campus?

Answer: Yes. This proposal deregulates the publicity legislation. Therefore, an institution may publicize a prospective student-athlete's visit to campus.

Question No. 6: Would this proposal allow an institution to post photographs and videos during a prospective student-athlete's visit to campus?

Answer: Yes.

Question No. 7: If this proposal is adopted, what restrictions would exist regarding publicity of a prospective student-athlete's celebratory signing?

Answer: If this proposal is adopted, the institution would be permitted to immediately publicize a prospective student-athlete's commitment to the institution using the celebratory signing form, regardless of whether the
prospective student-athlete has submitted a financial deposit to the institution. It would remain impermissible for celebratory signings to occur on the institution's campus and coaches would continue to be prohibited from attending a prospective student-athlete's celebratory signing.

**Question No. 8:** This proposal has two parts: (1) deregulation of social media; and (2) deregulation of the publicity legislation. What would happen if the deregulation of social media passes, but the deregulation of the publicity legislation is defeated?

**Answer:** The proposal would eliminate the requirement that electronic communications be private and direct between the sender and recipient. However, an institution would still be required to follow the publicity legislation, which would continue to restrict the content of those public communications. Specifically, since the publicity legislation limits a coach's public comments to only confirming recruitment, any conversations with the prospective student-athlete in a public social media platform would be subject to that limitation. Therefore, a coach, in a public social media forum, would not be able to have a recruiting conversation, discuss a visit to campus, post a photograph of a student-athlete during a campus visit or congratulate the prospective student-athlete on his/her athletics accomplishments. Coaches would be allowed to friend or follow a prospective student-athlete as that would be akin to confirming recruitment.

[Note: These two parts of the proposal would only be voted on separately if a delegate so moves during the business session at convention.]

**Question No. 9:** What type of electronically transmitted correspondence is currently permitted in Division I?

**Answer:** Before a prospective student-athlete has signed a National Letter of Intent or the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid, electronically transmitted correspondence must be sent directly to the prospective student-athlete (or his or her parents or legal guardians) and must be private between only the sender and recipient (e.g., no use of chat rooms, message boards or posts to "walls"). In certain Division I sports, electronically transmitted correspondence is limited to email and facsimiles and all other forms of electronically transmitted correspondence (e.g., Instant Messenger, text messaging) are prohibited.
An institutional staff member is permitted to initiate or accept a "friend" or "follow" request to or from a prospective student-athlete (or his or her parents or legal guardians) through a social networking site at any time, including prior to the first permissible date to send electronic correspondence, even if the social networking website sends an automatically-generated electronic notification (e.g., email, text message, push notification), provided the staff member does not modify the automatically-generated electronic notification and no additional communication is included.

Once a prospective student-athlete has signed a National Letter of Intent, or the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid or the institution has received his or her financial deposit in response to its offer of admission, electronically transmitted correspondence may be public. Division I will consider NCAA Proposal 2015-48 in April 2016. If adopted, this proposal would allow an athletics department staff member to take action on social media (e.g., "like," "favorite," "repost," etc.) that indicates approval of content generated by prospective student-athletes, among others.

Question No. 10: What type of electronically transmitted correspondence is currently permitted in Division II?

Answer: Before a prospective student-athlete has signed a National Letter of Intent or the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid or the institution has received his or her financial deposit in response to its offer of admission, electronically transmitted correspondence must be private and direct between the sender and recipient.

An institutional staff member is permitted to initiate or accept a "friend" or "follow" request to or from a prospective student-athlete (or his or her parents or legal guardians) through a social networking site at any time, including prior to the first permissible date to send electronic correspondence, even if the social networking website sends an automatically-generated electronic notification (e.g., email, text message, push notification), provided the staff member does not modify the automatically-generated electronic notification and no additional communication is included.

Once a prospective student-athlete has signed a National Letter of Intent, or the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid or the
institution has received his or her financial deposit in response to its offer of admission, electronically transmitted correspondence may be public.

**NCAA Division III Proposal Number 2016-3 (2-6).**

**Title:** PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- FOOTBALL -- NONTRADITIONAL SEGMENT

**Effective Date:** Immediate.

**Source:** Morrisville State College, Randolph-Macon College, Gallaudet University, Trine University, Hardin-Simmons University, Howard Payne University, Buffalo State, State University of New York, Louisiana College, University of Mary Hardin-Baylor, Alfred University, East Texas Baptist University, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire, University of Wisconsin, Stout, Emory and Henry College, University of Wisconsin, LaCrosse, Rowan University, University of Wisconsin-River Falls, St. John Fisher College, State University of New York at Cortland and University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh.

**Intent:** To establish a 14 day nontraditional segment for football, which shall include the following: (1) an instruction period consisting of four days of limited activity such as classroom sessions, film study, fitness testing, and strength and conditioning sessions; (2) an acclimatization period consisting of three days of helmet only on-field practice; and (3) a general practice period consisting of seven days of full equipment, three of which may include live tackling.

**Question No. 1:** If this proposal is adopted, is an institution required to conduct a nontraditional segment?

**Answer:** No.

**Question No. 2:** If this proposal is adopted, when may the nontraditional segment begin?

**Answer:** February 1.

**Question No. 3:** Does this proposal allow an institution to continue to conduct a strength and conditioning and limited skill instruction period as opposed to a full nontraditional segment involving contact?

**Answer:** Yes. However, each student-athlete would be required to complete three acclimatization days prior to participating in activities involving the use of sport related equipment (e.g., football or hand shield) or skill instruction.
If the institution wants to limit the activities to 14 days of strength and conditioning without sport related equipment or skill instruction then a three day acclimatization period is not required.

Question No. 4: If this proposal is adopted, does the football nontraditional segment have to be conducted during consecutive weeks?

Answer: No. The five calendar weeks during which an institution may conduct a nontraditional segment in football do not have to be consecutive. This proposal would establish a specific exception to the consecutive weeks requirement.

Question No. 5: If this proposal is adopted, is the institution required to have four noninstruction days?

Answer: No.

Question No. 6: Does this proposal require the four noninstruction days to occur prior to the three-day acclimatization period?

Answer: No. The four noninstruction days may occur at any point prior to, during or after the three-day acclimatization period. For example, if an institution has a declared week of Monday through Sunday, the institution may conduct the acclimatization period as follows:

Monday - Acclimatization Day One  
Tuesday - Noninstruction Day  
Wednesday - Acclimatization Day Two  
Thursday - Acclimatization Day Three  
Monday - General Practice Period – On-field

Question No. 7: If this proposal is adopted, are all student-athletes required to participate in the three-day acclimatization period?

Answer: Yes. All student-athletes, including those who arrive to the nontraditional segment after the first day of practice, are required to undergo a three-day acclimatization period prior to participating in activities involving the use of sport related equipment.

Question No. 8: Does this proposal limit the practice length?

Answer: No.
Question No. 9: Would this proposal allow football related meetings to occur on days in which student-athletes also engage in an on-field practice session (either during the acclimatization period or the general practice period)?

Answer: Yes. Football related meetings, including classroom sessions, film study and other team meetings are permissible before or after an on-field session.

Question No. 10: How does this proposal impact multisport athletes?

Answer: Multisport athletes must be provided one day off per week from all athletically related activities, regardless of the number of sports in which the student-athlete participates.

NCAA Division III Proposal Number 2016-4 (2-7).

Title: PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- ICE HOCKEY -- OFF ICE TRAINING

Effective Date: August 1, 2016.


Intent: To permit off-ice/dry-land training prior to the first permissible practice date while still keeping the 19 week length for the total ice hockey season.

Question No. 1: How does this proposal impact the length of the playing and practice season?

Answer: This proposal does not impact the length of the playing and practice season. The off-ice practice must still be included in the 19 week playing season.
Question No. 2: If this proposal is adopted, what is the first permissible practice date in men's and women's ice hockey?

Answer: The first off-ice practice may occur the first Monday in October and the first on-ice practice may occur on the third Monday in October. No athletically related activities may occur outside of the institution's declared 19 week playing season.

Question No 3: If this proposal is adopted, does the acclimatization period apply to off-ice practice?

Answer: No. The acclimatization period is specific to on-ice practices. If this proposal is adopted, student-athletes would not be required to undergo an acclimatization period prior to off-ice training but would continue to be required to participate in five on-ice practices, conducted on separate dates, prior to engaging in any outside competition.

Question No. 4: If this proposal is adopted, what is permissible during off-ice training?

Answer: The off-ice training may not occur on ice and may not occur before the first Monday in October. There are no other restrictions on the activities that may occur as part of off-ice training.

Question No. 5: If this proposal is adopted, and an institution chooses to conduct off-ice practice, can the institution redefine its week prior to beginning on-ice practice?

Answer: The institution may only redefine its week if the team takes seven consecutive days off from athletically related activity during a time frame that coincides with a vacation, final examination or holiday period. If these conditions don't exist, then an institution may not redefine its week.

NCAA Division III Proposal Number 2016-5 (2-5).

Title: PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS -- ATHLETICALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES -- EXCEPTIONS -- RESERVATION OF FACILITY BY CERTIFIED STRENGTH AND CONDITIONING COACH

Effective Date: Immediate.
Source: State University of New York Athletic Conference and New England Women's and Men's Athletic Conference and University Athletic Association.

Intent: To permit student-athletes to access a student-athlete only weight room outside of the declared playing and practice season. Additionally, to permit certified strength and conditioning personnel to reserve an institution's athletic facilities during the institution's regular academic year to conduct voluntary workouts for all student-athletes.

Question No. 1: Under the current rule, are student-athletes that are outside of their playing and practice season permitted to use facilities that are reserved exclusively for student-athletes?

Answer: No. Student-athletes may not use a facility that is reserved exclusively for student-athletes when they are not in-season. (See the September 24, 2015, blanket waiver identified in Question No. 2.)

Question No. 2: Under the current rule, what does the blanket waiver approved by the administrative committee on September 24, 2015 allow?

Answer: The administrative committee provided blanket relief from the application of Bylaw 17.02.1.1(i) and the official interpretation dated February 4, 2005 (Item No. 15b) through the conclusion of the 2016 NCAA Convention. Specifically, the blanket waiver allows student-athletes to access student-athlete only facilities outside of the playing and practice season until the close of the 2016 NCAA Convention Business Session. If the membership does not pass Proposal No. 2016-5, student-athletes would no longer be permitted to access facilities reserved exclusively for student-athletes outside of the playing and practice season.

Question No. 3: If this proposal is adopted, would student-athletes be permitted to access the student-athlete only weight room during the summer?

Answer: Yes.

[See Question No. 9 for issues related to reservation of a facility by a strength and conditioning coach during the summer.]

Question No. 4: If this proposal is adopted, is an institution required to charge the same fee for a student-athlete only weight room that the institution charges for its general use facility?
Answer: No. If this proposal is adopted, use of a student-athlete only weight room would be considered a permissible expense incidental to athletics participation; thus, the institution is not required to charge a fee for use of the student-athlete only weight room, even if the institution charges such a fee for use of its general facility.

Question No. 5: If this proposal is adopted, who is permitted to reserve an institutional athletic facility to conduct voluntary workouts for student-athletes outside of the declared playing and practice season?

Answer: This proposal only allows certified strength and conditioning personnel to reserve an institution's athletic facility outside of the declared playing and practice season. The certified strength and conditioning coach may reserve the facility for one or more of the institution's teams.

Question No. 6: Does this proposal allow a strength and conditioning coach who is not certified from a nationally recognized certification program to reserve an institutional athletic facility outside of the declared playing and practice season?

Answer: No. A noncertified strength and conditioning coach may monitor the athletic facility for safety purposes; however, a noncertified strength and conditioning coach may not reserve an institution's athletic facility outside of the declared playing and practice season.

Question No. 7: Does this proposal change the definition of a voluntary athletically related activity?

Answer: No. The definition of "voluntary" would remain the same. For any athletically related activity to be considered voluntary, all of the following conditions must be met: 1) the student-athlete must not be required to report back to any of his or her sport-specific coaches any information related to the activity. In addition, no athletics department staff member who observes, monitors or conducts the activity (e.g., strength coach, trainer, manager) may report back to the student-athlete's coach any information related to the activity; 2) the activity must be initiated solely by the student-athlete. Neither the institution nor any athletics department staff member may require the student-athlete to participate in the activity at any time; 3) the student-athlete's attendance and participation in the activity (or lack thereof) may not be recorded for the purposes of reporting such information to coaching staff members or other student-athletes; and 4) the student-athlete may not be subjected to penalty if he or she elects
not to participate in the activity. In addition, neither the institution nor any athletics department staff member may provide recognition or incentives (e.g., awards) to a student-athlete based on his or her attendance or performance in the activity.

**Question No. 8:** Does this proposal permit a certified strength and conditioning coach who is also a sport specific coach to reserve an athletic facility?

**Answer:** Yes. If the certified strength and conditioning coach is a sport specific coach, he/she must provide strength and conditioning services for all student-athletes.

**Question No. 9:** If this proposal is adopted, would it be permissible for the certified strength and conditioning coach to reserve an athletic facility over the summer?

**Answer:** No. The current legislation only allows a strength and conditioning coach to conduct voluntary workouts during the academic year and this proposal simply permits a strength and conditioning coach to reserve a facility to conduct those already permissible workouts. Thus, the strength and conditioning coach would not be permitted to reserve an athletics facility over the summer because he or she is precluded from conducting workouts over the summer.

**Question No. 10:** If this proposal is adopted, would a certified strength and conditioning coach be permitted to reserve a local fitness center instead of using their institution's weight room facilities?

**Answer:** No. This proposal only allows a certified strength and conditioning coach to reserve institutional athletic facilities.

**Question No. 11:** If this proposal is adopted, would a certified strength and conditioning coach be permitted to reserve an athletic facility for workouts that the strength and conditioning coach will not be conducting?

**Answer:** No. This proposal only allows a certified strength and conditioning coach to reserve an athletic facility to conduct voluntary workouts for student-athletes. The strength and conditioning coach would not be permitted to reserve an athletic facility for student-athletes to use other than during those voluntary workouts.
NCAA Division III Proposal Number 2016-6 (2-4).

Title: PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS -- ATHLETICALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES -- EXCEPTION FOR INSTITUTIONAL FUNDRAISERS INVOLVING ATHLETICS ABILITY

Effective Date: Immediate.

Source: Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and University Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit student-athletes to participate in out-of-season institutional fundraising activities involving athletics ability, provided participation in the activity is voluntary and the activity is open to any and all entrants.

Question No. 1: What does this proposal allow that is currently prohibited?

Answer: This proposal would allow student-athletes to "participate" in institutional fundraising events outside their playing season which include the use of athletics ability to obtain funds, provided: (1) participation is voluntary; (2) the event is open to any all entrants; and (3) the student-athletes receive approval from the institution's chancellor or president (or his or her designee).

[Note: "Participate" includes: (a) working the event in any capacity (student-athletes are currently permitted to work the event, provided they do not use athletic ability); (b) using athletics ability to obtain funds (e.g., using a golf student-athlete for a closest to the pin challenge); and (c) being a participant in the event (e.g., running in an institutional 5K, participating in a foursome in a golf outing).]

Question No. 2: What are examples of activities that are currently impermissible and would continue to be impermissible even if the proposal passes?

Answer: Swim-a-thons, lift-a-thons, and other activities that are limited to a specific team or group of student-athletes would still not be permitted outside the defined playing season.

The proposal would not allow competition or practice under the guise of a fundraising activity. Student-athletes would continue to only be permitted to represent the institution in outside competition during the declared playing and practice season. Additionally, coaching staff members would continue to be precluded from assessing or providing instruction to
student-athletes outside of the playing season. For example, if an athletics department conducted a 3 on 3 basketball tournament, basketball student-athletes would continue to be precluded from participating in that activity.

The current legislation permits student-athletes to engage in competition-type events that are being administered outside of athletics and do not benefit athletics. The current legislation also permits a student-athlete to participate in a competition-type fundraising activity conducted by the athletics department if the activity is in a sport other than the sport in which the student-athlete participates. For example, a football student-athlete could participate in a volleyball tournament that benefits the volleyball program. These examples would continue to be permissible under the proposal.

Question No. 3: If this proposal is adopted, would there be restrictions on who may organize the fundraising activity?

Answer: No. If this proposal is adopted, student-athletes may voluntarily participate in any fundraising activity that meets the criteria outlined above. Coaches, however, would continue to be precluded from assessing or providing instruction to student-athletes during their participation in the fundraising activity.

Question No. 4: If this proposal is adopted, would there be limits on the number of fundraisers in which a student-athlete may participate?

Answer: No.

Question No. 5: What does it mean for a fundraising event to be "open to anyone"?

Answer: The fundraising event may not be limited to a specific group of individuals and anyone is permitted to register and participate in the event.

Question No. 6: Does this proposal allow student-athletes to participate in institutional fundraising events during the summer?

Answer: Yes.

Question No. 7: If this proposal is adopted and a student-athlete uses athletics ability to obtain funds, would the institution be permitted to designate those funds for that particular student-athlete?
Answer: No. An institution may only designate specific funds if those funds are considered "earned" funds. Funds are considered "unearned" when a student-athlete participates in a fundraising event involving athletically related activity. As a result, funds received from this type of fundraiser would be considered "unearned" and could not be designated.

Question No. 8: Does this proposal allow prospective student-athletes to participate in institutional fundraising events in the summer before classes begin?

Answer: Currently all individuals (including prospective student-athletes) are permitted to participate in an institution's open event, even if that event is being conducted for the purpose of raising funds and involves the use of athletics ability; this participation would continue to be permitted with the adoption of the proposal. Otherwise, a prospective student-athlete may not be involved in an institutional fundraiser unless he or she has graduated from high school and has forwarded the paid acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid; in that case, the prospective student-athlete may be involved in a fundraising event to the same extent as current student-athletes.

NCAA Division III Proposal Number 2016-7 (2-3).

Title: RECRUITING - CONTACTS AND EVALUATIONS -- CONTACT RESTRICTIONS AT SPECIFIED SITES -- PRACTICE OR COMPETITION SITE -- EXCEPTION FOR ON-CAMPUS CONTACT

Effective Date: Immediate.

Source: Upper Midwest Athletic Conference, North Coast Athletic Conference, Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and North Atlantic Conference.

Intent: To permit institutional coaching staff members to have contact with a prospective student-athlete on a day of competition prior to the competition, provided that contact occurs on the institution's campus and the institution's campus is not the competition site.

Question No. 1: Under the current legislation, what is the rule regarding contact with a prospective student-athlete on the day of competition?

Answer: A coach may not have recruiting contact with a prospective student-athlete on any day of athletics competition in which the prospective student-athlete is a participant until the prospective student-athlete has completed
the day's competition and is released for that day by the appropriate authority (e.g., prospective student-athlete's coach or comparable authority).

Question No. 2: If this proposal is adopted, and the contest occurs on the institution's campus, is the institution's coach permitted to have contact with the prospective student-athlete before the competition?

Answer: No. This proposal only allows a coach to have contact with a prospective student-athlete on the institution's campus before competition if the competition occurs at a site other than the institution's campus.

Question No. 3: If this proposal is adopted and a prospective student-athlete is competing in the locale of a member institution, is the institution's coach permitted to meet with the prospective student-athlete off-campus (e.g., at a local restaurant, at the prospective student-athlete's hotel, etc.) prior to competition?

Answer: No. This proposal only allows a coach to have contact with a prospective student-athlete on the institution's campus on the day of competition prior to competition.

Question No. 4: Does this proposal allow a prospective student-athlete to engage in an official or unofficial visit if the prospective student-athlete will be competing on the institution's campus?

Answer: A coach would not be permitted to have contact with a prospective student-athlete that is competing on the institution's campus until after the prospective student-athlete has completed competition for the day and has been released by the appropriate authorities. This restriction would apply regardless of whether a prospective student-athlete is engaging in an official or unofficial visit.

NCAA Division III Proposal Number 2016-8 (2-8).

Title: CHAMPIONSHIPS INELIGIBILITY FOR USE OF BANNED DRUGS -- ELIMINATION OF REINSTATEMENT REQUIREMENT

Effective Date: August 1, 2016, for all drug tests administered on or after August 1, 2016.

Source: NCAA Division III Management Council (Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement).
Intent: To eliminate the requirement that the eligibility of a student-athlete must be restored by the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement after he or she has fulfilled a drug-testing penalty and has tested negative in accordance with the testing methods authorized by the NCAA Board of Governors.

Question No. 1: Under the current rule, how is a student-athlete reinstated after having a positive drug test?

Answer: Drug Free Sport is responsible for the general administration of the drug-testing program. Upon discovery that a test contains a positive finding, Drug Free Sport informs the institution. Once the institution has accepted the student-athlete's positive finding, legislation dictates the applicable penalty. If an institution would like the student-athlete's eligibility to be restored, the student-athlete must first serve the legislated penalty and test negative. An institution must schedule the exit test through Drug Free Sport (the exact timing of the exit test is communicated by Drug Free Sport). After the student-athlete has fulfilled the legislated penalty and tests negative, the institution shall request reinstatement through the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement. The Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement automatically reinstates the student-athlete, provided the student-athlete has fulfilled the legislated penalty and tested negative.

Question No. 2: If this proposal is adopted, how will this change the process for future positive drug tests?

Answer: The student-athlete will still be required to serve the legislated penalty. After the student-athlete has fulfilled the penalty, the institution can schedule a follow-up test for the student-athlete through Drug Free Sport. Upon confirmation that the student-athlete has tested negative, the student-athlete will be eligible for competition.

Question No. 3: If this proposal is adopted, what type of documentation must an institution keep on file when a student-athlete has a positive drug test?

Answer: An institution is not legislatively required to maintain documentation. The institution is responsible for certifying the student-athlete's eligibility and should follow institutional certification practices to verify that any student-athlete who has tested positive fulfills the legislated requirements for regaining eligibility.

Question No. 4: If this proposal is adopted, what happens when an institution allows a student-athlete to compete prior to completing the exit test?
Answer: Currently and if this proposal is adopted, a student-athlete who has previously tested positive for a banned substance and competes prior to fulfilling the legislated penalty and retesting negative would be considered to have competed while ineligible and must seek reinstatement through the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement.

NCAA Division III Proposal Number 2016-9 (2-10).

Title: EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS -- CONFERENCE AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS PROVISIONAL AND RECLASSIFYING MEMBER INSTITUTIONS

Effective Date: September 1, 2016.

Source: NCAA Division III Management Council (Championships Committee).

Intent: To specify that institutions in years three and four of the NCAA Division III provisional and reclassifying membership process may count toward the requisite number of conference members necessary to begin the two-year waiting period before a multisport or single-sport conference is eligible for automatic qualification for NCAA championships.

Question No. 1: If this proposal is adopted, would there be any effect on the grace period in addition to the waiting period?

Answer: No. This proposal does not have any impact on the grace period and only applies to the waiting period for conferences establishing a new automatic qualification.

Question No. 2: Under this proposal, what happens if a provisional or reclassifying member does not become an active member after the two-year waiting period?

Answer: If the provisional or reclassifying member is one of the seven conference members required for the conference to be eligible for the automatic qualification, the conference would not receive the automatic qualification at the conclusion of the two-year waiting period. The conference would not be eligible for the automatic qualification until the two-year waiting period has been satisfied and the conference has seven active member institutions.
As an example:

2015-16 year: Conference has six active members and one provisional member in its third year. The conference can begin year one of the two year waiting period.

2016-17: Conference now has same six active members and the provisional member is now in its fourth year. The conference can enter the second year of the two year waiting period.

2017-18: The conference's provisional member is required to repeat year four of the provisional membership process. The conference, does not get the Automatic Qualification.

2018-19: The provisional member is granted active status. The conference has the same six active and the newly active seventh member and therefore will receive the Automatic Qualification.

Question No. 3: Can a conference satisfy the two-year waiting period with all members being provisional or reclassifying institutions?

Answer: No. To satisfy the waiting period at least four of the seven members have to be core members. Per Bylaw 31.3.3.1.4, core members have to be active Division III member institutions. Consequently, four of the seven members must be active member institutions as opposed to provisional or reclassifying members.

NCAA Division III Proposal Number 2016-10 (2-9).

Title: DIVISION MEMBERSHIP -- DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS -- SPORTS SPONSORSHIP -- MINIMUM CONTESTS AND PARTICIPANTS REQUIREMENTS FOR GOLF

Effective Date: Immediate.

Source: Centennial Conference, Landmark Conference, Middle Atlantic Conference and Presidents' Athletic Conference.

Intent: To reduce the minimum number of participants for sports sponsorship in the sport of golf from five to four.
Question No. 1: If this proposal is adopted, how many participants are necessary to complete a golf contest to meet the minimum sport sponsorship requirement?

Answer: Four. To meet the minimum sport sponsorship requirement, four players must complete an 18-hole round. For purposes of the 2015-16 academic year, the Championships Committee has approved a waiver to allow institutions to compete with four participants in women's golf (rather than the currently legislated five) and still be eligible for championships consideration.

Question: No. 2: If one of the four players withdraws from the contest due to an injury and only three players complete the contest, would the round still count as a completed contest?

Answer: No. Current golf playing rules require that, in order for a golf contest to count, four participants must start and complete the 18-hole round. NCAA legislation requires that an institution complete a contest with the minimum number of participants per the playing rule in order for the contest to be counted for sports sponsorship.

Question No. 3: If this proposal is adopted, can more than four participants still travel, participate during practice rounds and compete in the golf contest during the playing and practice season?

Answer: Yes. The sport sponsorship legislation governs only the minimum number of participants required to count a contest for sport sponsorship purposes. This proposal does not impact the playing rules and does not dictate the number of players an institution may carry on its roster or compete in a contest.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>DIVISION III</th>
<th>ASSOCIATION-WIDE</th>
<th>ROOM LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, January 14</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 to 9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>PC/MC/SAAC Breakfast [Must be a member of these committees to attend]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marriott Rivercenter Ballroom Salons G, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 a.m. to 5 p.m.</td>
<td>ADR Institute [Invitation only]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marriott Rivercenter Ballroom Salons K-L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 to 9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Division III Education Session: Student-Athlete Well-Being and Mental Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry B Gonzalez Convention Center Room 214CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 to 11:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Division III Education Session: Integrating Athletics and Strengthening the FAR’s Role</td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry B Gonzalez Convention Center Room 217 C-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 a.m. to 2 p.m.</td>
<td>Division III Presidents Council Meeting [Must be a member of this committee to attend]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marriott Rivercenter Ballroom Salons G, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keynote Luncheon</td>
<td>Henry B Gonzalez Convention Center Ballroom 2C-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Division III Chancellor/President Engagement Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry B Gonzalez Convention Center Room 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 to 4 p.m.</td>
<td>Division III Education Session: Addressing Sexual Misconduct (NADIIIAA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry B Gonzalez Convention Center Room 217 A-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 to 4 p.m.</td>
<td>Divisions III and II Presidential Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry B Gonzalez Convention Center Ballroom A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 to 6 p.m.</td>
<td>[Doors open at 4:15 p.m.]</td>
<td>Opening Business Session</td>
<td>Henry B Gonzalez Convention Center Lila Cockrell Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Delegates Reception</td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry B Gonzalez Convention Center Grotto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday, January 15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 8 a.m.</td>
<td>Delegates Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marriott Rivercenter Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 to 11:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Division III Issues Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marriott Rivercenter Ballroom Salons A-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 a.m. to 2 p.m.</td>
<td>Presidents/Chancellors Luncheon and Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marriott Rivercenter Ballroom Salons H, K, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Conference Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Provisional/Reclassifying Educational Session [Must be a member of this group to attend]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marriott Rivercenter Conference Room 17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 to 5:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NCAA Presidents and Chancellors Reception</td>
<td>Henry B Gonzalez Convention Center Lonesome Dove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 9 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honors Celebration</td>
<td>Henry B Gonzalez Convention Center Ballroom C1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saturday, January 16</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 8 a.m.</td>
<td>Delegates Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marriott Rivercenter Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 to 11 a.m.</td>
<td>Division III Business Session</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marriott Rivercenter Ballroom Salons A-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon to 1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>NADIIIAA Reception</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marriott Rivercenter Ballroom Salons H, K, L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA

National Collegiate Athletic Association
NCAA Chancellors and Presidents Engagement Program

TBA January 14, 2016
San Antonio, TX 1 to 2:30 p.m.

1. Welcome.

2. Association-wide general session.
   a. Membership.
   b. National office.
   c. Divisional overview.
   d. Budget/revenue distribution.
   e. Governance.
   f. Academics.
   g. Championships.
   h. Enforcement/Committee on Infractions.

3. Divisional breakout sessions with peer chancellors and presidents.

4. Adjournment.
The National Collegiate Athletic Association

2016 Convention Division II & Division III Presidential Programming:
The Athletics Value-Add: Effective Communication and Budgeting

Henry B. Gonzalez Convention Center
Ballroom A
Thursday, January 14, 2016
2:30 to 4 p.m.

Moderators: Division II President – Cheryl Norton, Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania.
Division III President – Jeffrey Docking, Adrian College.

2:30 to 3:10 p.m. 1. Session One: Using Athletics to Tell the Institution’s Story.

- Celebrating athletics success stories as a way of communicating the institution’s story.
- Take advantage of technology to reach more audiences and expand your messaging.
- Using social media to manage costs.
- Marketing/promotion of athletics – making athletics the “front door” to campus by staging special events.

Questions for roundtable discussion:

- How do institutions use social media to contain costs while simultaneously reaching a greater audience?
- How do you ensure that your college/university relations and athletics communications (sports information) units are collaborating to tell the institution’s story? Are your student-athletes part of that story?
- What about athletics attracts your local or regional media to your story? Share examples of strategies you use to get your story out there.
3:10 to 3:50 p.m.  2.  Session Two: Budgeting to Add Value Rather Than Cut Costs.

- How athletics contributes to enrollment and student retention.
- How adding athletics programs results in a positive return on investment.
- Why a robust athletics program is a wise business model for your institution.
- How to determine the real value of athletics at Divisions II and III colleges and universities.

Questions for roundtable discussion:

- Does the Return on Investment (ROI) model work on your campus? Do you use this model? Why or why not?
- What extracurricular activities work best on your campus with respect to ROI, recruiting, growing your students enrollment and enhancing the campus culture?
- Would Division II and Division III institutions benefit from a more focused and aggressive marketing campaign to promote the positive role that athletics plays on these campuses?
- What is the downside of adding athletics teams on your campus? What do we need to worry about? Are there negative unintended consequences to expanding our athletics offerings and facilities?

3:50 to 4 p.m.  3.  Concluding remarks.

Available Resources:

1.  Best Practices for Athletics Communicators in Divisions II and III.
2.  Division II Chancellors and Presidents Oversight Summary, and Facts and Figures
National Collegiate Athletic Association

Joint Meeting of the Division III Presidents Council,
Management Council and Student-Athlete Advisory Committee

Marriott Rivercenter
Conference Room 17-18
January 14, 2016
7:30 to 9:30 a.m.

8 a.m. 1. Opening remarks. [Al Cureton, Lori Runksmeier and Amanda Ingersoll]

8:10 a.m. 2. SAAC report on key issues. [Domenic Fraboni and Ingersoll]
   a. Update on Its On Us initiative.
   b. Voice of student-athlete video.

8:20 a.m. 3. 2016 legislative proposals. [Ashley Fallon]
   a. Committee position.
   b. Questions and answers.

8:40 a.m. 4. Round table discussions. [All attendees, led by Taryn Stromback]
   a. Wagering on daily fantasy sports.
   b. Empowering students to approach campus leadership – defining the proper role of SAAC in on-campus communication efforts.
   c. Potential of conference SAAC representative from all 43 multisport Division III conferences attending Convention.

9:25 a.m. 5. Adjournment. [Fraboni]
AGENDA

The National Collegiate Athletic Association

2016 Division III Issues Forum

Marriott Rivercenter  January 15, 2016
Ballroom Salon A-F  8 to 11:15 a.m.

8 to 8:10 a.m.  1. Welcome and Overview.  [Al Cureton, president, University of Northwestern]

8:10 to 8:30 a.m.  2. 2016 Legislative Proposals.  [Jeff Myers, director of academic and membership affairs for Division III, and Sarah Otey, associate director of academic and membership affairs for Division III]

8:30 to 9:10 a.m.  3. Working Group Updates.

a. Sportsmanship and Game Environment Working Group.  [Gary Williams, athletics director, Wittenberg University]

b. Diversity and Inclusion Working Group.  [Dennis Shields, chancellor, University of Wisconsin Platteville and Heather Benning, executive director of the Midwest Conference]

9:10 to 11:10 a.m.  4. Roundtable Discussions.

• Playing and Practice Seasons Review.  [Chris Ragsdale, commissioner, Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference]

11:10 to 11:15 a.m.  5. Final Remarks.  [Cureton]

11:15 a.m.  6. Adjournment.
AGENDA

The National Collegiate Athletic Association

Division III Presidents and Chancellors Luncheon and Forum

Marriott Rivercenter
Ballroom Salon H, K, L

January 15, 2016
11:30 a.m. to 2 p.m.

11:30 a.m. 1. Lunch served.

11:45 to Noon 2. Welcome and remarks. [Al Cureton, president, University of Northwestern]

Noon to 1:45 p.m. 3. Roundtable discussions.
   a. Board of Governors update. [Kirk Schultz, president, Kansas State University and Board of Governors chair]
   b. Division I Governance restructuring. [Mark Emmert, NCAA president]
   c. Association-wide updates and impact on Division III.
      • NCAA communication plan. [Bob Williams, senior vice president, Communications]
      • Evolving health and safety policies. [John Parsons, director, Sports Science Institute]

1:45 to 1:55 p.m. 4. Open forum.

1:55 to 2 p.m. 5. Closing remarks. [Cureton]

2 p.m. 6. Adjournment.
AGENDA

The National Collegiate Athletic Association

2016 Division III Business Session

Marriott Rivercenter
Salons A-F

January 16, 2016
8 to 11 a.m.

8 to 8:05 a.m. 1. Welcome and Announcements. [Al Cureton, president, University of Northwestern]

8:05 to 8:20 a.m. 2. Financial Aid Annual Reporting Changes. [Rob Coleman, athletics director, Whittier College]

8:20 to 8:30 a.m. 3. National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) “It’s On Us” initiative and video. [Dominic Fraboni, SAAC vice chair, Concordia College, Moorhead]

8:30 to 8:45 a.m. 4. Acceptance of Convention Notice and Program. [Cureton]

8:45 to 10:15 a.m. 5. Voting on Presidential and General Groupings. [Cureton and Lori Runksmeier, athletics director, Eastern Connecticut State University]

10:15 to 10:20 a.m. 6. Election of New Management Council Members. [Kiki Jacobs, associate athletics director, Springfield College]

10:20 to 10:35 a.m. 7. BREAK.

10:35 to 10:50 a.m. 8. Window of Reconsideration. [Runksmeier]

10:50 to 11:05 a.m. 9. Open Forum

11:05 a.m. 10. Closing Remarks. [Cureton]

11:15 a.m. 11. Adjournment.
ACTION ITEMS.

- None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. Opening remarks. NCAA Vice President of Division III Dan Dutcher and NCAA Chief Medical Officer Brian Hainline welcomed participants and reviewed the summit’s purpose and desired outcomes.

   The Division III governance staff, in collaboration with the Sport Science Institute, convened presidents, athletics administrators, general counsel/risk management specialists, faculty athletics representatives, coaches, student-athletes and sports medicine personnel from a diverse collection of Division III institutions and conferences to discuss the issues, challenges, and opportunities related to delivering optimum athletics healthcare programs for all Division III institutions, which have varying levels of resources.

   The summit was a result of the Division III governance staff conferring with the Sport Science Institute regarding the challenges faced by Division III member institutions to provide a healthy and safe environment for student-athletes through acceptable athletic health care administration. The summit also aimed to address a concern heard from the Division III sports medicine community, which is challenged with staying abreast of the changing health & safety landscape. Significant national changes in recent years have had a requisite effect at the campus level. Legislation and policy may not always be the appropriate approach in affecting change; as such, requirements place additional stress on Division III institutions that may not have the infrastructure and personnel in place to meet the increased expectations.

   The summit took additional importance, given impending changes in the education of athletic trainers. Beginning in 2022, the Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (CAATE) is requiring all aspiring athletic trainers to obtain a master’s degree to enter the profession. Athletic training students will no longer be able to earn their requisite didactic and clinical experiences at the baccalaureate level. This change is significant, since many colleges and universities currently employ athletic trainers with baccalaureate degrees as graduate assistants while they work toward completion of a master’s degree at the institution. The new education standard will disrupt this practice.

2. Goals. The attendees discussed the summit’s goal, which was to discuss the issues identified above and find common ground upon which the division can build a strategic agenda and best practices (and legislation, if needed) that institutions can apply independent of resources, to provide optimum athletic health care administration to assure the health and safety of student-athletes.
3. **Discussion of priority areas.** The Sport Science Institute staff outlined the following four “priority areas” within the current health and safety agenda for summit participants to address via roundtable discussion and reporting-out. Participants were asked to review each priority area with an eye toward financial, personnel and facility challenges, and what the NCAA national office, Sport Science Institute, and the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports (CSMAS) could do to help mitigate challenges.

a. **Concussion management.**

   (1) **Background:** Properly diagnosing and managing concussion has become a national priority at all levels of sport. In January 2015, the five Division I conferences with autonomy in student-athlete well-being matters passed [Concussion Safety Protocol Legislation](#) that requires schools to submit a concussion safety protocol to the [Concussion Safety Protocol Committee](#) – also created by the Division I legislation – for review. The protocol must be consistent with the [Inter-Association Consensus: Diagnosis and Management of Sport-Related Concussion Guidelines](#). Of note, the Inter-Association Consensus document is likely to be updated because of emerging data from the landmark NCAA – United States Department of Defense Grand Alliance concussion study and the upcoming Second Safety in College Football Summit in February 2016. This study attempts to definitely establish the natural history of concussion, which could advance future effectiveness of concussion diagnosis, management, and treatment strategies.

   (2) **Roundtable discussion:** Summit participants noted that health professionals don’t yet understand the natural history of concussion or the neurobiological recovery of concussion, which complicates the return-to-play protocol for personnel managing student-athletes who have suffered a concussion. This knowledge gap also taxes the relationship between sports medicine personnel and faculty regarding when student-athletes who have suffered a concussion are ready to return to class (the “return-to-learn” protocol). The majority of conversation focused on the personnel implications to address concussion in a manner consistent with the Inter-Association Consensus document. For example, attendees noted that Division III utilizes more part-time coaches than other divisions, which creates challenges because these coaches tend to have less knowledge and awareness of concussion protocols and practices. In addition, the relatively small athletic training staffs can make timely completion of the multi-dimensional baseline testing components very difficult. For example, balance testing can be particularly challenging, so some skip it, or take several months to accomplish it.

   (3) **Potential action:** There was broad support that legislating an administrative day within Bylaw 17 (Playing and Practice Seasons), which would not allow
coach meetings or count against practice days, may help ease some of the time and personnel challenges, although several attendees felt that one day may not be enough. Such a day could work well in August for the fall sports, but is not as effective throughout the rest of the academic year for the start of other sport seasons. Participants agreed that an administrative day would be easier if the SSI staff provided a checklist and other strategic tools. It was also noted that costs associated with bringing students in a day or two earlier can create an additional financial burden. Lastly, the athletic trainers argued for a single, non-moveable date for the beginning of the fall non-traditional sport segment for the spring sports. The later that date, the more room they have to dispense with the administrative needs of the traditional fall sports that are already underway.

b. **Cardiovascular care.**

(1) Background: The NCAA convened a multidisciplinary task force in September 2014 to address cardiovascular care for college student-athletes. The primary focus was sudden cardiac death and the utility of screening, with or without electrocardiogram (ECG). The task force ultimately proposed an Inter-Association Consensus document, similar to the approach used for concussion management. The document has received important endorsements from key medical organizations and will be published in the spring of 2016. Summit participants reviewed a draft of the consensus document.

(2) Roundtable discussion: Several of the attendees noted efforts to standardize their pre-participation examination (PPE) requirements with those from their student health centers. This strategy was identified in an effort to mitigate the potential impact of having sports medicine have sole responsibility to increasing standards. There was discussion about the difference between physicals generated within the college/university versus those done by outside providers. There was also considerable discussion about the difficulties that arise when a PPE leads to the need for follow-up cardiac care; in these situations, variations in student insurance pose a significant obstacle. Division III schools cannot provide insurance to athletes if they are not also doing so for non-athlete students. The potential benefit of having physician oversight of this process was also discussed, though several attendees commented on how this would lead to a necessary change in the relationship of the physician to the school in a way that is not currently common across the division.

(3) Potential action: Although additional legislative interpretation is required, it may be possible for Division III schools to pay for medical services arising as incidental to participation. Most felt that at a minimum, specific guidance
from the NCAA about standardized components of a PPE would be helpful. Also of interest was coaching education about emergency response protocols and their role in ensuring adequate institutional response capabilities.

c. **Mental health and wellness.**

   (1) **Background:** While there are insufficient data to guide the appropriate level of mental health care for student-athletes, mental health occurs on a continuum, and that mental health should not be *apart from*, but rather *a part of*, student-athlete health care. The challenges involved with mental health include identification and help-seeking, as well as access to appropriate care. The Sport Science Institute convened a task force in 2013 to discuss mental health as it relates to athletics healthcare. As a result, the task force published a resource called “Mind, Body and Sport,” which is a collection of articles and essays that provide resources and best practices for NCAA member institutions in all divisions. The task force also developed an inter-association best-practices document that has received widespread endorsement, and that will be rolled out in January 2016.

   (2) **Roundtable discussion:** There was broad agreement that across the division there is an overwhelming need for mental health services, and that to date; institutions have been largely unprepared for the dramatic increase in the need for mental health services. Those counseling centers that do exist are overwhelmed, and typically do not have the resources to be available to the student population on a 24/7 basis. Some attendees felt there was a need for an honest discussion of limitations, and that a certain level of mental health services was beyond what many Division III member institutions can be expected to provide. There was also recognition that most PPEs do not incorporate mental health screens and that many institutions have not made mental health a standard part of their emergency action plans (EAPs). The participants acknowledged a role for the NCAA to play in providing guidance on mental health issues for all students and not just for student-athletes.

   (3) **Potential action:** The educational resources must be widely available and easy to access and implement especially targeting coaches and athletic trainers. Efforts should also be made to identify standard mental health screening tools for inclusion in PPEs. Lastly, guidance for the incorporation of mental health emergencies into existing EAPs should also be widely disseminated.

d. **Drug testing and deterrence.**

   (1) **Background:** The NCAA conducts year-round testing in Divisions I and II for performance-enhancing drugs, and at all NCAA championships. Such testing
has been a proven deterrent for “doping” and is considered one potentially effective protection option of student-athlete health and safety interests. The NCAA drug-testing program also includes testing at championships in all three divisions for recreational drugs (specifically, marijuana and heroin). Recent debate has focused on whether these “street drugs” should continue to be included in NCAA testing, since they are not known to enhance performance.

(2) Roundtable discussion: Summit participants did not agree about the degree of performance enhancing drug (PED) use by Division III student athletes. While the assumption is that use is lower given the less public platform of Division III sports, several medical professionals in the group disagreed based on their clinical experience with student-athlete PED use. There was also debate about who was ultimately responsible for creating a deterrent – the NCAA or the individual institution? Several attendees argued that the NCAA tests too infrequently at championships to create a deterrent impact and that only year-round testing would satisfy a deterrent goal. But others questioned whether a strategy similar to Divisions I and II would be financially viable and if it was consistent with the Division III philosophy. Lastly, most attendees acknowledge that recreational drug use and alcohol use were bigger health threats to both student-athletes and to the broader student population than PEDs. Many also expressed concern about nutritional supplement use, especially with the fact that strength and conditioning coaches were frequent sources of such supplements.

(3) Potential action: The epidemiologic research around PED use by Division III student-athletes must be reviewed and improved where necessary. In addition, strategies for making performance-enhancing drug testing at NCAA championships a more effective deterrent should also be identified. Lastly, participants agreed that a bio-psycho-social medical model and evidence-based educational platforms, such as 360 Proof, should be emphasized as a management platform for alcohol and other recreational drugs.

4. Discussion of minimum requirements for Division III student-athlete health and safety. While summit participants reviewed the four priority areas via roundtable discussion and reporting out, the entire group spent a good portion of the summit discussing overall expectations for Division III health and safety programs moving forward, and how the Division III governance staff and Sport Science Institute can help in that regard. Participants used the following questions to help frame the discussion:
a. What should the delivery of athletics health care look like five years from now?
b. What does Division III need to do now in order to be well positioned in five years to maximize athletics health care delivery efforts?
c. What checklists are necessary, and what measures should be taken to monitor compliance?
d. What education do sports medicine providers need and how best to deliver it?
e. What resources can be shared now and in the future?
f. How does the division determine funding priorities?

Consideration of these questions prompted a broad philosophical debate about the nature and scope of obligations to health and safety that a member institution accepts when sponsoring athletics. The discussion highlighted the unique resource pressures that exist for most Division III schools, and the difficult decision-making and resource prioritization that must occur in the current resource environment. Participants also identified a need to increasingly engage college/university presidents in the types of discussions that arose during the summit so they could develop a better understanding of the issues and could help prioritize resources in a way that would enhance health and safety efforts. Out of this discussion, three priority themes emerged:

a. **Director of Medical Services.** Participants agreed that the idea of a Director of Medical Services at every school was worth exploring in more detail. This person would have responsibility for overseeing legislative requirements and/or best practices, as well as for directing other members of the sports medicine staff. Some guidance may be necessary to help member institutions identify the characteristics of an “ideal” Director of Medical Services to satisfy the obligations identified above. Importantly, the group felt this person should be autonomous from athletics. Where possible, the Director of Medical Services should be aligned with on-campus health centers. There may have to be several models to suit the diversity of Division III institutions and their resources.

b. **Model Care Protocol Template.** Develop template protocols for model care and make widely available to the Division III membership. The value of these templates is that they would greatly assist the athletic training staffs, many of which are understaffed, in standardizing and implementing protocols that are known to be effective. An example of such a template is the concussion protocol and related checklist that is currently being utilized in Division I.
c. **Delay Start of Fall Non-Traditional Segment.** In late August/early September, sports medicine staff must prioritize the needs of traditional segment sports (e.g. football, soccer). The start of the fall non-traditional season (e.g. spring sports like baseball and softball) creates an additional time and resource challenge for the sports medicine staff. Committing to a single date for the start of the fall non-traditional season, and having that date as late as reasonably possible, would provide an important buffer for sports medicine personnel who attend to the preparation and screening requirements of fall traditional athletes until well into September.

5. **Closing remarks.** The summit concluded with a collective commitment to seek continuous improvement in athletics healthcare delivery and to tailor best practices and policies specifically to benefit the Division III membership. While many challenges exist in this regard, summit participants resolved to keep student-athlete health and safety as a top priority moving forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Troy Banse, Gustavus Adolphus College; Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Baudo, State University College at Fredonia; State University of New York Athletic Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Chillo, Newbury College; South Atlantic Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Corey, Olivet College; Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Curtin, Alfred University; Empire 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Eilbacher, Guilford College; Old Dominion Athletic Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrest Karr, Northern Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Gardiner, Southern Athletic Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny Griffin, Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Peluso, Middlebury College; New England Small College Athletic Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Emigh Mitchell, Grove City College; Presidents’ Athletic Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Newell, Kenyon College; North Coast Athletic Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Railey, Stevenson University; Middle Atlantic Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Rozen, University of Rochester; University Athletic Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Runksmeier, Eastern Connecticut State University; Little East Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Saltzman, Rosemont College; Colonial States Athletic Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanna Tyson, North Atlantic Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Ward, Landmark Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Warren, Defiance College; Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Wujciak, Kean University; New Jersey Athletic Conference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Guests in Attendance:**

**NCAA Staff Support in Attendance:**
- Dawn Buth, Sport Science Institute.
- Jessica Duff, Division III governance.
- Dan Dutcher, Division III governance.
- Brian Hainline, Sport Science Institute.
- Jay Jones, DIII governance.
- Louise McCleary, Division III governance.
- John Parsons, Sport Science Institute.

**Other NCAA Staff Members in Attendance:**
- Scott Bearby, legal counsel.
- Eric Hartung, research.
- Jeff Myers, academic and membership affairs.
- Sarah Otey, academic and membership affairs.
- Naima Stevenson, legal counsel.
The goals of these best practices are three-fold:

1. Enhance communication between chancellors and presidents and conference commissioners;
2. Clearly define the role of each group within the Division III governance structure; and
3. Effectively engage chancellors and presidents in the decision-making process.

Onboarding – Commissioners should set up a one-on-one meeting with any new chancellor or president to discuss structure, philosophy, and expectations within the conference. The onboarding of new chancellors and presidents to the conference can prove to be beneficial for all. Setting up an additional meeting time prior to an in-person meeting or scheduling a call to discuss the following topics and best practices can increase communication and engagement of the commissioner and presidential members. Chancellors and presidents may also consider gathering the following information in preparation for not only the on-boarding meeting but for an on-going basis, too.

Commissioners:
- History of the conference.
- Philosophy and mission statement.
- Structure (including to whom the commissioner reports).
- Budget and strategic plan.
- Membership requirements and obligations.
- Roles of commissioner and board members.
- Roles of other key conference groups such as faculty athletics representatives, senior woman administrators, coaches and Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.
- Logistical items such as board meeting dates and travel expectations.
- Conference-sponsored sports and championships.
- Key conference issues.

Chancellors and presidents:
- Athletic department’s philosophy and mission statement.
- Budget and strategic plan.
- Personnel roles and effectiveness, especially the faculty athletics representative, Title IX coordinator and coaches.
- Key topics for the school, conference, Division III and the NCAA.
- Student-Athlete Advisory Committee role on campus.
- Student-athlete well-being.
- Academics.
- Athletic performance.
2. **Conference involvement** – Conferences should meet with their chancellors and presidents an average of three times annually. Data from the 2015-16 Division III Conference Commissioner Survey shows that conferences are meeting with their presidents, on average, twice in-person and once via teleconference on an annual basis. Keeping the following areas top-of-mind can be beneficial for elevating conference communication and involvement between commissioners and chancellors and presidents during these meetings.

**Commissioners:**
- Roles and expectations for presidents, athletics direct reports and the directors of athletics.
- Conference budget and revenue distributions.
- Substructure and engagement of members.
- Key conference and NCAA matters.

**Chancellors and presidents:**
- Review key athletics topics with athletics direct reports and the directors of athletics.
- Engage the commissioner on a regular basis.
- Be an active voice in conference substructures.

3. **NCAA involvement** – If a chancellor or president is serving in the NCAA governance structure, the chancellor or president should communicate issues of presidential importance to their conference peers and the commissioner after the meetings. At least 30 Division III chancellors and presidents serve on committees at the national level annually. Additional engagement opportunities are also available such as the President’s Advisory Group and other topical working groups. Regular conversations between commissioners and chancellors and presidents regarding the following involvement with the NCAA are encouraged.

**Commissioners:**
- Committee openings.
- Best ways to communicate key divisional and national information.

**Chancellors and presidents:**
- Areas to consider regarding higher education.
- Feedback from athletics direct reports, directors of athletics and faculty athletics representatives.
- Feedback from student-athletes.
- If serving on a committee, volunteer to provide updates to other committees to increase engagement.
4. **Communications** – Commissioners should highlight issues of the utmost importance in communications to chancellors and presidents on a quarterly basis and provide **direction on what to do with the information**. Correspondence regarding key campus, conference and national topics are sent on a regular basis. To ensure nothing of importance is missed, the following best practices may prove beneficial.

**Commissioners:**
- Discuss different types of communications chancellors and presidents can expect:
  - Updates: Division III (monthly) and Presidents Council (quarterly).
  - Reports: Annual division report, manual, committee meetings.
  - Meeting summaries.
  - Events: NCAA Convention and conference events.
  - Guides and best practices.
- Summarize and emphasize key information and action items.

**Chancellors and presidents:**
- Share information learned in committee meetings or working groups.
- Share resources and best practices with peers.
DIVISION III IDENTITY INITIATIVE

Following is a status report on activation of the Division III Identity Initiative.

**Division III Week**
The fifth annual Division III Week will occur **April 4-10, 2016**. During the week, every Division III school and conference office is encouraged to conduct an outreach activity that falls into one of three categories: academic accomplishment; athletic experience; or leadership/community service/campus involvement. Please use available resources and check for updates on the [Division III Week website](#) while planning the 2016 events on campus and across your conference.

**Branding Initiative**
This fall’s effort to ensure that each Division III school and conference has the Division III specific NCAA logo on its athletics website linking to the Division III homepage was successful through the efforts of the assistant commissioners. By December 2015, 86 percent of the membership had updated their website to reflect the Division III brand. The goal is to have 100 percent of the membership update their websites to include the Division III logo and a link to the Division III homepage.

**Championships**
Updated Division III identity signage and banners were used at all fall championship finals sites. Each championship was also provided with a $1,000 allocation for the planning and promotion of Special Olympics-related programming. Staff viewed each broadcast and webcast to assess signage, branding, and presentation. After reviewing the comments, staff is identifying ways to enhance the Division III messaging through PSAs and talking points for announcers.

Attached is the 2015-16 fall championships live streaming report. Compared to 2014, field hockey and men’s soccer saw increases in video views and unique visitors, while cross country, women’s soccer, and women’s volleyball saw decreases year-over-year.

**Social Media**
The NCAA Division III Facebook page reached over 21,000 likes in December, while the @NCAADIII Twitter feed has over 27,300 followers. The staff is developing a social media strategic plan to leverage social media as a primary channel for sharing the Division III story with current student-athletes, administrators, potential student-athletes, parents, and supporters.

During fall championships, staff worked with designated on-site social media contacts to provide more timely social updates throughout the championship. From November 12 through December 5, the engagement rate on Twitter increased 33.3 percent compared to the same period in 2014. The tweet sent immediately following the volleyball championship garnered 93,430 impressions and an engagement rate of 10.6 percent, making it the most engaging tweet of the fall championship season (does not include football).
**Monthly Update Video**

The monthly video highlighting the content of the Monthly Update is produced to reach an audience (e.g., coaches and student-athletes) who may not directly receive the Monthly Update. Over the past year, the monthly update videos have been viewed an average of 300 times for an average of 1 minute and 30 seconds. Staff will continue the initiative and make changes to the format as needed.

**Division III Purchasing Website**

The Division III Purchasing Website is in its sixth year in operation, and its fourth year of management by Source One Digital. A $500 credit is being offered to institutions and conferences for purchases from the site during the 2015-16 year. The website features many new items this year, based on feedback from a summer 2015 membership survey, including knit hats, rally towels and bumper stickers. Thus far, over 100 institutions and conference offices have participated.

**Special Olympics**

Since September 1, fourteen (14) institutions and conference offices have reported Division III Special Olympics activities. Thus far, 1,100 Division III student-athletes and 2,600 Special Olympics athletes have participated in events across the country. To report your event and submit your story for the Special Olympics Spotlight Poll, fill out [this form](#) and encourage others to do the same.

**Website Content**

NCAA.org continues to provide Division III with additional opportunities to use its home page to share more stories portraying its unique student-athlete experience. The site now is regularly updated to include links in an “Around Division III” area featuring online articles produced by the membership and by media outlets that tell the Division III story. The page also is regularly highlighting new Division III feature stories from such sources as Champion magazine, and videos produced by the NCAA and by member schools and conferences. Sports information directors are encouraged to send human interest stories and record-breaking performances to d3identity@ncaa.org.

**“Know the Facts”**

The Division III “Know the Facts” campaign is continuing to target high schools and prospective student-athletes and their families, and seeks to better inform those audiences about the unique Division III philosophy and student-athlete experience. The division also redesigned its PSA print ads and the ads in the “Distinctly Division III” series have been made available to member institutions and conferences for use in game programs and other publications (all six ads can be downloaded [here](#)).
Congressional Overview

The last quarter of 2015 on Capitol Hill has been shaped by leadership changes, efforts to address several remaining legislative matters and developments in the 2016 elections. In late September, House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) announced his resignation from Congress. A month later, the House of Representatives elected Paul Ryan (R-WI) as the new Speaker. The Presidential election campaigns have intensified and with 34 Senate seats up for election in 2016, the fight for control of the Senate has also become a matter of great importance.

With bipartisan support, Congress reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act by passing the Every Student Succeeds Act, which reduces federal involvement in state education policies. Congress also approved a $305 billion highway bill, sending it to President Obama with just one day to spare before the scheduled expiration of the nation's road and transit spending. Following the terrorist attacks in Paris, Congress spent a considerable amount of time debating a variety of national security matters. During the week of December 14, Congress is expected to pass a major budget bill which would finance all government operations through the rest of this fiscal year, which began on October 1.

Congress has continued to monitor a variety of issues and recent developments within youth, collegiate and professional athletics. The NCAA government relations office has continued to engage congressional offices and respond to inquiries from Capitol Hill on a variety of matters related to the health and safety of student-athletes, athletically related financial aid and the academic experience of student-athletes.

Federal Issues

Department of Labor Proposed FLSA Overtime Rule

In March 2014, President Barack Obama instructed the Secretary of Labor to update regulations governing exemptions for the Fair Labor Standard Act’s overtime requirements for executive, administrative, and professional employees. Under current regulations, these “white collar” employees are exempt from federal overtime pay requirements if their salary is at least $23,600 and their duties require independent judgment and discretion. The Department of Labor (DOL) last updated these regulations in 2004.

Following this directive, the DOL issued proposed rules changes on July 6, 2015. Under the proposed changes, the salary threshold would increase by over 100%, so that current exempt employees making less than $50,440 would no longer be considered “exempt”. As a result, these
employees would be eligible for overtime pay and need to be paid on an hourly basis. The proposed rules also mandate annual updates to the salary threshold.

In response, 18 higher education associations joined together to submit a 27-page letter with comments on the proposed rules changes and the impact on the higher education community. Specifically, it requests that the DOL lower the proposed minimum salary threshold and eliminate the required annual increase to the salary threshold. Comments were also submitted by a large number of entities from a variety of sectors expressing their concerns with this proposal.

Recently, the federal government released its biannual regulatory agenda, which indicates that the target date for the DOL to release the final FLSA Overtime rules is July 2016. At this time there is no clear indication on whether the DOL will alter the proposed rules changes to address the concerns expressed by the higher education community and others. The NCAA will continue to monitor this issue and support the efforts of the American Council on Education and the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources.

**Medical Professional Liability Insurance**

On February 12, 2015, H.R. 921, the Sports Medicine Licensure Clarity Act of 2015 was introduced by Rep. Brett Guthrie (R-KY). A companion measure, S. 689, was introduced by Sen. John Thune (R-SD) on March 10, 2015. These proposals would provide protections for athletic trainers and medical professionals who provide medical services when traveling with their team across state lines. The bill clarifies medical liability rules and ensures that after providing notification of the type of services being rendered, the medical professional liability insurance or civil and criminal malpractice liability for physicians or athletic trainers is governed by the state where they are authorized to practice even when providing medical care in another state. The NCAA, along with the professional leagues, have provided their support to this legislation.

H.R. 921 currently has 104 cosponsors and has been referred to the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health. On December 9, 2015, the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health held a hearing titled “Examining Legislation to Improve Health Care and Treatment.” H.R. 921 along with several other health care focused bills were discussed during this hearing. Chad Asplund, MD; Director, Athletic Medicine and Head Team Physician, Georgia Southern University, served as a witness and testified in support of H.R. 921. S. 689 currently has 7 cosponsors and has been referred to Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.
Daily Fantasy Sports

An expansive promotional blitz advertising fantasy sports games brought increased attention to DraftKings and FanDuel in Washington. These fast growing companies, which offer daily fantasy sports games, garnered interest from Capitol Hill due to the significant entry fees and prizes that differ from the traditional season long fantasy sports games that many had become accustomed to. While the barrage of advertisements and the increased risk and reward associated with these games made some policymakers question their legality, reports of insider betting claims intensified the scrutiny of this industry. To date, much of the discussion regarding the legality of this industry has focused on the fantasy sports exemption of the 2006 Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act, which prohibits acceptance of any financial instrument for unlawful Internet gambling.

In response to these developments, legislators from both chambers expressed a desire to explore the legality of these games and the need for regulation of this industry. Rep. Frank Pallone (D-NJ), Ranking Member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, requested a hearing to examine if fantasy sports differ from gambling, as well as the relationship between professional sport leagues and the fantasy leagues. Also, Rep. Pallone, Senators Bob Menendez (D-NJ) and Richard Blumenthal (D-CT) requested that the Federal Trade Commission investigate the daily fantasy sports industry to determine if it has utilized deceptive and misleading practices. Additionally, the Department of Justice has launched a probe into the legality of daily fantasy sports.

Despite continued reports, no congressional hearings focused on the legality of daily fantasy sports have been scheduled. However, the NCAA government relations office will continue to educate Members of Congress on NCAA policies that prohibit participation in fantasy sports games.

State Issues

Daily Fantasy Sports

The legality of daily fantasy sports has been a pressing issue at the state level as well. Currently, the legality of daily fantasy sports is being decided state by state with little federal intervention. Due to concerns surrounding daily fantasy sports, the games have been a topic of debate for lawmakers, regulators, and law enforcement personnel in various states. For example, the Nevada Gaming Control Board recently found daily fantasy sports to be gambling under Nevada law resulting in daily fantasy sports operators being required to obtain a state gambling license in order to operate legally. In 2016, the NCAA government relations office expects additional states
to consider the legality of daily fantasy sports. Going forward, we will continue to closely monitor and provide insight concerning this issue.

**Revised Uniform Athlete Agents Act (RUAAA)**

Following approval of the Revised Uniform Athlete Agents Act (RUAAA) by the Uniform Law Commission (ULC), NCAA government relations staff has been working with the ULC and other stakeholders to prepare for enactment efforts in 2016. Currently, there are nearly a dozen state legislatures that intend to consider the RUAAA next year. The involvement of NCAA members in these enactment efforts has been very helpful in seeking adoption.

The RUAAA provides several improvements to the original Act, which was designed to provide protections to student-athletes and membership institutions by prohibiting athlete agents from engaging in certain types of conduct and establishing an athlete agent registration process. The revised Act expands the definition of athlete agent, requires an agent to notify an institution before communicating with a student-athlete to induce them into signing an agency contract, and creates a registration process that provides reciprocity for agents registered in other states.

**Higher Education Associations**

NCAA government relations staff continues to build strong relationships with various higher education associations. The American Council on Education (ACE), the Association of American Universities (AAU) and the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO), among others, continue to provide guidance and support on issues of common interest. Also, the NCAA has been working closely with the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU), which created an advisory group that will focus on policy issues related to collegiate athletics. The NCAA government relations staff looks forward to continuing these mutually beneficial relationships to better formulate and further the NCAA’s legislative goals.