



**REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I PRESIDENTIAL FORUM
OCTOBER 23-24, 2017, MEETING**

ACTION ITEMS.

- None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Feedback for the NCAA Division I Board of Directors Regarding the Composition of the Board of Directors.** Pursuant to its presidential advisory role to the Board of Directors, the NCAA Division I Presidential Forum reviewed material related to the review of the composition of the Board of Directors and provided focused feedback related to the models under consideration and the overall review. Twenty-five of the 32 Division I multisport conferences provided specifics to the composition models under consideration. The following statements highlight the Forum's discussion and feedback that was provided to the Board of Directors during its October 24 meeting:
 - a. Although there was no overall consensus, most conferences expressed support for model one (status quo with development of best practices for engagement) or model five (addition of two Presidential Forum members to the Board of Directors). Clear support that if model five is selected, Presidential Forum members should come from the unrepresented conferences.
 - b. Members expressed interest in a 36-member Board of Directors (32 presidents/chancellors, one faculty athletics representative, one senior woman administrator, one student-athlete and chair of the NCAA Division I Council) and some are strong in this sentiment. Members supportive of this model understand the challenges with this concept (e.g., size may impact effectiveness, introduces the possibility of weighted voting).
 - c. Throughout the Forum's discussion, fundamental questions about the Board of Directors composition were raised including:
 - (1) Why is the model based upon bowl subdivision football? Should bowl subdivision football (and the resource allocation) continue to be a significant factor in Board of Directors representation?
 - (2) Why does the model guarantee seats for all Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) members? There is agreement that the autonomy conferences will have permanent seats on the Board of Directors but some questioned permanent seats for the other FBS members.

- (3) Composition of the Board of Directors should reflect “democratic” principles within the existing structure.
- (4) Some believe the current model benefits higher-resourced institutions to the detriment and disenfranchisement of the other members.
- d. All want to strengthen the role and influence of the Presidential Forum, and are encouraged by the collaboration of the development and implementation of the strategic areas of emphasis of the division.
- e. All are interested in finding ways to improve the diversity of the Board of Directors and at the presidential levels in general.

The Board of Directors agreed to continue to examine models one and five. In January, the Presidential Forum will further detail the mechanics of model five (e.g., adding two Presidential Forum members to the Board of Directors) and make a recommendation to the Board of Directors for consideration. The Board of Directors does not support continued exploration of a 36-member Board of Directors.

2. Feedback for the Board of Directors Regarding Transfers. The Presidential Forum received an update on the work of the NCAA Division I Council Transfer Working Group. The Forum reviewed and discussed several concepts that have been developed. The following statements highlight the Forum’s discussion and feedback that was provided to the Board of Directors:

- a. Areas of consensus include:
 - (1) Supportive of ethical recruiting concept that adds “tampering” to the list of presumptive Level II (significant breach of conduct) violations in NCAA Bylaw 19.
 - (2) Supportive of the notification of transfer concept.
 - (a) Replaces current permission to contact rule.
 - (b) Does not permit an institution to restrict where a student-athlete can explore transfer or to restrict a student-athlete’s access to athletics aid.
- b. Supportive of discussions at conference level on intra-conference transfer policies.
 - Conferences are permitted to have more restrictive policies.

- c. General support of a uniform transfer eligibility rule.
 - (1) Noted concern about the availability of the current one-time transfer exception to some student-athletes based on the sport they play.
 - (2) Not supportive of a model that requires every transfer student-athlete to serve a residence requirement (e.g., “sit a year”).
 - (3) Supportive of eligibility based on academic criteria.
 - (4) Receiving institution should be accountable.
- d. Supportive of a comprehensive, multifaceted legislative package.

The Board of Directors was generally supportive of the Presidential Forum’s positions, noting that the Transfer Working Group will provide more detail on key elements of the transfer package, particularly related to the eligibility requirements tied to any uniform standard and institutional accountability measures.

3. Feedback for the Board of Directors Related to NCAA Division I Strategic Areas Emphasis. The Presidential Forum reviewed an initial draft of foundational goals and strategic areas of emphasis for 2018-2023. The following statements highlight the Forum’s discussion and feedback that was provided to the Board of Directors:

- a. The Presidential Forum stands ready to continue to serve in its role in supporting and collaborating with the Board of Directors to provide a presidential perspective on critical issues impacting Division I. The Presidential Forum looks forward to collaborating with the Board of Directors on the development of the strategic areas of emphasis for the division.
- b. Support for the establishment of foundational goals.
 - (1) Reinforce academic success in context of overall well-being.
 - (2) Broader “sustainability” of Division I membership should be the goal, with “financial sustainability” a major subsection.
 - (3) Consider whether the three foundational goals could be condensed into one (or two) without losing nuance.
 - (4) How to best capture the following key elements:

- (a) Lack of public trust in collegiate model is a threat.
 - (b) Emphasize importance of self-governance model.
 - Consider presidential statement to reinforce.
 - (c) Commitment to transparency to increase public and membership confidence.
 - (d) Coherence between our values and actions, and alignment in actions, operations and structure with our collective values.
 - (e) Strongly affirm the fundamental principle of the student-athlete and how athletics participation enhances the educational experiences within the context of a perception that all decisions are made based on money.
 - (f) Acknowledge the benefit of the diverse Division I membership.
- c. Specific comments on components of areas of emphasis:
- (1) Reinforce need to rely on data to make informed decisions.
 - (2) NCAA could partner with higher education organizations in our role as “context experts” to help inform new and future presidents.
 - (3) Need to examine ways to help presidents make good, value-based decisions.
 - (4) Need to examine whether existing regulations (or lack thereof) create incentives that unintentionally lead to unethical behavior.
 - (5) Support for NCAA examination of membership expectations as to role of NCAA related to academic misconduct/fraud.
 - (6) Support for examining role and expectations for directors of athletics and coaches to foster a culture consistent with our values.

The Board of Directors agreed with the Presidential Forum’s feedback and the planned approach for membership engagement. The Board of Directors and Presidential Forum will conduct a joint meeting in April 2018 to finalize the Division I strategic areas of emphasis 2018-2023.

4. **Continued Work on the “Charting the Course” Initiative.** The Presidential Forum received a report on progress of the “Charting the Course” initiative. Work is continuing on a “white paper” that will highlight presidential oversight of the Division I collegiate model and provide presidential principles to guide decision-making within the NCAA and on individual campuses. The areas identified as being most impactful and thus, the areas of initial focus, include principles that:
- a. Advance recruiting models and practices that better reflect the values of higher education and support student well-being.
 - b. Reinforce the need for the health and safety initiatives to gain traction on campuses so student-athletes can be better supported throughout their experience, including following graduation.
 - c. Advance through legislation, policy and campus practice that student-athletes are provided with a well-rounded educational experience – to include experiential learnings such as internships and study abroad opportunities should a student so desire – that enhances their overall well-being – from recruitment to graduation and beyond – and prepares them for a successful transition from college to lifelong productive citizenship.
 - d. Advocate for the long-term benefits of participation in a diverse set of athletic and academic experiences before entering college – including the potential negative impacts of sport specialization at an early age.
 - e. Introduce “best practices” for advancing student-athletes well-being and skill set development for all Division I members.

In addition, the Forum received a report on the creation of an inventory of successful campus programming designed to enhance the student-athlete experience. The goal is to provide the membership with an opportunity to highlight its own effective programming, catalog the responses and share the best ideas with campus presidents and administrators via an online database. A short survey was sent to each Division I faculty athletics representative. Over 200 responded. Using the responses as a starting point, the Presidential Forum will explore further membership engagement in developing best practices to ensure a well-rounded student-athlete experience (e.g., experiential learning). The Presidential Forum requests that the leadership of the faculty athletics representatives’ organizations assist in identifying exemplary programming.

5. **NCAA President’s Report.** The Presidential Forum received a report from NCAA President Mark Emmert regarding the formation of the Commission on College Basketball. The Commission on College Basketball, which will operate independently of the NCAA

governance structure, was established by the NCAA Board of Governors, Division I Board of Directors and NCAA President to fully examine critical aspects of Division I men's basketball. The Commission has been strongly encouraged to identify bold legislative, policy and structural modifications to improve the integrity of processes and the well-being of student athletes. Further, the boards stand ready and are committed to implement appropriate meaningful and lasting changes. Specifically, the Commission will focus on three areas:

- a. The relationship of the NCAA national office, member institutions, student-athletes and coaches with outside entities, including:
 - (1) Apparel companies and other commercial entities, to establish an environment where they can support programs in a transparent way but not become an inappropriate or distorting influence on the game, recruits or their families.
 - (2) Nonscholastic basketball, with a focus on the appropriate involvement of college coaches and others.
 - (3) Agents or advisors, with an emphasis on how students and their families can get legitimate advice without being taken advantage of, defrauded or risking their NCAA eligibility.
- b. The NCAA's relationship with the NBA and the challenging effect the NBA's so-called "one and done" rule has had on college basketball, including how the NCAA can change its own eligibility rules to address that dynamic.
- c. Creating the right relationship between the universities and colleges of the NCAA and its national office to promote transparency and accountability. The commission will be asked to evaluate whether the appropriate degree of authority is vested in the current enforcement and eligibility processes, and if the collaborative model provides the investigative tools, cultural incentives and structures to ensure exploitation and corruption cannot hide in college sports.

6. Report of the April 25 NCAA Division I Presidential Forum Meeting. The Presidential Forum approved the report of its April 25 meeting. (*Unanimous voice vote.*)

Presidential Forum chair: Kay Norton, University of Northern Colorado, Big Sky Conference
Staff Liaisons: Diane Dickman, Law, Policy and Governance
Jenn Fraser, Law, Policy and Governance
Kevin Lennon, Law, Policy and Governance
Todd Petr, Research

Division I Presidential Forum October 23-24, 2017, Meeting
Attendees:
Frank Bonner, Gardner-Webb University; Big South Conference.
John Broderick, Old Dominion University; Conference USA.
Tim Cost, Jacksonville University; Atlantic Sun Conference.
David DeCenzo, Coastal Carolina University; Sun Belt Conference.
Sharon Gaber, University of Toledo; Mid-American Conference.
Frank Gilliam, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro; Southern Conference.
Leo Lambert, Elon University; Colonial Athletic Association.
Ron Machtley, Bryant University; Northeast Conference.
James Maher, Niagara University; Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference.
Horace Mitchell, California State University, Bakersfield; Western Athletic Conference.
Kay Norton, University of Northern Colorado; Big Sky Conference, chair.
Philip Oldham, Tennessee Technological University; Ohio Valley Conference.
Mary Papazian, San Jose State University; Mountain West Conference.
David Pershing, University of Utah; Pac-12 Conference.
Carol Quillen, Davidson College; Atlantic 10 Conference.
Gary Roberts, Bradley University; Missouri Valley Conference.
Tom Sullivan, University of Vermont; America East Conference, vice chair.
Jack Thomas, Western Illinois University; The Summit League.
Kim Wilcox, University of California, Riverside; Big West Conference.
Randy Woodson, North Carolina State University; Atlantic Coast Conference.
Kevin Worthen, Brigham Young University; West Coast Conference.
Absentees:
Victor Boschini, Texas Christian University; Big 12 Conference.
John Bravman, Bucknell University; Patriot League.
John Crain, Southeastern Louisiana University; Southland Conference.
James Danko, Butler University; Big East Conference.
Michael Drake, The Ohio State University; Big Ten Conference.
Andrew Hugine, Alabama A&M University; Southwestern Athletic Conference.
Renu Khator, University of Houston; American Athletic Conference.
Gary Miller, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay; Horizon League.
Jere Morehead, University of Georgia; Southeastern Conference.
Christina Paxson, Brown University; The Ivy League.
Harry Williams, Delaware State University; Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference.
NCAA Staff Liaisons in Attendance:
Diane Dickman, Jenn Fraser, Kevin Lennon and Todd Petr.
Other NCAA Staff Members in Attendance:
Katrice Albert, Lydia Bell, Mark Emmert, Michelle Hosick, Donald Remy, Bridget Rigney, Cari Van Senus, Katy Yurk, and Leeland Zeller.