

A campus student affairs perspective on NCAA Proposal 2009-100

Scott Hirko, Kim Clark, Mike Fulford, Dennis Byrne, Noel Harmon, Kathleen Hill¹ for the ACPA Task Force for Recreation and Athletics

August 5, 2010

Executive Summary

For many years, organizations external to a college or university have been allowed to use an institution's athletics facilities for summer basketball camps. These "nonscholastic" camps typically attract hundreds to thousands of young men and women between 14 and 18 years old. A small number of the participants of the summer camps are elite athletes and may eventually compete as varsity scholarship athletes at the nation's highest competitive collegiate athletic level, National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I. This document concerns an NCAA Proposal directed at young male basketball players who participate in these camps. While these camps have provided important skill training to participants, they have also become important sources of revenue for institutions. Increasingly, the camps are directed by coaches external to the hosting institution, and those coaches typically do not receive training in developmental issues. The location of some of the more high-profile camps provides a recruiting advantage for the sponsoring institution because it allows these elite male basketball players to play against other elite athletes at some of the best facilities in the nation.

In the past, personnel associated with some of the more high profile camps have provided excessive attention to the financial aspect of basketball. Travel costs for elite participants to participate in these camps are often paid for by camp directors – this allows coaches to evaluate their athletic talents in a peer-to-peer environment. In these cases, educational benefits of college have been downplayed to elite participants. Furthermore, many camp directors demand institutions reduce their fees to host the camps, or they will move their camp to another institution.

To reduce the control of external camps over elite participants and to address difficulties associated with recruiting advantages for institutions hosting camps, NCAA Proposal 2009-100 would make it an NCAA violation if institutions host nonscholastic camps from campus locations or any off-campus location typically associated with its men's basketball practice or competition. However, if adopted, the Proposal would merely move these camps to off-campus locations, thus reducing significant camp revenue to some institutions. In turn, the loss in revenue would deny other learning opportunities (such as through campus recreation) to thousands more tuition-paying, non-athlete students during the regular school year.

¹ Scott Hirko, Ph.D. Candidate, Michigan State University, Associate for Communications & Research, Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics is Interim Chair of ACPA Task Force for Recreation & Athletics (TFRA); Kim Clark, Associate Director, Campus Recreation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro is Vice Chair of TFRA; Mike Fulford, Ph.D., Assistant Director of Housing for the Freshman Experience Program, Georgia Institute of Technology is Chair Elect of TFRA; Denny Byrne, Director of Campus Recreation, University of New Hampshire; Noel Harmon, Ph.D., Senior Program Manager, The Institute for Higher Education Policy; Kathleen Hill, Ph.D. Candidate, The Ohio State University.

The ACPA Task Force for Recreation and Athletics (TFRA) instead proposes that

1. The NCAA redraft its Proposal to consider the more holistic nature of the summer camps on a college campus by focusing on the difficulties associated with the recruiting advantages of elite participants;
2. The NCAA focus on the training and certification process of coaching staff associated with these camps;
3. The NCAA work with student affairs professionals on its member campuses to require training of all men's basketball coaches on relevant student development issues for young men in that age group;
4. The NCAA redesign the mandated one-hour orientation for camp participants to be more balanced by including a more direct engagement with participants about the advantages associated with college attendance and completion.

Introduction

In Spring 2010, the Task Force for Recreation and Athletics (TFRA) was approached by leadership in the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) and the National Intramural Recreation Sports Association (NIRSA) about the potential impact on college campuses from NCAA Proposal 2009-100. Members of the TFRA directorate were asked to provide knowledge from the perspective of student development and how the NCAA Proposal may affect different aspects of the lives of camp participants and college students. As a result, this document seeks to create a more holistic understanding of the Proposal's potential impact on higher education. It is intended to provide a body of knowledge for all TFRA members, ACPA members, and for all involved in American higher education.

The Problem

NCAA Proposal 2009-100 (Appendix A) was developed "to specify that an institution shall not host, sponsor or conduct a nonscholastic basketball practice, contest or event in which men's basketball prospective student-athletes participate on its campus

or at an off-campus facility regularly used by the institution for practice and/or competition by any of the institution's sport programs.” The Proposal would make it a violation of NCAA rules for Division I colleges to host a nonscholastic youth men’s basketball camp at their facilities. Nonscholastic camps operate at a college’s athletics facilities and are directed by organizations external to an institution. This Proposal stems from concerns in men’s basketball of recruiting advantages, misguided influence on youth from obscure individuals, institutions unknowingly involved in potential NCAA recruiting violations, and reports of corrupt activity (Parrish, 2010; Peter & Wetzel, 2010; Prisbell, 2009). These issues are significant to Division I athletics, and are growing more serious by the year as demand for athletic success, increased competitiveness, the need for greater revenues, and enhanced media exposure affect the college basketball recruiting process and, in turn, the personal and educational development of talented young basketball players.

While the intentions of this Proposal are good, there are several significant concerns that impact institutions if it is adopted:

- The policy attempts to control other aspects of institutions’ missions, beyond the scope of the NCAA’s [stated purpose](#)² as a governing body over athletics;
- The policy is narrow to only one part of campus, and does not address the potentially significant negative consequences to other activities, including recruitment, retention, and affecting student development to a wider population than the Proposal intends; and,

² NCAA’s Core Purpose: “Our purpose is 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.” Taken from www.ncaa.org.

- The policy impacts students, instead of being directed at the individuals and athletic departments who are creating the stated sense of disadvantage.

Discussion

The individuals at the heart of NCAA Proposal 2009-100 are several hundred young males aged 16, 17, or 18 years old with “elite” basketball skills that appeal to the nation’s premier institutions in NCAA’s highest competitive league, Division I. Every summer, these talented, elite young men participate with thousands of others in summer nonscholastic basketball camps. The camps provide opportunities to not only improve their basketball skills, but also provide important personal and social developmental opportunities. Student development theories (such as Kegan, Piaget, Vygotsky, or Chickering) articulate the most impressionable time for individuals is during these youthful years – as young men transition into an understanding of social expectations, begin to develop a sense of self, and begin to create their own identity (Astin, 1984; Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Ginsburg & Opper, 1979; Kegan, 1982; Love & Guthrie, 1999).

The elite players represent a very small percentage of the overall students who participate in these camps and eventually attend college without participating in intercollegiate athletics. These small numbers of student-athletes are at risk of having their emotional and intellectual development skewed by improper influence at these camps. There is a concern that parents or high school coaches may be losing their influence over these young students to nonscholastic camp coaches who may persuade these student’s college choice decisions for the wrong reasons: basketball and money.

For instance, some of the most elite participants are contacted by camp directors and invited to participate – this helps to elevate the prestige of their camps. Travel costs for many of these elite participants to participate in these camps are often paid by camp directors. With elite participants from around the nation competing against each other in the same summer camp, a peer-to-peer environment is created which allows for college coaches to evaluate the athletic talents of these potential student-athletes, and for the camp directors to influence the participants’ personal development and as well as participants’ college choice. In the end, these camps downplay the educational aspects of higher education and instead prey on the participants’ dreams of playing in the NCAA Final Four championship or in the professional National Basketball Association.

However, the current clearinghouse for those who coach in the nonscholastic camps, as stated in the “[Rules for Education](#)” on the NCAA’s website (NCAA, 2010a) does not provide any education or understanding of student development issues, particularly at the K-12 level. Rather, the Candidate Data Capture System in the Rules of Education (see Appendix B) relates only to an individual’s understanding of NCAA regulations, and provides for a subsequent criminal background check. This is a missed opportunity, whereby the NCAA could provide an opportunity to educate coaches and camp administrators about the cognitive processes, and emotional and identity development of prospective college students (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Love & Guthrie, 1999), and the impact of athletics on identity development (Brown, Jackson, et al 2003). Additionally, each summer camp is only required to show a one-hour video as an educational session to athletes; the NCAA website notes that participants often “become disinterested, disruptive and it becomes difficult to get them to attend the

required educational session” (NCAA, 2010b). Student affairs professionals can provide input at local educational sessions or in the development of such sessions. In addition, student affairs professionals can share their knowledge and expertise with coaches about how to better understand the processes of student development, and in turn, be better able to mentor young students educationally and sociologically, not just physically.

With respect to institutional policy and the NCAA’s commitment to create an equal level of competition for all member institutions, many Division I colleges feel they are held hostage by these nonscholastic organizations, which often request reduced costs of facility usage at their institution or they will “take their camp to their competitive rival down the road.” Further, those institutions not offered the opportunity to host these camps cry foul because they lose a recruiting advantage to other institutions for the same prized and highly skilled basketball players. The resulting institutional tug-of-war over the same athletically-gifted students is troubling and should be addressed to ensure that the competitive intercollegiate athletic environment is fair for all colleges.

However, the intent of the NCAA Proposal to not allow nonscholastic summer camps on campus will not eliminate the camps; rather, it will move them off campus. This denies opportunity for the vast majority of students, who will not be student-athletes, to gain impressionable experiences of college first-hand, and it further reduces their opportunity for informed college choice. The Proposal also does not eliminate the ability for high-profile coaches to attend camps off-campus and be seen in the stands by potential high-profile players, let alone potentially gain access to them and their families.

There has been a loud and concerning voice from campus recreation and other student affairs professionals about the unintended and potentially significant impact of

NCAA Proposal 2009-100. In particular, the National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) has identified a potential impact of millions of dollars in lost revenue to Division I campus recreation services, which benefit directly from the revenue generated from renting out the facility to community groups in addition to nonscholastic basketball camps. For instance, the Georgia Institute of Technology Campus Recreation Center projects a loss of \$66,000 -\$70,000 in revenue; at the University of Illinois, an approximate loss of \$50,000 to campus recreation and potentially a \$3 million loss in revenue to the Champaign region; and, a loss of \$70,000 in net revenue to recreation services at Temple University (source: NIRSA; Appendix C). The revenue is derived not only from camp fees, but also from housing, catering, conference services, and other auxiliary services across campus. By extrapolating these few cases to many of the more than 330 Division I campuses across the nation, institutions will need to find millions of dollars from elsewhere to maintain a consistent level of recreational services and community engagement.

It is significant to note that in most cases, campus recreation services do not have the revenue, expertise, nor the personnel to conduct these types of summer men's basketball camps. This is even more the case at smaller Division I campuses which rely on community organizations to conduct these camps. The smaller campuses, therefore, rely on the camps to raise a more significant amount of revenue to support their campus programming for tuition-paying students.

The resulting loss in revenue to campus recreation poses the concern that a policy affecting a small population (potential student-athletes) may have a detrimental impact on a larger population on campus (current and potential recreation participants and members

of the community). Participation numbers demonstrate the contrast between athletics participation and recreation use. In 2007, 5,119 students participated on scholarship in Division I men's basketball and nearly 17,000 participated in varsity men's basketball across all NCAA Divisions (NCAA, 2009). In comparison, 11 million students participated in campus recreation at NIRSA member institutions (NIRSA, 2010).

Thus, non-athlete students, who far outnumber student-athletes, would be disproportionately affected by these policies through the resulting loss of recreational activities. And, the aforementioned student development theories do not only apply to athletes. They also help us to understand how *all* students develop their own identities and sense of self. Out-of-classroom experiences for *all* students provide an opportunity for personal development through peer relations (Kegan, 1994; King & Magolda, 2005; Love & Guthrie, 1999), and campus recreation provides those opportunities (Artinger & Clapham, et al 2006; Belch, Gebel, & Mass, 2001; Huesman et al, 2007; Steffes, 2009).

Not only would this Proposal significantly disrupt the town-and-gown, community mission of many higher education institutions, it will likely also have an unintended negative effect on student recruitment, retention, and wellness. Students and parents see themselves more as consumers within the marketplace of higher education, and are more likely than ever to make decisions based on factors beyond the classroom.

- Recruitment: Campus recreation services and their facilities are increasingly viewed by prospective students as important to college choice because of recreation's impact on personal development, wellness, socialization, and enjoyment (Belch, Gebel, & Mass, 2001; Blumenthal, 2009; Lindsey, R. & Sessoms, E., 2006). The ability of institutions to recruit and retain students has

been difficult with higher expectations from students and parents coupled with reductions in revenue from state appropriations and decreasing endowment revenue. Reducing camp revenue to recreation services will make it more difficult for institutions with less financial resources to recruit all students, not just student-athletes.

- **Retention:** As is well-noted in higher education literature, socialization experiences outside of the classroom are critical to the success of college students – particularly during a student’s first year (Tinto, 1993). For those who participate, campus recreation has been found to contribute positively to students’ decision to remain at their institution, most significantly among first-year students (Belch, Gebel, & Mass, 2001; Blumenthal, 2009; Huesman et al, 2007). Proposal 2009-100 has the potential to reduce the services and experiences that can be offered to students at a time when sources of revenue (such as these camps) are of utmost importance to their ability to compete in the marketplace of higher education. The lost revenue for small campus recreational budgets will lead to reduced campus services translating into a potential decrease in student retention.
- **Wellness and Development:** As important as community partnership and student retention, campus recreation programs serve an important role in the development of college students (Astin, 1984; Blumenthal, 2009; CAS, 2010; Steffes, 2009). Demonstrable learning outcomes from engagement in campus recreation activities as identified by the Council for Advancement of Standards in Higher Education include cognitive complexity; knowledge application; humanitarianism; civic

engagement; intra- and inter-personal competence; practical competence; and, academic achievement:

1. Cognitive complexity: The ability to think critically and reflectively in a manner that integrates aspects of emotion, cognition, and identity in an intellectual manner.
2. Knowledge acquisition, integration, and application: The process of understanding knowledge in a range of disciplines, connecting this knowledge to ideas and experiences, and relating and reflecting upon this knowledge in daily life.
3. Humanitarianism: Developing a cultural competency of understanding and appreciating human differences and exhibiting socially responsible behavior.
4. Civic engagement: Exhibiting a commitment to public life through participation in communities of practice.
5. Inter- and intrapersonal competence: Developing the means to realistically appraise personal attributes such as identity, self esteem, confidence, ethics and integrity, and spiritual awareness by setting goals, developing meaningful relationships, collaborating with others, and challenging oneself to work with people who are different.
6. Practical competence: Learning to communicate effectively, become economically self-sufficient and vocationally competent, maintain a healthy lifestyle, prioritize leisure pursuits, and live a purposeful life.

7. Persistence and academic achievement: Managing the college experience to achieve personal and academic success, including degree attainment.

(CAS, 2010; Franklin, 2007; Steffes, 2009).

To summarize the point on wellness and development, the potential reduction in funding to campus recreation programs from NCAA Proposal 2009-100 will lead to more students having fewer important opportunities for personal development, multicultural understanding, decision-making, and growth through socialization experiences.

There are additional concerns shared with TFRA about how the elimination of nonscholastic men's basketball camps at colleges may impact the welfare of athletes via financial decisions within athletic departments. Institutions with less affluent athletic departments that rely on nonscholastic camp revenues to fund non-revenue (or Olympic) sports may decide to reduce scholarships (and educational opportunities) or eliminate sport teams altogether. Furthermore, a reduction in nonscholastic camp revenue may affect athletic training staff, with fewer individuals assigned to assist in the health and welfare of athletes during the school year, particularly for non-revenue sports.

Eliminating nonscholastic basketball camps may have an even greater affect on seventh, eighth, or ninth graders. The NCAA defines a prospective men's basketball student-athlete when he begins the seventh grade ([NCAA Bylaw 13.11.1.2](#)). There are very few, rare examples where seventh, eighth, or ninth graders are recruited or offered college scholarships. Thus, the Proposal may have a detrimental impact on the social development of 12, 13, or 14 year-old students by not providing an activity to those who

want to participate in the camps recreationally, who want to socialize with their peers, and who may witness their first impressions of college.

Conclusion and Recommendations

With Proposal 2009-100, the NCAA and its institutions are wrestling with the consequences of success – how private individuals take advantage of colleges and an athletics system that wants access to young male basketball players whose dreams are to play in the NCAA Final Four and in the professional National Basketball Association. The NCAA and its Men’s Basketball Issues Committee are addressing an important topic in their attempt to reduce the negative influences of nonscholastic summer camps on young men and its disruption to the recruiting process and to competitiveness in men’s college basketball.

However, NCAA Proposal 2009-100 as currently proposed reveals a nonscholastic camp process that lacks understanding of the development of youth and fails to consider the wider impact of camps on campuses outside of the athletic arena. The unintended effect of this policy will eliminate personal developmental opportunities for the majority of students participating in the camps who will never play varsity intercollegiate athletics, and potentially hundreds of thousands of college students participating in campus recreation; even though the policy’s aim is intended to affect only several hundred potential Division I student-athletes. These nonscholastic camps have an opportunity to educate *all* students, including prospective student-athletes, about the purpose and importance of higher education to their own lives and to their future contributions to society. Furthermore, the loss in revenue to institutions, including

campus recreation programs and other campus auxiliary services, would force campuses to find other sources of funding, potentially from academics or other campus programs. Colleges recognize that recreation opportunities are an important resource in the recruitment, retention, wellness, and development of college students, and a loss of revenue to campus recreation in the current economic climate will create greater challenges for higher education.

Therefore, we recommend:

(1) The NCAA should not eliminate the camps, which will only reduce revenues and move the problems and the students away from campus. Rather, the NCAA should consider the following replacement language for Proposal 2009-100 which reflects the holistic nature of the institutional environment and more closely focuses on the recruiting advantages stated as the rationale for the Proposal:

“13.11.1.6.1. If an institution hosts, sponsors, or conducts a nonscholastic basketball practice on its campus or at an off-campus facility regularly used by the institution for practice and/or competition by the institution’s men’s basketball team, prospective men’s basketball student-athletes will not be provided any reduced expenses compared to all event participants: this includes reduced event fees, travel, lodging, dining, or other perceived benefits.

13.11.1.6.2. Any institution which hosts, sponsors, or conducts a nonscholastic basketball practice shall not provide discounted operational costs to the event operator unless the operator is a nonprofit corporation.”

(2) NCAA’s summer camp coaching certification process include some minimal assessment of understanding the developmental aspects of youth;

(3) Nonscholastic basketball camps on campus put basketball into proper perspective by providing a more enriching educational experience than the current,

minimal one-hour video and instead provide a more intense and comprehensive understanding of the need of higher education to one's future;

(4) Higher education institutions and the NCAA create professional development opportunities for all coaches to have a better understanding of decision-making and identity development of youth. Notably, ACPA membership and student affairs professionals on campuses should be considered as resources for enhancing the educational and cognitive aspects of the camps to all participants;

(5) Each NCAA Division I member institution review NCAA Proposal 2009-100, with leaders in campus recreation and varsity athletics discussing the holistic impact of the Proposal on their campus. Findings should be shared with the leadership structure at each institution, including the President and the President's cabinet. Furthermore, institutional leadership should communicate findings to the institution's NCAA athletic conference, as well as to the NCAA Men's Basketball Issues Committee and the NCAA Leadership Council (Steve Mallonee, smallonee@ncaa.org or Lynn Holzman, lholtzman@ncaa.org) for their consideration.

While ACPA's Task Force for Recreation and Athletics supports the intent of NCAA Proposal 2009-100, it recommends a more holistic view of its impact on colleges. As currently written, the Proposal has an unintended impact on thousands of camp participants and tuition-paying students in response to issues relating to a small-number of potential student-athletes. At many campuses, this Proposal will be detrimental to efforts designed to support the personal development of the majority of student camp participants and to many campus recreation users, will impact partnerships between

communities and institutions, will reduce institutional revenue in a difficult economic climate, and will increase challenges for college recruitment and retention.

References

- Artinger, L., Clapham, L., Hunt, C., Meigs, M., Milord, N., Sampson, B., Forrester, S. (2006). The social benefits of intramural sports. *NASPA Journal*, 43(1).
- Astin, A. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory of higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(5), 518-529.
- Belch, H. A., Gebel, M., & Mass, G. M. (2001). Relationship between student recreation complex use, academic performance, and persistence of first-time freshmen. *NASPA Journal*, 38(2), 254–268.
- Blumenthal, K. (2009). Collegiate recreational sports: Pivotal players in student success. *Planning for Higher Education*, 37(2), 52-62.
- Brown, T. N., Jackson, J. S., Brown, K. T., Sellers, R. M., Keiper, S., & Manuel, W. J. (2003). "There's no race on the playing field": Perceptions of racial discrimination among White and Black athletes. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 27(2), 162-183.
- Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). The Seven Vectors. In M. E. Wilson & L. E. Wolf-Wendel (Eds.), *ASHE Reader on College Student Development Theory* (pp. 181-190). Boston: Pearson Publishing.
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. (CAS). (2010). CAS standards & guidelines. Retrieved July 1, 2010, 2010, from <https://www.cas.edu/FAQs/CAS%20Standards%20and%20Guidelines.html>
- Franklin, D. (2007). *Student development and learning in campus recreation: Assessing recreational sports directors' awareness, perceived importance, application of and satisfaction with CAS standards*. Unpublished Dissertation, University of Ohio, Athens, OH.
- Ginsburg, H., & Opper, S. (1979). *Piaget's theory of intellectual development* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Huesman, R., Brown, A., Lee, G., Kellogg, J., & Radcliffe, P. (2007). *Modeling student academic success: Does use of campus recreation facilities make a difference?* Paper presented at the The National Symposium on Student Retention, Milwaukee September 24-26, 2007.
- Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self: Problem and process in human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Lindsey, R., & Sessoms, E. (2006). Assessment of a Campus Recreation Program on Student Recruitment, Retention, and Frequency of Participation Across Certain Demographic Variables. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 30(1).
- Love, P. G., & Guthrie, V. L. (1999). Kegan's order of consciousness. In M. E. Wilson & L. E. Wolf-Wendel (Eds.), *ASHE Reader on College Student Development Theory* (pp. 59-66). Boston: Pearson Publishing.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). (2010a). NCAA Rules Education for Coaches of Prospective Student-Athletes. from http://www.ncaa.org/wps/portal/ncaahome?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/wps/wcm/connect/ncaa/NCAA/Sports+and+Championship/General+Information/Certified+Basketball+Events/Tool+Kit/Rules+Education+for+Coaches+of+Prospective+Student-Athletes
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (NCAA). (2010b). Educational tool kit. http://www.ncaa.org/wps/portal/ncaahome?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/ncaa/ncaa/sports+and+championship/general+information/certified+basketball+events/tool+kit/bbcert_toolkit_index
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (NCAA). (2009). *1981-82 – 2007-08 NCAA sports sponsorship and participation rate report*. NCAA: Indianapolis, IN.
- National Intramural Recreational Sports Association. (NIRSA). (2010). NIRSA's Rich History. <http://www.nirsa.org/Content/NavigationMenu/AboutUs/History/History.htm>
- Parrish, G. (June 3, 2010). Ending summer recruiting won't eliminate seedy side of game. *CBSSports.com*. <http://www.cbssports.com/collegebasketball/story/13475867/ending-summer-recruiting-wont-eliminate-seedy-side-of-game>
- Peter, J. & Wetzel, D. (March 11, 2010). Agents and AAU: Unrequited love. *Yahoo! Sports*. <http://rivals.yahoo.com/ncaa/basketball/news?slug=ys-agents031109>
- Prisbell, E. (October 22, 2009). Recruiting reform at issue: NCAA considering new recruiting restrictions for men's basketball. *Washington Post*. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/10/21/AR2009102103794.html>
- Steffes, J.. (2009). *Learning Reconsidered within the context of recreational sports*. Webinar presentation for ACPA/NIRSA: April 15, 2009.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

APPENDIX A

NCAA PROPOSAL 2009-100

[attached as PDF]



Proposal Number: 2009-100

Title: RECRUITING -- TRYOUTS -- NONSCHOLASTIC PRACTICE, CONTEST OR EVENT -- MEN'S BASKETBALL

Intent: In men's basketball, to specify that an institution shall not host, sponsor or conduct a nonscholastic basketball practice, contest or event in which men's basketball prospective student-athletes participate on its campus or at an off-campus facility regularly used by the institution for practice and/or competition by any of the institution's sport programs.

Bylaws: Amend 13.11, as follows:

13.11 TRYOUTS

13.11.1 Prohibited Activities. A member institution, on its campus or elsewhere, shall not conduct (or have conducted on its behalf) any physical activity (e.g., practice session or test/tryout) at which one or more prospective student-athletes (as defined in Bylaws 13.11.1.1 and 13.11.1.2) reveal, demonstrate or display their athletics abilities in any sport except as provided in Bylaws 13.11.2 and 13.11.3.

[13.11.1.1 through 13.11.1.5, unchanged.]

13.11.1.6 Nonscholastic Practice, Contest or Event -- Men's Basketball. An institution shall not host, sponsor or conduct a nonscholastic basketball practice, contest or event in which men's basketball prospective student-athletes participate on its campus or at an off-campus facility regularly used by the institution for practice and/or competition by any of the institution's sport programs.

[13.11.1.6 through 13.11.1.7 renumbered as 13.11.1.7 through 13.11.1.8, unchanged.]

[Remainder of 13.11 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division I Board of Directors

Effective Date: Immediate; a contract signed before October 29, 2009 may be honored.

Category: Amendment

Topical Area: Recruiting

Rationale: There has been a proliferation of nonscholastic events held on Division I campuses during quiet periods, specifically during the months of May and June. Generally, these events are being planned and operated in an attempt to assist institutions with recruiting opportunities. Travel and lodging expenses are routinely provided free of charge for those prospective student-athletes or teams identified as important to the coaching staff's recruiting efforts, and funds and/or services provided by institutions and boosters are sometimes used to pay these expenses. Reluctant college coaches are being leveraged to help the event operator arrange for discounted operational costs (e.g., facility fees) under the threat that the event operator will take the event (and all of the prospective student-athletes) to another institution's campus. Regardless of the level of complicity or involvement of the coaching staff, these events provide a significant recruiting advantage for the institution that hosts the events.

Budget Impact: Potential for lost revenue for use of facilities by outside entities.

Impact on S-A's Time: None.

Position Statement(s)

Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet: The cabinet acknowledged the potential recruiting advantages gained by institutions that host nonscholastic practices or events, but expressed concern that the proposal would



eliminate the opportunity for many institutions' auxiliary departments (e.g., recreation and athletics departments) to generate revenue by conducting such events on campus.

History

Oct 28, 2009: Submit; Submitted for consideration.

Oct 29, 2009: Board of Directors, Sponsored

Jan 14, 2010: Leg Council Init Review, Forwarded for Membership Comment

Jan 17, 2010: Comment Period; Start of Comment Period

Feb 04, 2010: Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet, No Formal Position

Mar 17, 2010: Comment Period; End of Comment Period; (Official Comment Totals: Support = 1, Oppose = 13, Abstain = 0)

Apr 13, 2010: Leg Council Final Review, Referred (referred proposal to Men's Basketball Issues Committee); The proposal remains in the legislative process and will be considered again in the 2010-11 legislative cycle. If the proposal is adopted, as noted in the effective date, a contract signed before October 29, 2009 may be honored. If the legislation is adopted, actions contrary to the legislation that are taken pursuant to contracts signed on or after October 29, 2009 will result in violations.

APPENDIX B**Candidate Data Capture System**

From: <https://screen.lexisnexis.com/pub/l/applicants/ApplicantUI.jsp#0>

The only Division I initial eligibility requirement is that an entering freshman must have graduated high school with a 2.0 grade point average. True False

If an entering freshman has not met the NCAA initial eligibility requirements and is deemed to be a nonqualifier, he/
* <https://screen.lexisnexis.com/pub/l/applicants/ApplicantUI.jsp#0she> will not be allowed to receive an athletics scholarship at a Division I institution during the first year in college. True False

In order to determine whether an entering freshman has met NCAA
* Division I initial eligibility standards, the overall grade point average from high school is considered True False

* Once awarded, an institution cannot reduce or cancel an athletics scholarship for any reason. True False

The mother of a prospective student-athlete may receive free
* transportation to a summer basketball event without jeopardizing the prospective student-athlete has eligibility as long as an NCAA institution does not pay for the transportation. True False

A verbal agreement between a prospective student-athlete and a
* club coach that the club coach will represent the prospective student-athlete in all matters relating to basketball will jeopardize the prospective student-athlete has NCAA eligibility. True False

A prospect-aged team can be sponsored by or receive funding from
* an individual who is employed by a sports agent as long as the financial contributions do not come directly from the agent. True False

High-school or junior-college coaches that have already undergone
* a background check as part of their employment are not required to complete the NCAA coaches' approval process. True False

* A boy's club team participating in an NCAA certified men's event can have an unlimited number of out-of-state residents on the team. True False

International athletes are permitted to cross the country borders to
* participate on a team if the foreign team is closer to the prospect's residence than the local national team. True False

Candidate Data Capture System

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Under NCAA guidelines, an affirmative answer to any question in this section of the application or the existence of a proscribed offense on a certified criminal record may result in a denial of approval for participation in coaching activities during an NCAA-certified event or the operation of an NCAA-certified event or league.

A prior criminal record, depending on the level of crime, may result in your disqualification for a credential. Failure to disclose your record on this application WILL disqualify you from receiving and/or maintaining a credential for a period of up to 5 years. The NCAA certification staff will conduct a criminal history check to verify the accuracy of the criminal history disclosure submitted with an application.

You will not receive approval until your application and criminal background check have been reviewed and approved by the NCAA Certification Staff.

Criteria for Review: A credential for coach in an NCAA-certified event or operate an NCAA-certified event or league may be withheld, suspended or revoked for any conviction, adjudication or term of probation or parole imposed if you have ever, as an adult or a juvenile, been convicted, adjudicated or placed on term of probation or parole for any felony-level crime or offense.

Offenses Committed Subsequent to Receipt of Credential : If a credential for coach in an NCAA-certified event or operate an NCAA-certified event or league was previously granted or is pending, and the applicant is subsequently indicted or charged for any crime not known at the time the previous application was submitted, the applicant must immediately notify NCAA Certification Staff. The prior approval or pending application will automatically be suspended, pending resolution of the indictment or charge. Provided that the applicant has notified the NCAA Certification Staff of the pending adjudication(s), a conviction, adjudication or term of probation imposed under any new indictment or charge, the amended application shall then be reviewed consistent with the criteria set forth in the Criteria for Review section above.

However, if the applicant knew or should have known about the existence of an indictment, charge, conviction, adjudication, term of probation or parole at the time any application for a credential was submitted to the NCAA, but failed to make a full disclosure of the required information, the approval for participation in coaching or operating activities during a men ;s or women ;s NCAA-certified event may be withheld, suspended, or revoked for a period of up to five years.

Notice of Banning Approvals for individuals who fail to cooperate OR participate in an NCAA violation

The NCAA has recently adopted a policy whereby individuals issued an NCAA

participant approval number could be adversely affected if the individual fails to cooperate with the NCAA staff and Eligibility Center staff in an inquiry relating to possible NCAA rules violations beyond the basketball certification rules and policies. Additionally, individuals who violate NCAA legislation could also be affected.

As with the other approval guidelines, if an individual fails to cooperate with the NCAA staff in an inquiry or is an involved participant in a violation of NCAA legislation, his or her approval status could be revoked or denied for up to a five-year period, and there would be no appeal rights for such an action.

* Have you ever been previously placed on probation, dismissed, expelled, suspended or refused participation in a youth program?

Yes No

Are you an individual or employed by an agency involved in the marketing of any individual's athletics reputation or ability (including an employee of an agent or anyone associated with an agent in his or her capacity of marketing any individual's athletics reputation or ability)?

Yes No

Does your team receive financial support from any representatives of an NCAA member institution's athletics interests that is assisting or has assisted in the recruiting process?

Yes No

* I acknowledge the information I am submitting is correct to my knowledge

Yes No

APPENDIX C

Potential impact on individual campuses (source: NIRSA)

[attached as PDF]

ADDENDUM

NCAA Proposal No. 2009-100 Examples at NIRSA Member Division I Schools

Georgia Tech (GT)

The potential negative impact of NCAA Division I Proposal No. 2009-100 on Georgia Tech is between \$66,000-70,000/year in lost revenue. GT depends on this revenue to deliver programs and services to the greater student body. With state cuts any reduction in this outside revenue would mean staff positions lost. GT conducts several external basketball tournaments, camps and clinics at the Georgia Tech Recreation Center. In early May 2010, GT hosted a very large tournament produced by a group called Celtic Basketball. The tournament was a 2.5 day program. GT also has an ongoing contract with Converse to open the Georgia Tech Recreation Center on a regular basis to the local community for informal play, or for an occasional program by professional athletes who are endorsed by Converse. These are just two of several groups that rent GT courts. This revenue was built into the GT business plan before construction of the new recreational sports facility (2004). Another concern is that the proposed NCAA rule will spread to other NCAA-sponsored sports such as swimming, which would kill the revenue generated by pools. Large major facilities such as GT's were constructed in part because of the benefits Aquatic Centers bring by exposing thousands of potential students to university campuses via large group swim meets.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (U of I)

[The following information was submitted on behalf of Big Ten Campus Recreation Directors]

NCAA Proposal No. 2009-100 will have a negative financial impact on various University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (U of I) campus recreation operations, similar to negative financial impacts realized at the other Big Ten schools. As is the case at a majority of Big Ten schools, collegiate recreational sports programs are separate from Athletics. Given the size of U of I operations, facilities are used extensively for camps (internal and external to the campus), tournaments, and clinics. At the U of I alone, rental revenues contribute approximately \$50,000 to the recreational sports operating budget each year. Given the economic recession, revenue from these activities is critical to U of I's Campus Recreation operation, which does not cross over into any aspect of the Athletic budget. In terms of the local community, the U of I campus works very closely with the local Visitor and Sports Bureau. Not only does U of I financially benefit, but there is a benefit as well to local hotel/motels and food operations within the city. These events also positively impact jobs within the greater U of I community. Jayne DeLuce of the Champaign Visitors Bureau estimates that any campus tournament can increase revenue to the city by up to \$3 million dollars.

University of Alabama (UA)

The University of Alabama has voiced departmental and University-wide concern with the potentially negative impact that NCAA Division I Proposal No. 2009-100 would have on many campus operations. Specific to UA, an adverse economic impact would be felt within operations such as:

- University Recreation Summer Camps Facility Rental Revenue
- Food Service Revenue
- Housing and Summer Conference Housing Revenue
- Auxiliary and Support Services such as parking, transportation, and meeting room rental revenue

The adverse impact to University Recreation alone would be in excess of an estimated \$10,000 in revenue reduction from a loss of camp activity within men's basketball. Additional losses would accrue if this was extended to women's basketball operations.

Beyond the immediate economic impact of these considerations, summer basketball camp activity is a major catalyst for recruitment of future students to UA. While the number is not known exactly, student admissions to UA are obviously related to the basketball camps conducted each year on campus (team and individual). In a state such as Alabama, exposure to campus facilities, housing, and food service is an essential recruitment tool to many students who may otherwise not visit UA's campus.

Temple University (Temple)

If NCAA Division I Proposal No. 2009-100 is adopted, the negative impact on Temple University's Department of Campus Recreation would be as follows:

- Loss of over \$70,000 in net revenue in a fiscal year. These funds are recycled back into the delivery of Temple's recreational sports program for Temple's students.
- Loss of upwards of 500 part-time and/or work-study student staff hours afforded to student recreational sports staff in support of AAU and travel basketball tournaments hosted by Temple in Student Recreation facilities during late spring and summer months.
- Loss of one internship position afforded to an undergrad student in Sports and Recreation Management that Temple typically has each summer to assist with coordination of external facility rentals associated with basketball tournaments.
- Loss of approximately \$12,000 in revenue typically collected by Temple Sport Clubs for their service in providing concessions at the tournaments and other events. These events are used as fundraisers by sport clubs and serve to augment their budgets, while offsetting "out-of-pocket" club dues. Income from the events is critical in the overall operation of many sport clubs.

Oregon State University (OSU)

Oregon State University, like many other institutions of higher education, has a Recreational Sports Department that generates revenue by renting facilities for a variety of activities to reduce dependence on Student Incidental Fees. This includes rentals for nonscholastic events, such as youth basketball activity, which generates about \$5,000 for OSU alone, as well as youth soccer, tennis, lacrosse, boys' rugby, and cheerleading. OSU is very supportive of these activities because it brings prospective students to the OSU campus and introduces them to OSU and a higher education environment. Research shows that most college-bound high school students select a college they have visited at some time in the past, and OSU's University Advancement and Enrollment Management programs are very concerned about the negative impact of NCAA Proposal No. 2009-100. Currently, OSU brings over 2,000 individuals to campus through facility rental activities, and OSU expects that number to increase to over 5,000 students in the near future. Restricting these events would negatively impact OSU's ability to recruit students. OSU generates over \$20,000 a year through these activities, and upon completion of two capital projects [outdoor field complex and Field House renovation], OSU predicts a three-fold increase in rental revenue – upwards to \$60,000-70,000 annually. The loss of this projected revenue could increase Student Incidental Fees and the overall cost of education. Other auxiliaries at OSU would also lose substantial revenue through reduced use of housing, dining, bookstore sales, and Memorial Union Food Service activity, especially through summer camp programs. OSU is very much in opposition to the NCAA Division I Proposal No. 2009-100.

Oklahoma State University (OSU)

Athletic camps comprise the majority of Oklahoma State University's summer conference programs. OSU relies on athletic camps to fund summer operations, which allows OSU to host a number of smaller academic-oriented camps. Revenues include, for example, approximately \$248,000 in housing fees and approximately \$221,000 in dining fees collected in 2009 from 28 athletic camps (including cheer camps that are mostly sponsored by Athletics). This year, OSU has 22 athletic camps scheduled (including cheer camps) with estimated housing and dining revenues at \$176,494 and \$99,475 respectively. Without these revenues from athletic camps it would not be feasible for OSU to host the smaller non-athletic camps, and it would be more cost effective for OSU to close completely for the summer. This would have a negative impact on housing revenues, summer employment for students, academic enrichment programs, and athletic development opportunities for thousands of youth in Oklahoma. Banning some or all athletic camps would hurt tens of thousands of youth and college students nationwide. It does not seem reasonable to enact a policy that will damage so many when the [NCAA] goal is to curtail the activities of a handful of athletes and coaches. Furthermore, it seems that banning universities from hosting basketball or other athletic camps will simply push these programs into the hands of private, for-profit camps where the NCAA would have no authority to provide oversight.

University of Denver (DU)

Each spring, the University of Denver hosts an annual youth basketball tournament, the Hoyt Brawner Memorial Basketball Tournament, which just celebrated its 36th anniversary. The tournament includes 88 youth basketball teams from the Denver area and over 2,000 spectators. Additionally, the tournament provides an opportunity for varsity basketball student athletes and club sports athletes to gain work and volunteer experience while exposing their programs to tournament participants, coaches, and spectators. If NCAA Division I Proposal No. 2009-100 is adopted, the Hoyt Brawner Memorial Basketball Tournament would not be a possibility on the DU campus. In its current format, the tournament provides annual net revenue of approximately \$28,000. If the tournament was to move off campus, this amount would be significantly reduced because of facility rental fees at local gymnasiums. Additionally, teams would lose the opportunity and excitement of competing on a college campus in Division I practice facilities. Currently, the Hoyt Brawner Memorial Tournament not only serves as a premiere basketball event in the Denver area, but also an opportunity for members of the Denver community to experience and visit the DU campus.

Miami (Ohio) University (Miami)

Miami University in Ohio believes that NCAA Proposal No 2009-100 will have an adverse affect on university summer rentals:

1. Potential revenue loss
 - a. Rental of recreational facilities - campus
 - b. Housing/dining/food services - campus
 - c. Community entities – restaurants, hotels, amenities
2. A great many programs already established:
 - a. Miami’s outreach to the local community
 - b. Regional programs
 - c. Diminished potential for prospective students to visit the Miami campus in their formative years

Potential Lost Revenue = \$ 530.00 per day in Gym Rental
 \$ 35.00 per day in housing
 \$ 20.50 per day in dining 3/day camps=\$1,756.50 potential loss
 \$ 585.50 potential loss/day 5/day camps=\$2,927.50 potential loss

Using an established formula to measure the economic impact on the community:

Unique Visitors	Athlete/Part	Spectators	Meals	Lodging	Total
EVENT Day 1	458	650	\$ 28,000	\$ 29,000	\$ 57,900
EVENT – Day 2	467	650	\$ 29,000	\$ 29,000	\$ 58,000
<u>EVENT – Day 3</u>	<u>368</u>	<u>500</u>	<u>\$ 22,500</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 22,500</u>
Totals	1,293	1,800	\$ 79,200	\$ 58,000	\$ 138,400