

**2016 NCAA Convention Division III Legislative Proposals
Question and Answer Guide**

Second Edition

**Approved December 17, 2015, by the
NCAA Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee**

Please note this is the second edition of the 2016 NCAA Convention Division III Legislative Proposals Question and Answer Guide. Newly approved questions and answers are shaded in gray. [Please note that the only new questions and answers are for Proposal No. 2016-6. All other questions and answers are the same as the first edition.]

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.

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.

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.