

MINUTES
STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA
BOARD OF GOVERNORS
TASK FORCE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA
APRIL 30, 2026

Video or audio archives of the meetings of the Board of Governors and its committees are accessible at:

<https://thefloridachannel.org/videos/4-30-26-florida-board-of-governors-task-force-on-intercollegiate-athletics/>

1. Call to Order

Mr. Ken Jones, Chair, convened the Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics meeting at 12:00 p.m. on April 30, 2026. Members present were Chair Ken Jones, Craig Mateer, Scott Carr, Tim Cerio, Peter Collins, Carson Dale, Manny Diaz, Mike Griffin, Alex Martins, Keith Perry, Nick Sinatra, Scott Stricklin, and Brian White.

2. Opening Remarks

Mr. Jones began his opening remarks by thanking everyone for being part of the Task Force. He pointed out that they have some key players in collegiate athletics at the meeting to discuss many of the changes the System is facing today. He introduced Mike Griffin, University of South Florida Board of Trustees Chair, and asked him to say a few words on behalf of USF.

Mr. Griffin opened by thanking everyone for being at the University of South Florida. He then spoke about some of the great things happening in Tampa and the many achievements on campus. He then took a brief moment to acknowledge the two Doctoral students who lost their lives to a heinous act, and thanked the members of law enforcement, the Governor, and his team for their leadership, the Attorney General, the Board of Governors, Chancellor Rodrigues, Chair Jones, and Chair Levine for being there during this difficult time on campus. He then concluded his opening remarks by stating that the University of South Florida is excited to be part of the task force, to help address the challenges the System is facing, and to provide solutions. He feels a lot of that help will come from their CEO of Athletics, Rob Higgins.

Mr. Jones concluded the opening remarks by stating that this should be a dialogue, a discussion about what it means to deal with a very fragmented Name, Image, Likeness System (NIL). There are jurisdictions across the country doing different things. There are a couple of court cases, and a recent announcement was made at a conference regarding the potential for private capital investment from a New York private equity firm. He noted that these will not be one-off stories; they will become the norm for how things are done in college athletics. He emphasized the significance of the moment, and they are not just convening a committee; they are stepping into one of the most consequential transitions in the history of college athletics. Since the NCAA permitted

student-athletes to benefit from Name, Image, and Likeness (NIL) in 2021, the landscape has changed rapidly and, in many ways, very unevenly. What began as an effort to create fairness for student-athletes has evolved into a system that is dynamic, fragmented, very inconsistent, and increasingly difficult to govern. He stated that there is not a single NIL framework in this country. There is a patchwork of state laws, institutional policies, and third-party agreements that often operate without clear party alignment. This results in a competitive environment that can reward short-term advantage over long-term stability. This is why the task force really matters; the responsibility is not just to react to the current environment but to help shape a framework that is clear, consistent, and competitive. A framework that will allow Florida institutions to compete at the highest level, while also preserving the integrity and long-term sustainability of college athletics. Sustainability is not guaranteed. If the current system is not corrected, then we risk creating a system defined by escalating financial pressures, donor fatigue, and widening gaps between specific sports programs. We risk losing sight of something fundamental, that college athletics does not exist without an educational system underneath it. This leads us to the most important discussion: the student athlete. NIL at its best should not be limited to what a student athlete earns in the moment. But it should also reflect what they build over time. Because most of these young men and women will go on to professional careers that will dwarf what they ever earn in college sports. Our system must prepare them not just for the competition of sports but the competition of life. He offers an idea for consideration: that the state of Florida should explore a structural model in which a percentage of NIL earnings can be directed into a professionally managed, athlete-owned trust that vests over time, encourages financial literacy and financial stability, and creates a foundation for long-term wealth building. This model could help stabilize what is currently an increasingly purely transactional system. It could align incentives between athletes and institutions, and between students and their future employers. Most importantly, it could ensure that NIL is not just about the income a person earns at eighteen or nineteen, but about the income they could earn at thirty or forty years old and beyond. He points out that the task force has an opportunity to lead, not by limiting opportunities but by expanding its impact. Florida has always been a state that competes and leads at the highest level in college athletics. This is the task force's chance to shape the future and shape how this system works, moving forward.

3. Minutes of Committee Meeting.

Mr. Jones introduced the first item of business: approval of the minutes of the Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics meeting held on March 23, 2026. He informed the committee that a corrected draft of the minutes was submitted, with a hard copy in everyone's packet. The corrections were to page one (members who were in attendance) and to page three (to correct a title). He then asked if anyone had any other corrections to the minutes before making a motion. Seeing none, he asked for a motion.

Mr. Martins moved that the committee approve the March 23, 2026, meeting minutes. Mr. Collins seconded the motion, and members of the committee concurred.

4. Panel Discussion

Mr. Jones began the panel discussion by thanking everyone for attending and asked those at the table to introduce themselves. This included members of the task force, invited panelists, and Board staff. Mr. Jones then asked the first panelist, Mr. Higgins, to begin.

Mr. Higgins started out by welcoming the committee to the University of South Florida. He thanked Chair Jones and the task force for everything they were doing. He gave a little background about himself, explaining how deeply rooted he is in the student-athlete experience. Part of his lifelong experience was with the Tampa Sports Commission, where he worked on a variety of projects, including bringing collegiate championships, super bowls, and youth and amateur events to Tampa. He pointed out that this task force has the opportunity to do something special, and that the world of college athletics right now is a little crazy, but it also opens up opportunities not only for the University of South Florida but for the State of Florida. He expressed that when he took on the position of CEO of the University of South Florida Athletics, he had 492 student-athletes who became his very own. He continues by saying that he is honored and privileged to have brought one with him today, Mudia Reuben, a football athlete who chose to stay at the University of South Florida when he could have left in the transfer portal. The transfer portal, NIL, and rev share are attracting a lot of negative attention, but there are many amazing stories of student athletes, and he is excited to introduce Mudia Reuben to share his story. Mr. Higgins shared some thoughts and ideas regarding:

- Regulations around agents
- Agent Compensation
- Transparency
- Recruiting student athletes: Several states do not have the ACT, SAT, and CLT requirements.
- Funding

He concluded by thanking the group for its leadership and expressing appreciation for the opportunity to work with the task force.

Mr. Jones thanked Mr. Higgins and informed the committee that Azariah Rusher, Captain of the Men's Tennis Team at Florida State University, and Carson Dale, Board of Governors student member, joined the meeting. He then introduced the members joining from online: Craig Mateer, Board of Governors member; Tim Cerio, Board of Governors member; Scott Stricklin, Athletic Director of the University of Florida; and University of West Florida President Manny Diaz.

Mr. Jones introduced Todd Golden to speak next, wanting him to give the coaching perspective on the situation and any ideas he may have.

Mr. Golden began by thanking the committee for inviting him to share his perspective as a coach and to be a part of this process. He then gave some background on himself and

how he got to where he is today. He noted that, over the years, as a coach, it has become increasingly difficult to navigate and manage NIL to ensure that student athletes are taken care of and not taken advantage of based on the financial opportunities they can receive. He pointed out that he has seen and heard some big challenges. NIL and the idea behind supporting it, making it something the student-athletes can take advantage of, is the right move. But the way it is being navigated right now is only good for the top 2- or 3% of the student-athletes. Student-athletes in the rev share sports program are primarily basketball and football players. He expressed concern for the non-revenue-producing sports, as many institutions in other states have begun to cancel those programs. His comments focused on the following topics:

- Supporting revenue sports while also providing experiences for non-revenue sport athletes
- Certification of agents
- Sustainability

Mr. Jones asks everyone to wait until the end of the discussion for questions and gives the floor to Azariah Rusher, captain of the men's tennis team at Florida State University and the Chair of the ACC Student Athletic Advisory Committee.

Mr. Rusher started by thanking everyone for inviting him to speak, then gave a little background information about himself and how he got to where he is today. Being so involved in athletics is what drove him to get more involved. This gave him the chance to represent Florida State University at the ACC level, where he learned a lot. He stated that he learned that the majority of student-athletes are in the same situation as him. They deeply care about their experience as student-athletes. He pointed out that, in his view, most student-athletes want to be paid in a way that helps them improve or thrive in that situation, without losing the foundation for why they chose to do this: to get an education. He noted that the education aspect is often lost when talking about NIL in school these days. He concluded by saying he is happy to answer any questions anyone may have.

Mr. Jones thanked him and introduced the next panelist, Mudia Reuben, a student athlete who plays football at the University of South Florida.

Mr. Reuben began by thanking the committee for having him there and for being willing to hear from student-athletes on this matter. He gave some background on himself and how he got to where he is today. He spoke on how it is not just about financial benefits when it comes to where an athlete chooses to go; it is also personal. He gave an example from his own life, when he immersed himself in the NIL environment and began to reap its benefits. He started a nonprofit that is now thriving. This laid the foundation not only for the communities in Nigeria, where his nonprofit is located, but also a foundation for the youth here in the states. He explained he was part of a research group studying the transfer portal and the student-athletes who are going in. Researching what makes them go and what's making them stay. They identified three main reasons players were leaving, and it wasn't just for money. It was for personal growth, brotherhood, and the resilience required to stay in the program. He stated that, from what he has heard so far from the panel, they have raised many issues he and other student-athletes have experienced, such as the need for regulations on agents and the transfer portal. In its current state, it is an unstable

environment. He feels, based on what he has heard, that it is becoming increasingly professional rather than student-athlete. What should matter is things outside of just the finances, like the things that make the student athlete, that isn't money. The experience is being stripped away because student-athletes are worried about being taken advantage of by their agents. He thinks that it would help regulate this issue through an intercollegiate system that requires all agents to be certified through something like the NFLPA, which was created back in the 1950's to protect players, contracts, and them from all the outside noise. He stated that something like that could be very beneficial to the student-athlete community.

Mr. Jones thanked Mr. Rueben for his time and insight. He commented that he feels it is very important to capture the different dialogues from the groups involved, especially from our student athletes. Hearing from them will give true insight into the effects it has on them, and that is why it is so important to have student athletes on the committee. He then introduced the final speaker, Amy Meyers Hass, Deputy Athletic Director and Senior Women's Administrator at the University of Florida. She brings a unique perspective, having been a General Counsel for the University of Florida. Mr. Jones said that Ms. Meyers Hass's background is very beneficial to today's discussion.

Ms. Meyers Hass opened by thanking the committee and Governor Jones. She stated that she thinks that what the task force and Board of Governors are doing is one of a kind. The college athletics world is chaotic, and many people are more emotional about it than they are about discussing it or getting information from different groups: student athletes, administrators, and coaches. She then gave a summary of her background and what led her to where she is now. Leading into the discussion topic, she stated that by discussing this issue and developing solutions, the state of Florida can overcome this chaos and get it right. She believes that, on the legal end, it will be decided in court unless or until it personally impacts someone in Washington. She began to give the legal perspective that she has faced in this new world, starting with the House Settlement. It is now sort of a known name, and she thinks it was intended to provide structure for college athletics and to set a cap on the market. And what it actually did was create a new floor. She gives an analogy that the \$22.5 million that is to be shared with the student athletes directly is, in a way, the ante to get into the poker game, and the real market is opaque, but they all work in and know it's in excess of the \$22.5 million that has been permitted to be allocated directly. Talking about this and understanding it is an important step because she isn't sure there is a common understanding about what those real dollars in athletic programs look like. Looking at it from a legal perspective, she asked herself what the state of Florida and the Board of Governors could do at the state level that would really have an impact and make a change, without requiring a federal process. Agreeing with the rest of the panel that agent regulation is a real, tangible thing that could be achieved and would make some impact on the market. She has seen firsthand how agents take advantage of students, and she has spent time with student-athletes to help get them out of those contracts. She concluded with one final recommendation: if there were a way to provide greater financial immunity protection for institutions when they are required to agree to some NIL contracts. Students enter into NIL deals into a system, the institutions have been getting, at the beginning of their obligations to go into that system and do their part to make sure their student-athletes are complying, that they're eligible, that they're doing what they are supposed to be doing, the universities are agreeing to exceptional legalese

and terms, just to get into the system. They are sometimes called ‘contracts of adhesion’ where you are required to do something, and the only way you can get to the thing you are required to do is to agree to basically shift liability from those organizations onto the institution. There may be an opportunity at the state level to provide more financial immunity protections for the institutions in this space. Behind the scenes, burdens are shifting to institutions that could be financially impacted if they don’t have immunity. Mr. Jones thanked Ms. Hass for her insight and comments. He commented on her point about the regulatory framework, which will come principally from four or five places:

1. School level: What can the institution or Board of Trustees do at the school level?
2. Board of Governors: What can the oversight committee do?
3. State Legislature: What can they do as a legally elected law-making body?
4. U.S. Congress: He is unsure how productive it will be in the short term, solely based on the importance of what is going on in the country, and if college athletics will rise to this level of importance with everything else going on in the country.
5. The Court System: The final arbiter of any new rules dealing with these issues. Whether that be a legislative rule, a federal rule, or even a Board of Governors rule.

With that said, he informed the committee about ongoing court cases, such as the Brown and Nebraska cases, as well as pending cases. He concludes by thanking the panelists and opens the floor to questions from the committee members, starting with Peter Collins, who gives an overview of his experience with the process.

Mr. Collins started by thanking everyone for coming and agreed 100% that there should be regulations on agents. His biggest issue is the competitive balance. He feels that they all need attestation and regulation, that agents should receive education, and that they should have to sign up and pay a fee to be registered agents. One of the things he found to be an issue is in the transfer portal is if one agent has a student-athlete and another comes in and says they could do more for the student-athlete, and they sign with them, they get rid of the old agent, but the new agent only gets paid on the lift if he stays at the university rather than if he goes to a different university and gets a brand new contract, he would get paid on the full contract. So, there is zero incentive for an agent today to keep their client, who is in the portal, at the university they are at. This is a big problem; it is kind of like hyperinflation that can’t really be controlled. Then you have agents who get their clients to enter the portal, only to find out they already have the best deal they could have, and then they lose their deal, which doesn’t help student athletes. He then spoke about what another panelist recommended, asking for a possible extension of \$22.5 million in the Board Regulation. He pointed out that when the Board of Governors put that into effect, everyone thought the House Settlement would bring guardrails, such as a cap, and that NIL deals would have to go through ‘NIL Go’. It turned out, however, that wasn’t the case, and it allowed for a very loose interpretation, which is causing chaos and problems. It needs regulation, but he asked, “How do we regulate it?”

Mr. Jones asked if the problem was that more money is needed.

Mr. Collins replied “no” because there are plenty of ways to generate revenue, and the Board of Governors helped the universities bridge that, since it is not something that can be done overnight. The Board of Governors regulates public universities, but private

universities don't have to follow any regulations, nor do they have to comply with most statutes regarding funding and restrictions on funding. Because of this, public schools are at a disadvantage compared to private universities. Another disadvantage he brings to the committee's attention concerns other states. We have other states passing rules that say you can have no restrictions on NIL deals for athletes, that you can't be penalized by the NCAA, or similar things. With these issues, there are things the Board of Governors and legislature can do to help universities be in a more competitive position that are not just about money. He concludes by saying that he is happy to be a part of this task force and thanks the panel for being there.

Mr. Jones asked the committee what they think the universities can do on their own, outside the Board of Governors, the legislature, and the courts?

Mr. Collins replied that he feels they could do a lot beyond what the Board of Governors and the legislature regulate. He then gave some examples: through the booster programs, the university collectives, and other revenue opportunities. The student athletic fee hasn't been raised in 10 years, nor has the student activity and service fee.

Mr. Jones then asked the athletic directors for their perspective on today's discussion and whether they had any suggestions. He asked Scott Stricklin to begin.

Mr. Stricklin began by saying he agrees with the others that there should be some structure around the agent piece of this, without becoming a disadvantage by creating something that would make agents want to drive athletes away from our schools. He went on to say that he doesn't feel we have a revenue problem; he believes it's more of an expense problem, and the fact of the matter is that it's against federal law to create the kind of cost constraints they all desire to make this more workable and sustainable. He then recommended that they create a class of payees that a government entity could designate that they are not full employees, but they have certain rights and abilities to create some structure, almost like collective bargaining. He stated that he knows it isn't a popular term, but the reason pro sports don't have the issues they are having is that they can collectively bargain with their athletes, whereas universities don't have athletes who are employees. Even though what they are doing today looks and feels like an employment relationship. He thinks that having an honest conversation about the actual nature of the relationship is important. He doesn't feel we can fix where they are now by tweaking the traditional model; it's going to take a dramatically new one.

Mr. Jones asked if the new model would look similar to a super conference. It looks completely different from how it looks today. You have a new collective of schools and programs that operate outside of the current framework. Where they can say they are not subject to any of the restrictions, they will just withdraw, take all their teams with them, and set up an entirely new system. Is that something realistic or possible?

Mr. Stricklin answered that it is possible, but he is unsure of what would trigger such an event. He thinks that if they were to structure something in the current model, it might prevent something like that from happening. But his fear stems from a Supreme Court comment in the Brown IV League case, in which the court said the conferences are free to make their own rules. This concerns him because he wonders if some league will come up

with a structure that allows them to compete at the highest level and is also really attractive to other schools, and that conference would become the super league. The thing is, everyone is so eager for a structure that makes sense. If a conference were to create that structure and be immune from collusion and antitrust claims, it would be a very attractive place for everyone. The downside is that they go off on their own and don't compete with everyone else. He feels that if we don't create a structure that makes sense, that is what will happen, because we will want that structure, and we currently do not have a structure and are prohibited from creating.

Mr. Jones then asked for the other athletics directors' insight. Continuing with Brian White and then going on to Mr. Scott Carr.

Mr. White began by thanking the committee for the conversation and the good points made. He feels the issue is that they lack a legally defensible model. He is interested in looking at the agent piece of the issue and getting some feedback from the coaches. He asked if there might be an impact if there were a cap on agent pay only in the state of Florida. He shared that he thinks that the idea of a Super League breakoff should be addressed. He feels that collaborating with the NLFPA is a great idea. Had they done that 5 years ago, \$22.5 million wouldn't have been the floor, and it wouldn't have been the cap either. They would be in a different world. Where are they now? The question is: when will they hit rock bottom? He stated this isn't just a Florida issue; it's a national issue. He noted that this may not be something Congress has time for. He also expressed support for collective bargaining.

Mr. Jones then recognized Scott Carr.

Mr. Carr began by thanking the committee for having him and for their comments. He, too, was interested in the coach's perspective on whether they had implemented agent regulations and what issues they might raise. He went on to make a few recommendations:

- If they could explore the facility side of things, and whether there are places within the universities where they can shift funds that could help athletics. The athletic facilities are state facilities. He is concerned that much of everyone's focus is on building sports rosters, leaving facilities to suffer. This affects the students' experience. He would like the committee to explore changing certain regulations to allocate more funds to updating facilities across all sports. He asked whether state funding could be used for deferred maintenance of athletic facilities.

Mr. Jones then asked Mr. Golden for his input on whether they should implement agent regulations and how he feels it might affect recruiting in Florida.

Mr. Golden replied that he feels implementing agent regulations as a whole would hurt the ability to recruit the best talent from outside Florida. If Florida were to cap agents, that could make more by having their player play in a different state.

Mr. Jones then asked Mr. Golden about the transfer portal and if it should be limited to a certain number of times.

Mr. Golden replied that with division one college athletics, he feels they should have a one-time transfer exception. They should not be able to have another transfer without sitting out a year in residence. He suggested two other exceptions: if a coach leaves, they should have 30 days to transfer; right now, they do have that option outside the portal. The second is if they finish their undergraduate degree with a year of eligibility left.

Mr. Jones asked the committee whether they all agreed that it was a rational way to handle the transfer portal. The committee and panelists agreed.

Mr. Carr informed the committee that, at the NCAA Division I cabinet level, one more vote is pending. They are looking to pass high school graduation or turn 19 (whichever comes first), which is when the clock starts, and the student-athlete has 5 years to remain eligible to compete in college athletics. There are only two exceptions that can affect the time frame: religious purposes and military service. There is a very high likelihood that the NCAA will vote in June, and that will be the new rule.

Mr. Jones stated that he believes the Board of Governors should present the issues, facilitate discussion, and then propose clear goals to recommend to the legislature or the universities. He would like the universities, boards of trustees, athletic directors, and coaches to be able to do their jobs, as they are the ones on the front lines who know what is happening at each institution. He then asked Chancellor Rodrigues for comments.

Chancellor Rodrigues commented that it works best when the Board of Governors has a light touch and gives the universities the freedom to run their ship. He continues to say that the world of college athletics has changed a lot. We have gone from student-athletes suing to leave college early so they can be drafted into the NFL to the current day, when they are suing to stay longer. The reason is that they can do more by staying in college athletics than by playing professionally. The two most popular sports in television ratings are professional football and college football. The NFL has an advantage because it has an antitrust exemption and the ability to collectively bargain. Collegiate athletics do not have either of those. So, what is happening with the House Settlement? Everyone thought that \$22.5 million would be the cap, but it has, in fact, become the floor. The costs are spiraling out of control, making it harder to be competitive with the revenue required. He points out that there are only two ways to legally address that issue: by obtaining an antitrust exemption that requires an act of Congress (there are multiple bills already moving through Congress, but it is yet to be seen if any will be successful). The second option would be an interstate compact. He then asked if he could get some feedback from those around the table and if they thought the interstate compact could be feasible. The reason for this question is that Florida universities are in multiple conferences, so, from one standpoint, would it be feasible for a state to enter an interstate compact with other states without involving every state in its conference? Would a compact theoretically work if only half the states in the conference joined it and the other half did not? He stated he doesn't know the answer to that and is hoping the committee does. If the answer is no, is there a way to get out of conferences to pursue an interstate compact? The market responds to incentives; that's been the secret of the State University System's success. They did that by aligning our academic goals with the incentives to support them, which were achieved through Performance-Based Funding. He feels the solution here is to identify the incentives they can support that will yield the desired result. Right now, the

only incentive he sees is money. He asked the committee if there were any others, and if so, he would like to know what they may be so that the Board of Governors can do what they can to equip the universities with those incentives.

Mr. Jones then asked Ms. Meyers Hass whether they could use the Parker Doctrine to sidestep antitrust regulations. Since antitrust is an issue, they need to find a solution. A solution that keeps them competitive and allows them to have those confidential conversations with athletes in the system. Thus, allowing for some antitrust exemptions.

Ms. Meyers Hass replied that applying the Parker Doctrine poses challenges if they are considering using it to regulate college athletics or athletic programs. That said, given the different conferences, the practical challenge is whether other states will join, as we work in an industry with head-to-head competition. She thinks it's creative; it would probably require some level of state operation of athletic departments rather than institutional-level operations. And in the case of regulating agents, you could use it because the system wouldn't be using it to allow institutions to have a set of common caps and compacts that are still managed at the institution level. The use would be to regulate an outsider interacting with an institution, and to protect the public safety and welfare of student athletes, not to have the system regulate athletics. She asked, looking at it from that perspective, what state wouldn't want to protect its student athletes? She concluded by saying that there is a place for it, that we could lead the cause and do right by our student athletes, and that we should advocate for other states to do the same. And she would ask that the Board of Governors issue a public statement affirming the value of athletics to our institutions.

Mr. Jones commented that athletics is the front door to many universities, not for every student, but for many.

Mr. Griffin commented that philosophically, athletics is the front door to every university, but it is a very wide door. It brings quality and numbers to admissions, brand affinity, philanthropic engagement, and media value. He feels they should find a way to allow additional flexibility with the marketing dollars from their central universities to help tell the story around athletics. It's not an area that is particularly permissible, but it is a lane that, if athletics are acknowledged, would do a lot. And doing so would not negatively affect the quality of higher education.

Mr. Martins commented that, with the understanding that we are dealing with a system we cannot change at the moment, they all want guardrails around it in a very significant way. He asked Mr. Golden what the state and universities could do today within the current system that would help them to be able to compete with the rest of those around the country.

Mr. Golden replied that fewer regulations are always a good option, especially when other states are seeking ways to gain an advantage.

Mr. Higgins commented that as many resources, as much flexibility, and as much support as possible can be provided.

Mr. Reuben commented that educating student athletes about the decisions they will have

to make and mandating them would be beneficial to the student athletes.

Mr. Jones commented that the Board of Governors did a 2030 Strategic plan outlining what they thought should be in the plan, and this athletics issue was not one of them. He feels that, since this is such a big issue, they should go back and amend their plan to address these issues.

Mr. Collins commented that over the last 10 years, Florida State University has received \$467 million in unearned media value from its athletics programs. That's powerful, showing how much attention athletic programs bring to universities.

Mr. Perry commented that traditions are important; we know changes are happening, but how do we effect change that still keeps our traditions? Starting with student-athletes and earning a diploma. Transfers reduce the likelihood that a student-athlete will earn their diploma by 20-25%. The State University System is about giving students an education. He feels they can develop ideas and policies to present to Congress and lead the way toward making this change.

Mr. Dale commented that the focus on student success is very important. By ensuring they graduate with a diploma, making them feel connected to the student body, treating them as part of the community, and embracing them as such.

Mr. Jones asked whether Mr. Nick Sinatra would share his perspective on the matter, having been a student-athlete growing up.

Mr. Sinatra began by saying he supports the Board of Governors issuing a statement on the importance of athletics to universities and on what athletics has done for them. He then asks the committee, as they try to frame this, whether they should be thinking strategically about fixing it or should they aim to lead and see if the other states and systems follow.

Mr. Mateer commented that he agrees: they need to decide whether they will lead, make the changes in a short- or long-term timeframe, and give the universities the flexibility under the Board of Governors' governance.

Mr. Jones made note of the goals he laid out during the first task force meeting:

- lay out a clear and consistent framework, a competitive framework that gives the system an advantage in competition with other states;
- have the long-term sustainability of college athletics with the system; and
- prepare student athletes for life outside of college sports.

He gave an overview of the recommendations he heard today. They were:

- Agent regulations
- Antitrust exemption
- The transfer portal, a one-time transfer subject to a few exemptions
- A statement made by the Board of Governors regarding college sports and their importance to universities, because many times, college sports are the front for these universities.

He then asked if there were any further comments.

Mr. Martins commented that he also thinks Mr. Reuben's comment about educating students on the system, how to deal with agents, and how to prepare for life after sports.

Mr. Rusher recommended that, after the statement is made, the Board of Governors could focus on implementing NIL offices where student athletes can ask questions, learn, and better understand it.

Ms. Meyers Hass commented that for those universities that have law schools or business schools, if there is a funding option to possibly sponsor an office where all the state universities have a place where the student athletes can go to get guidance and help, and possibly have their third-year law students help in the legal aspect of it by looking over a student-athlete's contract.

Mr. Collins commented that he would like the task force to develop a timeline for what needs to be done. For example, what can be done immediately, what they have to wait for the legislature to decide, and what to hold off on.

5. Concluding Remarks and Adjournment

Mr. Jones thanked Mr. Higgins for hosting and for all those who helped with the meeting setup. He then asked Mr. Higgins to close the meeting with his comment.

Mr. Higgins thanked Mr. Jones and the committee. He concluded by saying there is a lot of negativity around college athletics right now with NIL, the transfer portal, and people lamenting. It's a lot of change happening very quickly. He stated that the next time you hear someone talking negatively about college athletics, bring up the name Mudia Reuben. Tell them about how he came to the State University System from Stanford University through the transfer portal, how he uses his NIL and rev share to be able to get clean water to his parents' hometown in Nigeria, tell them about when 35 of his teammates left in the transfer portal, and he decided to stay in the State University System and lastly tell them about how great Mudia Reuben and Azariah Rusher did in meeting today.

With no further business, Mr. Jones adjourned the meeting at 2:23 p.m.

Ken Jones, Chair

Heather Chason,
Preparer of Minutes