Higher Ed. & Emp.	23-28, 33-77, 87-88, 91-93, 96, 98-99	59
House	4198-4208	11
Senate	6558, 6573-6578	7
		77

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

HIGHER EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT ADVANCEMENT

PART 1
1 - 331

2011
INDEX

FRANK SELF: The, I wanted also to add a word about the people who live there. We are a diverse group. There are 30 units. We're diverse in terms of incomes, racial, cultural backgrounds, age.

I'm considerably the oldest. They go down to young 20's. I don't understand how people can be so young today. It is a very diverse group of people living there now.

REP. LEGEYT: It sounds like a great place to live.

FRANK SELF: It is a great place to live.

REP. LEGEYT: Thank you for answering my question. Thank you.

REP. WILLIS: Thank you very much for your testimony.

FRANK SELF: Thank you.

REP. WILLIS: And we'll be in touch with your representative to discuss this further.

REP. O'BRIEN: Thank you very much.

REP. WILLIS: You're very fortunate. You have a very diligent representative, Mr. Self.

I am now going to move to the general public list, and the first on the list is Judith Greiman.

JUDITH GREIMAN: I thought it was on. Okay. I'm here to testify on two bills, unfortunately for the two legislators I've spoken with about these bills, in opposition to both.

But one is on the ACT CONCERNING STUDENTS OF

HB5241
HB5415

PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER ED LIVING OFF CAMPUS. And as Representative Adinolfi said, he had originally wanted, I guess was the proponent of the bill and had wanted it to include private colleges.

And I've been told that that was, should the bill move forward, that there would be a movement to include private colleges, but I thought I would make comment. And currently, we, I surveyed all of our campus representatives, and they don't treat students differently.

So the same code of conduct applies to a student, in fact, not just if they're living in, you know, what I'd call a dormitory setting or a campus-owned off-campus setting, but, in fact, the same code of conduct applies to students, as they said, at all times wherever they physically may be or reside.

And what that in part also means is, for example, if a student is living in a private home in, and is arrested for under-aged drinking, the student will have legal implication, but the student may also be subject to the campus judicial code for that kind of behavior. So in their view, they don't think it's needed for our sector at all.

On the second bill, and I can get you further information about how our institutions manage it, we have, you know, arranged, but some of them, Wesleyan is probably the greatest example of homes within the community all subject to the same code.

On the athletic bill, House Bill 5415, I've had a lot of athletic directors contacting me about this bill. They're very concerned that

Connecticut not pass any laws that conflict with or make it even more difficult to comply with the NCAA regulations.

Each athletic division has its own manual. I was going to print it, but the Division I was over 400 pages. They're incredibly detailed in terms of pretty much everything related to athletes but including medical scholarship and transfer information, which this bill covers.

So they have a great concern that we not walk into this highly regulated area that has significant monitoring and make it even more complicated or perhaps in conflict.

In conversation with Representative Dillon, I know that the language of the sort of minimal language of the bill may not be ultimately what was in mind, and so we'd obviously be happy to, you know, have a conversation.

I think that there are some of our athletic directors who would be good to bring to that conversation if something's going to go forward, but they're quite concerned that we not walk into that NCAA and conference regulations process.

REP. WILLIS: Questions or comments from members of the committee? Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON: Thank you very much.

The, I'm afraid I did a lot of bills this year, and I didn't keep track of that title. And if I were in a university in Connecticut and I saw something saying informed consent, I would probably lawyer out.

But I think that's a misnomer, and we should

change it, because it really doesn't create a call to action that I can see.

It's really intended to be per player, and the person who flew in here today to testify on it was really one of the reasons I filed it, because we're a small state, and we don't want to hurt our own franchises.

But having, my understanding is that the language that passed in California was a compromise with higher education and that they're not the problem and that, so we want to help the students and protect the franchises at the same time.

I'm beginning to have some problems with the NCAA, though. And I'm becoming a lot more forgiving of some of our institutions of higher education, to tell you the truth.

But I'm interested to hear the testimony today. And you're absolutely right to be vigilant, but I think we can work together.

REP. WILLIS: Any other questions or comments from members of the committee? Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE: Thank you, Madam Chair. Hi, Judy. Welcome. I'm sure we'll be seeing a lot of each other this session.

It sounds like on both of these bills, your concern is basically that both of them are covering things that are already required by other institutions, so there's really not a need for us to add regulation that's already covered. Is that it?

JUDITH GREIMAN: Yes, with the only addition I would make is that in, particularly in the

second one.

The rules and regulations of the NCAA and the, NCAA and the monitoring and all that is so incredibly specific on so many areas that it's both, there are certain requirements, but also there's a real concern that something not get passed here that somehow conflicts with that.

SENATOR BYE: Okay. I think Representative Dillon's trying to get at something that's really important for student-athletes. You know, they're being sold a dream, and it can all fall apart very quickly.

So I would just ask, you know, that perhaps you could go back to your institutions and the coaches and ask them to send us information or you bring us information showing us where the NCAA rules our concern.

Representative Dillon brought this to us, and it is a real concern, so I think that would be really helpful to the committee.

JUDITH GREIMAN: I'm happy to do that, and I think it will be helpful once I hear the other testimony to understand what's the, what the, what's the, what are the specific issues.

I would say that in my sector, there aren't that many of my schools that do athletic scholarships, so it, I mean, there are some other institutions, you know, everybody needs to be at the table, I guess, is all I'd say. And, again, some of it is in how this is written.

You know, one AD said there's a piece on talking about the future medical costs, potential medical costs, to which he replied,

how, I don't know what injury this person may someday have, I don't know what insurance coverage, you know, so it was a how would I possibly in advance begin to talk about that?

I'm assuming in California people ask that very same question, and they found a way to talk about it, so, you know, I would be happy to look at, or are they looking at the California, trying to pull that up, and we'll, you know, exchange cards and happy to do that.

SENATOR BYE: Back to the bill about campus housing that's not on the campus but is university sanctioned, basically. I just want to be really clear. HB5166

What you're saying is for all of your independent colleges in Connecticut, they already have to have the same rules that people that live off campus as people who live on campus.

And they're subject to both criminal and college, if you will, crimes or I don't know what you'd call them.

JUDITH GREIMAN: Campus judicial code.

SENATOR BYE: Campus judicial code.

JUDITH GREIMAN: Code of conduct, yeah.

SENATOR BYE: They already are.

JUDITH GREIMAN: Yes.

SENATOR BYE: And so this is covered. Representative Adinolfi may have seen situations where he thought this isn't being enforced.

JUDITH GREIMAN: I can get you the information.

SENATOR BYE: Okay.

JUDITH GREIMAN: I think there are very few with sworn officers, and then everybody else has public safety, but I can get you that information.

SENATOR BYE: Okay. I'm just trying to look at the expense of that on our state college campuses and the long-term recurring expenses that go with that. So I want to compare it to some of our private colleges.

JUDITH GREIMAN: Okay.

SENATOR BYE: So that would be great if you'd get me some information on it.

JUDITH GREIMAN: Yup.

SENATOR BYE: Thank you.

REP. WILLIS: Questions or comments? Thank you, Judy. Allen Sack.

ALLEN SACK: Good morning, everyone. My name is Allen Sack. I am a professor at the University of New Haven. HB5415

First, I'd like to thank Senator Bye, Representative Willis, and, in particular, Representative Pat Dillon for helping us to promote this particular initiative.

When I played college football at the University of Notre Dame in the 1960s, I received a four-year athletic scholarship. And that could not be canceled or reduced if I

were injured or if my athletic performance were deemed to be below my coach's expectations.

Since that time, rules regarding athletic scholarships have changed dramatically. In 1973, the NCAA made athletic scholarships renewable on a year-to-year basis. Four-year scholarships are a thing of the past.

Current NCAA rules clearly state, clearly state that athletic aid cannot be reduced or cancelled during the one-year period of its award on the basis of athletic ability or injury.

But the rules are murky when it comes to conditions for the renewal and non-renewal of a scholarship for a subsequent year. Some universities renew scholarships for four years as long as athletes continue playing and adhere to team rules. Others cancel scholarships for poor athletic performance or for injury.

And I truly believe this, reasonable people can disagree on which policy is best for their institutions, but prospective athletes and their parents must know with certainty the conditions under which scholarships can be reduced or cancelled while pursuing their degree.

Selecting a college to attend can be very, very difficult. I know that as a college professor. I talk to kids every day about this. It's hard. How do you finance this? What's going to happen in the future?

Knowing the conditions for the yearly renewal or nonrenewal of financial aid is absolutely

essential for making a well-informed decision.

The Connecticut Student-Athletes Right to Know Act, that's what I would call it, would require post-secondary institutions to disclose their policy regarding the renewal and nonrenewal of scholarships, including circumstances in which an athlete in good academic standing, an athlete in good academic standing suffers a sport-related injury, there is a coaching change, or athletic performance is deemed to be below expectations.

Coach, well, can I just --

A VOICE: Yes.

ALLEN SACK: We owe this kind of honesty to our students, including athletes who enhance the quality of student life on Connecticut's college campuses and provide a point of emotional attachment for Connecticut citizens to their colleges and universities.

Thank you.

REP. WILLIS: Thank you. Questions or comments? Representative Dillon, did you want to ask --

REP. DILLON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Perhaps I could wait until both testify, and then we'll have an idea of the full package. But I do want to mention that Dr. Sack is a resident of the 92nd District, which gives him elevated status, as you know.

REP. WILLIS: Right.

REP. DILLON: Right. Thank you. And his seat mate there is a nationally recognized expert on this and flew in from California specifically

because the chairs were willing to hear this bill, and I want to thank you for that.

REP. WILLIS: Thank you.

RAMOGI HUMA: First of all, I'd just like to thank this committee for addressing this issue.

Good morning. My name is Ramogi Huma. I'm a former UCLA football player, and I'm the President of the NCPA, the National College Players Association.

The NCPA is a nonprofit advocacy group made up of over 14,000 Division I student-athletes from universities in Connecticut and across the nation.

My phone is going off. I'm sorry. Thought I had it on vibrate here. Okay. Sorry about that.

The majority of high school recruits who are typically 16 and 17 years old during the recruiting process are deciding which colleges to attend based on false information given to them by athletic recruiters.

As a result, most recruits and their parents have no idea that colleges can leave them with sports-related medical expenses, take away their scholarships for any reason, leave them with tens of thousands of dollars in educational-related expenses, and hold their eligibility hostage when trying to transfer schools.

Under NCAA rules, colleges are not required to pay for any sports-related medical expenses. It's all optional. So if a player breaks his leg in the national championship game, that

school is not required to pay one penny in medical expenses.

In fact, The New York Times reported extensively about student-athletes stuck with sports-related medical bills. My organization attempted to get all NCAA Division I colleges to disclose a handful of key medical policies, for instance, who's responsible for sports-related deductibles and coinsurance when a player is injured during a game?

Unfortunately, 90 percent of Division I universities refused our request to voluntarily disclose this information so that recruits would be better informed. Also, universities across the nation offer full athletic scholarships that are not truly full.

In fact, NCAA rules cap every athletic scholarship in the nation below the cost of attendance. Last year, the NCPA conducted a joint study with Ithaca College.

Using the cost of attendance numbers that schools report to the U.S. Department of Education, we found that the average full scholarship will leave student-athletes with $3,000 per year in educational-related expenses.

And this scholarship shortfall ranges from as low as $200 per year to more than $6,000 per year, depending on which school. Now recruits, they don't even know that there's a scholarship shortfall. They don't know that it exists much less how much the shortfall is from one school to the next.

For all of these reasons, the NCPA sponsored the Student-Athletes Right to Know Act in

California, which won approval. Beginning in 2012, all of California's universities will post a handful of key policies and practices online.

This will allow recruits and their parents to make an informed decision about which college to attend. The bill fully complies with NCAA rules, and none of California's state colleges opposed the final language.

I'm here to urge the state of Connecticut to do the same and adopt language that's identical to the California law. Otherwise, even the most knowledgeable recruits who ask all of the right questions will be forced to rely on verbal promises from athletic recruiters.

And I did hear a couple other concerns, which I'm glad were brought up earlier, which, again, we talked about NCAA rules, and initially the California bill, I did run into that issue about compliance with NCAA rules.

In the final language, that's all worked out. The NCAA has never opposed this bill. And, in fact, they stated publicly that anything that gives recruits more information is a good thing. And in terms of athletic scholarships, I know some schools don't offer them.

Those schools would not, they, it wouldn't apply to those particular provisions in the bill. But student-athletes from those schools still need to know, if they're injured, what happens. So I'm open to any questions you guys might have. Thank you for your time.

REP. WILLIS: I think we may have a lot of questions, actually. I'm going to let my

members of the committee, and then I will, I'm sure Senator Bye and myself have some questions for you as well.

Yes, Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON: Thank you. I wanted to follow up a little bit, and I know that I kind of bungled the language that we put in there, but it could be worked on.

I really filed this bill partly because of your success in California, because as a graduate, I was at Ohio State, as I told you, when Woody Haze was there, and my husband's a Tar Heel.

We have very young franchises here in Connecticut, and we're a small state. And I was very concerned, because we're very protective of them. And I'm thinking really of UConn because of what Randy Edsall did.

I mean, he left in a pretty low-class way, in my view, and, but it made me think that we take our own folks for granted when they stick around.

And so for that reason, I was guarded about it, but, of course, these student-athletes are students, and so I would like to ask you just a couple questions, very small, but the current language requires athletic coaches to do the disclosing. You talked about post-secondary institutions. What's the difference to you?

RAMOGI HUMA: Well, the, it actually requires the programs, so the athletic program's really the coach's. The trouble is this.

The coaches, everything they, when they go recruit, there's nothing in writing, so to ensure a recruit knows and understands fully about these particular issues, the program, the athletic program would be responsible to post the policies online.

And in terms of the written material that recruits receive, they would all have to have a hyperlink to show recruits where to find those policies, and that's the extent of it. Hopefully, the coaches would be, you know, in line with what's posted.

And that's the whole point. If there's any confusion at all, recruits can go straight to the website and see.

ALLEN SACK: I'd also like to respond to that question, a very important question. There's a notion, if there are any athletic people in the room, athletic directors or what have you, they talk about institutional control, like if the president of the university (inaudible), and the university is not aware of what's going on in the athletic department, and the athletic department goes astray in some way or the other, the head of the institution can't say, I'm sorry, we just didn't know.

They're held institutionally responsible, therefore, I think that we have to be told about it, not about the coaches necessarily. We're really talking about the institutions making a commitment to the education of the athletes.

REP. DILLON: Thank you. And one other follow-up question. The, you know, in this committee, we've talked about the graduation rights of athletes many times. And my brother-in-law

owes his education to an athletic scholarship.

And for a lot of kids I know, you know, athletics are kind of like the National Guard, which is also, and that is it's a ticket to higher education.

So I'm concerned about, you know, what they're getting when they do this, and I want them to graduate without damaging anybody, you know, but, and I think we all agree.

We've always kind of talked about whether the colleges are doing a good job, or we blame the athletes for dropping out. I never thought of the NCAA rules, and I guess I want to poke that a little bit.

I realize neither one of you represents the NCAA, but based on your understanding of the current NCAA rules, can a coach recommend against the renewal of athletic financial aid on the basis of an athlete's ability or an athlete's injury?

ALLEN SACK: Yes, they certainly can, and they oftentimes do. A university, in fact, can take away his financial aid or not renew it for another year on the basis of injury or on the basis of performance.

Let me add to that, however, to be very fair, that once they do that, the young athlete who has been not renewed can appeal that to a hearing. They're allowed to go through a hearing. But, again, how that hearing comes up is up in the air for anyone.

You know, we don't know which way they're going to go on that. They can say, no, we're not going to let the kid for that reason, or

they could say, yes, we are going to let them go for that reason. So it's pretty arbitrary. So that's my point I was making about the murkiness.

My mom and dad knew exactly what was going on when I off to Notre Dame. They really did. It was clear. Today, it's not quite as clear. And we are, I know, I am not, and I don't think Ramogi is talking about changing NCAA regulations.

Those regulations, they have them, and we're not talking about changing them. We're just saying that each family and each prospective athlete should know exactly what those rules are, one or the other.

REP. DILLON: But I have to tell you that the more I learn about the work you two are doing, the better our own Connecticut colleges look, because we're a small state competing against franchises that have gone on for generations.

And I guess if, could you follow up, not today, obviously, with cases and with NCAA regs to support what you just said? I'm not challenging whether you're right or not, but it, never in my mind, in all the times we talked about graduation, did I think about the NCAA.

I was worried about whether the schools support the athletes, and I was worried about whether the kids were bolting for a better deal. I never thought about the NCAA. I know that maybe other people did. So if you could get us that, that would help me a lot.

ALLEN SACK: Representative Dillon, I go back and forth across this country. For 30 years, I've

been talking about this issue ever since 1973, and I run into people who absolutely cannot believe that they still don't have four-year scholarships.

They believe there are still four-year scholarships. And there are other people who absolutely believe we should be able to take away a scholarship if they don't perform.

We take away scholarships for an academic, on academic scholarships, because people don't perform to a certain grade point average, why shouldn't we be able to take them away from performance any other way?

Hey, that's a, you can argue that, but let the students know that that debate exists and what exactly the policies are at the universities.

In response to your question, does that mean if I get an affidavit of some sort or have these people send along this information, I do know people, compliance people from Marshall University and other places who can answer you directly about cases of just, you know, not renewing athletic scholarships. And I assume that's what you're asking for.

REP. DILLON: Well, I'm asking for the committee, for the public testimony that's going to be before the committee when we make decisions to have a citation available in the NCAA regulations, not just somebody's opinion but, you know, specific cases, because I'm not aware of abuses in Connecticut, but we have a lot of athletes.

We've been very aggressive about building a franchise that's only one generation old. And we're competing against, you know, the Chapel

Hills and the Ohio States and the UCLAs and so forth. So we want to protect the athletes. We want them to graduate. They're students.

We also want to try to figure out what's going on with the NCAA, or at least that's where I'm coming from. And having said that then, now having said I'm worried about the NCAA, you've suggested some changes to the proposed language that I filed, which is fine. I mean, I don't, this is a little bit over my head.

But to you, in your view, I mean, given that the California legislation was a compromise, look at higher education is my understanding. Are any of the things you're talking about to us this morning a violation of existing NCAA regulations?

ALLEN SACK: Not, not with the (inaudible).

RAMOGI HUMA: Initially, the initial language had some issues with the NCAA rules, just some of the simple language, and that's all been resolved in the California bill. The schools dropped that.

In terms of opposition and their concerns on that point, they dropped opposition on that point. And, again, the NCAA didn't, they didn't have anything bad to say about the bill, and they didn't oppose.

So this, the bill, and I have a hard copy for members of the committee or anyone else, and you can kind of see what's in the bill itself.

And, actually, I'd like to just follow up on that question, you said, did this happen. Just to paint a picture, we got calls from dozens of people in the summertime from all

over the nation. It was almost an identical call.

Look, it was July 1, because the deadline, if you're going to take away a scholarship from a player, you have to let them know by July 1, so, you know, we were getting a lot of calls in in late June and early July from players who were promised four years by their coach.

They said, look, I thought I was on a four-year scholarship. Then it come out, then come to find I'm only on a one-year scholarship, they took my scholarship away because I got injured, or a new coach just came in, doesn't want me here. They want to bring in their own players.

Can they do that? Is this even legal? Is this, is you, do the NCAA rules allow for this? And, unfortunately, it does. And like what Allen said, and the same thing with medical coverage, what happens if you get injured.

I asked every coach that question when I got recruited. They all said, don't worry, we'll take care of everything. And they don't. They don't have to. It's all optional.

And as a matter of fact, at the time, the NCAA, they didn't allow schools to pay for any medical expenses during summer workouts, which was a shock to everybody on my team when we found out.

So we want to make sure that there's continuity between what the recruiters are telling the athletes and what the schools actually are going to follow through on.

REP. DILLON: So in theory, you've got a football scholarship. Your knee gets ground freshman year. Your scholarship doesn't get renewed.

Your school technically may not be on the hook for your medical expenses, and they get dumped at the end. Is that a, I'm not saying that happened in Connecticut, but that could happen.

RAMOGI HUMA: Yes.

REP. DILLON: Or maybe you don't perform as well as they thought, and they find a newer model when you're a sophomore. Is that a potential also?

RAMOGI HUMA: Typically, the top three is injury, a new coach comes in, or poor performance. Those are the three main issues in scholarship non-awardance.

ALLEN SACK: Let me be fair to the NCAA, please. We have, right here is the NCAA's rules and regulations.

And they do say here in 15.3.3.1.2, and the book is this thick, a staff member of the school may inform a prospective student-athlete that the athlete's, athletics department will recommend through the financial aid authority that the prospective student-athlete's financial aid be renewed each year for a period of four years and may indicate that the authority always has followed the athletics department's recommendations in the past.

However, however, the prospective student-athlete must be informed that the renewal will not be automatic. All right?

So they're saying that they can recommend that to the committee, and they can say in the past the academic, the financial aid committee has gone along with that, but they don't have to follow that in the future.

What's missing from this, and I'm not saying the NCAA has to change its language, what's missing is it doesn't say when the university can actually take the scholarship away.

In other words, it's not saying that the, what the universities, I think, should say to the students is, by the way, we can recommend that you not receive your athletic scholarship just as well as we can recommend that we continue it.

And many people don't realize that they can recommend not to renew, and then that can be followed up by a hearing where they say, no, we're not renewing it.

So we have this young man or young woman who thought that they were trying very hard out there, they were keeping up their academic standards, and then they lost the scholarship, and they're surprised.

It should have been clear to them that, in fact, you can take away an athletic scholarship. You can.

REP. DILLON: Then could you provide copies of all of that to the committee --

ALLEN SACK: Sure.

REP. DILLON: -- so that we can look at it, too?

ALLEN SACK: Excellent. Yes. No problem.

REP. WILLIS: Thank you. This has certainly been an eye-opener, but as I've experienced, going up against athletic departments is the third rail.

A VOICE: (Inaudible).

REP. WILLIS: I know. A question for you. You said, unfortunately, 90 percent of the Division I schools refused your request to voluntarily disclose their medical policies. Where, was Connecticut in, any of our public universities in that?

RAMOGI HUMA: You know, I know that they were asked. I'm not sure if any of them reported, so I could check on that, and I'll (inaudible).

REP. WILLIS: Yes. I think members of this committee would like to know, and if there are private schools as well, we'd like to know, too, if they refuse to voluntarily disclose. The thing that strikes me about this is when students, and you know there's a lot of pressure on them in terms of recruitment.

You know, they're offered all kinds of packages. And this could be a deciding factor, you know, having this information whether a student went with one school or another, if they offered more protection.

I want to go back to the criteria for someone losing their athletic, how often does it happen, or does it happen that if a student is doing well, no sports injury, performing well, but their academics aren't up to snuff, how often do they not get their scholarships renewed?

RAMOGI HUMA: You're asking if they're doing well athletically? Is that --

REP. WILLIS: If they're doing, if they're crossing all their T's and dotting their I's in every other category except academics, do they lose their scholarships?

RAMOGI HUMA: Only if the school wants to take them away, but I think they --

REP. WILLIS: How often does that, does, is that a bar that's important to our universities?

RAMOGI HUMA: Well, I think, again, like Allen said, I think it's up to the universities for them to decide, you know, to determine how they want to operate their program. But in terms of the frequency, it's very tough to know.

I mean, from one school to the next, under NCAA rules, they can all operate differently. And very few times do these ever come to light. You know, it's becoming more of a hot topic.

Last January, ESPN covered when John Calipari went from Memphis to Kentucky and ran off all the players off scholarship by his own guys being over signed.

But you don't really know exactly from one school to the next, because a lot of times what happens is the coaches of the schools, they say, well, look, if you keep this under wraps, I'll help you transfer out somewhere else.

Maybe I can try to arrange a scholarship or,

you know, play nice and don't appeal, and, you know, I'll take care of you, so it's, I think it's only recently, as we've been able to get more, our organization's been able to gather the medium more on this issue, that I'd be glad to come on board and say, hey, there's something we can do. But from one school to the next can be very different.

REP. WILLIS: (Inaudible).

ALLEN SACK: Well, could I respond to your question as well? The NCAA makes it very clear, I think, that if an athlete renders him or herself ineligible, you know, then they lose the athletic scholarship. In fact, if you fail out, there's no scholarship (inaudible).

REP. WILLIS: Well, I'm actually not saying fail out.

ALLEN SACK: Yeah, you're just saying very low, yeah.

REP. WILLIS: Right, because don't they have standards that you have to maintain, you know, C or better, or, I mean, that wouldn't necessarily get you thrown out of school, or B or better, but the question is do you lose your scholarship if you fall below that threshold?

RAMOGI HUMA: You don't have to lose your scholarship. So the same school that takes away an athletic scholarship from a 3.5 player for some, because of injury or a new coach comes in, they can renew a scholarship for a player who's academically ineligible. They can do that, same as that institution.

REP. WILLIS: Okay. Next question. Here in

Connecticut, and I'm sure this may be a case across the nation, is a lot of the money for the athletic program comes through private dollars, the foundation, which gets complicated, because, in a way, well, they consider that private dollars.

How much does that come into play in terms of an athletic department that's funded through a foundation, not through state funds? Are there different standards in those situations? And is it harder to get at something like this?

RAMOGI HUMA: I honestly, from what I know from the different schools, it really doesn't have much bearing on this particular issue of scholarship renewals or health coverage.

The schools are free to operate how they want whether or not it's through public funds or private. Under NCAA rules, that's the standard, and the NCAA rules are so, I guess, lax that, so colleges can actually make their own determinations on these issues.

REP. WILLIS: I must say, I'm a little disappointed. This is a, I think, an issue that I hadn't really thought about, and it had never been brought to our attention before, I've been on this committee for eight years, but one that's obviously something we should be paying attention to.

And it's interesting that our universities aren't here to answer some of our questions on this.

Yes, Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAYERS: Sayers.

REP. WILLIS: Sorry.

REP. SAYERS: It happens all the time. I'm getting used to it. One other thing that you mentioned, and I just wanted to be clear, you talked about that sometimes families aren't aware that they might have expenses as part of that scholarship, sort of like a co-pay or some responsibility that they aren't informed ahead of time.

And the second half of my question is if, for instance, in the first game someone is injured, and they're going to be out or ineligible to play for the rest of the season, is it possible they could lose their scholarship and then be responsible for the full cost of their education even though they are expecting a scholarship?

RAMOGI HUMA: The scholarship out-of-pocket expenses, as defined and mandated by NCAA rules, virtually no family in the nation understands that that's even there, you know.

I mean, an example might be parking fees, fees that the university would charge that the schools by NCAA rules cannot provide for a player.

If given the option, maybe some of these universities would provide some of these expenses, but the world we live in, there's that gap and from one school to the next is different, you know. So that's why it's important that families understand what the price tag is with each respective institution.

In terms of the injured player on scholarship, in a given year, they cannot take the

scholarship away at the point of injury, but once the academic year is over, they can revoke the scholarship. They don't have to renew it.

But during the year, every single expense associated with that injury, they don't have to touch any of those expenses. They can leave those squarely on the family if they want to.

REP. SAYERS: Thank you.

REP. WILLIS: Representative Rovero.

REP. ROVERO: A quick question. I'm not sure if you have the answer. Do you have any idea how many states have a policy similar to Bill 5415?

RAMOGI HUMA: Just California. I can, we're the sponsor in California. We brought this to legislation in California. It was a first of its kind, and we're hoping to get into a couple more states.

Actually, there's a legislative cycle in addition to Connecticut. So this is something, I mean, it got bipartisan support in California. It was very popular.

And we're hoping that, you know, the same response is here, because I think, as you've stated, you know, you can be on the committee for years and years and not know about these issues, because they've never really been brought up.

But I think that, like Allen was saying, you know, it's one thing to say whether or not players should be covered, you know, with a,

their medical expenses should be covered or whether or not a scholarship should be full or not, those are all debatable.

But what shouldn't be debatable is whether or not players should be aware of what expenses they're going to be expected to pay out of pocket.

Whether or not, when they're injured, whether or not the school's going to pay any of it at all, if they'd like to transfer, would that school hold them hostage and not let them?

You know, those are things that players should know ahead of time, because the other thing that actually hasn't been covered in this committee is there's different signing dates. So, for instance, football just passed. You need to know all this information before you sign.

Once you get to the school, some schools say, well, you know, we have orientations once our athletes get here. Well, by that time, it's too late, because that player's already committed, signed, and at your school.

So players need to know this ahead of time, and that's why making it public is the right thing to do.

The Internet's a great tool. It's basically free. You know, the universities post things online all the time. They're hovering over the policies, so it doesn't take much for them to comply with this bill.

REP. ROVERA: You know, I agree with everything you're saying, except I always like to listen to both sides of the story. And there's got

to be a reason why there's only one state out of 50 of them that have not passed this policy.

Is it so expensive or, there's got to be a reason, and I wonder if I could hear the other side of the reason.

RAMOGI HUMA: Well, we're one for one. We're one for one. We started last year in California. We're one for one. It was the first time it was (inaudible).

REP. ROVERA: Okay. Then you just started doing this or --

RAMOGI HUMA: Yeah, last spring.

REP. ROVERA: Okay. Thank you.

SENATOR BYE: Representative Giegler.

REP. GIEGLER: Thank you very much, Mrs. Chairman.

A couple of questions. Right now, we are in the process, we see in all of our local papers that we're seeing the high school students signing their letters of intent for the universities.

How much information are these families actually being given at that time of the letter of intent being signed?

RAMOGI HUMA: That's a great question. Most letters of intent, at the time, in the fine print, they say that the scholarships are actually going to be up for renewal at the end of the year. So that's one piece of information they get.

Again, as I just mentioned, it's way too late. You know, they've already been promised. Most, the vast majority have been promised a four-year guarantee by recruiters.

So, you know, and at that point, whether or not, for them to go try to look into which school's doing what, it's too late, because all the other schools are going to wait.

If you have one school, you're going to sign with them. And if you don't sign at that point, you're going to have a very tough time signing at all afterwards, because most players, they're not the blue chip players. You know, there are very few blue chip players in this nation.

Those players might have other options, but for the average player, it's either that school or bust at that point. But that's the only piece of information of what we're talking about.

They don't have information about medical expenses and the ability to transfer, definitely nothing about out-of-pocket expenses for a scholarship.

They mention what's in the scholarship, but they don't mention what's not in the scholarship, and that's what's important to a player.

ALLEN SACK: And I would suggest that although they do tell the player that their athletic scholarship will be up for renewal in a year, they don't go to the next step and say, we don't have to renew it if you end up being a recruiting mistake or dead wood, as some people would call it. And I think that should

be disclosed.

REP. GIEGLER: Also in the NCAA, there's various divisions within the NCAA and also various sports. I know that Division I is the one that primarily is where the scholarships lie and not so much in Divisions II and III and also more so with one sport over another sport.

But is the, are the regulations universal for NCAA between sports and divisions that offer scholarships?

RAMOGI HUMA: For the most part, they're universal. There are some regulations, for instance, you guys might have heard of college athletes, if they transfer, they have to sit out a year. That's just football and basketball, ice hockey, and baseball.

Players of all other sports can transfer one time without punishment. So that's an example of how they might get there, but for these issues, within a given division, they're the same. But this bill in California applies to all divisions.

If, for instance, Division III, which doesn't give scholarships, you know, in terms of complying with that bill, they wouldn't, it would be, it wouldn't be applicable for them to disclose what's in a scholarship or not, because they don't offer them or what's in a scholarship renewal or not, because they don't offer them.

But they, players that participate in Division III do need to know if that school's going to help them on medical expenses or not and if they try to transfer, whether or not they

would allow them to transfer or not.

So this bill actually would apply to all divisions, but depending on the division's manuals and what the school's going to offer in the first place, some of it might not be as relevant.

But Division II does actually offer scholarships, so we're really talking about Division III, which is the exception.

ALLEN SACK: I would add that at the Division II level, I'm from the University of New Haven, and our scholarships are generally not room, board, tuition, and fees full athletic scholarships.

At the Division II level, they're far more likely to be an amalgam of need-based aid plus some kind of other non-athletic scholarship, plus some amount of athletic scholarship aid.

But I think that the students at the Division II level should know, they have as much of a right to disclosure about that athletic aid and how it can removed as any other level.

REP. GIEGLER: Well, the next question kind of goes more toward the Division II and III, but in light of what the economics is in a lot of colleges, I know there have been some sports, primarily not in football, basketball, but some of the other ones, where they choose to change their teams to club teams.

What if there's a student that signed on and has gone to school and signed on their freshman year and has no idea that the school has now decided.

And it may have had this team in place for years, and all of the sudden it drops it to a club team. There's nothing that they have to tell them that this is on the books, I guess.

RAMOGI HUMA: Right, and that's also outside the scope of this bill. And when it happens, I know it's devastating to the players that they lose scholarship opportunities. Some of them were highly recruited from other schools. Those opportunities are pretty much gone now, so it can definitely be tough.

Some of the schools, you know, they'll keep them on either the scholarships that they were giving them, you know, initially whether that be a partial scholarship or a full scholarship.

Some schools would do that so that there's not such of a hard condition. Some of them only do it for a year, so, yeah, that's a tough one for athletes.

ALLEN SACK: I'm going to brag about my university for a minute, University of New Haven, and as some of you may know, we did drop football all together about five years ago, and then we just brought it back.

But when we dropped football, those football players, many of whom were in my classes, they were guaranteed that they would still have their scholarships until they graduated or for the next couple of years. But that, it varies.

That's what I'm saying. People have to know what the institution's saying. It changes from one place to another.

REP. GIEGLER: Thank you (inaudible).

ALLEN SACK: You're welcome.

A VOICE: Yeah.

ALLEN SACK: Thanks for having us.

REP. WILLIS: I'm going to ask a couple of questions here, and then I'll go to, we have more questions. We're not done with you.

ALLEN SACK: Oh, okay. Sure.

REP. WILLIS: I'm looking through the testimony that CSU submitted. And they raised an interesting point which is of concern to me, and that's, well, first of all, you know, students, you know, Notre Dame comes and recruits you to play football.

Kids have stars in their eyes. They're not going to be looking necessarily at the practical side of it that may be apparent. And that's, and they're going to make those kinds of choices.

But one issue that CSU raised is, and you see it more now with emphasis on the foot, the head injuries for football players, traumatic brain injury, lifetime medical bills, repeated hits to the head.

I know there's a lot of, even in pro ball, talking about that. That's expensive. That is a lifetime, you know, ramifications, and so those incalculable costs are out there. Anyway, let me go to Representative LeGeyt.

REP. LEGEYT: Thank you, Madam Chair. Welcome, gentlemen.

It seems like our discussion here has, is essentially in two camps. One is the inequities that occur when a player is in college and the disadvantage that that player might have vis a vis the institution when it comes to discovering the circumstances that may develop about his continued scholarship status or trying to, you know, do some kind of bargaining to make sure that he gets the best, he or she gets the best opportunity they can.

But the other side is prior to enrollment and the disclosure needs that have to happen for prospective students, players, and their families, I was just wondering, this seems like there's a little business vacuum going on here in that it would be very helpful for families to have resources of a counselor, an advisor, maybe even an attorney to steer them through this process, even if the bill that we're talking about becomes a law. Do you know if that exists at all?

RAMOGI HUMA: To my knowledge, it's not widespread, and, in fact, recruits, they're not able to, it might sound strange, but most of us, if we want to go get a lawyer, we can go get a lawyer.

But if you do that as a prospective NCAA athlete, in terms of, especially if you try to use that in terms of negotiating a deal or getting the best deal for you, it's a violation of NCAA rules, which puts players even at a further disadvantage. Just as a member of society, they don't have that privilege.

REP. LEGEYT: What's the violation?

RAMOGI HUMA: It violates their amateur status, basically because you have an agent negotiating a deal for you in college.

REP. LEGEYT: Wow.

RAMOGI HUMA: So it's a tough deal for families, and information is all they have. If you make an informed decision as a recruit, then while you're there as a player, at least you know what you're getting.

Whether it be favorable policies or not, you knew ahead of time, and if you had other options, you've already explored those, but you went with a certain school.

So it's more of a fair deal than what they have now, because right now, I mean, it's complete and utter, too often, it's complete and utter deception, you know.

And even if a coach really wants to follow through on their promises, that coach may or may not be there the next year. He might get fired or take another job. So you got somebody else coming in who hasn't promised you anything.

REP. LEGEYT: Right.

RAMOGI HUMA: And I'd like to just address the, actually the long-term head injuries. The bill in California actually addresses that, because part of the disclosure is asking them how long a duration will these medical, if at all, will a school pay for medical expenses?

So if I'm a baseball player, and I get injured in the spring, and I'm a senior, but my eligibility is done in a few months later, but

I need knee surgery, and it's going to take a year of rehab, I should know that before I get there.

But a school that doesn't want to commit to long-term financial agreements for medical expenses, you know, they don't have to, but players should still know that.

And, yes, we're in a new frontier with all these head injuries and what that really is going to mean.

But they're, the schools are free to address that even if they want to specifically and say, well, with head injuries, here's our policy, because this is unknown, and there's unknown cost. So it doesn't prevent schools from doing that.

REP. LEGEYT: Thank you. I had another question.

ALLEN SACK: I just wanted to respond to Representative LeGeyt. With regard to those young kids, they could be in seventh grade, and they're being contacted already by the universities.

I think it would be a tremendous step forward if a family could go online to the university's website, and they would be able to, and they were advised, in fact, by the NCAA or whatever coach contacted them first to look online at the university's website, and they would see a clear and understandable set of guidelines with regard to what's going on with regard to financial aid injury and so forth.

If we're having a discussion right now, and many of us may find it pretty complicated,

just think about the family that really doesn't know that much about college sports to begin with or a young kid who doesn't have much guidance from parents or others.

It should be clearer. And that's all we're asking for here. We're not asking for a revolutionary change in NCAA regulations at all. We're just saying, where are the regulations? Could you make it clearer for the families?

RAMOGI HUMA: Just to piggyback, it's not a subtle point. Right now, everybody here knows what the pitfalls are for a recruit.

And if you had a child going through the recruiting process right now, you can ask all the right questions and still have to rely on a verbal promise from a coach. It may or may not be true. So we need something in writing for these recruits so they can depend on it.

REP. LEGEYT: Right. And my wife works in financial aid at a four-year institution in Connecticut.

And even before families get to the negotiation process regarding athletics, if that's an opportunity for them, just the process of trying to work through the myriad of considerations and aspects that going to college and trying to arrange for financial aid present, families aren't prepared for that much less, you know, trying to sense the landscape that applying for a student, for an athletic scholarship represents.

I think that's a, to me, that seems like a huge problem. I wondered if you knew if there are any initiatives in other states besides

California, which has passed this, and Connecticut.

RAMOGI HUMA: Well, we plan, there's two other states. Right now, I don't want to mention them yet, but we plan on introducing in two other states this year.

And you mentioned that this is more of a smaller state, and you're protective of your athletic programs, and these other states are all, they're very large states.

And I think it's important for us to make this become the norm, and it shouldn't matter if you're from a small state or a large state, but at the end of the day, it's about each state protecting the vulnerable population, which are the minors.

These guys, you know, there's, these guys and girls are 16 years old, 17 years old, they're being sold a bill of goods, which may or may not be true.

And, you know, I think California found that to be of utmost importance above and beyond some of the concerns that the schools raised. So every state has the opportunity to do that, but we are hoping to go to at least two more states this year.

REP. LEGEYT: I think the fact that the students are minors when they go through this process just exacerbates the disparity that is set up.

And I know as an attorney that as a certain level, disparity between contracting parties is an issue for, you know, it might make or break a contract, so thank you.

ALLEN SACK: One other thing I'd like to add is that I don't want people to misunderstand. I went to the University of Notre Dame on an athletic scholarship, and I consider that to be a tremendous privilege and tremendous opportunity, and I thank God. My parents could not have afforded that.

And today, young men and women that were given those God-given skills that they can leverage now in education, again, that's a wonderful opportunity. We're not trying to take that opportunity away.

We're not trying to say that we think schools shouldn't do this stuff. All we're saying is just, please, make it very clear what those rules are and how they apply to families.

SENATOR BYE: Okay. I have a few questions for you, and I just, before I start my questions, I just want to say to Mr. Sack, thank you for coming. I'm just sort of surprised you're the only university here testifying on it.

Actually, we have testimony from the CSUs, but this could really apply to UConn, you know, where we're giving out a great number of scholarships, very high profile athletes who start being recruited very early.

And so I want to thank you for coming on behalf of Connecticut universities, and to Mr. Huma, am I saying that right?

RAMOGI HUMA: Huma, yes.

SENATOR BYE: Huma. You flew in from California?

RAMOGI HUMA: Yes.

SENATOR BYE: I mean, that just speaks to your commitment to looking out for the needs of students after you've been through the process. And Representative Dillon, thank you so much for bringing this before us.

And like all things, we're talking about college sports. We're going to spend talking about this than curriculum. I have a few questions for you. I'm just in this process a little bit myself as a parent.

And before a student can speak to a university, they need to go to a clearinghouse and put, to a Division I university, that is. They need to go and sign up for a clearinghouse.

Now when the students sign up on that clearinghouse to speak to a D-I coach, is there any sort of informed consent? Does that say some of these rules?

I mean, that seems like that would be an excellent place, because before any coach could talk to you, you have to go to the clearinghouse.

So is there anything in the clearinghouse that takes care of this problem or that gives information to parents and students?

RAMOGI HUMA: Unfortunately, no. And when we voluntarily asked, we asked all the colleges to volunteer their medical information, we also asked the NCAA to do something about this. They're very, they know about this issue.

They know that players don't have information on medical expenses, and we urge them strongly

to do something. But they're not willing to do it, which is unfortunate, which is why we're here.

You know, if the NCAA and the schools were doing things voluntarily, that would be the best case scenario.

I wouldn't have had to come from California, and, you know, I think recruits would have had a better deal. But it's, unfortunately, it looks like it's going to be a fight to get information out there.

SENATOR BYE: Well, what about the clearinghouse having information about scholarships being revoked, because at least for me, that's one of the most shocking things here. And maybe it shouldn't be. I'm still back with Notre Dame pre-1973, you know.

ALLEN SACK: A lot of people are.

SENATOR BYE: I think that's the general public's understanding, so do you think the clearinghouse could be a good place that would say, if you have a scholarship, here, it can be revoked at any time?

ALLEN SACK: They don't have to be renewed.

SENATOR BYE: Right. Right.

ALLEN SACK: They cannot be revoked during the period of its award --

SENATOR BYE: I got it. Got it.

ALLEN SACK: -- which is one year, and that's --

RAMOGI HUMA: I think there's two different issues.

That's the NCAA rule, but schools have their own policies under those rules, so that clearinghouse doesn't have the ability to be a bottleneck for all the schools' policies.

SENATOR BYE: Oh, they don't all have to?

RAMOGI HUMA: No, it's one clearinghouse, and let's just say the NCAA rule was up there. Well, then at least that helps me to know my scholarship may or may not be revoked, but it doesn't tell me whether or not school A is going to actually use that, wield that power if I get injured or not.

SENATOR BYE: Right.

RAMOGI HUMA: So you actually need every single school to disclose their information, because it can change from one school to the next. That rule is universal, but underneath that rule, costs and practices are very different.

SENATOR BYE: Okay. Thank you. And to Representative LeGeyt's question related to contracting parties not being on a level playing field, now can parents bargain at all?

Could they, say, meet with an athletic director and say, look, you want my kid to be a running back. I'm only letting him come here if you promise four years of scholarship, because running backs get hurt a lot.

RAMOGI HUMA: Well, actually, technically, any coach that promises four years or guarantees four years is in violation of NCAA rules. It happens all the time. That's the norm. As Allen said, referencing NCAA rules, they kind of give them cover for it, too, so it makes it very murky.

The NCAA says, well, you can tell people what you normally do. Well, if normally means revoking 49 percent of the scholarships every year, then you really actually retain 51 percent. You normally renew scholarships. I mean, that could be interpreted very widely, so it's tough.

SENATOR BYE: Well, yeah, and that, again, makes it not a really fair process. Go ahead.

ALLEN SACK: Now this may take us somewhere else, but I just want to mention as a point of fact, there is now a court case in, at Rice University of a young man who was actually injured and also ended up not being able to perform to the standards that they really expected who lost his scholarship.

He has taken an anti-trust case against the NCAA saying that he and any other athletes should be able to bargain. Like he just said, any other student can do that and not ask them.

If you want more financial aid at Wesleyan University as to go someplace else, you can go back and forth and say, I'm not coming here, I'm going to UConn College or whatever, right?

But college athletes cannot do that, and that's, I'm watching that case very, very closely, because it could mean that it would end up with, if he wins, if this young man wins, then you would be able to bargain and say, look, I want a four-year scholarship for my son or for my daughter, and the other schools won't give it to me, and I deserve it.

We're not asking for pay. We're just asking

for financial aid. It's another violation of amateurism.

RAMOGI HUMA: If I could, that, this bill can actually help prevent some of these lawsuits from coming up as well.

ALLEN SACK: Yeah.

RAMOGI HUMA: Some, now the Connecticut schools have no choice but to agree with the NCAA to cap scholarships at one year. But, for instance, there's a lot of issues with schools offering scholarships and then rescinding the offer later.

Those are verbal agreements. Some of them have offered written agreements, and they still rescind them. And there's been lawsuits.

Some of these schools are being sued, and, you know, the more that you could put in writing disclosed, the more it's going to protect your institution from these lawsuits, because a verbal agreement is supposed to be binding.

SENATOR BYE: Okay. A couple more questions. If, oh, sorry, a little distracting. That's okay. Mine went off earlier. Yours went off.

If the student is injured, and they lose their scholarship, so they're playing football for the University of Connecticut, they tear their ACL, it's so wrecked they can never play again, do you have a sense of what percentage of schools then would say, if you're not playing, because you got injured playing football, you don't get your scholarship next year? I mean, is that the norm, or is this rare?

RAMOGI HUMA: It's a good question, and it varies school to school, honestly. So it's really, no one knows, no one knows, but everyone should know, and that's a big problem. But we know it does happen.

SENATOR BYE: And back to Division III. I mean, it's pretty clear with Division III athletes, because they're very competitive recruiting athletes in Division III schools. And we've got some in this state.

It's very clear that they, their financial aid packages change, and I heard an example just last week of a student that went to a NESCAC school as a football player, and this was a while ago, but got injured, couldn't play football anymore, and so his financial aid just tanked. He didn't get financial aid. I mean, is that rare, or is that something that does go on?

ALLEN SACK: Well, that's very interesting you should say that. My understanding is that that cannot happen at a Division III school.

My son went to Wesleyan University. He was a lacrosse player. And the understanding is that you can walk away from that, from playing lacrosse, and it doesn't affect your aid, because it's need-based financial aid. Unless your need changes, then there shouldn't be a change in your financial aid.

SENATOR BYE: Right, but I think there is some, like you talked about negotiations. I mean, I have a nephew who is a basketball player, two NESCAC schools were, and one ended up coming up with more need-based financial aid.

ALLEN SACK: Oh, no doubt about that. They do, they do, you will find that a Conn college may give a little more financial aid to, than another school will to your son or daughter, but once they get it, they can't take it away.

SENATOR BYE: Okay. So --

ALLEN SACK: And that's why the coaches get so upset at the Division III level. They say, darn it, we went out of our way to give you more financial aid, and you're going to quit and go to, on an international program or something for the fall? You can't do that to us. Well, you can, you can.

SENATOR BYE: Right. Okay. Well, maybe it's changed. Like I said, this person was talking about, about a while ago, and, I'd asked that one. I'm sorry. I waited a long time to ask my questions. Those are most of them.

But I really want to thank you for coming here today and bringing this to our attention. And I do think you picked a good state to be second, because I think you can tell by this committee that we're very concerned about our students and that they get a fair shake.

And if you think of other ways that we can be helpful and live within the room, please let the committee know. Thank you.

ALLEN SACK: Well, we certainly thank you as well for listening to us.

REP. WILLIS: I have another question. You talked about the students and the parents not being on a level playing field with the schools, yeah, really, literally, with the schools, and that you couldn't bring in a third party, you

know, attorney or advisor.

My question would be, as a nonprofit, could a nonprofit such as yourself, your organization, be structured in such a way that you could collect fees from athletic departments to then set up an advocacy group, an information clearinghouse, that parents could contact and be advised and counseled? Have you ever thought about that, or is that something you --

RAMOGI HUMA: I think it is possible. The athletic programs, I don't know if they'd choose our organization to do that, but we'd be more than willing, and we are planning on actually being a bottleneck anyway. So even if they're all on different websites, we're going to gather all this information.

We're going to make ourselves a bottleneck so that recruits can, you know, if the NCAA and the schools don't do it themselves, they'll have a one-stop shop to be able to look what, how everybody's conducting business on the athletic program level.

REP. WILLIS: And, again, as a follow-up, not just school athletic departments, by why not the NCAA paying a fee to someone like your, you know, to an organization that could do advocacy work?

RAMOGI HUMA: I think it's not a lack of ability, it's a lack of will, unfortunately, and (inaudible).

REP. WILLIS: Yeah, well, I get that part, so, well, certainly students and families have a right to know. And, again, like my colleagues, we want to thank you for opening

up our eyes and shedding some light on this issue that I know we're going to be talking about and looking at.

RAMOGI HUMA: Thank you very much for having us.

ALLEN SACK: Yeah, thank you.

REP. WILLIS: And thank you, Representative Dillon. Oh, I'm sorry, Representative Rovero.

REP. ROVERO: You know, a quick question. And I'm very familiar with a student-athlete losing his scholarships, very, very familiar.

But, and I'm not saying you're wrong for coming to the state of Connecticut, secondly, but don't you think you should be working with the NCAA in conjunction with going to different states, because by the time you get done getting this past in 50 states, which I think it should be, you're not going to be here anymore.

Maybe your children can carry on for you, but this is, I think you ought to not only come to Connecticut and other states, you ought to try to hit NCAA, which I know is like going through a wall.

But the only way you're going to get this and get it, everybody on the same playing ground is if you get it through those people, because otherwise, you're going to hit here, hit there, hit there, and you're going to have half the schools involved and half of them not involved, and it's a very competitive sport.

I mean, most of these scholar athletes go to college to play pros athletics, to hit that big dollar, and we don't blame them, and I,

God bless them all, but I think you should be hitting the NCAA as much as you're hitting the states. And that's just my personal opinion.

RAMOGI HUMA: That's a great point. And the more states we get, the more leverage we'll have with the NCAA. Right now, they definitely have resisted participating in this process of making more information available to recruits, but I think that will change as we get more and more states.

We definitely, if I thought we had to go to 50 states, I'd be, you know, I'd be pretty discouraged. But I think if we get a good nucleus, we'll be where we want to be.

REP. ROVERA: Just don't give up the good work. Thank you for your time.

REP. WILLIS: I think your strategy is a wise one. You get a few states, and then they'll start paying attention, because they do want a level playing field nationally. They don't want different rules from state to state.

And a lot of times with a lot of legislation that we do in Connecticut and elsewhere, the goal is that we can attract attention, you know, nationally to respond. So Connecticut is a trendsetter, so maybe we'll be a trendsetter on this. Thank you very much.

RAMOGI HUMA: All right. Thank you.

ALLEN SACK: Thank you.

SENATOR BYE: Our next speaker is Kevin Corcoran.

KEVIN CORCORAN: That's going to be a tough act to follow.

A VOICE: I know. Yeah. Welcome.

KEVIN CORCORAN: Good afternoon, Senator Bye, Representative Willis, the committee members. My name is Kevin Corcoran. I'm the Associate Executive Director for the Connecticut Distance Learning Consortium, and I'm here to talk and offer our support for Bill 5886, AN ACT CONCERNING THE INCREASING ACCESS TO EDUCATION FOR INMATES.

I'd like to read the testimony I have just because it's very brief and then leave time for questions. Today marks the second week of closed online courses for eight offenders within the Carl Robinson Correctional Facility in Enfield, Connecticut.

Just after the first day of classes, just after one session, offenders expressed their excitement and eagerness to return and continue their studies.

This collaborative effort has between the Connecticut Distance Learning Consortium, Department of Correction, the Unified School District, and was made possible by a legislative funding from last year.

This pilot program offers inmates the ability to gain financial literacy skills that will be invaluable during their re-entry and help reduce recidivism rates within the state. Additionally, this financial literacy course is Connecticut Adult Ed approved and is worth one credit upon completion.

While it may be premature to call this pilot project a success after just one week, there have been several successes realized along the

Page 4 Line 4

Testimony Before Connecticut Legislature (2011)

Good morning everyone. My name is Allen Sack. I am a professor in the College of Business at the University of New Haven. First, I would like to thank HB5415 Senator Bye, Representative Willis and the entire Higher Education Committee for giving me this opportunity to present my views on this proposed legislation. Thanks also to Representative Pat Dillon for moving this important legislation along.

When I played college football at the University of Notre Dame in the 1960s, I received a four-year athletic scholarship that could not be canceled or reduced if I were injured or my athletic performance were deemed to be below my coach's expectations. Since that time, rules regarding athletic scholarships have changed dramatically. In 1973, the NCAA made athletic scholarships renewable on a year-to-year basis. Four-year scholarships are a thing of the past.

Current NCAA rules clearly state that athletic aid cannot be reduced or cancelled during ***the one-year period of the award*** on the basis of athletic ability or injury. But the rules are murky when it comes to conditions for the renewal and non-renewal of the scholarship in the subsequent year. Some universities renew scholarships for four years as long as athletes continue playing and adhere to team rules. Others cancel scholarships for poor athletic performance or for injury.

Reasonable people can disagree on which policy is best for their institution. But prospective athletes and their parents must know with certainty the conditions under which scholarships can be reduced or cancelled while pursuing their degree. Selecting which college to attend can be difficult. Knowing the conditions for the yearly renewal or non-renewal of financial aid is absolutely essential for making a well informed decision.

The Connecticut Student-Athletes Right to Know Act would require post-secondary institutions to publicly disclose their policy regarding the renewal and non-renewal of athletic scholarships, including circumstances in which an athlete in good academic standing suffers a sports-related injury, there is a coaching change, or athletic performance is deemed to be below expectations.

We owe this kind of honesty to all students, including the athletes who enhance the quality of student life on Connecticut's college campuses and provide a point of emotional attachment for Connecticut citizens to their colleges and universities.

Line 4 page 1

State of Connecticut

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
STATE CAPITOL

REPRESENTATIVE AL ADINOLFI
ONE HUNDRED AND THIRD ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING
ROOM 4200
HARTFORD, CT 06106-1591

TOLL FREE: (800) 842-1423
CAPITOL: (860) 240-8700
HOME: (203) 272-9701
EMAIL: Al.Adinolfi@housegop ct.gov

RANKING MEMBER
SELECT COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

MEMBER
HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE
JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEE

Testimony by Representative Al Adinolfi
Before the Higher Education & Employment Advancement Committee
On House Bill 5241
February 8, 2011

Good morning Chairman Bye, Chairman Willis, Representative LeGeyt, Senator Boucher, and members of the Higher Education & Employment Advancement Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. I'm here this morning to express my support for ***HB 5241 – AN ACT CONCERNING STUDENTS OF PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION LIVING OFF CAMPUS.***

Students that currently live in off-campus housing owned or leased by an institute of higher education should have to adhere to the same policies and regulations as those who live on campus. Whether it be security, alcohol use or litter regulations, there is not a uniform policy when it comes to off campus housing. This could set up two different standards that could be discriminatory towards on campus housing students. I want to be clear though that many colleges do enforce security ordinances for off campus housing however such enforcement is not constant. If such policies were established as law it would make enforcement easier and standard among all higher education facilities. While out in the district I was concerned when I looked at the recycle bins loaded with empty alcoholic containers. I firmly believe that if HB-5241 becomes law it will make it easier to monitor and enforce the institute of higher education's rules and regulations

I would like to bring to your attention that when the bill was drafted it erroneously included the word "public" in its language. The bill's intent was that it should apply to all higher education institutions, public and private. I respectfully request that when the committee deliberates on this bill that the word public be stricken from all sections.

Thank you for the hearing on HB 5241 and I wish to express my support of the bill and the committee's favorable action.

Sincerely,

Rep. Al Adinolfi

Page 4 line 7

Good morning, my name is Ramogi Huma. I'm a former UCLA football player and the President of the NCPA, the National College Players Association. The NCPA is a nonprofit advocacy group made up of over 14,000 Division I student-athletes from universities in Connecticut and across the nation. I'm here to declare the NCPA's support for HB 5415.

The majority of high school recruits, who are typically only 16 and 17 years old, are deciding which college to attend based on false information given to them by athletic recruiters.

As a result, most recruits and their parents have no idea that colleges can leave them with sports-related medical expenses, take away their scholarship for any reason, leave them with tens of thousands of dollars in educational-related expenses, and hold their eligibility and scholarship opportunities hostage when they try to transfer schools.

Under NCAA rules, colleges are not required to pay for ANY sports related medical expenses – its optional. So, if a player breaks his leg in the national championship game, that school is not required to pay one penny of the medical expenses. In fact, The NY Times reported extensively about student-athletes stuck with sports-related medical bills.

My organization attempted to get all NCAA Division I colleges to disclose a handful of key medical policies. For instance, who is responsible for sports related deductibles and coinsurance? Unfortunately, 90% of Division I universities refused our request to voluntarily disclose their medical policies so that recruits would be more informed.

Also, universities across the nation offer recruits "full" athletic scholarships that are not truly full. In fact, NCAA rules cap every athletic scholarship in the nation below the cost of attendance.

Last year, the NCPA conducted a joint study with Ithaca College. Using the cost of attendance numbers that schools report to the U.S. Department of Education, we found that the average full scholarship leaves student-athletes with $3000/year in educational related expenses. The scholarship shortfall ranges from as low as

$200/year to more than $6000/year depending on the school. Recruits don't know that a scholarship shortfall even exists, much less how much the shortfall is from one school to the next.

For all of these reasons, the NCPA sponsored The Student-Athletes Right to Know Act in California, which won approval. Beginning in 2012, all of California's universities will post a handful of key policies and practices online. This will allow recruits and their parents to make an informed decision about which college to attend. This bill fully complies with NCAA rules and none of California's colleges opposed it.

I am here to urge the state of Connecticut to do the same and adopt language identical to that of the California law. Otherwise, even the most knowledgeable recruits who ask all of the right questions will be forced to rely on verbal promises from athletic recruiters.

Thank you.

Notes

Compliance for this bill will require very few resources since every school already has a system to comply with an ever-changing 400 page NCAA rule book. These schools don't spend significant resources each time there's an NCAA rule change.

Can help protect Connecticut schools from financial liabilities related to the lawsuits that other universities have endured for breaking their verbal promises. i.e.

NCPA Schools: University of Connecticut, Quinnipiac, Hartford

Example: Elizabeth Marini – Quinnipiac field hockey – after promising four years on scholarship, her coach told her she wouldn't have her scholarship going into senior season – Quinnipiac also stopped paying for her sports-related medical expenses.

For the record

Testimony by Dr. Louise Feroe
Connecticut State University System
Before the Higher Education and
Employment Advancement Committee
February 8, 2011

Good morning, Senator Bye, Representative Willis and members of the Higher Education and Employment Advancement Committee. For the record, I am Louise Feroe, Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs for the Connecticut State University System (CSUS). Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify today. We are grateful for your advocacy for higher education and the difference it can make, not only for our students but for our state.

I would like to comment briefly today regarding three proposed bills that the Committee is considering.

1. House Bill 5241, *An Act Concerning Students of Public Institutions of Higher Education Living Off Campus*

   The bill is directed toward students who live off-campus and rent or lease their housing from the University. Only one of the four Universities in the Connecticut State University System is impacted by this bill. For the fall semesters in each of the past two years, because of significant demands for housing, Eastern Connecticut State University (ECSU) has paid a daily rate to rent rooms in the Annex building at the Best Western nearby the University for about 55-58 students. In turn those student residents pay the Housing fee directly to the University for the semester. Housing assigns two Resident Assistants ("RAs") to oversee the group and holds them to the same Code of Conduct that all students, and resident students in particular, must observe. The standards are defined and enumerated in the Student Handbook. These off-campus residents would seem to meet the definition as described in this proposed bill.

2. House Bill 5415, *An Act Requiring the Informed Consent of Prospective Athletes Being Recruited to Institutions of Higher Education*

   According to Central Connecticut State University (CCSU), the athletic scholarship renewal requirements and transfer policies are routinely disclosed and, in fact, a recruit is asked to sign an agreement which does so. It would appear, therefore, that the only additional obligation would be that the recruiter would have to gather routine informed consent documents for these issues.

   I would say that the provision of the bill regarding "... the details of medical expenses associated with playing the sport..." is more difficult. Certainly, the requirement to carry appropriate medical insurance is discussed. But the language here is so broad that "details of medical expenses" might include any number of 'one in a million' life altering injuries with incalculable expenses. So it is difficult to imagine what might meet the intent of this sentence. It would seem that what is being sought is some additional assurance beyond a statement that playing the sport carries risks. Likely, universities would develop a statement to be signed by potential recruits that concerns risks and cost potentialities.

HB5419

Page 3 Line 7

21 Talcott Notch Road, Suite 1, Farmington, Connecticut 06032
Phone: (860) 678-0005 • Fax: (860) 678-0006
www.theccic.org

Testimony for the
Higher Education & Workforce Advancement Committee
From
Judith B. Greiman
Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges
February 8, 2011

On behalf of the member institutions of the Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges (CCIC), **I am submitting testimony opposing two bills before you today.**

HB 5241, AAC Students of Public Institutions of Higher Education Living Off Campus

This bill requires that campuses impose the same regulatory requirements and penalties on off-campus students renting or leasing housing from public institutions of higher education as those imposed on students living on campus. Although the bill as written does not impact the independent college sector, I have been told that legislators intend to make this apply to all colleges and universities in Connecticut and felt that I should comment.

I have surveyed campus representatives and find that there is no difference in how students are treated in my sector. The schools apply the same set of standards of conduct for all resident students regardless of whether they live in owned or leased housing. As noted by several representatives, the student conduct code applies to all students at all times, wherever they physically may be or reside. While there may be less "supervision" in non-dormitory style housing, the standards of conduct – and the consequences for misconduct – are no different. Additionally, in many cases of legal misconduct occurring off-campus where a student is cited by the police for something like underage drinking, the student is subject to disciplinary action from the university in addition to whatever legal ramifications there may be.

We do not think the bill is needed for our sector.

HB 5415, AA Requiring the Informed Consent of Prospective Athletes Being Recruited to Institutions of Higher Education

This bill requires athletic coaches involved in recruiting athletes to disclose medical, scholarship and transfer information to athletes who are being recruited. We oppose this bill because of the strict requirements set by the National College Athletic Association regarding the rules of recruitment.

Each athletic division has its own manual that covers transfer, insurance and scholarship along with a myriad of other things. The Division I manual is 434 pages and is quite specific about all manner of activity that may and

21 Talcott Notch Road, Suite 1, Farmington, Connecticut 06032
Phone: (860) 678-0005 • Fax: (860) 678-0006
www.theccic.org

may not occur during the recruitment process. The other divisions have similarly detailed manuals. Additionally, the various athletic conferences have detailed rules and both entities monitor compliance with the rules. We do not want Connecticut schools to be in a situation where they face different policies or policies that are in conflict with NCAA regulations.

On the specifics of the bill, students at private colleges in Connecticut are required to purchase or show evidence of medical insurance coverage. Additionally, many, if not all, of the schools also have athletic accident insurance and the NCAA has a catastrophic insurance policy that is free of charge for the student-athlete. Student-athletes are given information on the various coverage requirements and availabilities. It would be extremely difficult to estimate what potential costs a student-athlete might incur without having full knowledge of both the insurance coverage of the student and the vast range of possible injuries.

While many schools do not give out athletic scholarships, those that do are governed by a strict set of rules outlined by the NCAA. These rules outline both what kinds of scholarships are acceptable and when they can be given out as well as how students must be informed of scholarship requirements.

Transfer information is similarly governed by NCAA and conference regulations. All of this information is web-accessible. Recruiters are monitored closely on the types of communications that they have with student-athletes. At least one of the Athletic Directors in my sector noted that it would be highly inappropriate to discuss transfer with a student before the student has matriculated at an institution. He and others pointed to the monitoring process that exists on all NCAA and conference rules.

This bill would complicate an already highly regulated area.

H – 1104

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
2011

VOL.54
PART 13
4109 – 4473

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll call. Members to the Chamber. The House is voting by roll call. Members to the Chamber, please.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Please check the roll call board to make sure your vote has been properly cast. If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked. The Clerk will please take a tally.

Clerk, please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

House Bill Number 6259.

Total number voting	144
Necessary for passage	73
Those voting yea	144
Those voting nay	0
Those absent and not voting	7.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The bill is passed.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar 187.

THE CLERK:

On page number 9, Calendar 187, substitute for House Bill Number 5415, AN ACT REQUIRING FULL

DISCLOSURE TO PROSPECTIVE ATHLETES BEING RECRUITED TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, favorable report from the Committee on Higher Education.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The 92nd district of New Haven, Representative Pat Dillon, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. DILLON (92nd):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Good afternoon, Madam.

REP. DILLON (92nd):

I move the committee -- the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The question is on acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

Will you remark?

REP. DILLON (92nd):

Request permission to summarize.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Please. Please summarize.

REP. DILLON (92nd):

I had -- the bill before us provides for additional transparency in the recruiting of student

athletes to institutions of high education. The Clerk has in his possession an amendment, LCO 6534. Will the Clerk please call and I request permission to summarize.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Will the Clerk please call LCO 6534, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "A."

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 6534, House "A" offered by Representatives Dillon, Willis, LeGeyt and Senators Bye and Boucher.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Any objection? Hearing none, Representative Dillon, you may proceed.

REP. DILLON (92nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This amendment incorporates two changes, one which was suggested by the University of Connecticut. The other which was a potential oversight in the draft original file copy which was caught by the eagle eyed ranking member, Representative LeGeyt. And I move adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The question is on adoption. Will you remark further?

Representative Willis, on the amendment.

REP. WILLIS (64th):

Oh no, I'm sorry.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative LeGeyt.

REP. LEGEYT (17th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this amendment, rather obviously, and, uh, uh, am glad to be able to be part of it to correct an oversight and a small gap in this bill and urge adoption.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Would you care to remark further on the amendment? Care to remark further on the amendment?

If not, let me try your minds.

All those in favor of the amendment, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The resolution -- the amendment is adopted.

Remark further on the bill as amended.

REP. DILLON (92nd):

Representative -- hmm.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Dillon --

REP. DILLON (92nd):

I'm so sorry.

Um, Mr. Speaker, briefly on the bill before us. In many parts of our state, sports are considered to have a redemptive value. They teach discipline and focus and teamwork. They also provide access to higher education for many students, that's true.

And those of us in Connecticut have done an incredible thing in the past generation. We now have nationally ranked teams. And it took a lot of work to do that. When families though, find that one of their students are recruited, very often, they don't have all the information that they need to make a choice. This has been a national issue and in some states, state legislatures have looked regulating or cracking down on recruiters because they are

approaching students in sixth and eighth grade in their playgrounds.

However, last year, at a block (inaudible) party, one of my constituents suggested to me that one way that we could look at the problem would be to simply disclose the information to the families and to permit them to make the choice.

That's what this bill does. It builds on what the schools are already doing. They already have websites. But it could provide better information for the families who may very well, no matter how sophisticated they believe they are, find themselves going on gut. And after having dinner with a very charming recruited who says, "We take care of our players," maybe they don't read the fine print.

This standardizes it as well. This standardizes the information so it is not only of benefit to the students, it could also be a genuine service to some of our smaller programs.

I'd like to thank Dr. Allen Stack, the constituent who helped me walk through some of these issues. Ramogi Huma of the Players Association, who flew in from the Super Bowl on a day's notice to come and testify before the Higher Education Committee, to

Representative Willis and Senator Bye for having such an open committee process and also, to the University of Connecticut.

This issue rarely affects the big programs, but they do have the depth and sophistication to help a legislator walk through the NCAA issues. So this has been a really positive experience that's been bipartisan and has involved some folks who really know what they're doing. And it can help not only the students and their families, it can help the smaller schools so that they'll know exactly what they should be disclosing.

I move passage as amended.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative LeGeyt.

REP. LEGEYT (17th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to align myself with the remarks of Representative Dillon and to share that with regard to this bill, it may seem onerous or perhaps overkill that the bill requires that schools provide a hyperlink with quite a bit of information for student athletes to consider, especially when that information is already available

on the NCAA website. However, the mere fact that student athletes, many of them minors, are not allowed to engage someone as their counsel or their agent when it's time to discuss the possibility of their scholarship with a school of higher education, this bill will somewhat level the playing field in that regard, because they won't be caught off guard as much, operating on their own or with their parents trying to find the way with them.

With this information they can have a more balanced consideration of what a scholarship means and be forewarned of some of the pitfalls that result when scholarships are awarded.

So I urge my colleagues to support this bill and vote in favor. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Willis.

REP. WILLIS (64th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of this bill.

First, I would like to thank Representative Dillon for bringing this issue before our committee. It really was an eyeopener, I think, for many members

of the committee to learn of the, in some cases, the lack of transparency in the process for parents and students to be able to make informed decisions.

There are a lot of students out there who are student athletes and they're making decisions about where to go to college. And they're being recruited rather -- it's a very competitive process with different schools coming in and offering basically different packages for them. So this bill really makes that landscape a lot easier for a family and a student to make a decision. And it is an important life decision, and what the conditions of those scholarships are, what the ramifications may be in terms of injury or grades and how that may impact their future educational plans.

So again, I want to thank all the members of the committee. I want to thank the individuals who came to speak to our committee as well.

Representative Dillon brought in people who were experts in the field that really helped us to see the issue and get a clear picture of what Connecticut is going to do in this regard. This is really ground breaking for Connecticut. California has taken this action, but I think we'll be the second state to take

this action to protect our student athletes. So thank you, sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Would you care to remark further on the bill? Care to remark further on the bill as amended.

If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members, take their seats. The machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll call. Members to the Chamber. Members to the Chamber, the House is voting by roll call.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Please check the roll call board to make sure your vote has been properly cast. If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked. The Clerk will please take a tally.

Clerk, please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

House Bill 5415 as amended by House "A."

Total number voting 143

Necessary for passage 72

Those voting yea 140

Those voting nay 3

Those absent and not voting 8.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The bill as amended is passed.

Will the Clerk please call E-Certified Bill Number 6650.

THE CLERK:

House Bill 6650, AN ACT IMPLEMENTING THE PROVISIONS OF THE BUDGET CONCERNING THE JUDICIAL BRANCH, CHILD PROTECTION, CRIMINAL JUSTICE, WEIGH STATIONS AND CERTAIN STATE AGENCY CONSOLIDATIONS, LCO Number 6855, introduced by Representative Donovan and Senator Williams.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The House Chair of Appropriations, Representative Toni Walker, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. WALKER (93rd):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Good afternoon.

REP. WALKER (93rd):

S – 632

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
2011

VOL. 54
PART 21
6546-6914

Move to place the item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Calendar 552, House Bill Number 6413.

Move to place the item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Continuing calendar page 19, Calendar 553, House Bill Number 6227.

Move to place the item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Moving to calendar page 20, Calendar 554, House Bill Number 5415.

Move to place the item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call's been ordered in the Senate on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber. Immediate roll call's been ordered in the Senate on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

THE CLERK:

Madam President, the items placed…

THE CHAIR:

I would ask the Chamber to be quiet please so we can hear the call of the Calendar for the Consent Calendar.

Thank you.

Please proceed, Mr. Clerk

THE CLERK:

Madam President, the items placed on the first Consent Calendar begin on calendar page 5, Calendar 336, House Bill 5697.

Calendar page 7, Calendar 421, Substitute for House Bill 6126.

Calendar page 8, Calendar 449, Senate Bill 1149.

Calendar page 10, Calendar 470, Substitute for House Bill 5340. Calendar 474, Substitute for House Bill 6274. Calendar 476, House Bill 6635.

Calendar page 12, Calendar 499, Substitute for House Bill 6638. Calendar 500, House Bill 6614. Calendar 508, House Bill 6222.

Calendar page 13, Calendar 511, House Bill 6356. Calendar 512, Substitute for House Bill 6422. Calendar 514, House Bill 6590. Calendar 515, House Bill 6221. Calendar 516, House Bill 6455.

Calendar page 14, Calendar 517, House Bill 6350. Calendar 519, House Bill 5437. Calendar 522, House Bill 6303.

Calendar page 15, Calendar 523, Substitute for House Bill 6499. Calendar 524, House Bill 6490. Calendar 525, House Bill 5780. Calendar 526, House Bill 6513. Calendar 527, Substitute for House Bill 6532.

Calendar page 16, Calendar 528, House Bill 6561. Calendar 529, Substitute for House Bill 6312. Calendar 530, Substitute for House Bill 5032. Calendar 532, House Bill 6338.

Calendar page 17, Calendar 533, Substitute for House Bill 6325. Calendar 534, House Bill 6352.

Calendar 536, House Bill 5300. Calendar 537, House Bill 5482.

calendar page 18, Calendar 543, House Bill 6508. Calendar 544, House Bill 6412. Calendar 546, Substitute for House Bill 6538. Calendar 547, Substitute for House Bill 6440. Calendar 548, Substitute for House Bill 6471.

Calendar page 19, Calendar 550, Substitute for House Bill 5802. Calendar 551, House Bill 6433. Calendar 552, House Bill 6413. Calendar 553, Substitute for House Bill 6227.

Calendar page 20, Calendar 554, Substitute for House Bill 5415. Calendar 557, Substitute for House Bill 6318. Calendar 558, Substitute for House Bill 6565.

Calendar page 21, Calendar 559, Substitute for House Bill 6636.

Calendar page 22, Calendar 563, Substitute for House Bill 6600. Calendar 564, Substitute for House Bill 6598. Calendar 566, House Bill 5585.

Calendar page 23, Calendar 568, Substitute for House Bill 6103. Calendar 570, Substitute for House Bill 6336. Calendar 573, Substitute for House Bill 6434.

Calendar page 24, Calendar 577, Substitute for House Bill 5795.

Calendar page 25, Calendar 581, House Bill 6354.

Calendar page 26, Calendar 596, Substitute for House Bill 6282. Calendar 598, Substitute for House Bill 6629.

Calendar page 27, Calendar 600, House Bill 6314. Calendar 601, Substitute for House Bill 6529. Calendar 602, Substitute for House Bill 6438. Calendar 604, Substitute for House Bill 6639.

Calendar page 28, Calendar 605, Substitute for House Bill 6526. Calendar 608, House Bill 6284.

Calendar page 30, Calendar number 615, Substitute for House Bill 6485. Calendar 616, Substitute for House Bill 6498.

Calendar page 31, Calendar 619, Substitute for House Bill 6634. Calendar 627, Substitute for House Bill 6596.

Calendar page 32, Calendar 629, House Bill 5634. Calendar 630, Substitute for House Bill 6631. Calendar 631, Substitute for House Bill 6357. Calendar 632, House Bill 6642.

Calendar page 33, Calendar 634, Substitute for House Bill 5431. Calendar 636, Substitute for House, correction, House Bill 6100.

Page 34, Calendar 638, Substitute for House Bill 6525.

Calendar page 48, Calendar 399, Substitute for Senate Bill 1043.

Calendar page 49, Calendar 409, Substitute for House Bill 6233. Calendar 412, House Bill 5178. Calendar 422, Substitute for House Bill 6448.

Calendar page 52, Calendar 521, Substitute for House Bill 6113.

Madam President, that completes the item placed on the first Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir.

We call for another roll call vote. And the machine will be open for Consent Calendar number 1.

THE CLERK:

The Senate is now voting by roll on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber. The Senate is now voting by roll on the Consent Calendar, will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

Senator Cassano, would you vote, please, sir.

Thank you.

Well, all members have voted. All members have voted. The machine will be closed, and Mr. Clerk, will you call the tally?

THE CLERK:

Motion is on option Consent Calendar Number 1.

Total Number Voting	36
Those voting Yea	36
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

Consent Calendar Number 1 has passed.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

We might stand at ease for just a moment as we prepare the next item…

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)