NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet
June 28-29, 2010, Meeting Schedule
Hyatt Regency Indianapolis
Indianapolis, Indiana

Meeting	Sunday, June 27	Monday, June 28	Tuesday, June 29
CABINET MEETING	Travel Only.	8 a.m. to 3 p.m. (Cosmopolitan BCD)	Return travel after 12:30 p.m.
JOINT AC/CAP MEETING		3 to 6 p.m. (Cosmopolitan BCD)	8 to 10:30 a.m. (Cosmopolitan BCD)
Breakfast		7:15 to 8 a.m. (Discovery)	7:15 to 8 a.m. (Studio Lounge)
Lunch		Noon to 1 p.m. (Discovery)	None.
Snack	None.	2:45 p.m. (Cosmopolitan BCD)	None.
Dinner (Academic Cabinet and Committee on Academic Performance)	None.	6:30 p.m. (Network)	None.

A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association

Division I Academic Cabinet

Hyatt Regency Hotel
Indianapolis, Indiana

June 28-29, 2010

Pre-Meeting Teleconference.

1. Welcome and announcements.

2. Review the February 2010 report of the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet. [Supplement No. 1] (Carolyn Callahan)

3. Updates from the Division I governance structure.

   a. NCAA Division I Board of Directors and NCAA Division I Leadership Council update. [Supplement Nos. 2 and 3] (Julie Cromer)

   b. NCAA Division I Communications and Coordination Committee update. [Supplement No. 4] (Matt Burgemeister)

   c. NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance update. [Supplement Nos. 5 and 6] (Cromer)

   d. Other Division I cabinets updates. [Supplement No. 7] (Burgemeister)

   e. NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee update. [Supplement No. 8] (Jarrett Newby)

4. Review of legislation and interpretations. (Burgemeister)

   a. Update on legislation sponsored by the Academic Cabinet. [Supplement No. 9a]

   b. Update on legislation reviewed by the cabinet in the 2009-10 legislative cycle. [Supplement No. 9b]

   c. Update on NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group proposals. [Supplement No. 9c]

5. Updates from committees reporting to the cabinet.

   a. NCAA International Student Records Committee. [Supplement No. 10] (Frank Arredondo and Doug Healey)

   b. NCAA Student Records Review Committee. [Supplement No. 11] (Brandy Hataway and Alex Smith)

6. Update on implementation of NCAA Proposal Nos. 2008-34 (core curriculum time limitation for prospects with education-impacting disabilities), 2009-60 (authority of academic waiver committees and academic waiver appellate process) and 2009-64 (standards for nontraditional courses). [Supplement No. 12] (Steve Clar and John Shukie)

7. Review Academic Cabinet policies and procedures. [Supplement Nos. 13a, 13b and 13c] (Burgemeister)

Anticipated Action Item:

- **Approve updated policies and procedures for the cabinet.**

8. Review of home school standards. [Supplement No.14] (Clar and Bill Regan)

<u>In-Person Meeting</u>.

9. Welcome and announcements.

10. Follow-up from teleconference, if necessary.

11. Consider designating certain elements of initial-eligibility legislation as "common provisions." [Supplement No. 15] (Burgemeister)

Anticipated Action Item:

- **Sponsor a legislative proposal to designate several bylaws within NCAA Bylaw 14.3 as common provisions.**

12. NCAA Division I Football Academic Working Group update. [Supplement No. 16] (Cromer)

13. Update on women's basketball academic and access model. [Supplement No. 17] (Diane Dickman)

Anticipated Action Item:

- **Provide feedback to the NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Issues Committee regarding the proposed academic and access model.**

14. Continue review of nontraditional courses for current student-athletes to satisfy full-time enrollment and progress-toward-degree requirements. [Supplement No. 18 to be distributed at later date.] (Burgemeister)

Anticipated Action Item:

- **Sponsor a proposal to amend the existing legislation regarding the use of nontraditional courses to meet full-time enrollment and progress-toward-degree requirements.**

15. Continue discussion regarding academic preparation of prospective student-athletes and review of eligibility standards. [Refer to Supplement Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 for joint meeting.] (Cromer)

16. Review data collection regarding two-year college transfer student-athletes. [Supplement No. 19] (Binh Nguyen)

Anticipated Action Item:

- **Provide feedback to the Committee on Academic Performance regarding whether to continue data collection on the academic performance of two-year college transfers beyond the 2010 Academic Performance Censes (APC) data collection.**

17. Academic waivers.

    a. Continue discussion regarding an academic plan requirement as part of the initial-eligibility waiver process. [Supplement No. 20] (Stephanie Bacan and Clar)

Anticipated Action Item:

- **Approve a revision to the Initial-Eligibility Waiver policies and procedures to require and academic plan as part of the initial-eligibility waiver process.**

    b. Discuss policies regarding prospective student-athletes who graduate from high school before the expected graduation date for the prospective student-athlete's class. [Supplement No. 21 to be distributed at later date.] (Clar)

18. Discussion of initial-eligibility test score validity and notification. [Supplement No. 22] (Smith)

19. Update on Facilitating Learning and Achieving Graduation Program (FLAG). (Burgemeister)

20. Demonstration of Division I Governance Collaboration Zone. (Jackie Campbell)

21. Updates on communications and outreach.

22. Review dates of future cabinet meetings.

    a. September 13-14, 2010; Indianapolis.

    - September 12 — Travel anytime.
      New member orientation - tbd.
    - September 13 — Meeting from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.
    - September 14 — Meeting from 8 to 11 a.m.
      Return travel after 1 p.m.

b. February 7-8, 2011; Indianapolis.

- February 6 Travel anytime.
- February 7 Meeting from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.
- February 8 Meeting from 8 to 11 a.m.
  Return travel after 1 p.m.

23. Other business.

24. Adjournment.

NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet
Roster

MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX/E-MAIL	CONFERENCE & SUBDIVISION	TERM EXPIRES
Tom Adair Faculty Athletics Representative Texas A&M University, College Station Department of Physics MS 4242 College Station, Texas 77843-4242	Phone: 979/847-9451 Fax: 979/845-2590 E-mail: tadair@tamu.edu **Assistant: Minnette Bilbo** **Phone: 979/847-9451** E-mail: Bilbo@physics.tamu.edu	Big 12 Conference FBS	July 2010 (eligible for reappointment)
John Bruno Faculty Athletics Representative The Ohio State University 57 Psychology Building Columbus, Ohio 43210	Phone: 614/292-1770 Fax: 614/688-4733 E-mail: bruno.1@osu.edu **Assistant: Tatiana Tramel** **Phone: 614/292-6512** E-mail: tramel.2@osu.edu	Big Ten Conference FBS	July 2010 (eligible for reappointment)
Carolyn Callahan, chair Faculty Athletics Representative University of Virginia Curry School of Education 405 Emmet Street South Charlottesville, Virginia 22903	Phone: 434/924-0791 Fax: 434/924-1384 E-mail: cmc@virginia.edu **Assistant: Lisa Miller** **Phone: 434/982-2849** E-mail: lam3v@virginia.edu	Atlantic Coast Conference FBS	July 2010 (eligible for reappointment)
Kim Capriotti Faculty Athletics Representative Jacksonville University 2800 University Boulevard North Jacksonville, Florida 32211-3394	Phone: 904/256-7443 Fax: 904/256-7467 E-mail: kcaprio@ju.edu **Assistant:** **Phone:** E-mail:	Atlantic Sun Conference FCS	July 2011
Pete Carlon Director of Athletics University of Texas at Arlington 1309 West Mitchell Arlington, Texas 76013	Phone: 817/272-5039 Fax: 817/272-4115 E-mail: carlon@uta.edu **Assistant: Lorraine Palmer** **Phone: 817/272-7170** E-mail: llpalmer@uta.edu	Southland Conference FCS	July 2012
Barbara Church Senior Associate Director of Athletics Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference 712 Amboy Avenue Edison, New Jersey 08837-3554	Phone: 732/738-5455 Fax: 732/738-8310 E-mail: bchurch@maac.org **Assistant:** **Phone:** E-mail:	Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference FCS	July 2012
J. Patrick Dobel Faculty Athletic Representative Evans School of Public Affairs University of Washington Box 353055 Seattle, Washington 98109	Phone: 206/616-1680 Fax: 206/685-9044 E-mail: pdobel@u.washington.edu **Assistant:** **Phone:** E-mail:	Pacific-10 Conference FBS	July 2010 (eligible for reappointment)
David Dosser Faculty Athletics Representative East Carolina University 349 Ward Sports Medicine Building, Ficklen Drive Greenville, North Carolina 27858	Phone: 252/916-6634 Fax: 252-737-1278 E-mail: dosserd@ecu.edu **Assistant:** **Phone:** E-mail:	Conference USA FBS	July 2010 (eligible for reappointment)
Rhonda Hatcher Faculty Athletics Representative Texas Christian University 2840 West Bowie, TTC - 206 Fort Worth, Texas 76129	Phone: 817/681-7549 Fax: 817/257-7766 E-mail: R.Hatcher@tcu.edu **Assistant:** **Phone:** E-mail:	Mountain West Conference FBS	July 2010 (eligible for reappointment)

MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX/E-MAIL	CONFERENCE & SUBDIVISION	TERM EXPIRES
Herman Holt, Jr. Faculty Athletics Representative University of North Carolina, Asheville One University Heights, CPO 2010 Asheville, North Carolina 28804-3299	Phone: 828/232-5167 Fax: 828/232-5179 E-mail: hholt@unca.edu **Assistant: Brenda Henderson** **Phone: 828/251-6443** E-mail: bhenders@unca.edu	Big South Conference FCS	July 2012
Pat Howey Deputy Athletic Director University of North Carolina, Wilmington 601 South College Road Wilmington, North Carolina 28403-3297	Phone: 910/962-3767 Fax: 910/962-3002 E-mail: howeyp@uncw.edu **Assistant: Donna Cook** **Phone: 910/962-7909** E-mail: cookdw@uncw.edu	Colonial Athletic Association FCS	July 2011
Anna Taylor James Faculty Athletics Representative Texas Southern University 3100 Cleburne Street Houston, Texas 77004	Phone: 713/313-7394 Fax: 713/313-1049 E-mail: ajames@tmslaw.tsu.edu **Assistant: Jeanetta Washington** **Phone: 713/313-7158** E-mail: jwashington@tmslaw.tsu.edu	Southwestern Athletic Conference FCS	July 2011
Loretta Lamar Associate Director of Athletics/SWA U.S. Naval Academy 566 Brownson Road Annapolis, Maryland 21402-5000	Phone: 410/293-8936 Fax: 410/293-8959 E-mail: lamar@usna.edu **Assistant:** **Phone:** E-mail:	Patriot League FCS	July 2012
Warde Manuel Director of Athletics University at Buffalo Alumni Arena Buffalo, New York 14260	Phone: 716/645-3454 Fax: 716/645-3754 E-mail: wmanuel@buffalo.edu **Assistant: Val Wudyka** **Phone: 716/645-6594** E-mail: vwudyka@buffalo.edu	Mid-American Conference FBS	July 2010 (eligible for reappointment)
Jarrett Newby Student-Athlete East Carolina University 700 Willow Street Greenville, North Carolina 27858	Phone: 607/206-9000 Fax: E-mail: jarrettnewby@gmail.com	Conference USA FBS	September 2010
Mary Newton Faculty Athletics Representative Jacksonville State University 304 Brewer Hall, 700 Pelham Road North Jacksonville, Alabama 36265-1602	Phone: 256/782-5337 Fax: 256/782-5168 E-mail: mnewton@jsu.edu **Assistant:** **Phone:** E-mail:	Ohio Valley Conference FCS	July 2011
Annette O'Connor Faculty Athletics Representative LaSalle University 1900 West Olney Avenue Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19141-1199	Phone: 215/951-1247 Fax: 215/951-1772 E-mail: oconnor@lasalle.edu **Assistant:** **Phone:** E-mail:	Atlantic 10 Conference FCS	July 2012
Jill Varnes Faculty Athletics Representative University of Florida Florida Gym 5, Stadium Road, P.O. Box 118210 Gainesville, Florida 32611-8210	Phone: 352/392-0583 ext. 1230 Fax: 352/392-1909 E-mail: jvarnes@hhp.ufl.edu **Assistant: JoAnne McLeary** **Phone: 352/392-0583 ext. 1304** E-mail: jmcleary@hhp.ufl.edu	Southeastern Conference FBS	July 2010 (eligible for reappointment)

MAILING ADDRESS	PHONE/FAX/E-MAIL	CONFERENCE & SUBDIVISION	TERM EXPIRES
Ken White Faculty Athletics Representative Utah State University 4815 Old Main Hill Logan, Utah 84322-7400	Phone: 435/797-2162 Fax: 435/797-2118 E-mail: ken.white@.usu.edu **Assistant: Jean Edwards** **Phone: 435/797-2162** E-mail: jean.edwards@usu.edu	Western Athletic Conference FBS	July 2010 (eligible for reappointment)
Nonie Wiggins Faculty Athletics Representative Arkansas State University 217 Olympic Drive, P.O. Box 910 State University, Arkansas 72467	Phone: 870/972-3385 Fax: 870/972-2954 E-mail: nwiggins@astate.edu **Assistant:** **Phone:** E-mail:	Sun Belt Conference FBS	July 2010 (eligible for reappointment)
Elaine Wise Faculty Athletics Representative University of Louisville Humanities Building 303 Belknap Campus 2301 South 3rd Street Louisville, Kentucky 40208	Phone: 502/852-7149 Fax: 502/852-0778 E-mail: elaine.wise@louisville.edu **Assistant: Cindy Saling** **Phone: 502/852-6811** E-mail: cindy.saling@louisville.edu	Big East Conference FBS	July 2010 (eligible for reappointment)
Anne Woodrick Faculty Athletics Representative University of Northern Iowa 1227 West 27th Street, Baker Hall 356 Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614	Phone: 319/273-6375 Fax: 319/273-7104 E-mail: anne.woodrick@uni.edu **Assistant: Wayne Fauchier** **Phone: 319/273-2846** E-mail: wayne.fauchier@uni.edu	Missouri Valley Conference FCS	July 2011
NCAA STAFF LIAISONS			
Matt Burgemeister Associate Director of Academic and Membership Affairs NCAA	Phone: 317/917-6656 Fax: 317/917-6845 E-mail: mburgemeister@ncaa.org **Assistant: Lynn Dickey** **Phone: 317/917-6616** E-mail: ldickey@ncaa.org		
Julie Cromer Director of Academic and Membership Affairs NCAA	Phone: 317/917-6611 Fax: 317/917-6845 E-mail: jcromer@ncaa.org **Assistant: Anne Grieger** **Phone: 317/917-6517** E-mail: agrieger@ncaa.org		
Diane Dickman Managing Director of Academic and Membership Affairs NCAA	Phone: 317/917-6621 Fax: 317/917-6865 E-mail: ddickman@ncaa.org **Assistant: Lynn Dickey** **Phone: 317/917-6616** E-mail: ldickey@ncaa.org		

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISON I ACADEMIC CABINET FEBRUARY 1-2, 2010, MEETING

KEY ITEMS.

- **Review of Eligibility Standards for Prospective Student-Athletes.** The NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet continued its review of initial-eligibility and transfer-eligibility requirements. Based on NCAA research, along with feedback from the NCAA Division I Board of Directors, two-year college and academic support communities, the cabinet continues to believe that the greatest improvements in student-athlete academic preparation will come when all eligibility requirements (e.g., initial eligibility, progress toward degree, transfer) are aligned to support student-athletes' academic success. The cabinet considered enhancements to the current initial and transfer eligibility requirements designed to identify those prospective student-athletes who are academically prepared for college work, and to foster additional support and accommodation to student-athletes who are academically underprepared. The cabinet will continue to discuss both models in June when it meets jointly with the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance.

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.

- None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. Review of Initial-Eligibility Standards. The cabinet continued its review of the division's initial-eligibility standards with the goal of further developing Division I initial-eligibility requirements to ensure they can be used to appropriately identify academically prepared prospective student-athletes.

NCAA research continues to indicate that a combination of standardized test scores and high school grades is a better predictor of academic success than using either grades or tests alone. However, when examined independently, the high school core grade-point average is two to three times more predictive of first-year college academic success than

test scores. This is an increase from earlier years, as the high school grade-point average has become more predictive as the number of required core courses has increased. Based on these findings and feedback from the Board of Directors and the NCAA Division I Leadership Council, the cabinet continues to focus on a prospective student-athlete's high school core-course grade-point average as an important element of any enhancement to the current initial-eligibility model. The cabinet noted that requiring a higher core-course grade-point average should increase the probability that a particular prospective student-athlete will be academically successful in the first year of enrollment and eventually will graduate from an institution.

NCAA research also indicates that certain revisions to the initial-eligibility standards could result in an increase in false negatives outcomes (i.e., declaring as ineligible prospective student-athletes who are able to be academically successful over time). Such modifications may negatively affect a number of individual prospective student-athletes, while producing only a slight overall increase in aggregate academic success and graduation. Therefore, to reduce the likelihood of such results, the cabinet is interested in identifying a series of required interventions to support academic success among academically underprepared student-athletes, rather than blocking such prospects from accessing higher education through athletics scholarship and participation opportunities.

In response to feedback from the Board of Directors, the cabinet discussed a tiered model of initial eligibility that focuses on preparing prospective student-athletes to be academically successful in the college setting. Under such a model, a prospective student-athlete who presents an academic profile indicating academic preparedness for college and who is regularly admitted by his or her certifying institution would have full access to financial aid, practice and competition in the initial year of enrollment. Prospective student-athletes who are admitted with academic profiles predicting greater challenges in achieving collegiate academic success also would have access to financial aid and some athletics participation, but would be subject to specified interventions during the first year of college enrollment. Some examples of possible interventions include mandatory learning assessments, required academic support plans and limits on missed class time. Such interventions would be designed to address issues beyond direct access to higher education and would be intended to improve the quality of the long-term educational experience of student-athletes who are less academically prepared when they arrive on a college campus. The cabinet noted that a tiered approach would provide an opportunity to implement the most appropriate legislative, policy and best practice recommendations to promote academic success among those who are underprepared, without imposing a national standard that might limit opportunities for prospective student-athletes who are capable of succeeding in college with an appropriate level of academic support.

At its June meeting, the cabinet will consider benchmarks for initial-eligibility tiers, as well as potential interventions for the first year of enrollment. These concepts will be examined during its joint session with the Committee on Academic Performance. In preparation for this meeting, cabinet members were charged to discuss potential modifications to the current initial-eligibility model with their respective conferences and other contacts and to gather feedback prior to the cabinet's June meeting.

2. Review of Two-Year College Transfer Student-Athletes. Using data recently submitted by the Division I membership, the cabinet began the task of identifying a model for transfer student success that will motivate the necessary academic behaviors for two-year college transfer student-athletes to be academically successful at four-year institutions. NCAA research indicates two-year college transfers accounted for approximately five percent of all Division I student-athletes in the 2007-08 academic year, and that this percentage had declined in each of the previous four years. Baseball and men's basketball have the highest rate of two-year college transfers, while women's sports other than basketball have the lowest rate of two-year transfers. Generally, data indicate that two-year college transfers tend to be less academically prepared and do not perform as well as nontransfers and four-year college transfers; however, the graduation rate for two-year college transfers has increased recently and the rate of two-year transfer student-athletes departing their four-year institutions while not eligible has decreased.

For the first time, the cabinet was able to review preliminary findings regarding the academic performance of two-year college transfers while at the two-year college. Specifically, the cabinet noted that a prospective student-athlete's overall grade-point average at the two-year college is the most significant predictor of first-year academic outcomes at the four-year college, even more predictive than a student-athlete's grade-point average in coursework transferable to the four-year institution. The cabinet also noted that credits earned in any particular subject area are not related to the first-year grade-point average at the four-year institution, except that there is a negative relationship between the number of physical education credits earned at the two-year college and the first-year grade-point average at the four-year institution. On average, nonqualifiers earn more credits, transferable credits and subject-specific credits (English, math, science) than qualifiers while at the two-year college; however, this difference can be linked to nonqualifiers' longer average enrollment at the two-year college.

To supplement the research findings, the cabinet met with representatives from the two-year college community to discuss possible approaches to improve the academic preparation of two-year college transfers. The group noted that many two-year college transfers are academically prepared and perform well on transfer; however, some transfers are underprepared and require remediation and additional support to prepare for

matriculation at a four-year institution. The two-year college representatives noted that the five-year clock and percentage of degree requirements can present particular challenges for a student-athlete who requires significant remediation at the two-year college. Further, the representatives stated that accommodations within the applicable eligibility legislation would help these student-athletes by allowing time to improve their academic performance without jeopardizing their seasons of athletics eligibility. The cabinet noted that many four-year institutions offer limited or no remedial courses, and that two-year colleges may provide more opportunities and programs for remediation of underprepared students. The cabinet agreed to continue to collaborate with the two-year community to develop a transfer model that ensure that two-year college prospective student-athletes are academically prepared on enrollment at the four-year institution, while also encouraging the continued engagement and retention of these student-athletes to graduation.

The cabinet discussed several concepts to improve the academic preparation of two-year college transfers. The cabinet and representatives noted the potential value of individual education plans that outline the student-athlete's educational path and appropriate support services. The cabinet also noted that an additional year in residence at the two-year college may provide additional time for the student-athlete to improve his or her academic readiness and be more prepared for success at the four-year institution. The cabinet also considered a core curriculum to be completed at the two-year college, though a prescribed combination of courses indicating likely four-year success was not readily apparent based on the research findings. Additional strategies that the cabinet considered include: allowances for remediation at the two-year college, the opportunity to enroll in summer terms at the four-year institution prior to transfer and required tutorial support on enrollment at the four-year institution. The cabinet will continue to consider these concepts during its joint meeting with the Committee on Academic Performance in June.

3. Update on Proposals in the 2009-10 Legislative Cycle. The cabinet noted that NCAA Proposal No. 2009-60 regarding initial-eligibility and progress-toward-degree waiver appeals and Proposal No. 2009-64 regarding nontraditional courses used to meet initial-eligibility waivers both were adopted by the NCAA Division I Legislative Council. Staff from NCAA academic and membership affairs and the NCAA Eligibility Center will begin to implement the concepts from both proposals and will provide progress reports to the cabinet regarding procedural changes and any potential policy changes requiring cabinet approval.

4. Nontraditional Courses Used by Currently Enrolled Student-Athletes to Meet Full-Time Enrollment and Progress-Toward-Degree Requirements. The cabinet

continued its discussion regarding the use of nontraditional courses by current student-athletes to meet full-time enrollment and progress-toward-degree requirements. The cabinet discussed the feedback it received from the Legislative Council chair during its last meeting, as well as feedback from the membership, and identified the following considerations for the development of future legislative proposals:

a. In light of the prevalence and acceptance of nontraditional courses throughout post-secondary education, it is appropriate to provide student-athletes with similar access to such courses as other students at their respective institutions.

b. Institutional autonomy must be maintained with regard to determining the appropriateness of coursework for degree credit and to maintain integrity and security in the delivery of nontraditional courses.

c. NCAA legislation should define more clearly the term "nontraditional courses" to clarify the use of such coursework to meet eligibility requirements.

d. Promoting campus engagement of student-athletes through enrollment in traditional, in-person courses will help foster student-athlete integration into the general student-body and will encourage balanced student-athlete self-identities.

5. Discussion with Representatives from National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics (N4A). The cabinet hosted its annual meeting with representatives from N4A. The association's president and president-elect discussed the impact of academic reform on academic support professionals, initial-eligibility and two-year college transfer requirements, and the challenges of supporting academically underprepared student-athletes. The representatives also discussed the impact of varying levels of institutional resources on the academic support provided to student-athletes. Finally, the representatives encouraged the cabinet and Division I governance structure to continue to involve the academic support community in discussions related to academic policy and legislation.

6. Results of Comprehensive Academic Support Services Survey. The cabinet continued to review the results of a comprehensive study of academic support resources and practices for student-athletes at Division I institutions. The cabinet reviewed individual student-athlete and institutional characteristics that influence first-year academic outcomes, as measured by grade-point average and eligibility status, with a particular focus on institutional investment in academic support services. The research staff will continue to review the survey results and will provide additional reports at future cabinet

meetings. Specifically, the cabinet asked to study the impact of particular support services on student-athlete academic performance and the potential implications of various reporting structures for the academic support unit (e.g., within athletics, outside athletics, both).

7. **Academic Support Plan as Required Information in Initial-Eligibility Waivers.** The cabinet initially supported a revision to the initial-eligibility waiver policies and procedures to require an academic support plan to be submitted with certain initial-eligibility waiver requests. For example, an academic support plan may be appropriate when the prospective student-athlete's academic record falls outside the threshold to be considered in the waiver process. The cabinet noted that an academic support plan would require the institution to be proactive and identify strategies to support the student-athlete to be academically successful and eventually graduate. The cabinet asked the initial-eligibility waiver staff to further develop the concept – including when a plan will be required, what elements will be required in a plan, and who will approve the plan – for review during the June cabinet meeting.

8. **Academic Certification of Prospective Student-Athletes from Exam-Based Countries.** At the request of the NCAA International Student Records Committee, the cabinet discussed the academic certification policies and procedures for international prospective student-athletes, particularly in situations when a prospective student-athlete from a country that bases graduation on the successful completion of examinations delays his or her graduation. The cabinet noted that the current process of using credits and passing grades from the prospective student-athlete's transcript (rather than grades from the core-course exams) could provide a benefit to those who delay graduation over those who graduate on time. The cabinet considered several alternatives provided by the International Student Records Committee to revise the certification procedures for international student-athletes from exam-based countries.

As a general principle, the cabinet noted that prospective student-athletes from exam-based countries should be certified using grades from the examination, rather than the prospective student-athlete's transcript, regardless of a delay in graduation. This approach recognizes the nature of exam-based countries and is consistent with the educational system in the prospective student-athlete's home country. Further, a consistent approach for all prospective student-athletes from a particular country appears to be the most fair and appropriate.

The cabinet noted that the International Student Records Committee will continue to consider appropriate modifications to the certification procedures at its March meeting, and will work with the Eligibility Center staff to implement any changes. The cabinet

also requested information about the number of such cases reviewed by the Eligibility Center each year, and the reasons for the delayed graduations, to help determine the appropriate approach to certifying initial academic eligibility in these situations.

9. Initial-Eligibility Waivers and Prospective Student-Athlete Reviews. The cabinet received a report on the number and outcome of initial-eligibility waivers and prospective student-athlete reviews processed through December 31, 2009. The academic and membership affairs staff has reviewed 499 initial-eligibility waivers thus far, which represents a slight decrease from 2008-09. In addition, the academic and membership affairs staff has processed 294 prospective student-athlete review cases.

Waivers involving a core-course deficiency have decreased, which was anticipated given the pattern observed in the years surrounding previous changes in core-course requirements. The staff has noticed a continued increase in the number of waivers for international prospective student-athletes, including those who begin in an international country and graduate from a domestic high school. Approximately 78 percent of all waiver requests receive some type of relief, which is similar to the rate in 2008-09.

10. Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers. The cabinet received a report regarding progress-toward-degree waivers submitted during the 2009-10 academic year. The NCAA academic and membership affairs staff has processed 362 requests to date, compared to 485 for the same time period in 2008-09 and 386 in 2007-08. The greatest percentage of waiver requests are related to the percentage-of-degree requirements, followed by the 18/27-credit hour rule. Approximately 68 percent of waiver requests are approved or conditionally approved, which is comparable to a 70 percent approval rate in previous academic years.

The cabinet also reviewed a report of progress-toward-degree waivers for baseball student-athletes that have been conditionally approved based on the student-athlete following an established, individualized academic recovery plan and passing all of his fall courses with grades that would allow the courses to be degree applicable. Such waivers were first granted during the 2008-09 academic year. Of the 23 such waivers granted in fall 2009, 21 student-athletes satisfied the established conditions to be eligible for the 2010 season.

11. NCAA High School Review Committee Policies and Procedures. The cabinet approved revisions to the High School Review Committee's policies and procedures, as recommended by the High School Review Committee. The revisions provide the Eligibility Center staff additional flexibility in the identification of schools to be reviewed

and further clarify the committee's hearing procedures. The cabinet noted these policies also must be approved by the NCAA Division II Academic Requirements Committee and will be distributed to the Division I and II membership once that action has been taken.

12. Facilitating Learning and Achieving Graduation (FLAG) Update. The cabinet received an update regarding the development and implementation of the FLAG program. Specifically, the Graduation Risk Overview (GRO) module, which assists institutions to evaluate and quantify each student-athlete's risk of not graduating, was released to the membership in December 2009. The second module, an online database of support services associated with specific risk factors, is currently under development by the national office staff. The module is projected to be available to the membership during spring or summer 2010.

Committee Chair: Carolyn Callahan, University of Virginia, Atlantic Coast Conference
Cabinet Liaisons: Matt Burgemeister, Academic and Membership Affairs
Julie Cromer, Academic and Membership Affairs
Diane Dickman, Academic and Membership Affairs

REPORT OF THE APRIL 29, 2010, MEETING OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

1. **Opening Remarks from the Chair**. President Barker noted that this would be his last meeting and wanted to leave the group with a few thoughts:

   - Financial decisions often can be in conflict with our values/mission. The Association has evidenced that it can find equilibrium, as shown by the new Turner/CBS media contract. Emphasis should continue on supporting values-based decisions.

   - The NCAA needs to be human and transparent. A bureaucracy works against our values.

   - We need to link postseason competition more clearly to academic success. I see this as the next major step in academic reform.

   - We should survey our student-athletes to collect data regarding the question—If you had it to do over again, would you select the same institution to attend?

2. **Report of the January 16, 2010, Board of Directors meeting. The Board approved the report of its January 16, 2010, meeting**. (Unanimous Voice Vote.) [Reference Supplement No. 1.]

3. **Report of the Division I Presidential Advisory Group**. The Board received a report from Ann Millner, chair of the Division I Presidential Advisory Group (PAG), regarding the group's April 28, 2010, meeting. The Board was informed of PAG's view regarding various Board agenda items as they were considered by the Board. [Reference Supplement No. 3.]

4. **Report from the Interim President.** NCAA Interim President Jim Isch reported on the following items:

   a. **Introduction of NCAA President-Elect**. Mark Emmert, NCAA president-elect, was introduced to the Board. The president-elect addressed the group, noting the challenges ahead for the Association and his excitement in working with the NCAA staff and the membership to address them.

   b. **Media Contract**. The Board received a report from Greg Shaheen, NCAA senior vice president for basketball and business strategies, regarding the general terms of the NCAA's Turner/CBS media contract.

BOARD ACTION: The Board discussed expansion of the Division I Men's Basketball Championship field and agreed to expand the championship field from 65 to 68 teams. (Unanimous voice vote)

c. **Internal Task Forces**. Jim Isch informed the Board of the various short term task forces that have been formed to evaluate topics of importance to Division I and the national office. It is anticipated that appropriate recommendations from these groups will be reported to the Board of Directors and referred to appropriate groups within the governance structure for consideration.

5. **Final Report from the Football Academic Working Group**. The Board received the final report of the working group's key findings regarding the academic performance of Division I football student-athletes and recommendations for strategies to improve their academic performance.

BOARD ACTION: The Board expressed strong support for the first four recommendations, noting its intent to sponsor legislation in the 2010-11 cycle to implement the recommendations. The Board requested that the recommendations be put in legislative format for review during its August meeting, with the understanding that the working group will work with the Committee on Academic Performance to address CAP's concerns and any potential unintended consequences that could arise as a result of planned changes in the rules. (Unanimous voice vote) [Reference Supplement No. 5.]

6. **Division I Governance Structure Update**.

a. **Report of the March 23, 2010, meeting of the Leadership Council**. Damon Evans, chair of the Division I Leadership Council, reported the following from the March 23, 2010, Leadership Council meeting:

(1) The Council initiated discussion of cost savings recommendations from various Division I cabinets, as wells as financial recommendations discussed by the Division IA Athletics Directors Association. The Council recommended a more global approach when attempting to address spending in intercollegiate athletics. The Council suggested that principles be developed to guide a review of spending and costs. Several Board members suggested that central to values-based decision making will be identification of a set of guiding principles.

(2) The Council completed its study of the Division I membership standards and presented its final report to the Board, requesting that the Board sponsor legislation for the 2010-11 legislative cycle to implement the recommendations.

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the recommended Division I membership standards, with plans to review the recommendations in legislative format in August, prior to inserting them in to the 2010-11 legislative cycle. (Unanimous voice vote) [See Attachment for the membership standards.]

b. Report of the April 12-13, 2010, meeting of the Division I Legislative Council.

(1) Report on proposals receiving the requisite number of override votes. The Board was informed that the Legislative Council reconsidered Proposal Nos. 2009-22 and 2009-51-B, which were subject to override requests from the membership.

(a) The Council amended the effective date of Section E (related to delayed enrollment and organized competition) of Proposal No. 2009-22 to August 1, 2011, for sports other than tennis, and August 1, 2012, for tennis.

(b) The Council amended Proposal No. 2009-51-B to apply only to men's and women's basketball.

If these changes are acceptable to the membership, no override vote will be necessary at the 2011 NCAA Convention.

(2) Report of Actions Related to Proposals Recommended by the Basketball Academic Enhancement Group and Sponsored by the Board.

(a) The Council adopted Proposal No. 2009-97, which would specify that a student-athlete who receives athletically related financial aid in academic years following the departure of a head coach from the institution is not a counter, provided several criteria are met.

(b) The Council also adopted Sections A and B and defeated Sections C and D of Proposal No. 2009-98. Section A of the proposal specifies policies related to missed class time and Section B modifies the current departure/return restrictions in men's basketball. Section C of the proposal modifies the preseason playing and practice season regulations in men's basketball while Section D would have reduced the maximum number of contests in men's basketball by one.

(3) Report of Actions Related to Proposals that originated with the Basketball Focus Group (BFG). The Council took the following actions regarding the BFG proposals:

(a) Referred Proposal No. 2009-100 to the Division I Men's Basketball Issues Committee for review and consideration of possible legal issues related to the proposal. Proposal No. 2009-100 would specify that an institution shall not host, sponsor or conduct a nonscholastic basketball practice, contest or event in which men's basketball prospective student-athletes participate on its campus or at an off-campus facility regularly used by the institution for practice and/or competition by any of the institution's sport programs.

(b) Adopted Proposal No. 2009-101, as amended by Proposal No. 2009-101-1, which would permit men's basketball coaches to engage in recruiting conversations with prospects during the institution's men's basketball camps or clinics.

(c) Defeated Proposal No. 2009-102, which would specify that in men's basketball, an institution shall only employ (either on a salaried or a volunteer basis) enrolled students or institutional staff members in any capacity at its camps and clinics.

(4) Report of Actions Related to other Selected Proposals. The Council adopted the following selected proposals:

(a) Proposal No. 2009-32-B, which would permit telephone calls at an institution's discretion during a contact period in sports other than football with defined recruiting calendars. D'Antonio noted that the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee expressed its opposition to this legislation; however, the Council supported it.

(b) Proposal No. 2009-47-B, which would specify that that prior to August 1 of a prospective student-athlete's senior year in high school, an institution shall not provide a written offer of athletically related financial aid or indicate in writing to the prospective student-athlete that an athletically related grant-in-aid will be offered by the institution.

(c) Proposal No. 2009-75-B as amended by Proposal No. 2009-75-B-1, which would specify that the required medical examination or evaluation that student-athletes who are beginning their initial season of eligibility and students who are trying out for a team must undergo prior to participation

in voluntary summer conditioning or voluntary individual workouts pursuant to the safety exception, practice, competition or out-of-season conditioning activities shall include a sickle cell solubility test (SST), unless documented results of a prior test are provided to the institution or the individual declines the test and signs a written release.

(5) Resolution. Harvey Perlman presented a resolution requesting that the Legislative Council develop a draft of a policy statement that the Board of Directors and Legislative Council might adopt that would provide better guidance regarding consideration of proposed NCAA legislation by applying a metric to identify those legislative proposals to defeat or consider, and those proposals to call to the attention of the Board. The objective of this policy statement should be twofold: (1) to limit the number of legislative proposals approved to those that identify and document a clear national problem that needs to be addressed, and (2) identifies those proposals that might appropriately be considered directly by the Board.

In considering a policy directed at (1) above, the Legislative Council may wish to consider procedures that assure proposals receive the comments of the various governance groups and what evidence should be submitted with any proposal to document its need. In considering a policy directed at (2) above, the Legislative Council may wish to consider the extent to which the proposed legislation has received broad support or whether a governance group or other cabinet or council has rejected the proposal. It may also wish to consider whether the proposed legislation implements a core NCAA value or is at the periphery or has implications that may conflict with a core NCAA value.

The Board would value the Council's advice regarding possible categories of proposals that should be reviewed by the Board (e.g., those that intrude on student athlete time or benefits, those that increase costs).

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the resolution. (Unanimous voice vote)

7. **Litigation Update**. Elsa Cole, NCAA General Counsel, provided this report to the Board.

8. **Report from the Committee on Academic Performance**. The group received an update on the activities of the Committee on Academic Performance (CAP) from the chair, Walter Harrison. Harrison previewed the latest Academic Performance Rate (APR) data, noting recent trends in football, men's basketball and baseball. The committee continues its

extensive review of the Academic Performance Program (APP) and supported a request to continue the Division I Supplemental Support Fund for fiscal year 2011.

9. **Report of New Budget Initiatives for Division I.** Harvey Perlman informed the Board of the new Division I budget initiatives for fiscal years 2010-11 and 2011-12.

BOARD ACTION: The Board approved the new initiatives. (Unanimous voice vote) [Reference Supplement No. 9.]

10. **Committee on Infractions.**

a. **Committee on Infractions Appointment**. The Board appointed Gregory Sankey, associate commissioner of the Southeastern Conference, to the Division I Committee on Infractions. (Unanimous voice vote) [Reference Supplement No. 13.]

b. **Review of Infractions Issues**. The Board received an update on the work of the Task Force to Clarify Roles of the Committee on Infractions and Infractions Appeals Committee. The Board was informed that the NCAA staff along with Shirley Raines have been engaged in conversations with the national testing agencies to identify ways in which improved and more timely information can be shared with member institutions and the NCAA Eligibility Center in instances in which a test score is being questioned or challenged by the testing agency. Raines agreed to work with the task force on issues regarding "strict liability" that affects institutions and consideration of "evidence" when such cases are deemed to affect eligibility for competition. Future reports will be provided to the Board as the discussions continue.

11. **Governance Transitional Issues.**

a. **Appointment of new members to the Board of Directors**. The Board unanimously approved the following new Board members whose terms begin following the Board's April 2010 meeting:

- Nathan Hatch, Wake Forest University, Atlantic Coast Conference
- Lee Todd, University of Kentucky, Southeastern Conference
- Steadman Upham, University of Tulsa, Conference USA

b. Appointments to the NCAA Executive Committee. The Board unanimously approved the appointment of the following Board members to the Executive Committee whose terms begin following the Board's April 2010 meeting:

- James Cofer, University of Louisiana at Monroe
- David Schmidly, University of New Mexico

c. Appointment of FBS Members to Councils and Cabinets. The Board reviewed the slate of nominees for councils and cabinets submitted by the FBS conferences. Although the slate falls slightly short of the enhanced diversity requirements, the Board agreed to approve the slate with the condition that any subsequent modifications due to attrition would have to assist in meeting the enhanced diversity requirements. (Unanimous voice vote)

12. Expression of Appreciation. David Berst, NCAA vice president of Division I, thanked departing Board members Michael Adams, president, University of Georgia, Southeastern Conference, and Shirley Raines, president, Memphis University, Conference USA, for their service to Division I. He gave a gave a special thanks to James Barker, president, Clemson University, Atlantic Coast Conference, for his service as chair of the Board.

13. Future meeting Dates.

a. August 12, 2010, Indianapolis, Indiana.

b. October 28, 2010, Indianapolis, Indiana.

c. January 15, 2011, NCAA Convention, San Antonio, Texas.

d. April 28, 2011, National Office, Indianapolis, Indiana

e. August 11, 2011, National Office, Indianapolis, Indiana

f. October 27, 2011, National Office, Indianapolis, Indiana

Board of Directors chair: James Barker, Clemson University
Staff Liaisons: S. David Berst, Division I governance
Jacqueline Campbell, Division I governance

The National Collegiate Athletic Association
April 30, 2010 SDB/JGC:vlm

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I LEADERSHIP COUNCIL MARCH 23, 2010, MEETING

1. ACTION ITEMS.

- **Division I Membership Standards**. The Leadership Council reviewed a final draft of recommendations for Division I membership standards.

  Recommendation: That the Board of Directors endorse the attached report of recommendations for Division I membership standards for review by Division I membership groups and conferences during the spring 2010 and that in August 2010, the Board sponsor necessary legislative proposals for implementation of the recommendations beginning in August 2011. (See Attachment)

2. INFORMATION ITEMS.

a. **Update on President's search**. Jim Isch, interim NCAA president, updated the group on the search for the next NCAA president and noted that the process appears to be on track to have the new president in place by the start of the 2010-11 academic year.

b. **Update on Media Contract**. Greg Shaheen, NCAA senior vice president of basketball and business strategies, discussed the status of the Association's media contract. Shaheen reviewed information related to past contracts and options as the Association moves forward. Shaheen informed the Council of discussions related to expansion of the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Championship and the factors being considered as expansion is evaluated.

c. **Litigation Report.** Elsa Cole, NCAA general counsel, reported on the legal activity in which the Association is involved.

d. **Cost Savings Initiatives**. The Leadership Council reviewed a list of possible cost savings measures recommended by various Division I cabinets, as well as a number of financial recommendations discussed by the IA Athletics Directors Association. The Council noted that many of the recommendations appear to address "low-hanging fruit" and it may be wiser to take a more global approach when attempting to address spending in intercollegiate athletics. The Council recommended that staff collect additional data regarding actual spending areas and, with the possible help of consultants, develop a set of principles that could guide a review of spending. The Council suggested a two-pronged approach involving the evaluation of costs on campus as well as a review of the Association's spending related to the activities of the national office.

e. **Legislative items in the 2009-10 cycle of potential interest to the Leadership Council.** The Council received a report on the two legislative proposals (Proposal No. 2009-22 and Proposal No. 2009-51-B) that received the requisite number of requests for an override vote. The Council was informed of the status of the two proposals and the options for action by the Legislative Council during its April meeting.

f. **Report of the January 14, 2010, Leadership Council meeting**. The Council approved the report of its January 14, 2010, meeting. (Unanimous voice vote)

g. **Report from the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.** Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee chair Nick Fulton presented a report of the committee's recent meeting and priorities for the upcoming year.

h. **Future Meetings**.

a. October 5, 2010, Indianapolis, Indiana.
b. January 15, 2011, San Antonio, Texas.

Leadership Council chair: Damon Evans, University of Georgia
Staff Liaisons: S. David Berst, Division I governance
Jacqueline Campbell, Division I governance
Kevin Lennon, academic and membership affairs

NCAA Leadership Council Final Report Regarding Division I Membership Criteria

Background.

On August 9, 2007, the Division I Board of Directors adopted Legislative Proposal 2007-10, which established a four-year a moratorium that prohibited consideration of any new institutional, conference or multi-divisional Division I members until August 2011.

The Board concluded that the time was right, following similar moratoriums in Divisions II and III, for the Division I membership to assess and study the impact of membership migration and to develop reasonable philosophical expectations and legislative requirements for membership in the division. The Board requested the Leadership Council to conduct this study and to make appropriate recommendations regarding possible NCAA legislation.

A preliminary report of recommendations was provided to the Board of Directors in April 2009 and the Division I governance structure, member conferences and institutions were asked to provide reactions. The Leadership Council has continued discussions and submits the following report of recommendations to the Board of Directors for its April 29, 2010 meeting.

Excerpt from the Division I Manual--Division I Philosophy (Bylaw 20.9).

Athletics programs in Division I are guided by a philosophy statement that among other things:

- Emphasizes high standards of academic quality and breadth of academic opportunity;
- Strives for regional and national excellence and prominence and recognizes the dual objective of serving both the institutional community and the general public;
- Provides for extensive opportunities for participation in varsity intercollegiate athletics for both men and women (consistent with the requirements of Title IX) and sponsors at the highest feasible level of intercollegiate competition, men's and women's basketball and football, recognizing subdivisional designations in football;
- Advocates scheduling athletics contests primarily among Division I institutions;
- Emphasizes maintaining institutional control over all funds supporting athletics; and that
- Understands, respects, and supports the programs and philosophies of other membership divisions.

Additional Standards and Assumptions Relied Upon by the Leadership Council in its discussions included that:

- Applicants for membership in Division I should be required to meet, over a period of time, prescribed criteria in order to assure compatibility and compliance with the principles and program objectives of Division I.
- Central to the mission of intercollegiate athletics in Division I is the academic and athletic success of student-athletes, as well as protection of the student-athletes' health and well-being.
- Division I members should be expected to demonstrate a meaningful program-wide financial commitment across its entire athletics program, including for financial aid, number of sports sponsored, recruiting, athletics facilities, rules compliance, coaching, team travel and academic support services.
- Membership standards should promote conference stability, provide access to Division I for qualifying institutions and treat institutions fairly in determining their status as members of Division I.
- The number and nature of multisport conferences in Division I are fundamental considerations in establishing the level, structure and scope of Division I championship competition, the allocation of financial benefits and access to services and governance of the division.
- The multisport conference is the foundation of the NCAA DI governance structure, championships structure, and compliance structure and is rightly positioned in the proposed Division I membership process as a gatekeeper in the new membership model.
- A more comprehensive definition of a multisport conference is appropriate.
- There is a finite level of resources, benefits and good will available to current members of the division, which should be maintained or enhanced through any further expansion of membership.
- Potential new members of Division I should be expected to demonstrate a sustained commitment to Division I standards, assumptions and the Division I philosophy statement before election to membership in the division.
- Current voting ratios/percentages by conference and subdivision within Division I should be maintained through appropriate mathematical adjustments in the event the membership increases.
- The Division I brand has a value that can be approximated through a calculation of the value of direct and indirect services and benefits, as well as of the "image" of Division I and its subdivisions.

Recommendations.

The Council requests that the Board of Directors endorse the following recommendations for further discussion and debate by Division I membership groups and conferences during the spring 2010 and that in August 2010, the Board sponsor appropriate legislative proposals for membership consideration in January and April 2011.

1. **Potential new members of Division I shall enter the division through a four-year "reclassification" process following no less than five-years of membership in Division II. Further, the process described in Bylaw 20.5 shall apply, and an application for membership in Division I will be accepted only after presenting a bona fide offer of membership from a Division I multisport, voting conference. The sponsoring conference will be expected to provide appropriate guidance and counsel to the transitioning new member, assist with scheduling, monitor student-athlete well being and enhance accountability during the transition process.**

   Comment: Requiring conference sponsorship and prior membership in Division II is intended to promote the long-term stability of the Association. There should be a check list to assist conferences and transitioning institutions to ensure that institutions are meeting their appropriate benchmarks. The Administration Cabinet should provide additional thought to the timing of when various benchmarks should apply.

2. **The "provisional" process provided for in Bylaw 20.3.1, which now permits an institution outside the NCAA to become a Division I member through a seven-year process, shall be eliminated.**

   Comment: Multisport conferences within the Division I championships and governance structure are well suited to determine the needs of conferences and thereby the division. Experience in Division II serves as an appropriate platform to demonstrate the traits necessary to become a productive Division I member.

3. **An application fee shall be required before entering the "reclassification" process, which should either be commensurate with; (1) the estimated annual average value of direct benefits through distributions and championships made available to Division I members - - currently approximately $1,300,000, or (2) the "median" annual value of direct benefits through distributions and championships - - currently approximately $900,000.**

   Comment: This requirement should be data-driven and will change from time to time. This calculation does not include the costs of services or costs to administer the reclassification program. Upon election to Division I membership, the application fee shall be deposited in the NCAA Student Athlete Opportunity Distribution Fund. In the event an institution withdraws during the reclassification process, the application fee would be returned to the institution on a prorated basiss—75% after year one, $50% after year two, 30% after year three and 0% thereafter. It should also be emphasized that conferences may require separate fees for joining the conference. Discussion occurred regarding alternatives where the application fee would be analogous to a business model tied to "brand" value or

possibly tied to the educational and administrative costs of the process. It was concluded that as a higher-education association, data based on direct benefits received would be a simple and clear method and also would demonstrate a meaningful commitment from the prospective member.

4. **Upon beginning the "reclassification" process, the institution must meet Division I sports sponsorship requirements (i.e., 50 percent of the grants-in-aid maximums in the conference sponsored sports in which the institution will participate). In addition, the alternative means of satisfying this requirement now set forth in Bylaw 20.9.1.2-(b) (c) and (d) would continue to apply.**

   Comment: This is the current requirement and no change is recommended. Data reviewed regarding a possible increase to these minimums did not appear to support a change.

5. **A prospective member institution may not be elected to active membership in Division I if it is subject to a "historical penalty" under the APR program.**

   Comment: The Leadership Council believes a demonstrated commitment to academics should be required. The Committee on Academic Performance recommends that a numerical standard (e.g., 925) be avoided in deference to a "category" of academic penalties.

6. **A preliminary NCAA certification shall be required in year 1 of the four-year "reclassification" period and a full compliance review shall be required before final election to Division I membership. (See Proposed new Division I Reclassification Process beginning on page 8.)**

   Comment: There should be an expectation that the sponsoring conference will assist the institution in this process and that special attention should be given to rules compliance, academic support services, recruiting, coaches, team travel and facilities. Meeting standards early in the process and then demonstrating the ability to sustain such standards is important. The review process must make it clear that reclassification is an evolutionary process so that there is no confusion that receiving positive marks during the certification process does not guarantee eventual Division I membership.

7. **A member institution in Division I will qualify to begin receiving revenue distributions related to sports sponsorship and grants-in-aid upon serving three**

calendar years as an "active" Division I member. The institution would qualify in year one of active membership to receive Student-athlete Opportunity, Special Assistance and Academic Enhancement Funds, as well as basketball grant funds as determined by its sponsoring conference.

Comment: This change ensures that sustainability in the division is not based solely on receipt of NCAA revenues.

8. **The multi-divisional practice that permits a Division II or III institution to designate one men's and one women's sport in Division I shall be discontinued upon the completion of the 2010-11 academic year, except in a sport where no championship is conducted in its division. Division II and III institutions that sponsor sports teams in Division I in 2010-11 may continue to do so in the sports so designated but will forfeit this opportunity permanently if it fails to conduct the sport in Division I in any ensuing academic year. No change is recommended to qualify for participation in national collegiate championships.**

   Comment: It appears there is agreement to discontinue multidivisional competition, but teams that currently conduct such division I programs should be "grandfathered."

9. **A multisport conference in Division I may not receive voting privileges, conference grant funds or committee service positions in the Division I governance structure until legislation is enacted that names the conference among those identified in applicable sections of Constitution 4 related to representation and voting ratios on the Division I Board of Directors, Legislative and Leadership Councils and the five cabinets. (Refer to No. 13 below.)**

   Comment: This is the current requirement in Division I. Refer to Constitution 3.3.3.2.

10. **No change in criteria is recommended for designation in the Football Championship Subdivision, although it is recommended that the FBS subdivision consider legislation that would require a bona fide invitation for membership in an FBS conference before and an FCS institution may change subdivisions.**

    Comments: The FCS conferences do not appear to support additional membership requirements for its subdivision. However, it was noted that the bowl structure of the FBS should not be expected to support an expanded membership in that subdivision without conference sponsorship and support.

11. The role of the Administration Cabinet and the benchmarks for the four-year reclassification process shall be reviewed by the Administration Cabinet to ensure coordination by the cabinet with sponsoring conferences.

Comments: Through coordination with conferences in providing guidance and assistance to potential new member institutions, some procedural functions performed now by the Administrative Cabinet could be transferred to conference offices.

12. Constitution 3.2.3.1 shall be amended to provide that the vote to elect an institution to Division I active membership upon recommendation by the Administration cabinet shall be taken by the Board of Directors, rather than the Leadership Council.

Comments: This should be noncontroversial legislation and is recommend by the Leadership Council.

13. NCAA Division I – Recommended Multisport Conference Standards and Definition.

a. Institutional Members.

(1) A multisport conference shall have a minimum of seven (7) active Division I members.
(2) A multisport conference shall have a minimum of seven (7) active members participate in both men's and women's basketball.

b. Conference Sports Sponsorship.

(1) A multisport conference shall sponsor a minimum of 12 NCAA Division I sports.
(2) A multisport conference shall sponsor a minimum of six men's sports. In each of these six sports, a minimum of six active members shall compete.
(3) A multisport conference shall sponsor a minimum of six women's sports. In each of these six sports, a minimum of six active members shall compete, or a minimum of five active members for an emerging sport.
(4) In addition to men's basketball, a multisport conference shall, at a minimum, sponsor either football, with a minimum of six active members competing in football, or sponsor two additional men's team sports, with a minimum of six active members participating in each of these two sports.
(5) In addition to women's basketball, a multisport conference shall sponsor at least two additional women's team sports, with a minimum of six active members participating in each of these two sports.

c. Regular Season Conference Competition.

(1) Basketball: Basketball teams shall participate in a regular season conference schedule of a double round robin, or a minimum of 14 regular season conference contests.
(2) Minimum Required Team Sports, Other Than Basketball [b- (4) and (5) above]: In the team sports sponsored to meet the minimum team sports sponsorship requirement, teams shall compete in a minimum regular season conference schedule of five contests. A minimum of five regular season conference contests must be hosted by one of the two competing teams at its home site venue.

d. Officiating. A multisport conference shall provide oversight of the officiating programs for selecting, training and assigning officials for its men's and women's basketball programs.

e. Compliance. A multisport conference shall have a comprehensive compliance program.

f. Continuity. A multisport conference must meet the institutional membership requirement (a. above) before it may be considered for continuity. To establish continuity, a multisport conference must meet the sports sponsorship and regular season competition requirements (b. and c. above) for a period of eight consecutive years. If a conference establishes continuity, it may be considered for multisport membership in Division I.

g. Core. A multisport conference that is recognized in the NCAA Governance Structure as a result of legislation [see No. 9 above] shall be considered a core conference. A core conference shall:

(1) Have representation and voting standing in the NCAA Division I Governance Structure.
(2) Be eligible to submit nominees for and have its delegates serve on NCAA Division I committees.
(3) Be eligible to receive AQ into NCAA championships, provided the conference competes with a minimum of six active participants in the sport.
(4) Receive conference grant funds.
(5) Receive, on behalf of its members, Special Assistance/Student-Athlete Opportunity Funds.

Proposed New Division I Reclassification Process.

The following information outlines the membership reclassification process for any Division II or non-NCAA institution seeking to reclassify its entire athletics program to Division I membership. It should be noted that multidivisional membership (i.e., classifying one men's and or one women's sport other than football and basketball in Division I) will be discontinued following the 2010-11 academic year for any additional Division II or III institutions.

General Requirements.

The following general requirements must be satisfied prior to an institution entering the reclassification process.

- The reclassifying institution must have been an active NCAA Division II member for the preceding five years.
- The institution must be meeting applicable Division I minimum financial aid and sports-sponsorship membership requirements.
- The institution must have been extended a bona fide offer of membership by an active DI multisport voting conference.
- The institution and conference must complete an application form accompanied by an application fee (based on a yet to be determined figure based on either the average or mean of the Division I revenue distributions and championship benefits in the year of application) no later than June 1 preceding entry into year one of the reclassification process that is approved by the Division I Administration Cabinet. The institution must provide notice if it is currently involved in an investigation, an infractions case or on probation with its current governing body.
- The institution must submit a skeletal strategic plan to the Administration Cabinet that addresses the Division I philosophy statement (see Bylaw 20.9) and athletics certification operating principles (see Bylaw 22.2) approved by the conference office no later than June 1 preceding entry into year one of the reclassification process.

[Note: The Administration Cabinet shall have oversight responsibilities and shall monitor each institution's progress through the reclassification process. The cabinet shall have the authority to decline moving an institution to the ensuing year of the process if it deems that deficiencies warrant that the institution repeat a year].

Year One.

- Attendance at an orientation session conducted by the national office staff related to basic Division I operating rules and membership requirements. Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Attendance at the NCAA Convention Division I Issues Forum and business session (if such a session is conducted). Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Attendance at a regional rules seminar conducted by the NCAA. Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president [or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution], the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Apply all Division I legislation except scheduling requirements and continuing eligibility requirements (e.g., progress-toward-degree, five year rule) for student-athletes who are completing their final season of competition and were enrolled at the institution at least one year prior to entering year one of the reclassification process.
- Completion of a preliminary NCAA athletics certification orientation (conference representatives will also be required to be in attendance).
- Process institutional and individual student-athlete violations of Division I legislation through the Division I enforcement and student-athlete reinstatement processes. The institution shall be subject to any and all sanctions for violations of Division I legislation.
- Submit an annual report and an updated strategic plan by June 1 based on feedback from the previous year's plan. The institution shall report all violations to the Administration Cabinet as part of the annual report and provide notice if the institution is currently involved in an investigation, infractions case or on probation with its current governing body.

Year Two.

- Full compliance with all Division I legislation and membership requirements.
- Attendance at the NCAA Convention Division I Issues Forum and business session (if applicable). Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Attendance at a regional rules seminar conducted by the NCAA. Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Completion of a compliance review conducted by the national office and submission of a report with an institutional response to the findings and recommendations.
- Process institutional and individual student-athlete violations of Division I legislation through the Division I enforcement and student-athlete reinstatement processes. The institution shall be subject to any and all sanctions for violations of Division I legislation.
- Submit an annual report and an updated strategic plan by June 1 based on feedback from the previous year's plan. The institution shall report all violations to the Administration Cabinet as part of the annual report and provide notice if the institution is currently involved in an investigation, infractions case or on probation with its current governing body.

Year Three.

- Attendance at the NCAA Convention Division I Issues Forum and business session (if applicable). Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Attendance at a regional rules seminar conducted by the NCAA. Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.

- Completion of an athletics certification orientation.
- Process institutional and individual student-athlete violations of Division I legislation through the Division I enforcement and student-athlete reinstatement processes. The institution shall be subject to any and all sanctions for violations of Division I legislation.
- Submit an annual report and an updated strategic plan by June 1 based on feedback from the previous year's plan. The institution shall report all violations to the Administration Cabinet as part of the annual report and provide notice if the institution is currently involved in an investigation, infractions case or on probation with its current governing body.

Year Four.

- Successfully complete an NCAA athletics certification and evaluation visit.
- Attendance at the NCAA Convention Division I Issues Forum and business session (if applicable). Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president (or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution), the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Attendance at a regional rules seminar conducted by the NCAA. Institutional representatives required to attend are the chancellor or president [or an individual appointed by the chancellor or president with executive status at the institution], the director of athletics, the senior woman administrator, the faculty athletics representative and the senior compliance administrator.
- Process institutional and individual student-athlete violations of Division I legislation through the Division I enforcement and student-athlete reinstatement processes. The institution shall be subject to any and all sanctions for violations of Division I legislation.
- Submit an annual report and an updated strategic plan by June 1 based on feedback from the previous year's plan. The institution shall report all violations to the Administration Cabinet as part of the annual report and provide notice if the institution is currently involved in an investigation, infractions case or on probation with its current governing body.
- A prospective member institution may not be elected to active membership if it is subject to a historical penalty under the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program.

Post-Reclassification.

- After completion of the four year reclassification process, the Board of Directors, on the recommendation of the Division I Administration Cabinet, shall have the authority to elect the institution to active Division I status.
- The institution must submit a progress report to the Committee on Athletics Certification regarding its progress on any plans for improvement (as previously recommended by the committee) no later than the conclusion of its second year of active Division I membership.
- A new Division I institution will qualify to receive revenue distributions related to sports sponsorship and grants-in-aid after serving three calendar years as an active Division I member.
- A new Division I institution will qualify immediately to receive Student-Athlete Opportunity, Special Assistance and Academic Enhancement Funds, as well as basketball grant funds as determined by the institution's conference.

REPORT OF
THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
DIVISION I COMMUNICATIONS AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE
CONFERENCE CALL

Participants: April 21, 2010

Grace Calhoun, Indiana University – (Awards, Benefits Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet)
Carolyn Callahan, University of Virginia – (Academic Cabinet)
Joseph D'Antonio, Big East Conference – (Legislative Council)
Damon Evans, University of Georgia – (Leadership Council)
Nick Fulton, chair of the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
Rob Halvaks, Big West Conference – (Administration Cabinet)
Mike Rogers, Baylor University – (Amateurism Cabinet)
Judy Rose, University of North Carolina, Charlotte (Championships/Sports Management Cabinet)
Jacqueline Campbell, NCAA – recording secretary

Petrina Long, UCLA – (Recruiting/Athletics Personnel Cabinet) was unable to participate on the call.

NCAA Staff: David Berst, Matt Burgemeister, Jeremiah Carter, Shauna Cobb, Angie Cretors, Julie Cromer, Vanessa Fuchs, Lynn Holzman, Steve Mallonee, Carol Reep, Kris Richardson, Dave Schnase, Carl Segura, Maricela Schukie, Jackie Thurnes, Sharon Tufano and Leeland Zeller also participated on the call.

The conference call was called to order at 3:07 p.m. by Damon Evans, chair. All were present as noted above.

1. Brief Updates from Leadership and Legislative Councils.

a. Leadership Council. The Leadership Council completed its work on the new Division I membership standards and forwarded a final report to the Board of Directors for review during its April 29 meeting. The Council also spent time reviewing possible cost savings measures recommended by various Division I cabinets. The Council recommended that staff collect additional data regarding actual spending areas and, with the possible help of consultants, develop a set of principles that could guide a review of spending. The Council suggested a two-pronged approach involving the evaluation of costs on campuses as well as a review of the Association's spending related to the activities of the national office.

b. Legislative Council. The Legislative Council reconsidered Proposal Nos. 2009-22 and 2009-51-B, which were subject to override requests from the membership. The

Council amended the effective date of section E of Proposal No. 2009-22 to August 1, 2011, for sports other than tennis, and August 1, 2012, for tennis. In reviewing Proposal No. 2009-51-B, the Council amended the proposal to apply only to men's and women's basketball. The Council's actions, relative to these proposals, will be reviewed by the Board of Directors during its April 29 meeting.

2. Comments Regarding Cabinets' Key Items. The cabinet chairs briefly shared the following meeting highlights:

a. Academic Cabinet. The cabinet continued its review of initial- and transfer-eligibility requirements, with the goal of aligning the requirements to ensure the academic success of student-athletes. In June, the cabinet will discuss the pros and cons of possible enhancements to the current initial- and transfer-eligibility standards. The cabinet also will meet jointly with the Committee on Academic Performance (CAP) in June.

b. Administration Cabinet. During its February meeting, the cabinet engaged in its second cycle of committee appointments. During its June meeting, the cabinet will conduct its annual evaluation of institutions in the Division I membership reclassification process. The cabinet continues its work with the NCAA research staff to develop a governance assessment tool to determine if the new governance structure is achieving its stated goals and objectives.

c. Amateurism Cabinet. The cabinet continued its review and examination of commercial activity in intercollegiate athletics. During its June meeting, the cabinet expects to review legislative proposals regarding the use of student-athletes' names, pictures and likenesses that will be introduced into the 2010-11 legislative cycle. The cabinet also plans to discuss the implications of Proposal No. 2009-22 on elite athletes who participate in Olympic and national team training programs.

d. Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet. The cabinet continued its review of proposed changes to the financial aid model, which was shared with the membership through a discussion document. The cabinet reviewed feedback from the membership and will be sending out an updated document for membership review and comment during upcoming conference meetings.

e. Championships/Sports Management Cabinet. During its February meeting, the cabinet continued its discussion of possible cost savings concepts related to the administration of championships and playing and practice seasons. The cabinet plans to continue its discussions in June.

f. Recruiting Cabinet. During its February meeting, the cabinet discussed the current recruiting model and developed three alternative models for membership review and feedback. The models recently were circulated to the membership for review and comment during upcoming conference meetings. The cabinet also reviewed the results of a survey pertaining to noncoaching staff members with sport-specific responsibilities and directed staff to draft proposals that include numerical limitations on such personnel in the sports of men's and women's basketball and football. The proposals will be circulated to the membership and the appropriate coaches' associations for review and feedback to be used by the cabinet in its consideration of legislation for the 2010-11 cycle.

3. Expected Traffic Flow of Issues on the Division I agenda. The committee was informed of the possible proliferation of legislation in the Division I cycle during the upcoming year. Legislation likely to move forward this year includes proposals in the areas of commercial activities, Division I membership requirements, financial aid, football and basketball academic working groups, and possibly cost savings. Legislation related to a new recruiting model and changes to the initial- and transfer-eligibility requirements may not be ripe until the next legislative cycle, unless membership feedback and academic data dictate otherwise. The staff noted that all of these areas include complex concepts that will require focus and debate by the membership. Therefore, the staff has encouraged conferences to be selective in submitting legislative proposals that add bulk but little substance to this year's legislative process.

4. Appointment of New Cabinet and Council members.

a. FBS Members of Cabinets and Councils. The committee was reminded that the terms of the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) representatives on all the cabinets and councils expire this summer; however, all of them have the opportunity for reappointment. The Board of Directors will approve the FBS nominations during its upcoming meeting, provided they meet the new diversity requirements endorsed by the Board in January.

b. Chairs of Cabinets and Councils. The staff noted that NCAA legislation mandates that chairs of the Division I cabinets and councils serve in that role for no longer than two years, which means the terms of all chairs expire this summer. In order to maintain continuity on this committee, the staff will recommend to the Board that the terms of half of the chairs be extended for one year. The staff will keep the chairs informed of the Board's action regarding this matter.

5. **Update on Division I Governance Collaboration Zone.** The staff noted that it continues to work internally to have the Division I Governance Collaboration Zone (CZ) fully operational prior to the fall cabinet and council meetings. The cabinets will receive a brief demonstration of the CZ during their June meetings. Additional information and instructions regarding use of the CZ will be forwarded to cabinet and council members this summer.

6. **Proposed Future Call Dates**. The staff noted that the expected next call date would probably be in mid-August following the Board of Directors meeting. The committee will be sent calendars to indicate their availability sometime in early summer.

7. **Adjournment**. The call was adjourned at 3:53 p.m. EDT.

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE FEBRUARY 22-23, 2010, MEETING

***KEY ITEMS*.**

1. **Examination of the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP).** The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance continued its examination of the APP to determine the program's effectiveness in reaching the membership's goals for academic reform. This review will continue through the summer and will include further discussions regarding the NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) benchmarks and penalty structures, filters and waiver directives.

2. **Review of Academic Eligibility Standards for Prospective Student-Athletes.** The committee reviewed comprehensive data regarding the requirements for initial eligibility and transfer eligibility of prospective student-athletes. The committee reviewed potential enhancements to the current initial- and transfer-eligibility standards, which may assist with identifying those student-athletes who are academically prepared for college work, as well as with identifying those student-athletes who are academically underprepared and may benefit from academic support and accommodations. The committee will continue to discuss these topics in June when it meets jointly with the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet.

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. **Legislative Items.**

   - None.

2. **Nonlegislative Items.**

   - None.

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

1. **Examination of the APP.** The committee continued its review of the APP and began to address key research issues and questions related to the program's effectiveness. At this meeting, the committee initiated a framework for possible enhancements, which will prompt further research and development of potential concepts for review during the committee's June meeting.

After review of the principles that served as a foundation for recent academic reform efforts, the committee affirmed its commitment to the stated goals of the APP and agreed that its principles are still applicable. The committee further noted that even with the adjustments and modifications made to the program over the years, the essential structure remains relatively simple and easy to comprehend, as demonstrated by the widespread acceptance and general understanding of those within athletics, higher education and the general public.

As the committee turned its attention to the penalty structure, it was reminded that the overall purpose of the APP is not to penalize teams, but instead to strive for academic improvement and increased graduation rates among student-athletes. However, data demonstrate that some teams and institutions improve academically after experiencing consequences for consistent academic underperformance. Taking this into consideration, the committee discussed whether the APP acts as a deterrent for avoiding academic underperformance and if the current structure is a sufficient motivating factor toward improvement for teams who find themselves in the penalty structure. The committee examined several modifications to the current penalty program, including the integration of contemporaneous penalties within Occasion-One Historical Penalties, the development of additional historical penalties and potential changes to the current Occasion-Four Historical Penalties to focus on the underperforming squad, rather than the entire athletics program.

In addition to considering changes to the current APP penalty structure, the committee began to examine the APP penalty benchmarks and filters. The committee is considering whether the institutional academic and resource characteristics and by-sport comparison historical penalty filters that are part of the "improvement-plus" model are effective and whether additional standards, such as a Graduation Success Rate (GSR) benchmark, may be warranted. During its June meeting, the committee will continue its examination and it anticipates making any recommendations to the NCAA Division I Board of Directors later this year.

2. **Head Coaches' APR Portfolio.** The committee received a progress report regarding the Head Coaches' APR Portfolio, specifically noting the implementation timeline and the verification process of the head coaches' employment history. This spring head coaches will be able to view their head coaching employment history dating back to the 2003-04 academic year in the sports of football, women's indoor and outdoor track and field, baseball, and men's and women's basketball. Reporting for all remaining NCAA Division I sponsored sports will occur during the 2010-11 academic year. The committee supported the staff's planned outreach to various coaches' associations to encourage the verification of information by both active and inactive coaches in their respective sports. The Head Coaches' APR Portfolio Web site, containing information on the six initial

sports, is scheduled for public release in summer 2010. The Web site will report each head coach's employment history and the team's single-year APR for each year of the head coach's tenure.

3. **NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program Supplemental Support Fund (SSF).** The committee received a report regarding the SSF. Thirty-three limited-resource institutions are eligible to apply for funding during the 2009-10 academic year. These funds are intended to provide resources for new or enhanced programs developed to support student-athlete academic performance and for professional development opportunities for academic support administrators. Institutions that receive funds are required to report on the use of these funds and implementation of current APR Improvement Plans. Testimonials provided by institutions receiving funding in prior years indicate initial positive benefits to their respective academic support services. The SSF currently is being integrated into other outreach efforts led by the NCAA educational affairs staff, including a one-day professional development workshop for representatives of all SSF-eligible institutions.

   The committee directed the staff to provide written information for its April meeting that includes recommendations regarding the specific metrics that should be used in the future to evaluate the effectiveness of the SSF program; available evidence regarding the effect of the first two years of the funds; detailed information regarding the uses of the funds to date; and other data or information that would help assess the program at this early stage.

   Lastly, the committee continued its discussion regarding a request for a possible extension of the program, which currently is scheduled to conclude with the 2009-10 academic year. In this regard, the committee requested that the staff provide for its next meeting information regarding possible future funding sources that could underwrite the continuation of the SSF program.

4. **Exemption for Contemporaneous Penalties for Men's Basketball Student-Athletes Who Receive Athletics Aid Per NCAA Proposal No. 2009-97.** The committee determined it would amend its policies and procedures to create an additional waiver for contemporaneous penalties for men's basketball student-athletes who might receive athletics aid if Proposal No. 2009-97 is adopted. Assuming such action, this policy change would be effective with the collection of the 2010-11 APR data. Proposal No. 2009-97 specifies that a men's basketball student-athlete who receives athletically related aid in the academic years following the departure of a head coach would not be considered a counter, provided certain criteria are met. This concept initially was developed by the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group to provide additional flexibility to men's basketball student-athletes to earn their college

degrees when their head coaches leave, particularly for those student-athletes who are in their final two to three semesters of a degree program and may not wish to transfer. If Proposal No. 2009-97 is adopted, this waiver for contemporaneous penalties would be added for men's basketball student-athletes who would receive athletics aid under the new rule; thus, if such a student-athlete becomes an "0/2" during any regular academic term, he would not subject the team to contemporaneous penalties. The addition of this waiver would be consistent with exemptions currently in place, as this financial aid also would be exempt from team financial limits.

5. **Review of Initial-Eligibility Standards.** The NCAA research staff provided comprehensive data on the Division I initial-eligibility requirements and reviewed several initial-eligibility enhancements under consideration by the Academic Cabinet. NCAA research continues to indicate that a combination of standardized test scores and high school core-course grades is a better predictor of academic success than using either grades or tests alone. However, when examined independently, the high school core grade-point average is two to three times more predictive of first-year college academic success than test scores. This is an increase from earlier years, as the high school grade-point average has become more predictive as the number of required core courses has increased.

   The committee reviewed a tiered approach to initial eligibility that focuses on preparing prospective student-athletes to be academically successful in the college setting. Under such an option, a prospective student-athlete who presents an academic profile indicating preparedness for college and who is regularly admitted by his or her certifying institution would have full access to financial aid, practice and competition in the initial year of enrollment. Prospective student-athletes admitted with academic profiles predicting greater challenges in achieving collegiate success also would have access to financial aid and some level of athletics participation, but would be required to participate in specified interventions during the first year of college enrollment. Some examples of possible interventions include mandatory learning assessments, required academic support plans and limits on missed class time and travel. Such interventions would be designed to improve the quality of the long-term educational experience of student-athletes who are less academically prepared when they arrive on a college campus. The committee will continue to consider this topic during its joint meeting with the Academic Cabinet in June.

6. **Review of Two-Year College Transfer Student-Athletes.** The committee reviewed preliminary data on two-year college transfer student-athletes submitted by the Division I membership for the first time in fall 2009. NCAA research indicates two-year college transfers accounted for approximately five percent of all Division I student-athletes in the

2007-08 academic year, and that this percentage has declined in each of the previous four years. Baseball and men's basketball have the highest rate of two-year college transfers, while women's sports other than basketball have the lowest rate of two-year transfers. Generally, data indicate that two-year college transfers tend to be less academically prepared and do not perform as well as nontransfers and four-year college transfers; however, the graduation rate for two-year college transfers has increased recently and the rate of two-year transfer student-athletes departing their four-year institutions while not eligible has decreased.

The committee also reviewed preliminary findings regarding the academic performance of two-year college transfers while at their respective two-year institutions. Specifically, the data indicate that a prospective student-athlete's overall grade-point average at the two-year college is the most significant predictor of first-year academic outcomes at the four-year college. The committee also noted that credits earned in any particular subject area are not related to the first-year grade-point average at the four-year institution, except that there is a negative relationship between the number of physical education credits earned at the two-year college and the first-year grade-point average at the four-year institution. On average, nonqualifiers earn more overall credits, transferable credits and subject-specific credits (English, math, science) than qualifiers while at the two-year college; however, this difference could be attributed to nonqualifiers' longer average enrollment at the two-year college. The committee also reviewed initial analyses on first-year outcomes of two-year college transfer student-athletes in men's basketball and football who entered Division I institutions in the 2008 fall term. NCAA research indicates that only six percent of two-year college transfer student-athletes in these sports were required to fulfill remediation requirements on enrollment at the four-year college. The committee will continue to consider this topic during its joint meeting with the Academic Cabinet in June.

7. Recent Academic Performance of Teams Participating in Spring 2009 Historical Penalty Hearings. The committee received an update on the academic performance of teams that participated in historical penalty hearings before the committee in 2009. It was noted that many of the penalized teams showed improvement in their single-year APR. The committee also heard a summary of the waiver decisions the staff has made for teams subject to historical penalties during the 2009-10 academic year.

8. Educational Initiatives Regarding Changes of Degree Programs and Majors. During its October 2009 meeting, the committee requested an update regarding education related to waiver opportunities for student-athletes who may wish to change their respective courses of study, but run the risk of failing to meet progress-toward-degree requirements if they do so. While current progress-toward-degree waiver policies and procedures

promote flexibility for student-athletes facing this dilemma, it often appears that institutional administrators, faculty and student-athletes are not aware of the availability of such avenues for relief. In response to the committee's concerns regarding this environment, the staff agreed to provide information summarizing waiver outcomes for student-athletes seeking relief from NCAA eligibility requirements due to major changes and to outline educational initiatives for the membership and academic partner organizations. It was noted that since the 2003-04 academic year, 244 progress-toward-degree waivers citing major/degree change have been submitted by the membership, of which 226 were approved. An overview of the legislative and waiver flexibility currently available to student-athletes who wish to change degree programs, as well as best practices for facilitating such transitions, will be emphasized through various educational outlets starting spring 2010.

9. **APR Adjustment Requests for Student-Athletes Who Meet the Criteria for the Missed-Term Exception.** The committee approved an amendment to its policies and procedures to permit adjustments to the calculation of the APR to discount the lost retention point one time during a student-athlete's career when he or she loses the retention point for a term but satisfies the criteria for the missed-term exception, as outlined in NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3.5-(a). Such adjustments will be processed automatically during the data submission phase. During fall 2009, 35 requests were received for this specific adjustment and 31 were approved. The requests that were denied lacked supporting documentation. This policy change will improve the efficiency of the data collection process and will reduce administrative burden on member institutions. Programming and validation checks within the APP data collection portal will ensure the criteria for the adjustment have been met by the student-athlete. In addition, verification that institutions are applying the automatic adjustment properly will occur through the APP data review process. Finally, this policy change will be effective with 2009-10 APR data submitted fall 2010 and will not apply to any prior cohorts.

10. **APR Adjustment Requests for a Student-Athlete Who Receives a Medical-Absence Waiver.** The committee approved an amendment to its policies and procedures to permit an APR adjustment to discount the lost eligibility point and/or retention point for a student-athlete who suffers an incapacitating injury or illness. Such requests must be supported by a letter of approval of a medical-absence waiver from the conference office (or in the case of an independent institution, from the NCAA Division I Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee), that coincides with when the student-athlete lost the APR point(s). Also, such adjustments will be processed automatically during the data submission phase. The current APR adjustment directive permits institutions to request adjustments for lost eligibility and/or retention points for student-athletes who suffer incapacitating injuries or illnesses that clearly are supported by contemporaneous medical

documentation. Such documentation must indicate that a student-athlete was unable to be academically successful and/or retained as a result of the incapacitating physical or mental circumstances. Generally, if an institution presents a letter of approval of a medical-absence waiver that coincides with when the student-athlete lost the APR point(s), the staff has approved the adjustment request. The staff has not required copies of the medical documentation with the waiver application because the threshold for the injury or illness as outlined in Bylaw 14.4.3.6-(a) mirrors the language currently in the APR adjustment directive, in that the student-athlete's injury or illness must clearly indicate that a student-athlete was unable to be academically successful and/or retained as a result of the incapacitating physical or mental circumstances. In fall 2009, 46 requests were received for this specific adjustment and all were approved by the staff. This policy change will improve the efficiency of the data collection process and will reduce administrative burden on member institutions. Programming and validation checks within the APP data collection portal will ensure this criterion for the adjustment has been met. In addition, verification of proper application of the automatic adjustment will occur through the APP data review process. Lastly, this policy change will be effective with 2009-10 APR data submitted fall 2010 and will not apply to any prior cohorts.

11. Signature Page for APR Adjustment Requests and Appeals. The committee approved an amendment to its policies and procedures to permit the signature of the institution's director of athletics, senior woman administrator, faculty athletics representative or director of compliance to be acceptable for APR adjustment requests and appeals. Currently, each adjustment request and any related appeals of denied decisions require the signature of the institution's chancellor or president or his or her designee. This policy change will increase the efficiency of the APR adjustment process, as it will allow one of four other individuals to sign the signature page for APR adjustments in the absence of the chancellor or president. It is important to note that all other APP waivers (e.g., penalty waiver, deadline extension requests) still will require the signature of the institution's chancellor or president. Lastly, this policy change will be effective with APR adjustment requests and appeals submitted fall 2010.

12. APR Adjustment for a Transfer Student-Athlete Who Subsequently Graduates from a Different Four-Year Institution. The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting considered the concept of providing relief from a lost retention point if a transferring student-athlete subsequently graduates from a second four-year institution within a certain timeframe (e.g., four years, five years). Currently, an adjustment is available to discount the lost retention point in those instances when a student-athlete transferred while presenting a cumulative grade-point average of at least 2.600 and meeting additional criteria. The subcommittee agreed to table this discussion until after another year of APR adjustments

have been processed to determine the frequency of such circumstances. At that time, the subcommittee will determine whether this concept should be reviewed further.

13. Data Submission Requirements for an Institution Transitioning From Division I. The Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting continued its discussion regarding policies related to facets of the APP for institutions and/or teams that transition from Division I. Specifically, the subcommittee considered which APP data submission requirements these institutions are required to meet and how APP penalties apply in these situations. The subcommittee noted that during the last several months, the staff has been notified of two institutions that plan to transition from Division I and another institution that has decided to abandon its pursuit of Division I membership and return to Division II. The subcommittee also noted this issue presents unique circumstances that were not contemplated by the committee during the development of its current policies. The subcommittee directed the staff to further develop options for its consideration for these situations and it anticipates making a recommendation to the full committee in April.

14. Timeline for APP Data Review. The Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting noted modifications made to the current data review process timeline, effective immediately. Specifically:

a. Selection of institutions will begin in January each year and institutions will be notified of their selection shortly thereafter; and

b. The review will be conducted in two separate segments, with GSR data being reviewed February through May and APR data to be reviewed June through October.

To enhance the consistency, accuracy and integrity of APP data submitted in prior data collections and in the future, an earlier start to the data review process is warranted. At present, the data review process often is interrupted by the campus activities surrounding the start of the fall term, which can create delays in the institution's responses to the requests for documentation necessary to complete the data review. The change in the timeline will allow appropriate time for institutions to provide documentation. In addition, this timeline change will reduce delays in data corrections to GSR, as institutions will have the opportunity to correct previous years' data errors simultaneously with the current GSR data collection, which begins in early spring.

15. APP Data Reviews. The Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting received a status report on the 30 institutions selected to have their APP data reviewed during the

2009-10 academic year. These institutions are being reviewed for the accuracy of the eligibility, graduation and retention data entered in the APP data collection system for the academic years 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08. The subcommittee also received a final report on the five institutions that were being reviewed for the accuracy of the GSR data entered in the APP data collection system for the 2002-03 cohort. In addition, the subcommittee was informed of the completion of the data review for one institution from the 2008-09 data review class. It is anticipated that all data reviews for the 2009-10 academic year will be completed by March 2010.

Committee Chair: Walter Harrison, University of Hartford, America East Conference
Staff Liaisons: Julie Cromer, Academic and Membership Affairs
Diane Dickman, Academic and Membership Affairs
Kevin Lennon, Academic and Membership Affairs
Todd Petr, Research
Bill Regan, Academic and Membership Affairs

REPORT OF THE NCAA DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE APRIL 26-27, 2010, MEETING

***KEY ITEMS*.**

1. **Sixth Year of NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP) Data.** The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance reviewed a summary of the NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) data that will be released publicly next month. In the coming weeks the NCAA will announce team APR, public recognition for top performers and APP penalties. Institutions and conference offices will be notified when the release dates are scheduled.

2. **Examination of the APP.** The committee continued its examination of the APP to determine the program's effectiveness in reaching the membership's goals for academic reform. This review will continue through the summer and will include further discussions regarding the APP benchmarks, penalty structures, filters and waiver directives.

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. **Legislative Items.**

   - None.

2. **Nonlegislative Items.**

   - None.

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

1. **Examination of the APP.** The committee continued its review of the APP and began to address key research issues and questions related to the program's effectiveness. The data presented showed the likelihood of significantly fewer teams below both the 900 and 925 benchmarks by 2010-11. This is due in part to overall academic improvement, as well as changes made to the APR metric over time. In addition to reviewing the effects of the current penalty benchmarks, the committee discussed the effectiveness of the current historical-penalty filters and noted the by-sport comparison and institutional characteristics filters will become irrelevant for the vast majority of teams if the APR benchmarks remain the same. The committee also examined concepts regarding the relationship between the APR and graduation rates and the way both could

be used within the structure of the APP. These topics will be discussed again during the June meeting.

2. **Sixth Year of APP Data.** The committee received a summary of the most-recent APR data submitted by member institutions, which will be available for public review in May or early June.

3. **NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program Supplemental Support Fund (SSF).** The committee supported a request for fiscal year 2011 funding of the SSF in the amount of $950,000 to be allocated from the NCAA Academic Enhancement Fund. Further, the committee noted this request will be reviewed as part of the Association's normal budget process. Since 2007-08, the SSF has supported campus-based initiatives designed to foster student-athlete academic success at limited-resource institutions (e.g., additional staffing, academic support equipment, facility renovations and upgrades). Further, this fund has demonstrated the Association's commitment to a meaningful program that encourages academic achievement and facilitates academic improvement. The committee also directed the staff to provide in April 2011 a detailed, data-driven progress report that will outline the impact of all initiatives funded through the SSF and will provide a qualitative review of institutional progress in implementing APR Improvement Plans. This report should include the latest APR and Graduation Success Rate (GSR) data, which will assist in the measurement and assessment of success of the program against the program's initially established success criteria or revised criteria. In addition, the report should include details on the uses of the grant funding and the connection between the SSF and the institution's APR Improvement Plan. Lastly, the committee directed the staff to ensure that all future SSF requests are directly tied to APR Improvement Plan element(s).

4. **NCAA Division I Football Academic Working Group Report.** The committee reviewed the Football Academic Working Group's final report with a focus on the impact of the report's recommendations on current APP policies and procedures. The group supports the general concept of encouraging graduation within four and a half years to synchronize the end of competitive eligibility with graduation for many football student-athletes. However, the committee noted several complications associated with the working group's recommendation to require football student-athletes to complete nine hours and earn the eligibility point during the fall term in order to be eligible for all games of the subsequent season. Specifically, the committee noted the possible impact to student-athletes attending institutions following quarter-based academic calendars, which will be examined by the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet in June. Further, the committee noted the need to identify and examine any potential unintended consequences

of this rule change, particularly for upperclassmen who may be considering whether to remain in school or to withdraw to pursue professional opportunities (e.g., loss of eligibility for two to four games could factor into decisions to declare for the NFL draft).

Regarding the recommended changes to APP policies, the committee's initial position is that the credit-hour requirement (i.e., nine-hour requirement) within the working group's recommendation would not be tied to the awarding of the APR eligibility point in the fall term. The committee noted this decision is consistent with current policy, in that, even if the student-athlete fails to meet the new requirement, he still would be eligible for most of the contests that would occur in the next season.

The committee initially does not favor the working group's recommendation to no longer exempt the aid of "0/2" student-athletes who have exhausted eligibility when calculating contemporaneous penalties for NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision teams. The committee noted the minimal potential impact of this policy change. Further, while incoming student-athletes are protected under other APP policies, continuing student-athletes could experience financial aid reductions to accommodate the additional penalties resulting from the removal of the exemption.

Finally, the committee discussed the working group's recommendation to expand the Head Coaches' APR Portfolio to include additional institutional administrators. The committee maintained its position that such information should not be added at this time, given the additional complexities and institutional administrative burden associated with reporting additional information. Once the Head Coaches' APR Portfolio initiative has been fully implemented and evaluated in summer 2011, the committee will revisit the issue.

5. **Evaluation of APR Improvement Plans.** The committee approved a modification to the staff policies for review and evaluation of APR Improvements Plans. As part of its evaluation, the staff will continue to ensure that the plan contains all required elements and will continue to identify the elements of APR Improvement Plans that positively affect a team's APR. However, rather than determining whether a plan is acceptable or unacceptable, the staff's evaluation simply will outline the plan's strengths, weaknesses and opportunities for enhancement for those initiatives that address critical issues identified by the institution in its data analysis. Additionally, for plans considered in APP penalty waivers and requests for SSF, after receiving feedback from the staff, institutions will have a specified time to make revisions. If the institution does not resubmit its plan by the established deadline, the staff/committee will consider the original plan when evaluating a waiver or a request for SSF. Any subsequently submitted plan will not be considered new or different information in the waiver process. These changes to the plan review process will provide member institutions with more meaningful feedback and

avoid delays in the resolution of penalty-waiver decisions and the awarding of SSF grants. It also will allow for more timely feedback to institutions on their APR Improvement Plans.

6. **APR Improvement Plan Deadline Submission Dates and Educational Initiative.** The following dates have been established for APR Improvement Plan updates and implementation reports in 2010-11:

2010-11 Team/Institution Reporting Requirements	Submission Deadline
Teams that received a conditional waiver of penalties in 2009-10 (implementation only)	October 4
Teams with a multiyear APR below 900	November 1
Institutions requesting SSF	November 1
Teams requesting a waiver of penalty	November 1 or with waiver request (whichever is earlier)

The committee also reviewed an educational document drafted to assist member institutions as they develop or revise their APR Improvement Plans. The document is intended to assist in identifying critical issues that have impacted teams' academic performance, steps institutions have used to achieve specific goals and ways to measure success in achieving those desired outcomes. Further, this educational document may serve as a catalyst for campus dialogue and may help foster ideas that lead to successful strategies designed to help improve academic progress rates. Lastly, this document will be posted online on the committee's Web site and will be distributed to the membership though various outlets (e.g., N4A, NACADA).

7. **APR Adjustment Directive.** The committee approved the APR adjustment directive, effective immediately. During its February 2010 meeting, the committee approved amendments to the directive for processing APR adjustment requests for student-athletes who meet the criteria for the missed-term exception, requests for student-athletes who receive a medical-absence waiver and the signature page requirements for all requests and appeals of denied requests. Accordingly, the directive has been updated to reflect these changes. The directive will be posted online so that institutions can prepare for adjustments to be submitted fall 2010.

8. **2009-10 APR and Penalty Reporting Forms.** The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting approved the final version of the institutional and public APR and penalty reports to be used during the 2010-11 academic year. The reports are intended to provide institutions with teams' APR, as well as a summary of the teams subject to contemporaneous and/or historical penalties and detailed worksheets explaining how the penalties were calculated.

9. **APP Data Reviews.** The committee received a progress report regarding the selection of 30 institutions for GSR data reviews for the current cycle, which began in early February. The APR data reviews will be conducted June through October and final reports will be issued shortly thereafter.

10. **NCAA Division I Head Coaches' APR Portfolio.** At its February 2009 meeting, the committee determined that any head coach employed between August 1 and July 31 of a given academic year would have the team's APR information from that year displayed on his or her individual page. Since that time, the NCAA staff has received feedback from coaches' associations questioning the use of this date range for displaying of single-year APRs. For instance, a head coach who is hired in April, May or June at the end of a given academic year would be associated with the academic performance of his or her new team for the entire previous academic year. After consideration of options developed by the staff, the committee agreed to maintain the previously adopted plan (i.e., August 1 through July 31) for displaying employment dates for coaches; however, additional context will be provided to the data displayed for each academic year in instances where there has been a coaching change (e.g., asterisk with the date of when the head coach left or was hired by the institution). This modification will indicate that the academic year in question was a "transition year" and will be implemented with this summer's release of the public Web site.

11. **Committee on Academic Performance Policies and Procedures, Penalties Guide and Data Collection Guide.** The committee approved the updated Committee on Academic Performance Policies and Procedures, Penalties Guide and Data Collection Guide. The guides will assist institutions in the 2010-11 data collection process and penalty applications and will be posted on the committee's page on the NCAA Web site at www.ncaa.org. This posting also will satisfy annual reporting requirements specified in NCAA Bylaw 23.

12. **NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification and Committee on Academic Performance Joint Ad Hoc Working Group.** The committee received a report

regarding the NCAA Division I Athletics Certification program, which includes self-study items related to the analysis of APR, GSR and retention data. During its April 2010 meeting, the Committee on Athletics Certification proposed the creation of a joint ad hoc working group between the Committee on Athletics Certification and the Committee on Academic Performance to investigate ways in which these two committees may work together to enhance the graduation rates of student-athletes, to address concerns regarding certification of eligibility, and to support academic reform, specifically in the areas of APR/GSR reporting and implementation of APR Improvement Plans. The committee agreed with this recommendation and representatives from both groups will be identified for service on the ad hoc group.

13. Occasion-Three Historical Penalty Hearing. The committee conducted hearings for two institutions subject to Occasion-Three Historical Penalties.

Committee Chair: *Walter Harrison, University of Hartford, America East Conference*
Committee Liaisons: *Diane Dickman, Academic and Membership Affairs*
Julie Cromer, Academic and Membership Affairs
Kevin Lennon, Academic and Membership Affairs
Todd Petr, Research
Bill Regan, Academic and Membership Affairs

Excerpts from the
Report of the NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet

The NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet submits this report from its February 9-10, 2010, in-person meeting in Indianapolis, Indiana.

***KEY ITEMS*.**

1. **Committee appointments**. The cabinet approved appointments to Division I and Association-wide committees. A list of the appointments and reappointments is attached to this report as an Attachment.

***INFORMATION ITEMS*.**

3. **Diversity in the Division I Governance Structure.** The cabinet received an update on the Leadership Council's recommendations to the Board of Directors regarding ways to enhance diversity in the Division I governance structure. Those recommendations will be shared with the Presidential Advisory Group (PAG) in April prior to the Board of Directors' consideration of legislative proposals related to diversity.

4. **Governance Assessment Tool**. The cabinet reviewed the results of a preliminary tool designed to assess the 31 multisport conferences' knowledge of the goals and objectives behind the recent changes to the Division I governance structure. The cabinet discussed possible next steps in conducting a broader assessment of the new governance structure. The cabinet agreed on a course of action to include:

a. Conducting exit interviews with chairs of cabinets and councils this summer;

b. Conducting exit interviews with departing cabinet and council members this summer;

c. Discussion with the Board of Directors as to its understanding of the goals and objectives for the new structure as well as its thoughts regarding the effectiveness of the new structure; and

d. Developing a more detailed survey for member institutions and their level of satisfaction with the current governance structure.

NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet
Committee Appointments
February 9-10, 2010
(All terms begin September 1, 2010, unless otherwise noted.)

Postgraduate Scholarship Committee

- Jean Boyd, associate director of athletics, Arizona State University, Pacific-10 Conference.

Research Committee

- Corey Bray, assistant director of athletics, Eastern Kentucky University, Ohio Valley Conference.

Walter Byers Scholarship Committee

- Martha Putallaz, faculty athletics representative/professor, Duke University, Atlantic Coast Conference.
- Donna Ritch, faculty athletics representative/associate dean, University of Wisconsin, Green Bay, Horizon League.

Progress Toward Degree Waiver Committee.

- Dawn Martinez, assistant director of athletics, University of New Mexico, Mountain West Conference.
- Thomas Cody, faculty athletics representative, Western Illinois University, The Summit League.

Excerpts from the Report of the
NCAA Division I Recruiting and Athletics
Personnel Issues Cabinet
February 3-4, 2010, Meeting

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

2. Nonlegislative.

a. Priority Item – Examination of Recruiting Model. As noted during its September 2009 meeting, the cabinet believed that a comprehensive examination of the entire recruiting model was necessary and critical to understand how existing legislation aligns or conflicts with the realities of today's environment. The cabinet's discussion included: a review of communication methods and frequency, evaluations, campus visits and offers of athletics aid. The cabinet directed the staff to develop alternative recruiting models, based on its discussion, for each of the four areas addressed and to solicit feedback from the membership, including conferences and coaches' associations, regarding those proposed recruiting models. The cabinet will discuss that feedback during its June 2010 meeting and accordingly propose legislation for a revised recruiting model for consideration by the membership as part of the 2010-11 legislative cycle.

REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I STUDENT-ATHLETE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) submits the following report from its January 12-16, 2010 meeting.

KEY ITEMS.

1. **Legislative Proposals**. The committee reviewed and discussed numerous proposals in the current legislative cycle related to student-athlete well-being. The position of national SAAC on the proposals considered is included in this report (Attached).

2. **Commercial Activity in Intercollegiate Athletics.** The committee discussed the use of student-athlete name, image and likeness and current trends of student-athletes involvement in commercial activities. The committee directed the staff to create a discussion document outlining the committee's recommendations for future legislation on commercial activity. This document will be provided to the Amateurism Cabinet at its February meeting and the Leadership and Legislative Councils during their April meetings.

3. **Division I Recruiting Environment.** Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet (RAPIC) Chair, Petrina Long, requested feedback from the committee to assist RAPIC on its examination of Division I recruiting model. SAAC will provide verbal feedback to RAPIC at its February meeting regarding the five areas of examination and the guiding principles.

4. **Examination of Grant-In-Aid Limitations**. Division I Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet (ABEFAC) requested feedback from the committee regarding nine financial aid concepts that were recently developed by ABEFAC. ABEFAC is seeking feedback on the financial concepts as it prepares to propose legislation for the 2010-2011 legislative cycle. The committee will provide verbal feedback on the financial aid concepts at the February ABEFAC meeting.

5. **Football Academic Enhancement Working Group**. Dennis Poppe spoke to the committee regarding the Football Academic Enhancement Working Group and recent initiatives including a more in depth look into academic performance among football student-athletes. SAAC is preparing verbal feedback for the February Football Issues Committee meeting.

6. **Division I Revenue Distribution and Cost Savings Initiatives.** The committee reviewed the NCAA budget and revenue distribution and discussed cost-saving initiatives and financial priorities considering the committee's position on current legislation.

ACTION ITEMS.

1. **Legislative Items.**

- **Legislative Proposals.** The committee reviewed and discussed numerous proposals in the current legislative cycle.

2. **Nonlegislative Items.**

   a. Chair and vice chair selections. The committee reviewed the requirements for the positions of committee chair and vice chair and selected Nick Fulton, University of Wisconsin, Madison and Big Ten Conference representative as chair, and Scott Krapf, Illinois State University and Missouri Valley Conference representative, as vice chair.

   b. Olympic Sports Liaison Committee and Joint SAAC representative selections. The committee selected Natalie Hemphill, University of Portland and West Coast Conference representative to serve on the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee and Eugene Daniels, Colorado State University and Mountain West Conference representative, as Joint SAAC representative.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Guest Speakers.** The committee welcomed a number of speakers from the NCAA staff and membership to discuss issues involving student-athlete well-being, including:

   a. Brad Hostetter, NCAA Director of Academic and Membership Affairs.

   b. Petrina Long, Chair of the Division I Recruiting and Athletics Personnel Issues Cabinet and Senior Associate Athletics Director/Senior Woman Administrator at University of California Los Angeles.

   c. Dennis Pope, NCAA Vice President of Baseball and Football.

   d. Ivan Blumberg, chief executive officer for Athletes For Hope, addressed the committee regarding potential community service activities.

   e. Amy Perko, President of the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics, reviewed the executive summary from the Knight Commission's October meeting with a specific emphasis on commercialism and the impact of the current economy on intercollegiate athletics.

2. **Division I Issues Forum and Business Forum**. The committee attended the Division I Issues Forum and received updates from Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group (MBAEG) and chairs of the Division I cabinets regarding key agenda items for the upcoming year. The committee also attended the Division I Business Forum and spoke on the convention floor in opposition to the override of proposals 2008-59 and 2008-46.

3. **Division I Board of Directors Breakfast.** The committee met with the Division I Board of Directors and discussed key issues impacting student-athlete well-being. The Board proposed increasing communication between SAAC and the Board, including additional in person meetings.

4. **Leadership and Legislative Council Luncheon.** The committee met with the Leadership and Legislative Councils to discuss proposed legislation, commercialism, MBAEG initiatives, recruiting and the impact of the current economy on intercollegiate athletics.

5. **Joint Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Meeting.** The join SAAC provided updates on association-wide committees as well as divisional SAAC initiatives. Interim President Dr. Jim Isch solicited feedback regarding the new NCAA presidential selection process. Members also participated in a professional development session focusing on business etiquette.

6. **Green Team Update.** Eryn Crane, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference and SAAC Green Team representative, updated the committee on the Green Team's recent activities. Members discussed green initiatives taking place on their respective campuses and exchanged ideas and suggestions for continued progress for Division I SAAC and Joint SAAC activities.

7. **Media Update.** The committee was updated regarding the media team's initiatives including Twitter and Facebook updates and the creation of a blog calendar.

8. **Attendance.** Attendance for the January meeting is as follows:

Conference	School	Name	Sport	Present
America East Conference	Binghamton University	Robert Nolte	Men's Diving	Yes
Atlantic 10 Conference	University of North Carolina at Charlotte	Darius Law	Men's Track and Field	Yes
Atlantic Coast Conference	Georgia Institute of Technology	D'Andre Bell	Men's Basketball	No
Atlantic Sun Conference	Jacksonville University	Danielle Gray	Women's Basketball	No
Big 12 Conference	University of Kansas	Matthew Baysinger	Men's Track and Field	Yes
Big East Conference	Georgetown University	Norah Swanson	Women's Soccer	Yes
Big South Conference	Winthrop University	Matthew Horn	Men's Soccer	Yes

Big Sky Conference	California State University, Sacramento	Anne Morrison	Women's Rowing	Yes
Big Ten Conference	University of Wisconsin, Madison	Nick Fulton	Men's Swimming	Yes
Big West Conference	University of the Pacific	Danielle Neault	Field Hockey	Yes
Colonial Athletic Association	James Madison University	Matthew Goff	Football	Yes
Conference USA	East Carolina University	Jarrett Newby	Men's Track and Field	Yes
Horizon League	Cleveland State University	Audrey Piotrowski	Women's Cross Country	Yes
Ivy Group	Columbia University-Barnard College	Natalia Christenson	Women's Tennis	Yes
Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	Loyola College	Eryn Crane	Women's Swimming	Yes
Mid-American Conference	Kent State University	Catherine Marosszeky	Women's Soccer	Yes
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference	Hampton University	Aminah Charles	Women's Volleyball	No
Missouri Valley Conference	Illinois State University	Scott Krapf	Men's Track and Field	Yes
Mountain West Conference	Colorado State University	Eugene Daniels	Football	Yes
Northeast Conference	Fairleigh Dickinson University, Metropolitan	Lauren Chapman	Women's Golf	Yes
Ohio Valley Conference	Jacksonville University	Chelsea Pelletier	Women's Soccer	Yes
Pacific -10 Conference	University of Southern California	Jonathan Hackett	Men's Volleyball	No
Patriot League	American University	Zack Solomon	Men's Soccer	Yes
Southeastern Conference	Mississippi State University	DJ Looney	Football	Yes
Southern Conference	Western Carolina University	Kendra Eaton	Women's Basketball	Yes
Southland Conference	Lamar University	William McInnis	Baseball	No
Southwestern Athletic Conference	University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff	Monique Carroll	Women's Volleyball, Track	Yes
The Summit League	Western Illinois University	Eric Anerino	Men's Cross Country/Track	Yes

Sun Belt Conference	Western Kentucky University	Patrick Jenkins	Men's Cross Country/Track	Yes
West Coast Conference	University of Portland	Natalie Hemphill	Women's Cross Country/Track	Yes
Western Athletic Conference	University of Nevada	Trisha Gibbons	Women's Soccer	Yes
Others:				
Legislative Council	Texas State University – San Marcos, Associate Athletic Director	Tracy Shoemake	Southland Conference	Yes
Leadership Council	Pepperdine University, Director of Athletics	John Watson	West Coast Conference	Yes
Leadership Council	University of Maryland, College Park, Faculty Athletic Representative	Charles Wellford	Atlantic Coast Conference	No

9. **Future Meeting Schedule.**

a. 6:00 p.m. ET March 7, 2010, Teleconference. (tentative date and time)

b. July 15-18, 2010, Indianapolis, Indiana.

c. Legislative Webinar, September 2010.

d. November 2010, Indianapolis, Indiana.

e. January, 2011, in conjunction with the 2011 NCAA Convention, San Antonio, Texas.

Committee Chair: Matthew Baysinger, University of Kansas, Big 12 Conference
Committee Vice-Chair: Nick Fulton, University of Wisconsin Madison, Big Ten Conference
Staff Liaison(s): Kelly Groddy, Academic and Membership Affairs
Tim Nevius, Enforcement
Abigail Renaker, Academic and Membership Affairs
Maricela Shukie, Educational Affairs

REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I STUDENT-ATHLETE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) submits the following report from its April 11, 2010, teleconference.

***KEY ITEMS*.**

1. **Commercial Activity in Intercollegiate Athletics.** Scott Bearby, NCAA associate general counsel, updated SAAC regarding the continuing analysis of commercial activities in intercollegiate athletics and recent litigation on the topic. Bearby indicated that the SAAC's memo regarding aspects of commercialism related to student-athlete well-being was well received by the Amateurism Cabinet. Bearby discussed potential future action related to commercialism legislation including the distribution of a "best practices" document to institutions and requested additional feedback from SAAC on this topic.

2. **Terms of Service.** SAAC received an update regarding proposed changes to the terms of committee service. Members were informed that service terms will start July 1 each year to align with other cabinets and committees terms. The change will enable new members to begin service by attending an in-person meeting leading up to discussion and review of proposed legislation. This transition will be handled through attrition beginning with those members whose terms expire September 1, 2011, based on Legislative Council's action at its upcoming meeting.

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

Cabinet position selection. SAAC selected Robert Nolte, men's diving student-athlete from Binghamton University, to represent SAAC on the Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **New Members**.

   a. Logan Roberts, men's track and field student-athlete from Baylor University was introduced as a new member representing the Big 12 Conference.

   b. Susan Lipnickey, Faculty Athletic Representative from Miami University (Ohio), was introduced as the new member from the NCAA Leadership Council.

2. **Guest Speakers.**

   a. Eric McDowell, Chair of the College Sports Information Directors of America (CoSIDA), addressed SAAC regarding ways CoSIDA can assist SAAC with its mission and the benefits of building a relationship with CoSIDA.

   b. Eileen Patton, 2009-10 NCAA Educational Affairs intern, provided information about the 2010 Career in Sports Forum, 2010 Regional Leadership Conference and discussed the new Educational Affairs Grant available to 50 student-athletes in each division.

3. **Season of Competition Waiver – Competition While Eligible**. SAAC was provided several different scenarios involving coaching errors triggering the use of a season of competition. Members provided feedback about whether relief should be provided through the waiver process based on scenarios presented.

4. **Cabinet and Committee Reports**. SAAC was updated regarding Division I and association-wide cabinets and committees on which SAAC members serve.

5. **NCAA Leadership Council**. SAAC was updated regarding the March Leadership Council meeting including discussions related to expansion of the men's basketball championship and cost savings initiatives.

6. **NCAA Legislative Council**. SAAC was updated regarding the Legislative Council's upcoming meeting and its anticipated actions on legislative proposals including Proposal 2009-22 regarding amateurism.

7. **Media Update.** SAAC was updated regarding the media team's initiatives including the positive feedback related to SAAC 's blog and efforts to produce a video for display on Web page.

8. **2010 Gender Equity and Issues Forum**. SAAC was updated regarding the upcoming Gender Equity and Issues Forum which will take place April 25-27 in Chicago, Illinois. Eugene Daniels and Monique Carroll will attend the forum on behalf of SAAC and provide a report in July.

9. **National SAAC Award of Excellence.** SAAC discussed the National SAAC Award of Excellence including how institutions can apply and application deadlines.

10. **National Student-Athlete Day**. SAAC discussed National Student-Athlete Day, which took place April 6, 2010, and mentioned community service projects related to the event.

11. **Cabinet and Committee positions**. SAAC received information regarding future opportunities to represent SAAC on various cabinets and committees. It was noted that training for members serving in these positions will occur during July 2010 in-person meeting.

12. **Attendance.** Attendance for the April meeting is as follows:

Conference	School	Name	Sport	Present
America East Conference	Binghamton University	Robert Nolte	Men's Diving	Yes
Atlantic 10 Conference	University of North Carolina at Charlotte	Darius Law	Men's Track and Field	Yes
Atlantic Coast Conference	Georgia Institute of Technology	D'Andre Bell	Men's Basketball	No
Atlantic Sun Conference	Jacksonville University	Danielle Gray	Women's Basketball	Yes
Big 12 Conference	Baylor University	Logan Roberts	Men's Track and Field	Yes
Big East Conference	Georgetown University	Norah Swanson	Women's Soccer	Yes
Big South Conference	Winthrop University	Matthew Horn	Men's Soccer	Yes
Big Sky Conference	California State University, Sacramento	Anne Morrison	Women's Rowing	Yes
Big Ten Conference	University of Wisconsin, Madison	Nick Fulton	Men's Swimming	Yes
Big West Conference	University of the Pacific	Danielle Neault	Field Hockey	Yes
Colonial Athletic Association	James Madison University	Matthew Goff	Football	Yes
Conference USA	East Carolina University	Jarrett Newby	Men's Track and Field	Yes
Horizon League	Cleveland State University	Audrey Piotrowski	Women's Cross Country	Yes
Ivy Group	Columbia University-Barnard College	Natalia Christenson	Women's Tennis	Yes
Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	Loyola College	Eryn Crane	Women's Swimming	Yes

Mid-American Conference	Kent State University	Catherine Marosszeky	Women's Soccer	No
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference	Hampton University	Aminah Charles	Women's Volleyball	Yes
Missouri Valley Conference	Illinois State University	Scott Krapf	Men's Track and Field	Yes
Mountain West Conference	Colorado State University	Eugene Daniels	Football	Yes
Northeast Conference	Fairleigh Dickinson University, Metropolitan	Lauren Chapman	Women's Golf	Yes
Ohio Valley Conference	Jacksonville University	Chelsea Pelletier	Women's Soccer	Yes
Pacific -10 Conference	University of Southern California	Jonathan Hackett	Men's Volleyball	Yes
Patriot League	American University	Zack Solomon	Men's Soccer	Yes
Southeastern Conference	Mississippi State University	DJ Looney	Football	Yes
Southern Conference	Western Carolina University	Kendra Eaton	Women's Basketball	Yes
Southland Conference	Lamar University	William McInnis	Baseball	No
Southwestern Athletic Conference	University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff	Monique Carroll	Women's Volleyball, Track	Yes
The Summit League	Western Illinois University	Eric Anerino	Men's Cross Country/Track	No
Sun Belt Conference	Western Kentucky University	Patrick Jenkins	Men's Cross Country/Track	Yes
West Coast Conference	University of Portland	Natalie Hemphill	Women's Cross Country/Track	Yes
Western Athletic Conference	University of Nevada	Trisha Gibbons	Women's Soccer	Yes

Others:				
Legislative Council	Texas State University – San Marcos, Associate Athletic Director	Tracy Shoemake	Southland Conference	No
Leadership Council	Pepperdine University, Director of Athletics	John Watson	West Coast Conference	No
Leadership Council	Miami University (Ohio), Faculty Athletic Representative	Susan Lipnickey	Mid-American Conference	Yes

13. **Future Meeting Schedule.**

a. July 15-18, 2010, Indianapolis, Indiana.

b. Legislative Webinar, October 3, 2010.

c. November 19-21, 2010, Indianapolis, Indiana.

d. January, 2011, in conjunction with the NCAA Convention, San Antonio, Texas.

Committee Chair: Nick Fulton, University of Wisconsin Madison, Big Ten Conference
Committee Vice-Chair: Scott Krapf, Illinois State University, Missouri Valley Conference
Staff Liaisons: Kelly Groddy, Academic and Membership Affairs
Tim Nevius, Enforcement
Abigail Renaker, Academic and Membership Affairs
Maricela Shukie, Educational Affairs

Proposals Sponsored by the Academic Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2009-60	ELIGIBILITY -- ACADEMIC WAIVERS -- AUTHORITY OF INITIAL-ELIGIBILITY WAIVERS COMMITTEE AND PROGRESS-TOWARD-DEGREE WAIVERS COMMITTEE	Adopted - Final	NCAA Division I Academics Cabinet	May 1, 2010	To specify that the NCAA Division I Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee shall be the final appellate body for initial-eligibility waivers and that the NCAA Division I Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee shall be the final appellate body for progress-toward-degree waivers.
2009-64	ELIGIBILITY -- FRESHMAN ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS -- CORE-CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS -- NONTRADITIONAL COURSES	Adopted - Final	NCAA Division I Academics Cabinet	August 1, 2010; for student-athletes initially enrolling full time in a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2010	To specify that for purposes of using a nontraditional course to satisfy NCAA core-course requirements, the course must be one in which the instructor and the student have ongoing access to one another and regular interaction with one another for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student throughout the duration of the course; the student's work (e.g., exams, papers, assignments) is available for review and validation; and a defined time period for completion of the course is included.

Date Printed: June 8, 2010

Proposals Reviewed by the Academic Cabinet

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2009-17	PERSONNEL -- CERTIFICATION TO RECRUIT OFF CAMPUS -- CERTIFICATION ADMINISTRATION -- FACULTY ATHLETICS REPRESENTATIVE OR DESIGNEE	Defeated - Final	Atlantic Sun Conference	May 1, 2010	To specify that an institution's faculty athletics representative (or his or her designee who is an institutional staff member outside of the athletics department) shall administer the annual coaches' certification test.
2009-29	RECRUITING AND ELIGIBILITY -- FOUR-YEAR PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES -- PERMISSION TO CONTACT AND TRANSFER RELEASE -- RESPONSE TO REQUEST AND HEARING OPPORTUNITY	Adopted, 60-Day Override Period	Big South Conference	August 1, 2010	To specify that if an institution receives a written request from a student-athlete to permit another institution to contact a student-athlete about transferring or a request for a release in conjunction with the application of the one-time transfer exception, the institution shall grant or deny a request within seven business days of receipt of the request; further, to specify that if the request is denied, the institution shall conduct a hearing and provide written results within 15 business days of receipt of the student-athlete's written request and that the student-athlete shall be provided the opportunity to appear in-person or via telephone and actively participate in the hearing. To also specify that if the institution fails to respond to the student-athlete's written request or fails to conduct the hearing or provide written results within the specified time period, permission to contact or the transfer release shall be granted by default and the institution shall provide the written permission or release to the student-athlete.
2009-45	RECRUITING -- OFFICIAL VISIT -- FIRST OPPORTUNITY TO VISIT -- JUNE IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO SENIOR YEAR -- FOOTBALL	Defeated - Final	Big Ten Conference	Immediate	In football, to specify that a prospective student-athlete may be provided an expense-paid visit during the month of June immediately preceding the prospective student-athlete's senior year in high school, provided the prospective student-athlete's high school academic year has concluded.

Date Printed: June 8, 2010

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2009-51-A	RECRUITING -- CAMPS AND CLINICS -- INSTITUTION'S SPORTS CAMPS AND CLINICS -- LOCATION -- BASKETBALL	Rendered Moot - Final	NCAA Division I Championships/ Sports Management Cabinet (Men's Basketball Issues Committee)	Immediate; a contract signed before September 17, 2008, may be honored	In basketball, to specify that an institution's camp or clinic shall be conducted on the institution's campus or within a 100-mile radius of the institution's campus.
2009-51-B	RECRUITING -- CAMPS AND CLINICS -- INSTITUTION'S SPORTS CAMPS AND CLINICS -- LOCATION RESTRICTION -- BASKETBALL	Adopted, 60-Day Override Period	NCAA Division I Legislative Council	Immediate; a contract signed before September 17, 2008, for men's basketball camps may be honored; a contract signed before September 16, 2009, for women's basketball camps may be honored.	In basketball, to specify that an institution's camp or clinic shall be conducted on the institution's campus or within a 100-mile radius of the institution's campus.
2009-61	ELIGIBILITY -- FULL TIME ENROLLMENT -- REQUIREMENT FOR PRACTICE -- WAIVER -- U.S. OLYMPIC COMMITTEE/ NATIONAL GOVERNING BODY -- FORMER STUDENT ATHLETE AT ANOTHER INSTITUTION -- INDIVIDUAL SPORTS AND WOMEN'S ROWING	Adopted, 60-Day Override Period	NCAA Division I Championships/ Sports Management Cabinet (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee)	August 1, 2010	In individual sports and women's rowing, in a case in which the U.S. Olympic Committee or national governing body in the sport has recommended the individual's participation, to permit a former student-athlete who has graduated and has no eligibility remaining to participate in organized practice sessions at an institution other than the one he or she previously attended.

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2009-62	ELIGIBILITY -- FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT -- REQUIREMENT FOR PRACTICE -- WAIVER -- U.S. OLYMPIC COMMITTEE/ NATIONAL GOVERNING BODY -- FORMER STUDENT-ATHLETE -- DURATION OF WAIVER -- INDIVIDUAL SPORTS AND WOMEN'S ROWING	Adopted, 60-Day Override Period	NCAA Division I Championships/ Sports Management Cabinet (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee)	August 1, 2010	In individual sports and women's rowing, in a case in which the U.S. Olympic Committee or national governing body (NGB) in the sport has recommended the individual's participation, to specify that a former student-athlete's participation in organized practice sessions shall be limited to the number of years that allows the individual to practice with the institution's team in preparation for two consecutive Olympic Games following exhaustion of eligibility or completion of degree, whichever is earlier.
2009-63	ELIGIBILITY -- SEASONS OF COMPETITION -- CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING SEASON OF COMPETITION -- ALUMNI GAME, FUNDRAISING ACTIVITY OR CELEBRITY SPORTS ACTIVITY	Adopted - Final	Big East Conference	August 1, 2010	To specify that a student-athlete may engage in outside competition in either one alumni game, one fundraising activity or one celebrity sports activity during a season without counting such competition as a season of competition, provided the event is exempted from the institution's maximum number of contests or dates of competition as permitted in the particular sport per NCAA Bylaw 17.
2009-65	ELIGIBILITY -- TRANSFER REGULATIONS -- FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS -- ONE-TIME TRANSFER EXCEPTION -- WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL	Defeated - Final	Mountain West Conference	August 1, 2010	To specify that the one-time transfer exception to the four-year transfer residence requirement is not applicable to student-athletes in women's volleyball.
2009-66	ELIGIBILITY -- TRANSFER REGULATIONS -- FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS -- COMPETITION OR RECEIPT OF ATHLETICALLY RELATED FINANCIAL AID IN YEAR OF TRANSFER -- TENNIS	Adopted - Final	Southeastern Conference	August 1, 2010	In tennis, to specify that a transfer student from a four-year institution who enrolls at the certifying institution as a full-time student after the conclusion of the first term of the academic year and qualifies for an exception to the one-year residence requirement shall not be eligible for competition until the following academic year if he or she has competed during the same academic year or received athletically related financial aid during the same academic year from the previous four-year institution.

Date Printed: June 8, 2010

Proposals Recommended by the Basketball Academic Enhancement Group

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2009-96	ELIGIBILITY -- TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS -- PHYSICAL EDUCATION ACTIVITY COURSES -- MEN'S BASKETBALL	Adopted - Final	NCAA Division I Board of Directors (Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group)	August 1, 2010; applicable to two-year and 4-2-4 college transfer student-athletes who enroll full-time as transfer students at a Division I institution on or after August 1, 2010.	In men's basketball, to specify that not more than two credit hours of physical education activity courses may be used to fulfill the two-year college transfer requirements; further, to specify that a student-athlete enrolling in a physical education degree program or a degree program in education that requires physical education activity courses may use up to the minimum number of credits of physical education activity courses that are required for the specific degree program to fulfill the two-year college transfer requirements.
2009-97	FINANCIAL AID -- COUNTERS -- AID AFTER DEPARTURE OF HEAD COACH -- NONCOUNTER -- MEN'S BASKETBALL	Adopted, 60-Day Override Period	NCAA Division I Board of Directors (Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group)	August 1, 2010	In men's basketball, to specify that a student-athlete who receives athletically related institutional financial aid in academic years following the departure of a head coach from the institution is not a counter, provided: (a) The student-athlete participated in basketball and received athletically related institutional financial aid during the coach's tenure at the institution; and (b) The student-athlete does not participate in basketball during the later academic years at the institution; further, to specify that if the student-athlete later participates in basketball at the institution, the student-athlete shall become a counter for all years during which athletically related institutional aid was received.
2009-98	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- MISSED CLASS-TIME POLICIES -- DEPARTURE/RETURN RESTRICTIONS -- MEN'S BASKETBALL	Adopted, 60-Day Override Period	NCAA Division I Board of Directors (Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group)	August 1, 2010	In men's basketball, to specify that an institution's athletics participation schedule, which shall include the anticipated amount of missed class time due to athletics participation, shall be approved by the institution's faculty athletics representative or faculty oversight committee prior to the beginning of each regular academic term; further, to specify that an eligible student-athlete may receive actual and necessary travel expenses to represent the institution in athletics competition, provided the student-athlete departs for the competition no earlier than 48 hours prior to the start of the actual competition and remains no more than 24 hours.

Date Printed: June 8, 2010

Proposal Number	Title	Status	Source	Effective Date	Intent
2009-98	PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS -- PRESEASON PRACTICE MODEL -- MEN'S BASKETBALL	Defeated - Final	NCAA Division I Board of Directors (Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group)	For preseason practice provisions: August 1, 2010. For the maximum number of contests: August 1, 2011 (Contracts signed before 8/6/09 that cause noncompliance with the maximum contests limitation may be honored.)	In men's basketball, to establish a preseason practice model, as specified.

REPORT OF THE NCAA INTERNATIONAL STUDENT RECORDS COMMITTEE MARCH 4-5, 2010, MEETING

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

- **None.**

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

1. Review of NCAA International Student Records Committee October 1-2, 2009, Report.

a. Estonia.

The committee determined that the *Gumnaasiumi Loputunnistus* (upper secondary school leaving certificate) will continue to be required for all prospective student-athletes from Estonia. The committee also determined that the *Hinneteleht*, an accompanying document to the *Gumnaasiumi Loputunnistus*, shall be used to calculate a prospective student-athlete's core-course grade-point average pursuant to the grading scale set forth in the NCAA Guide to International Academic Standards for Athletics Eligibility. The committee determined that the *Riigieksamitunnistus*, the national exam, must also be submitted as proof of graduation for prospective student-athletes from Estonia.

The committee noted that completion of the national exam (the *Riigieksamitunnistus*) is an essential component of the secondary credential (the *Gumnaasiumi Loputunnistus*) and required for admission to university. However, an individual's core-course grades as reflected on the *Hinneteleht* are essential for determining secondary school achievement and the corresponding core-course grade-point average.

b. Lithuania.

The committee determined for prospective student-athletes from Lithuania that the core-course grade-point average shall be calculated using core courses included on the *Brandos Atestatas* and pursuant to the grading scale in the Guide to International Academic Standards. National or school exams included on the *Brandos Atestatas* shall be disregarded when calculating a core-course grade-point average because the grading scale varies annually based on students' performance on the national-level exams.

The committee noted that although every student is required to complete national or school exams to graduate, the grading of these exams varies widely, and the core-

course grading scale set forth in the Guide to International Academic Standards is a more consistent grading scale for all students.

c. Latvia.

The committee determined that for prospective student-athletes from Latvia, tertiary entrance exam results, which are included on the *Visparejas Videjas Izglitibas Sertifikats*, shall be disregarded and not used in the calculation of an individual's core-course grade-point average. In making this determination, the committee noted that tertiary entrance exam grading varies annually and, therefore, is not a consistent method for determining secondary school achievement and corresponding core-course grade-point averages.

2. Scotland.

The committee determined that prospective student-athletes from Scotland must present results from Standard, Intermediate 1 and 2, Higher or Advanced Higher examinations.

The committee approved an updated grading scale for Standard examinations as follows.

Numeric Grade	Equivalent U.S. Grade	Quality Points
1	A	4
2	A	4
3	B	3
4	B	3
5	C	2
6	C	2 (lowest passing grade)
7	F	0

The committee also approved the following grading scale for Intermediate 1 and 2, Higher and Advanced Higher examinations.

Grade	Equivalent U.S. Grade	Quality Points
A	A	4
B	B	3
C	C	2
D	D	1 (lowest passing grade)

Further, the committee determined that only Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework levels four or higher will be used to determine graduation of prospective student-athletes.

In addition, the committee determined that Foundation and Access levels are not acceptable.

3. The committee reviewed and revised the Guide to International Academic Standards profile for the following countries.

Brazil, Columbia, Croatia, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Jamaica, Kenya, Mexico, Montenegro, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Republic of South Africa, Russia, Serbia, Spain and Sweden.

4. European Baccalaureate.

The committee determined that the European Baccalaureate academic credential shall be considered a category one document. In making this determination, the committee noted that the European Baccalaureate curriculum meets or exceeds the committee's expectations for a category one document. The committee noted further that the European Baccalaureate is similar to the International Baccalaureate, which is also classified as category one. Finally, the committee approved the following amended grading scale for the European Baccalaureate.

Numeric Grade	Equivalent U.S. Grade	Quality Points
10	A	4
9	A	4
8	A	4
7	B	3
6	C	2 (lowest passing grade)
1-5	F	0

5. New academic credential in Portugal and grade nine grading scale.

The committee determined that the *Diploma Nivel Secundario de Educacao* from Portugal shall be considered a category two document. The committee also approved the following grade nine grading scale for delayed graduates.

Numeric Grade	Equivalent U.S. Grade	Quality Points
5	A	4
4	B	3
3	C	2(lowest passing grade)
2-1	F	0

6. Ireland's Further Education and Training Awards Council credential.

The committee discussed the re-categorizing of Ireland's Further Education and Training Awards Council credential and determined that it will conduct further research and address the re-categorization of this credential at a subsequent meeting.

7. *Higher Secondary Certificate* from Goa, India.

The committee determined that for prospective student-athletes from Goa, India, the *Higher Secondary Certificate* will be categorized as a category two document in all streams other than arts and sciences. In making this determination, the committee noted that all of the states of India offer the same curricular guidelines and should be treated consistently.

8. NCAA Eligibility Center.

The Eligibility Center staff provided an update on the number of registrations and certifications performed from 2006 through 2009 for domestic and international prospective student-athletes.

9. Other business.

The committee discussed newly adopted legislation that amended the composition of the committee to include two Division I members, two Division II members and two members who are either from Division I or Division II.

10. Future meeting dates.

November 4-5, 2010 (Indianapolis).

Committee Chair: *Robert Watkins, University of Texas at Austin, Big 12 Conference*
Committee Liaisons: *A. Frank Arredondo, Academic and Membership Affairs*
Doug Healey, Academic and Membership Affairs
Jobrina Perez, Academic and Membership Affairs

REPORT OF THE NCAA STUDENT RECORDS REVIEW COMMITTEE MARCH 25-26, 2010 MEETING

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. Legislative Items.

- None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- The NCAA Student Records Review Committee identified guidelines to be used during the prospective student-athlete review process to assist in making a determination regarding academic soundness. The Student Records Review Committee directed staff to forward the guiding principles to the NCAA High School Review Committee for comment.

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

1. The committee reviewed current initial-eligibility legislation, including proposals from the 2008-09 and 2009-10 legislative cycles applicable to initial eligibility.

2. The committee received a summary of prospective student-athlete review cases from the 2009-10 academic year, as well as a four-year statistical summary of review cases. The committee requested data from the NCAA research staff regarding the academic outcomes of individuals which have triggered the prospective student-athlete review process. Further, the committee requested from the research staff a comparison of the progression of completed core courses by student-athletes who are reviewed through the prospective student-athlete review process and student-athletes who are automatic qualifiers, with a focus on the type of environment in which the core courses were completed.

3. The committee approved the following amendments to the prospective student-athlete review trigger list:

   a. The following single triggers were moved to the multiple trigger list:

      (1) Time between repeated courses is greater than one academic year;

(2) Prospective student-athlete has attempted to repeat a course more than twice;

(3) Final core course grade-point average is within 0.100 points of the grade-point average required for qualifier status at either DI or DII; and

(4) Concurrent enrollment that includes taking more than one credit at the second school.

b. The following single triggers were removed:

- Grade-point average increase of .5 or greater in an academic year.

c. The following single triggers were added:

(1) Grade-point average increase of .5 or greater post-sixth semester to end of eighth semester; and

(2) Grade-point average increase of .5 or greater post-eighth semester to full-time enrollment.

d. The following single triggers were modified:

(1) Disproportionate amount of ~~coursework (eight or more) taken~~ *credits earned post-sixth semester* when compared to other semesters; and

(2) Two or more repeated *credits taken post-sixth semester* ~~*core* courses taken during an academic year~~.

4. The committee supported the development of a policy to permit institutions to request an initial-eligibility waiver prior to the completion of the prospective student-athlete review process and a final academic certification. The request would be for athletically related financial aid only.

5. The committee received an update regarding the high school review and core-course review processes from NCAA staff. This update included a presentation regarding the increased use of credit-recovery programs by prospective student-athletes.

6. The committee amended its policies and procedures to indicate the following:

a. The designated institutional representative for appeal teleconferences must be employed by the institution, or outside counsel retained by the institution; and

b. When reviewing new courses at issue subsequent to a previous review, the staff may consider a prospective student-athlete's academic record in its entirety.

7. The committee received a presentation from Allison Powell, vice president of the North American Council for Online Education (iNACOL), regarding future trends in nontraditional education.

Committee Chair: *Dan Garrick, St. Francis DeSales (Ohio) High School*
Staff Liaisons: *Steve Clar, Academic and Membership Affairs*
Brandy Hataway, Academic and Membership Affairs
Alex Smith, Academic and Membership Affairs

SUPPLEMENT NO. 12

Effective Date: August 1, 2010

Title:14.3.1.2.2 - Nontraditional Courses.

Courses taught via the Internet, distance learning, independent study, individualized instruction, correspondence, and courses taught by similar means may be used to satisfy NCAA core-course requirements if all of the following conditions are satisfied: *(Adopted: 1/11/00 effective 8/1/00)*

(a) The course meets all requirements for a core course as defined in Bylaw 14.3.1.2;

(b) The instructor and the student have ongoing access to one another for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student throughout the duration of the course; *(Revised: 1/16/10 effective 8/1/10; for student-athletes initially enrolling full time in a collegiate institution on or after 8/1/10)*

(c) The instructor and the student have regular interaction with one another for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student throughout the duration of the course; *(Adopted: 1/16/10 effective 8/1/10; for student-athletes initially enrolling full time in a collegiate institution on or after 8/1/10)*

(d) The student's work (e.g., exams, papers, assignments) is available for evaluation and validation; *(Adopted: 1/16/10 effective 8/1/10; for student-athletes initially enrolling full time in a collegiate institution on or after 8/1/10)*

(e) Evaluation of the student's work is conducted by the appropriate academic authorities in accordance with the high school's established academic policies;

(f) The course includes a defined time period for completion; and *(Adopted: 1/16/10 effective 8/1/10; for student-athletes initially enrolling full time in a collegiate institution on or after 8/1/10)*

(g) The course is acceptable for any student and is placed on the high school transcript.

Proposal Number: 2009-64

Title: ELIGIBILITY -- FRESHMAN ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS -- CORE-CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS -- NONTRADITIONAL COURSES

Intent: To specify that for purposes of using a nontraditional course to satisfy NCAA core-course requirements, the course must be one in which the instructor and the student have ongoing access to one another and regular interaction with one another for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student throughout the duration of the course; the student's work (e.g., exams, papers, assignments) is available for review and validation; and a defined time period for completion of the course is included.

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.2.2, as follows:

14.3.1.2.2 Nontraditional Courses. Courses taught via the Internet, distance-learning, independent-study, individualized-instruction, correspondence, and courses taught by similar means may be used to satisfy NCAA core-course requirements if all of the following conditions are satisfied:

[14.3.1.2.2-(a) unchanged.]

(b) The instructor and the student have **ongoing** access to one another ~~*during the duration of the course*~~ for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student **throughout the duration of the course**;

(c) The instructor and the student have regular interaction with one another for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student throughout the duration of the course;

(d) The student's work (e.g., exams, papers, assignments) is available for evaluation and validation;

(~~c~~**e**) Evaluation of the student's work is conducted by the appropriate academic authorities in accordance with the high school's established academic policies; ~~*and*~~

(f) The course includes a defined time period for completion; and

[14.3.1.2.2-(d) relettered as 14.3.1.2.2-(g), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division I Academics Cabinet

Effective Date: August 1, 2010; for student-athletes initially enrolling full time in a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2010

Category: Amendment

Topical Area: Eligibility

Rationale: Current legislation permits the use of nontraditional courses (courses taught via the Internet, distance-learning, independent-study, individualized-instruction, correspondence or similar means) to satisfy NCAA initial-eligibility requirements, provided certain conditions are satisfied. The recent increase in the prevalence of nontraditional courses has created a number of challenges in the determination of initial eligibility for prospective student-athletes, particularly related to ensuring that courses are academically sound and meet the NCAA definition of core courses. Additional challenges are presented by the emergence of institutions providing courses that are not regulated by a regional accrediting agency or state educational authority. After consultation with the NCAA Student Records Review Committee and NCAA High School Review Committee, this recommendation is intended to help ensure that acceptable nontraditional courses provide opportunities for students to demonstrate their work was completed in a manner consistent with the intent and design of the core-course curriculum requirements. This legislation will allow the NCAA Eligibility Center to determine which courses and institutions are acceptable to satisfy

initial-eligibility standards with the ultimate goal of ensuring that prospective student-athletes are enrolled in quality courses that satisfy the intent of the core-curriculum requirements and prepare prospective student-athlete for college academic work.

Budget Impact: None.

Impact on S-A's Time: None.

Position Statement(s)

High School Review Committee: The committee supports the proposal. The committee believes that the additional requirements of regular interaction between the student and the instructor for teaching, evaluating and assistance in courses used to meet core-course requirements would impact student-athletes in a positive manner by better preparing prospective student-athletes for college work.

History

Jun 29, 2009: Submit; Submitted for consideration.

Jun 30, 2009: Academics Cabinet, Sponsored

Sep 29, 2009: High School Review Committee, Recommends Approval

Jan 13, 2010: Leg Council Init Review; Defeated an amendment to delay the effective date to August 1, 2011; for student-athletes initially enrolling full time in a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2011.

Jan 13, 2010: Leg Council Init Review, Adopted; Pending Possible Board of Directors Review

Jan 16, 2010: Adopted, Override Period; No Action Taken by the Board of Directors

Jan 17, 2010: Adopted, Override Period; Start of Override Period

Mar 17, 2010: Adopted, Override Period; End of Override Period; (Number of Override Request = 3)

Mar 17, 2010: Adopted; Adopted - Final

Educational Column - 1 Educational Column

Title : Proposal No. 2009-64 Eligibility -- Freshman Academic Requirements -- Core-Curriculum Requirements -- Nontraditional Courses (I)

Item Ref : 35

Date Issued: January 14, 2010

Date Published: January 14, 2010

Educational Column:

Question: Must a nontraditional course be completed within a certain timeframe (e.g., equivalent of one traditional term)?

Answer: No, the proposal does not prescribe a timeframe in which a nontraditional course must be completed. However, the entity offering the course must establish a defined time period for completion of the course.

Notice about Educational Columns and Hot Topics: Educational columns and hot topics are not official or staff interpretations. They are intended to assist the membership by providing examples, scenarios and reminders related to legislation and interpretations at the time of publication. Member institutions are reminded to review the referenced bylaws and interpretations to ensure correct application of current rules and regulations.

References

Legislative References

Div.	Number	Title
I	14.3.1.2.2	Nontraditional Courses.

Other

References Educational Columns: 0

Educational Columns: 0

Proposals: 1

Educational Column - 1 Educational Column

Title:

Eligibility -- Freshman Academic Requirements -- Core-Curriculum Requirements -- Nontraditional Courses (I)

Item Ref: 1

Date Issued: May 11, 2010

Date Published: May 11, 2010

Educational Column:

NCAA Division I Proposal No. 2009-64 was adopted in January 2010 and is effective August 1, 2010, for those individuals initially enrolling at a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2010. Division I institutions should note that this proposal amends the conditions a nontraditional course must meet to be used to satisfy NCAA core-course requirements. More specifically, a nontraditional course must be one in which:

1. The instructor and the student have ongoing access to one another, and regular interaction with one another, for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student throughout the duration of the course;

2. The student's work (e.g., exams, papers, assignments) is available for review and validation; and

3. A defined time period for completion of the course is identified by the high school or secondary school program.

The recent increase in the prevalence of nontraditional courses has created a number of challenges in the determination of initial eligibility for prospective student-athletes, particularly related to ensuring that courses are academically sound and meet the NCAA definition of a core course. Additional challenges are presented by the emergence of courses that are not regulated by a regional accrediting agency or state educational authority. After consultation with the NCAA Student Records Review Committee and NCAA High School Review Committee, this legislation was developed to help ensure that acceptable nontraditional courses provide opportunities for students to demonstrate their work is completed in a manner consistent with the intent and design of the core-course curriculum requirements. This legislation will allow the NCAA Eligibility Center to determine which high school and secondary school program courses are acceptable and satisfy initial-eligibility standards. The ultimate goal is to ensure that prospective student-athletes are enrolled in quality courses that satisfy the intent of the core-curriculum requirements and prepare individuals for college academic work.

The following questions and answers are designed to assist the Division I membership with the application of this legislation.

Question No. 1: How will nontraditional courses completed prior to August 1, 2010, be considered for initial-eligibility purposes?

Answer: If a nontraditional course is **completed**prior to August 1, 2010, it will be evaluated using the legislative standards in place prior to the adoption of Proposal No. 2009-64 for a nontraditional course. The nontraditional coursework may be subject to the prospective student-athlete review process; however, the coursework does not have to meet the additional guidelines outlined in Proposal No. 2009-64.

If nontraditional coursework is completed on or after August 1, 2010, (even if a prospective student-athlete enrolled in the course prior to August 1, 2010) the requirements of Proposal No. 2009-64 will be applicable to the coursework.

If the nontraditional coursework does not meet the new legislative parameters and the prospective student-athlete has a resulting initial-eligibility deficiency, an institution may request an initial-eligibility waiver on behalf of the prospective student-athlete. However, reliance on such coursework alone may not be sufficient mitigation for relief to be provided through the waiver process.

Question No. 2: What constitutes ongoing access and regular interaction for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student throughout the duration of the course?

Answer: In order to have a course approved as "core," the high school or secondary school program will need to demonstrate there was ongoing access and regular interaction between the student and the instructor for the entire course. The minimum expectation in this regard is that the course must include instruction from an instructor throughout the duration of the course. Students cannot self-pace or teach themselves a core course. Requiring a course to be taught by an instructor reduces the opportunities for prospective student-athletes to complete courses in a condensed timeframe.

Interaction for the purpose of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance may include, but is not limited to, telephonic communication, electronic mail, instant messaging and other forms of electronic communication between the student and instructor; the provision of feedback on assignments and course assessments by the instructor to the student; and the opportunity for the instructor to provide individual instruction to the student.

Interaction that is condensed into a timeframe shorter than the timeframe identified for completion of the entire course may not satisfy this requirement. Further, student/teacher interaction that is optional or available, but not required, does not satisfy this requirement.

Question No. 3: What if the student doesn't need or request any interaction?

Answer: If the course, as designed, does not require any interaction between the student and the instructor, it will not meet the definition of a core course. If the course is designed with interaction as a requirement but through prospective student-athlete review it is identified that a particular prospective student-athlete did not interact with an instructor throughout the completion of a course, the course will be invalidated.

Question No. 4: Is there a defined minimum period of time for completing a nontraditional course that is considered acceptable? For example, if the defined minimum period is four weeks and the course satisfies all other requirements in the proposal, may the course be used to meet initial-eligibility standards, even if completing the course in four weeks seems ambitious?

Answer: If the high school or secondary school program indicates the nontraditional course may be completed in a condensed timeframe (e.g., four weeks), it may be determined that the course is not four-year college preparatory and, therefore, is not a "core" course. However, if the course meets the definition of "core," it may permissibly be completed in four weeks per the high school or secondary school program's direction.

The completion of a nontraditional course in a timeframe that is not consistent with the timeframe identified by the high school or secondary school program may be invalidated through the prospective student-athlete review process if the completion of the course by an individual student is not academically sound. For example, if an individual completes eight nontraditional courses in a condensed timeframe while also enrolled in a regular school day and participating in secondary school athletics, it may be determined that even though the eight courses were completed within the appropriate timeframe identified by the high school or secondary school program, completion of those courses was not academically sound. In this case, the eight courses would likely be invalidated through the prospective student-athlete review process.

Question No. 5: Will the NCAA publish a list of NCAA courses for a nontraditional high school or program?

Answer: Yes, provided the school's course offerings satisfy the requirements set forth in Proposal No. 2009-64.

Question No. 6: Will nontraditional courses appear on a high school or secondary school program's list of NCAA courses?

Answer: Yes, provided the course in question satisfies the requirements set forth in Proposal No. 2009-64.

The Eligibility Center staff may approve a nontraditional course as a core course when presented by a high school or secondary school program. However, the course as completed by a prospective student-athlete may be different and, as a result, may not fulfill the legislated definition of a core course. For this reason, a course may appear on a list of NCAA core courses, but may not qualify for an individual student-athlete's certification.

Question No. 7: How will a prospective student-athlete or member institution know if courses from a particular nontraditional program may be used for a student's certification?

Answer: If all courses from a particular nontraditional academic school or program are deemed "not core" under the parameters of this legislation, this will be noted under the heading "denied courses" on the program's list of NCAA courses available on the Eligibility Center Web site.

[References: NCAA Division I Bylaws 14.3.1.2 (core-curriculum requirements) and 14.3.1.2.2 (nontraditional courses)]

Notice about Educational Columns: Educational columns and hot topics are intended to assist the membership with the correct application of legislation and/or interpretations by providing clarifications, reminders and examples. They are based on legislation and official and staff interpretations applicable at the time of publication. Therefore, educational columns and hot topics are binding to the extent that the legislation and interpretations on which they are based remain applicable. Educational columns are posted on a regular basis to address a variety of issues and hot topics are posted as necessary in order to address timely issues.

References

Legislative References		
Div.	Number	Title
I	14.3.1.2.2	Nontraditional Courses.
I	14.3.1.2	Core-Curriculum Requirements.

Other
References Educational Columns: 0
Educational Columns: 0
Proposals: 0

Date Printed: June 9, 2010

Close Print

NCAA decertifies selected nontraditional secondary education courses

May 25, 2010 8:31:56 AM

By Gary Brown
The NCAA News

The NCAA has begun identifying nontraditional courses from various secondary education programs that do not meet the parameters of recently adopted Division I legislation regulating such courses.

Nontraditional courses include online, virtual, independent study, correspondence, individualized instruction and courses taught through similar means, which would also include software-based credit recovery courses.

Courses identified thus far as insufficient include those from BYU Independent Study and American School (two of the programs most frequently submitted to the NCAA Eligibility Center). Courses that meet (as well as those that do not meet) core-course requirements for eligibility purposes are updated on the NCAA Eligibility Center Web site.

Division I adopted legislation earlier this spring (Proposal No. 2009-64) requiring nontraditional courses considered as core to include regular access and interaction between an instructor and student for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student throughout the duration of the course.

The legislation became necessary as nontraditional courses became more prevalent, which made determining initial eligibility for prospective student-athletes more difficult. In particular, the variance of interaction and instruction between teacher and student in many online courses raised concern about whether these courses are academically sound and meet the NCAA definition of a core course. Additionally, the sometimes abbreviated timeframe for completion of such courses was of concern.

Proposal No. 2009-64 originated from the Division I Academic Cabinet after consultation with the NCAA Student Records Review Committee and NCAA High School Review Committee. The legislation helps ensure that acceptable nontraditional courses allow students to demonstrate that their work was completed in a manner consistent with the intent and design of the core-course curriculum requirements.

“To have a course approved as ‘core,’ the high school or secondary school program needs to demonstrate that there was ongoing access and regular interaction between the student and the instructor for the entire course,” said Kevin Lennon, NCAA vice president of academic and membership affairs. “Students cannot self-pace or teach themselves a core course.”

The interaction between teacher and student may include telephone conversations, electronic mail, instant messaging and other forms of electronic communication between the student and instructor. That interaction should include feedback on assignments and course assessments by the instructor to the student, and the opportunity for the instructor to provide individual instruction to the student.

Even if the student does not request that interaction, the course will not be approved as meeting the standards of Proposal No. 2009-64 unless the course is designed to require it.

The legislation also reduces the opportunities for prospects to complete courses in a condensed timeframe. While Proposal No. 2009-64 does not prescribe a timeframe in which a nontraditional course must be completed, the entity offering the course must establish a defined period for completion of the course.

Because the effective date of the new legislation is August 1, 2010, students who complete a course identified as insufficient before then may still have that course evaluated on a case-by-case basis. However, such courses completed on or after August 1 may not be used for Division I initial-eligibility certification.

As of now, these decisions do not apply to students seeking to use these courses for eligibility to compete at Division II institutions. The Division II Presidents Council at its April meeting tabled a proposal that is identical to the Division I legislation and will review the measure again in June.

Division I requires prospective student-athletes to complete 16 core courses in high school to be initially certified. Currently, Division II requires 14 core courses but will require 16 starting in 2013.

For questions and answers about this decision, click here.

View online at: http://www.ncaa.org/wps/portal/newsdetail?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/wps/wcm/connect/ncaa/NCAA/NCAA+News/NCAA+News+Online/2010/Division+I/NCAA+decertifies+selected+nontraditional+secondary+education+courses_

Copyright © 2009 by NCAA
Further reproduction is prohibited without express written permission from NCAA.

International Association for K-12 Online Learning Responds to Article on Correspondence Courses

Susan Patrick
The Chronicle of Higher Education
June 1, 2010

Dear Editor:

As the leading non-profit, membership organization representing the online learning providers in K-12 education, I wanted to respond to the article published May 26, 2010 titled “NCAA's Technological McCarthyism” by Diane Auer Jones.

With K-12 online learning growing at 30% annually, new educational opportunities are being made to students with an unprecedented flexibility. One in four college students takes an online course, according to the Sloan Consortium, thus making the acceptance level for college-readiness another prime reason to offer online courses in high school.

Online learning programs in K-12 education are held to the same standards of accountability as traditional courses: accreditation, standardized tests and end of course exams. Many online learning programs for high school online courses are holding themselves to a higher standard of quality than many traditional classrooms.

Online learning environments are more transparent than their traditional classroom counterparts. Online learning is data-rich – collecting every interaction in an online learning environment. And the results show. The U.S. Department of Education research study of online learning released on June 26, 2009 states, “Students who took all or part of their class online performed better, on average, than those taking the same course through traditional face-to-face instruction.”

With regard to the NCAA decision, the Jones’ article doesn’t cover what aspects of the courses or programs were problematic. In reviewing the national quality standards, there are a number of important aspects of quality, such as faculty to student interaction, communication and collaboration to enhance learning using data-driven instruction. However, not all online courses are created equal, and the NCAA should, and must, have the ability to review these courses to make sure that their method of delivery meets the standards that have been put in place by its member institutions. In analyzing its policies and drafting this new legislation, the NCAA actually used iNACOL’s National Standards of Quality for Online Courses as a guidepost for its decision-making. So to argue as Jones did, that the NCAA is somehow ignorant or indifferent to the multitude of laudable online learning programs available for high school students, is misguided.

It wasn’t mentioned that the NCAA approves hundreds of high school online courses annually from a variety of our members’ K-12 online learning programs. This isn’t a debate about the brick-and-mortar delivery medium versus online medium for courses. Online learning has the transparency of learning management systems that record every student to teacher interaction and a record of the quality of the work a student performs. Looking closer, perhaps the question should be asked, "How many online high school courses does the NCAA accept?"

In addition, I am inviting the NCAA to participate in a web-based presentation with online learning institutions to discuss how their programs are evaluated for quality and college-

readiness. This should be an interesting discussion. In our work with the NCAA, the NCAA has been pro-active in reaching out to the secondary school community to make sure that the standards adopted by its member institutions are available to secondary school administrators at both brick and mortar schools as well as online learning programs. NCAA representatives attended, engaged in meetings with programs and made presentations at our last three Virtual School Symposium (VSS) annual conferences and also presented in a special webinar on NCAA High School Eligibility and online courses.

Online learning works and is providing solutions to challenges facing K-12 schools now. From keeping students in school and on-track through online credit recovery to accelerating a students' college readiness by earning college credits in the local high school through online dual enrollment, schools are finding new, innovative ways to help students re-engage in academics and learn critical technology literacy skills at the same time. Remember, 40% of high school students who do graduate and enter college require remediation in math and writing.

Perhaps this isn't McCarthyism as much as a Sherlock Holmes approach to reviewing 15,000 high school courses, both online and face-to-face, with a fine tooth comb and magnifying glass. I applaud the NCAA for striving to ensure that its student-athletes are arriving on campus with the tools that they need to succeed academically. To chastise the association for providing more stringent requirements in areas where it has seen consistent abuses is foolish. I hope the result of their recent policy changes is all programs being held to a higher level of quality to ensure our students are college-ready and better prepared.

Sincerely,

S. Patrick

P.O. Box 7110
Indianapolis, Indiana 46207
Telephone 317/223-0700

Shipping/Overnight Address:
1802 Alonzo Watford Sr. Drive
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

www.ncaa.org

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Date

TO: Contact
School Name.

FROM: Lisa Mills, Director of High School Review.

SUBJECT: Scholastic Program/High School Information Request.

In January 2010, the NCAA Division I membership revised its bylaws regarding the use of nontraditional coursework for NCAA initial eligibility. These legislative changes may impact the use of [school/program name] courses in the initial-eligibility process.

To assist in determining whether your program may be used for initial-eligibility purposes, the NCAA Eligibility Center requests that the attached form be completed and returned to the e-mail address or fax number listed below within 30 days from receipt of this notice. The Eligibility Center will conduct a review of your program and make a determination whether your courses may be used for NCAA Division I initial eligibility in the future.

If you do not respond within 30 days from receipt of this notice, the Eligibility Center may presume that your courses do not meet the newly legislated definition for acceptable nontraditional courses, and reserves the right to remove previously approved courses from your list of approved core courses used in certifying Division I initial eligibility.

For your convenience, a copy of the new NCAA legislation is included. If you have questions, please call our toll-free high school line at 877/622-2321.

Thank you for your assistance. To submit required information, please send to one of the following:

E-mail: ec-highschool@ncaa.org
Fax: 317/968-5102

LM:cv

NCAA Division I Bylaw 14.3.1.2.2 Nontraditional Courses.

Courses taught via the Internet, distance learning, independent study, individualized instruction, correspondence, and courses taught by similar means may be used to satisfy NCAA core-course requirements if all of the following conditions are satisfied:

(a) The course meets all requirements for a core course as defined in Bylaw 14.3.1.2;

(b) The instructor and the student have ongoing access to one another for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student throughout the duration of the course;

(c) The instructor and the student have regular interaction with one another for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student throughout the duration of the course;

(d) The student's work (e.g., exams, papers, assignments) is available for evaluation and validation;

(e) Evaluation of the student's work is conducted by the appropriate academic authorities in accordance with the high school's established academic policies;

(f) The course includes a defined time period for completion; and

(g) The course is acceptable for any student and is placed on the high school transcript.

Nontraditional Academic Review Questionnaire

School Name: _____

High School Code (if applicable): ☐☐☐-☐☐☐

Contact Name: _____

Title: _____

Address: _____

_____

City: _____ _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Telephone (include area code): _____ Extension: _____

Facsimile (include area code): _____

E-mail: _____

General Information:

1. Please write a detailed description of the program. In the response, be sure to address the following:
   a. What is the format of the program? (e.g., online, correspondence, virtual classroom)
   b. What materials are used?
   c. Does the program serve a specific population?

2. When was the program established?

3. Is the program affiliated with any other similar programs? (i.e., an umbrella organization or sister program)

4. Is the program accredited? If so, please provide the name, address, phone number and other pertinent contact information of the accrediting agency/association. Also, please provide the date of accreditation as well as the expiration date of the accreditation.

5. Is the program affiliated with any high schools, districts or postsecondary institutions? If so, please provide the name(s).
   - If the program is affiliated with another school/district, please explain how grades and credit are awarded.

6. Does the program produce an official transcript?

7. Does the program award a high school diploma?
   a. If so, is this diploma recognized by the State Department of Education?
   b. May students take individual courses without being enrolled in the diploma program? If so, how many?
   c. May students receive a diploma from the program without taking any courses? If not, how many courses must they take from the program in order to receive a diploma?

8. May the program be used for credit recovery (e.g., recovery of credits for courses where the student performed poorly earlier in his/her high school career)? If so, please explain.

9. Is the program available to students who have already graduated from high school?

10. Is tuition charged for the courses?
    - If so, does the program provide tuition assistance? Provide the percentage of students receiving tuition assistance by graduating class and, if available, compare student-athletes with nonathletes.

11. Is credit by exam offered? Please explain.

12. Is credit for life or work experience offered? Please explain.

Curriculum:

1. Who created the curriculum?

2. To what standards is the curriculum aligned?

Student/Instructor Interaction:

1. How is content instruction delivered and by whom?

2. Is there an instructor for the course(s)? (If "no," please skip to the "Delivery" section.)

3. What is the educational role of the instructor in the course(s) (aside from administrative/record-keeping duties)?

4. Are students required to interact with the instructor?
   a. If so, what method(s) of communication do students use to interact with their instructor?
   b. If so, who initiates the interaction for each method?
   c. If so, how frequently does interaction occur for each method?

5. Are the courses delivered using synchronous or asynchronous learning? Please explain in detail.

6. Are the courses open entry/open exit (students may start/finish courses at will), or are there specified timeframes for entry/exit (students must start/finish courses within established dates)? Please explain in detail.

7. Are instructors required to be licensed teachers in their area of instruction?
   - If not, what are the minimum credentials required for instructors?

8. How are instructors trained to deliver and interact with students in the program's delivery system?

9. What is the average student/instructor ratio for the courses in the program?

10. What type of oversight is in place to monitor instructor performance and interaction with students?

Delivery:

1. Does the program use a Content or Learning Management System? If so, which one(s) and in what capacity?

2. Are students required to take a pre-test prior to the start of each course?

3. Can the units/modules within a given course be customized or tailored for each individual student? If so, how and by whom?

4. Are the assignments within a given course the same for all students? If not, please explain.

5. May students be exempted from certain units/modules within a given course? If so, please explain.

6. May students repeat work if they do not receive a satisfactory grade? If so, please explain.

7. What is the policy regarding the maximum number of courses students may take at one time?

8. Is there a minimum time for completion of courses in the program? If so, please explain.

9. Are students permitted to work at their own pace to complete a course?
   - If so, please explain:
     (1) What is the minimum/maximum pacing allowed?

(2) Is there a pacing chart for the course?

(3) Is the pacing chart tracked by the instructor? If so, how?

10. How are assessments graded and by whom?

11. Please describe the nature of the assessments. (e.g., types of assessments, frequency of assessments)

12. Please explain the type(s) of feedback the students receive from the instructor, based on the assessment of the student's work.

Quality Control:

1. How are courses designated on a student's transcript?

2. Explain circumstances under which students are permitted to take more than one course in a given academic discipline at the same time. (e.g., Algebra I and Algebra II in the same term)

   - Please explain for each academic discipline. (i.e., English, math, science, social studies, foreign language)

3. How does the program ensure the validity of a student's work?

4. What policies govern students found to have fraudulently completed coursework?

Athletics:

1. Is the program used by an athletics team/entity/program? If so, please explain and give the name of the team/entity/program.

2. When students register for courses, are they asked if they are seeking to meet NCAA initial-eligibility requirements?

3. Does the program sponsor any athletics teams? If so,

   a. What sports are offered as part of the athletics program?

   b. Are the teams a member of a high school athletics league or the state athletics association? If so, which league(s) or state association(s)?

   c. Are the coaches full- or part-time school employees?

      - Please explain additional responsibilities the coaches have.

Nontraditional Coursework Questionnaire

In January 2010, the NCAA Division I membership revised NCAA Bylaw 14.3.2.2, which outlines the definition of a nontraditional core course (including but not limited to courses taught via the Internet, correspondence courses, computer-based instruction, etc.). Due to this revision it is necessary to obtain information regarding nontraditional courses taught by your school. Please answer the following questions with regard to your school's use of nontraditional courses within 30 days of receipt.

School's six-digit CEEB code: ❑❑❑-❑❑❑

Name of School: _____

Your Name: _____

Your Title: _____

E-mail: _____ Phone: _____

School's Web site: _____

School's NCAA Contact (if different than above): _____

Student/Instructor Interaction:

1. What is the role of the instructor in delivering the course content?
2. What are the minimum credentials required of the instructor?
3. Are students required to interact with their instructor? Please describe the nature and frequency of interaction between the student and the instructor.
4. What method(s) of communication do students use to interact with their instructor?
5. Please describe the nature of assignments and assessments (types of assessments, frequency of assessments, etc.).
6. How are assessments graded and by whom?

Delivery:

1. Who designed the curriculum in the courses (content provider, high school staff, etc.)?
2. Are the lessons, modules and assignments within a given course the same for all students? If not, please explain.

_____

3. Can a student be exempted from or test out of certain portions of a course?
4. Can the lessons, modules or assignments within a given course be customized or tailored on a student-by-student basis? If so, how and by whom?
5. Under what circumstance may a student be permitted to repeat a lesson, module or assignment? Please be detailed in your response.
6. Is there a minimum timeframe for completion of courses in your program? If so, please explain.
7. Are students permitted to work at their own pace to complete a course? If so, please explain.

Transcripts:

- How are these courses designated on your school's transcript?

When you are finished, please mail, fax or e-mail your response to:

NCAA Eligibility Center
High School Review
P.O. Box 7136
Indianapolis, Indiana 46207-7136

Fax:
317/968-5102

E-Mail:
ec-highschool@ncaa.org

Shipping address:
1802 Alonzo Watford Sr. Drive
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

Date

VIA OVERNIGHT DELIVERY

NAME
TITLE
HIGH SCHOOL NAME
ADDRESS
CITY, STATE, ZIP CODE

Dear <Name>:

Thank you for your cooperation in the review of your program for use in the NCAA initial-eligibility process.

Based on a complete review of the information submitted by <INSERT HIGH SCHOOL NAME>, a determination has been made that core courses from <INSERT HIGH SCHOOL NAME> do not meet the parameters of Division I proposal No. 2009-64 (attached). Specifically, the legislative component requiring regular interaction between the instructor and student for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student throughout the duration of the course has not been met. Therefore, courses and grades from your program may not be used in the NCAA initial-eligibility process for Division I academic certification beginning August 1, 2010.

Students who complete a <INSERT HS NAME> course prior to the proposal's August 1, 2010 effective date may still have that course evaluated on a case-by-case basis. However, courses completed on or after August 1 will not be used for Division I initial-eligibility certification. Your list of NCAA courses on the Eligibility Center Web site will reflect this change. It is important to note that Division II has not adopted similar legislation; therefore, this decision does not impact students who wish to use courses from your school for Division II purposes.

If your program wishes to appeal this decision, notification of the desire to appeal must be provided in writing to the Eligibility Center High School Review Staff within 14-calendar days of the date of this letter. Appeals must be submitted with the signature of the representative who provides oversight for the program. Your program is required to state in its appeal the reason it believes the staff's decision should be overturned.

Please feel free to contact me at 317/233-0740 if you have any questions regarding the processing of this case.

Sincerely,

Lisa Mills
Director of High School Review

NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet

Policies and Operating Procedures

June 2010~~09~~

DRAFT

NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet
Policies and Operating Procedures

Table of Contents

Cabinet Responsibilities.....1

Cabinet Composition 1

Cabinet Terms.....2

~~Cabinet Organization .....3~~

Policies and Requirements for Committees the Report to the Cabinet.....4

Selection of Cabinet Chair.....6

Agenda Development.....6

Meeting Participation by Noncabinet Members 7

Processing Committee Recommendations.....7

Cross-Committee Consultations 8

Voting Procedures.....8

Absences 8

Conflict of Interest Policy.....8

Speaking Agent Policy.....9

Cabinet Responsibilities

Legislated Duties of the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet ~~(NCAA Bylaw 21.7.6.1.2)~~

The cabinet shall:

(a) Be responsible for review and consideration of the portions of Division I legislation that relate to principles of sound academic requirements;

(b) Work with the Division II governance structure to ensure that consistent policies exist, when possible, while maintaining each division's philosophy and legislative intent;

(c) Study issues and make policy or legislative recommendations concerning transfer student-athletes, including maintaining relationships between the Association and the nation's two-year colleges as represented by established regional and national organizations;

(d) Oversee academic policies;

(e) Establish, manage and monitor eligibility standards and related policies; and

(f) ~~Serve as the final appellate body for academic waivers as specified by legislation and/or policy~~Administer waivers as specified by legislation and/or policy.

Cabinet Composition

Full Cabinet Membership. Pursuant to ~~Bylaw 21.7.6.2.1~~NCAA legislation, the cabinet shall be composed of 21 members. Of the 21 members, each of the 11 Football Bowl Subdivision conferences will be represented and the other 10 members will come from among the 20 Football Championship Subdivision/Division I conferences on a rotating basis. The conferences will be responsible for developing a rotation schedule.

One member of the NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee shall serve as a member of the cabinet in an advisory capacity and may serve on the cabinet up to one year after completion of his or her intercollegiate athletics eligibility ~~(Bylaw 21.7.6.2.1.2)~~.

Appointments. The conferences represented in each subdivision shall review the open cabinet positions in the subdivision and coordinate the appointments to those positions to assure

consistency with the compositional requirements of each cabinet and with the diversity requirements. ~~As a minimal goal, the combined membership of the Academic Cabinet, NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet, NCAA Division I Agents and Amateurism Cabinet, NCAA Division I Awards, Benefits and Financial Aid Cabinet and NCAA Division I Recruiting Cabinet~~ At minimum, each council and cabinet in the governance structure shall include representatives that comprise of at least 20 percent persons who are ethnic minorities and at least 35 percent persons of each gender. Each council and cabinet shall also have positional requirements to include 20 percent athletic directors and 20 percent facult athletics representatives. The NCAA Division I Leadership Council shall assure that there is a fair rotation among those conferences of representation on more than two cabinets at any one time, and that over any period of time there is a fair rotation of representation on each cabinet. The NCAA Division I Board of Directors shall review the appointments from each subdivision and may direct any subdivision or conference to revise its appointments.

Cabinet Terms

1. **Four-Year Term.** Members of the cabinet shall be appointed for one four-year term. A member's term of service shall commence on the first day of July following the member's appointment, and a former cabinet member may be appointed to an additional term on the cabinet after three years have elapsed. An individual who has served two terms on the cabinet may not serve further on that cabinet or committee. The terms of office of Football Bowl Subdivision positions and Football Championship Subdivision and Division I Subdivision positions shall expire on a staggered basis to provide for continuity. Members may be appointed for less than full terms. A conference may remove its representative to a cabinet during a term.

2. **The NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet Administrative Committee.** The NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet Administrative Committee is empowered to act on behalf of the full cabinet to transact necessary and routine items of business clearly required to promote the normal and orderly administration of cabinet business.

   The Administrative Committee consists of five or six members, including the chair of the cabinet (who also serves as chair of the Administrative Committee), chair-elect (when applicable), and four other members appointed by the chair (each of the subdivisions must be represented). All Administrative Committee members, including the chair, may vote on items of business before the committee.

   The Administrative Committee is authorized to:

   a. Act for the cabinet on routine and noncontroversial matters (e.g., site recommendations) between cabinet meetings.

b. Act for the cabinet on matters of an emergency nature.

c. Organize and structure meeting agendas subsequent to the submission of agenda items by cabinet members and conferences.

d. Appoint ad hoc members to the cabinet.

e. Serve as the appellate body for waivers outside the responsibilities of the existing waiver subcommittees.

~~f. Appoint cabinet members to waiver subcommittees.~~

~~g~~f. Submit nominations for the position of cabinet chair to the Leadership Council and NCAA Division I Legislative Council for final approval by the Board of Directors.

~~h~~g. Recommend to the Administrative Cabinet that a member be replaced if he or she is not properly discharging his or her duties.

~~i~~h. Establish cabinet meeting dates.

The full cabinet will receive all Administrative Committee minutes.

~~Cabinet Organization~~

~~Generally, each cabinet member shall be appointed to one waiver subcommittee, on which that member will normally serve for the duration of the member's term on the cabinet. On occasion a cabinet member may be asked to serve on two waiver subcommittees.~~

~~**Waiver Subcommittees.** The following standing waiver subcommittees shall report directly to and help facilitate the work of the cabinet:~~

~~Subcommittee~~	~~Duty~~
~~NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet Initial-Eligibility Waiver Appeals Subcommittee~~	~~Serve as the final appellate body for the review of Division I initial-eligibility waivers.~~
~~NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet Progress-Toward-Degree Waiver Appeals~~	~~Serve as the final appellate body for the review of Division I progress-toward-degree waivers.~~

~~Subcommittee~~	

~~The Administrative Committee will serve as the appellate body for waivers outside the responsibilities of the existing waiver subcommittees.~~

Policies and Requirements for Committees that Report to the Cabinet

Committee	Composition	Duty
NCAA Division I Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee	The committee shall consist of 20 members appointed by the ~~Academic~~ Administration Cabinet. ~~(Bylaw 21.7.6.1.3.1.1)~~	~~To review requests for waivers of the initial-eligibility requirements in accordance with Bylaw 14.3.1.5. (Bylaw 21.7.6.1.3.1.3)~~ Oversee the process for reviewing requests for waivers of the initial-eligibility requirements and consider appeals of staff decisions related to initial-eligibility waiver requests.
NCAA Division I Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee	The committee shall consist of eight members appointed by the ~~Academic~~ Administration Cabinet. ~~(Bylaw 21.7.6.1.3.3.1)~~	~~To review requests for waivers of all progress-toward-degree requirements set forth in Bylaw 14.4.3. (Bylaw 21.7.6.1.3.2.2)~~ Oversee the process for reviewing requests for waivers of the progress-toward-degree requirements and consider appeals of staff decisions related to waiver requests for which the committee has jurisdiction.
NCAA International Student Records Committee	The committee shall consist of ~~eight~~ six members including ~~three~~ two Division I representatives, ~~three~~two Division II representatives and two representatives who may be from either Division I or Division II. ~~and two ex-officio members, one of whom shall be the NCAA Eligibility Center's primary foreign-student records consultant. (Bylaw 21.6.3.1)~~	Assist in reviewing initial-eligibility standards for international students. ~~(Bylaw 21.6.3.2)~~
NCAA Student Records Review	The committee shall consist of nine members and shall be constituted as	Establish policies and procedures related to the review of a

Committee	follows: a. One admissions officer of a Division I or Division II institution; b. One staff member of a Division I or Division II institution or conference office; c. One representative from the Division I Academic Cabinet; d. One representative from the Division II Academic Requirements Committee; e. Four representatives from the secondary-school community; and f. One member selected at large from either the secondary-school community or a Division I or II institution or conference office.	prospective student-athlete's academic credentials and to determine the validity of a prospective student-athlete's credentials for the purpose of meeting initial-eligibility requirements.
NCAA High School Review Committee	The committee shall consist of nine members and shall be constituted as follows: a. One admissions officer of a Division I or Division II institution; b. One staff member of a Division I or Division II institution or conference office; c. One representative from the Division I Academic Cabinet; d. One representative from the Division II Academic Requirements Committee; e. Four representatives from the secondary-school community; and f. One member selected at large from either the secondary-school community or a Division I or II institution or conference office.	Establish policies and procedures related to the academic review of high schools and to determine the validity of a high school (e.g. core courses, curriculum, grades) for the purpose of meeting initial-eligibility requirement.

Members of all committees reporting to the cabinet are appointed by the NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet.

The Academic Cabinet approves policies and procedures for all committees reporting to the cabinet.

Selection of Cabinet Chair

The cabinet chair serves a two-year term as chair. The cabinet shall nominate two of its members to the Board of Directors for possible selection as the cabinet chair. The chair shall not be eligible for immediate re-election to that position or to the position of vice-chair. At least once in every three term rotation, there shall be an NCAA Football Championship Subdivision or Division I representative serving as chair.

A cabinet member is eligible for nomination for the position of chair if:

1. His or her cabinet term expiration date will permit service as chair for the two-year term, and

2. A particular subdivision must be represented due to the rotation requirement, he or she represents a conference in that division.

The process for identifying the two chair nominees is as follows:

In years in which a chair is to be selected, during or prior to the February meeting, cabinet members eligible to serve as chair shall nominate themselves or another cabinet member by communicating with the current chair. When nominating another cabinet member, the person nominating should confirm that the nominee would accept the chair position. The cabinet's Administrative Committee shall consider all the nominees and forward two names to the Board of Directors for consideration.

Agenda Development

1. Any cabinet member or conference may submit an agenda item for a full cabinet meeting. (Conferences not represented on the cabinet may submit agenda items only with the knowledge of their conference commissioner.) Agenda items should be sent to the cabinet's primary staff liaison at the NCAA national office. The staff will consult with the cabinet member or conference to determine how best to handle the item and what supplementary material should be provided, if any. The item will be placed on the agenda, with the name of the member or conference that submitted the item.

2. Items should be submitted eight weeks prior to the meeting, and the agenda and supplements will be placed on the NCAA Web site ~~mailed to cabinet members approximately three weeks~~ not later than 17 days prior to the meeting.

3. The full cabinet will receive agendas and supplements in advance of the meetings to ensure that each cabinet member has an opportunity to comment on issues being addressed by those groups. All actions, except where otherwise legislated (e.g., waivers) or determined by policy (e.g., referrals to other committees), are subject to review and final approval by the full cabinet.

Meeting Participation by Noncabinet Members

1. Generally, appearances before the full cabinet are by invitation only. Exceptions may be made by the cabinet chair or Administrative Committee on a case-by-case basis.

2. The chair can invite subject matter experts to participate in meetings based on topics included in the agenda.

Processing Committee Recommendations

The cabinet follows these policies in processing recommendations from committees that report to it:

1. Committees shall provide a written report from their meeting to the full cabinet (or designated subcommittee) prior to the meeting. These reports shall include any recommendations for which the committee requests full cabinet action.

2. Any change in a Division I bylaw that is recommended by a committee shall be presented to the full cabinet for discussion and action. If approved by the cabinet, the recommendation will be forwarded to the Legislative Council for review. In cases of cross-committee collaboration, recommendations may be forwarded to other relevant committees or cabinets within the governance structure.

3. The cabinet may elect to alter the recommendation, requiring a vote of the full cabinet.

4. If further deliberations are required, the cabinet may table the recommendation or refer it back to the committee for additional discussion.

Cross-Cabinet Consultations

For topics or agenda items under the purview of more than one committee or cabinet within the governance structure, joint review by two or more bodies may be necessary. Such topics and issues shall be handled on a case-by-case basis, as determined by the cabinet chair and/or the relevant chair(s). When issues are reviewed by multiple groups within the structure, such groups should work together to coordinate the communication of their recommendation(s).

Voting Procedures

The method of voting on issues considered by the cabinet shall be by show of hands, except for actions taken by the unanimous or obvious consent of the cabinet members present and voting.

Absences

The cabinet meets three times annually (February, June and September). If a cabinet member is unable to attend a cabinet meeting for a compelling reason, a conference may appoint an alternate for that individual. Alternates may attend, participate fully in and vote in any cabinet meeting or activity in which the regular member is unable to participate (excluding Administrative Committee meetings~~ and waiver subcommittees~~).

Conflict of Interest Policy

The NCAA is a voluntary Association comprised of colleges, universities, conferences and other organizations, and governed through a membership-led committee structure. Within the governance structure, committee members must carefully balance their responsibilities to their respective institutions and/or conferences with the obligation to advance the interests of the Association, the division, or the sport, and ultimately enhance the student-athlete experience. While the fiduciary obligations of committee members to their own institution, their conference, and to the Association ordinarily are not in conflict, it is recognized that as a representative membership organization, committee members' fiduciary obligations are first to their institution, second to their conference, and third to the Association. NCAA committee service involves important ethical and moral obligations. Committee integrity is critical to the decision-making process and includes trust, confidentiality and honesty in all issues and aspects of service and representation. NCAA committee members shall disclose any conflict or potential conflict between their respective personal, professional, institutional, conference, or business interests and the interests of the Association that may affect or otherwise threaten such integrity, in any and all actions taken by them on behalf of the Association, for committee evaluation under this Statement.

In addition to any fiduciary obligation to their institution and conference, committee members also have a fiduciary duty to the Association not to use knowledge or information obtained solely due to service on that committee to the disadvantage of the Association during the term of committee service. Further, a Committee member shall not participate in the committee's discussion or vote on any action that might bring direct or indirect personal financial benefit to the member or any organization (other than the member's institution or conference) in which the member is financially interested. A committee member should also not participate in a discussion or vote for which the member's institution or conference is to be accorded a special benefit beyond benefits shared with other institutions or conferences or is to receive a penalty or disqualification. A violation of either of the above rules by a member of the committee shall not invalidate the action taken by the committee if, following disclosure of the conflict of interest, the committee authorizes, ratifies or approves the action by a vote sufficient for the purpose, without counting the vote of the committee member with the conflict of interest, and the appropriate oversight body approves the action.

A committee member is responsible for advising the chair of any actual or potential conflicts of interest or obligations which he/she may have hereunder, and should recuse him/herself from participating in proceedings, as may be warranted by this policy. Abuse of one's position as a member of a committee may result in dismissal from that position. Where such abuse appears evident, a committee member will be notified by the committee chair and will have the opportunity to present a rebuttal or details of the situation. (August 2008 Executive Committee minutes)

Speaking Agent Policy

The president of the Association and the chair of the Executive Committee are the only individuals authorized to speak on behalf of the Association except as outlined below.

An individual representing a member institution or conference who speaks or opines on an Association issue only has the authority to express the view of that individual or the member institution or conference unless the individual has been designated by the Executive Committee of the Association as a speaking agent of the Association on that issue.

Committee chairs are hereby designated as speaking agents of their committees regarding issues within their committees' jurisdiction on which there is consensus, except that positions of advocacy on behalf of the committee or the Association to be communicated in writing or orally to persons or entities external to the Association must have prior approval by the NCAA Executive Committee or the president of the Association.

The president of the Association is hereby granted authority to designate additional speaking agents of the Association.

NCAA Division I

Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee

Policies and Procedures Manual

Effective July 1, 2010

Table of Contents

Legislated Duties of the Committee 1

Responsibilities of the Committee 1

Committee Composition and Reporting Lines 1

Committee Terms 1-2

Committee Organization 2

Committee Appointment Policies and Requirements 2-3

Resignation Policy 3

Selection of Committee Chair 4

Responsibilities 4-5

Teleconference and Voting Procedures 5-6

Decisions of the Committee 6-8

Outside Participation 8-9

Appeals 9

Reconsideration 10

Recusal 11

Confidentiality 11

Speaking Agent Policy 11

Federal Education Right to Privacy Act (FERPA) 12

Absences 12-13

Appendixes

Roster of Committee Members ..... APPENDIX A

Progress-Toward-Degree Directive ..... APPENDIX B

1. Legislated Duties of the NCAA Division I Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee (NCAA Bylaw 21.7.5.1.3.2.2).

The Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee shall be responsible for reviewing requests for waivers of the progress-toward-degree requirements in accordance with Bylaw 14.4.3 **and 14.1**.

2. Responsibilities of the Committee.

a. Review appeal cases and render decisions consistent with related legislation and policies and procedures.

b. On a regular basis, not later than quarterly, review cases decided by both the Academic and Membership Affairs staff and committee to determine if case decisions should continue to be included as case precedent.

c. On an annual basis, provide a report of all staff and committee decisions to the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet.

d. Study and make recommendations to the cabinet concerning the policies and procedures governing progress-toward-degree waivers.

e. Study and make recommendations to the cabinet, on request, regarding portions of the NCAA Division I legislation that relate to continuing eligibility.

3. Committee Composition and Reporting Lines.

Legislated composition and reporting lines (NCAA Constitution 4.9 and Bylaws 21.7.5.1.3.2.1 and 21.7.5.1.3.2).

The Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee shall consist of eight members appointed by the Academic Cabinet. The committee reports directly to the cabinet.

4. Committee Terms.

Legislated term of office (Bylaw 21.7.3.4).

Generally, committee members shall be appointed for one four-year term. The member's term of service shall commence on the first day of September following the member's

appointment. The committee member may be appointed to an additional term on the committee after three years have elapsed. An individual who has served two terms on the committee may not serve further on the committee. The chair of the committee may recommend to the cabinet that a committee member be replaced if he or she is not properly discharging his or her duties.

5. Committee Organization.

The committee will operate as one unit and will hear appeal requests for progress-toward-degree waivers involving any deficiency in accordance with Bylaw 14.4 (credit hour, grade-point average or percentage of degree) **and Bylaw 14.1.8 (full-time enrollment)**.

6. Committee Appointment Policies and Requirements.

Legislated appointment of committee members (Bylaw 21.7.3.3).

The Administrative Cabinet shall make committee appointments. When specified, committees that are subordinate to a cabinet (and their chairs) shall be appointed by that cabinet.

- **Appointment Policies:** The cabinet considers the following in making appointments to the Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee:

  a. Appropriate subdivisional representation.

  b. Consideration of an individual's position on campus or at the conference office.

  c. Individuals eligible for reappointment.

  d. Consideration of an individual's expertise/background in a particular area or field.

  ~~e. Consideration of an individual's expertise in learning disabilities and foreign student records.~~

f. A one-page information form has been developed on which each nominee provides information regarding institutional/conference position, experience, current or past NCAA committee service, education and qualifications. Submission of other documentation such as resumes is not requested. Such documents, if submitted, are not provided to the cabinet. No nominee will be considered by the cabinet unless the information form is submitted.

g. Nominations must be submitted by member conferences. Only nominations submitted in accordance with the deadline will be considered, except in a situation where no nominee meets the specific requirements for the vacancy. In that case, the cabinet may appoint an individual to fill the vacancy.

h. All nominations are to be sent to the coordinator responsible for committee administration at the NCAA national office and not directly to the members of the cabinet.

i. Replacements for a conference's original submission will be accepted only if the replacement is received by the chair of the cabinet at least seven-calendar days prior to the initial day of the cabinet's next regularly scheduled meeting.

j. A file of nominees for committee service shall be maintained in the national office for a one-year period, and such nominees should be considered for any vacancy occurring on the appropriate committee during that year.

k. The cabinet will solicit additional nominations when there are no eligible and qualified individuals nominated prior to the deadline.

7. <u>Resignation Policy</u>.

If a member of the Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee decides that he or she must resign from participating as a member of the committee, the committee member must provide written notice to the NCAA staff member responsible for coordinating Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers. Once the NCAA staff has received a written notice of

resignation the procedures to solicit and appoint a new member will be initiated and a new committee member will be appointed as soon as possible.

8. Selection of Committee Chair.

The chair of the committee shall be selected from among the committee members. Generally, the chair serves as chair for the remainder of his or her term on the committee. The Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee shall recommend appointment of a chair to the Academic Cabinet which shall appoint the chair.

9. Responsibilities.

a. Chair of the Full Committee:

(1) Chair administrative committee calls and any in-person committee meetings;

(2) Welcome and assist in transition and training of new committee members;

(3) When requested, review cases that do not meet the filing-deadline requirement to determine if the case should be considered by the committee; and

(4) Contact committee members who are not discharging their responsibilities and recommend to the Academic Cabinet that a member of the Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee be replaced if such a member is not discharging his or her duties.

b. Committee Members:

(1) Thoroughly review all case materials prior to the teleconference and be prepared to discuss and decide each case;

(2) Be present and participate on all scheduled teleconference calls;

(3) Communicate to staff if unable to participate on a particular teleconference call;

(4) Recuse themselves from cases when appropriate; and

(5) Adhere to the Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee policies and procedures.

c. Staff:

(1) Review and process/prepare all progress-toward-degree waiver cases;

(2) Render all initial decisions based on standard of review of progress-toward degree waivers issued by the cabinet (Appendix B);

(3) For case decisions appealed by a member institution, the staff will prepare the case in accordance with established guidelines for review by the committee; and

(4) Provide all information the committee needs. The staff shall present the case on a committee teleconference call. During its presentation, the staff shall provide a brief overview of the case, including the mitigating circumstances that the institution and/or student-athlete have raised and applicable case precedent. The staff will then answer questions. The staff will provide assistance to the committee but will not deliberate or determine any waiver appeal. The staff will provide the applicant institution with the result of the committee's decision as soon as reasonably possible, but not later than 24 hours after the decision.

10. Teleconference and Voting Procedures.

The committee shall meet via teleconference as needed. A quorum of more than 50 percent of the committee members present and eligible to vote is needed for the call to proceed. It is vital that all committee members be present on all calls to ensure the timely consideration of waiver appeals.

The committee chair is responsible for conducting the teleconference call and begins by asking for a motion to approve the minutes (the cases decided on the previous

teleconference) and the staff decisions, if any. Once the minutes and staff decisions are approved with any noted revisions, the chair proceeds to the cases for discussion, which are considered individually. The staff member who processed the case is present on the call to present the basic facts of the case. The chair then leads the discussion and calls for a vote.

Each case must be moved, seconded and a vote taken. The chair votes only in the event of a tie or if the chair is needed for a quorum. If a case involves a committee member's institution, or an institution from his or her conference, or feels that he or she must recuse himself or herself and the committee member is needed to establish a quorum, the committee member should move the case prior to discussing the case and then recuse himself or herself from discussion or voting on the case. The committee member should hang up to avoid participating in the discussion.

- **Decisions of the Committee:** The committee has the authority, pursuant to the authority provided to it by the Academic Cabinet (Bylaws **14.1.8.1.7, 14.1.8.2.7.2, 14.1.8.2.7.3, 14.1.8.2.7.4,** 14.4.3.4.3.1, 14.4.3.6, 14.4.3.7, 14.4.3.8 and 14.4.3.9) to hear, deliberate and decide all waivers of the progress-toward-degree requirements. After reviewing all information, the committee will render one of the following decisions:

  a. Approval: The committee believes that the student-athlete's academic record and/or demonstrated circumstances warrant a waiver of the normal application of the progress-toward-degree legislation. By approving the waiver, the committee is permitting the student-athlete to compete.

  b. Conditional approval of future deficiencies: The committee believes that the student-athlete's academic record and/or demonstrated circumstances warrant a conditional approval of the normal application of the progress-toward-degree legislation of a future designated deficiency. [A waiver decision may be conditionally approved, provided the student-athlete's academic-recovery plan is reasonable and demonstrates the student-athlete's ability to graduate within five years of initial collegiate enrollment.]

  c. Denial: The committee believes that the student-athlete's academic record and/or demonstrated circumstances do not warrant a waiver of the normal application of the progress-toward-degree legislation.

d. Partial approval: The committee believes that the student-athlete's academic record and/or demonstrated circumstances warrant a partial approval of the normal application of the progress-towards-degree legislation.

e. Table/Defer: The committee may table/defer a student-athlete's waiver due to inadequate or insufficient documentation. The case will be heard at the next available opportunity, and the committee will direct the staff to work with the institution to obtain the needed information. In its directive to the staff, the committee should indicate what information/documents need to be acquired. A case may be tabled for not more than two calls unless the committee agrees that it is unable to render a decision without the requested information. In no case will any waiver be tabled for more than four weeks (calls).

If an institution is unable to obtain the requested information within four weeks, it may request an extension from the chair of the committee. The request should include documentation of the institution's efforts to obtain the requested information. If the request is denied, the case shall be heard on the next available call. If the extension request is approved, the chair shall provide a deadline for the case to be heard.

f. Information to be considered: When deliberating the outcome of any progress-toward-degree waiver, the committee may consider any information submitted by the applicant institution and student-athlete relative to, or affected by, the student-athlete's institutional-academic record. This may include, but is not limited to:

(1) **Documented** extenuating/mitigating circumstances that may have contributed to the student-athlete's failure to satisfy the progress-toward-degree requirements;

(2) Documented misadvisement, nonadvisement and/or misapplication of progress-toward-degree regulations that may have contributed to the student-athlete's failure to satisfy progress-toward-degree requirements;

(3) Reasonable academic-recovery plan for the student-athlete;

(4) In cases of misadvisement, a reasonable institutional recovery plan indicating how the misadvisement, lack of advisement and/or misapplication of progress-toward-degree legislation will be avoided in the future.

(5) Official transcripts;

(6) Summer-school courses and grades;

(7) Degree-audit form/degree-completion plan;

(8) Letters of recommendation or support;

(9) Student-athlete's written comments;

(10) For waivers other than disability waivers, case precedent provided by the applicant institution; and

(11) For student-athletes with a disability, the committee must follow the guidelines as presented in Appendix B.

g. Outside participation: For those cases in which NCAA enforcement services is involved in the continuing eligibility of a prospective student-athlete, the following procedures shall be used. Institutional, legal, enforcement services and academic and membership affairs representatives may participate in a portion of the waiver proceeding; however, a total of three representatives may appear, including legal counsel. The student-athlete is permitted three participants, limited to the student-athlete, his or her parent or guardian and legal counsel. Academic and membership affairs staff shall have five minutes to present the case pursuant to normal waiver procedures. The institution, enforcement services and the student-athlete each have up to 10 minutes to present relevant facts and information. Progress-Toward-Degree Waiver Committee members are permitted to ask questions of any participants during the call. After the presentations, the institutional representatives, enforcement services staff, student-athlete and his or her representatives will leave the call. Only the committee members and academic and

membership affairs staff remain on the call for deliberation and decision. The staff provides assistance to the committee but do not deliberate or determine any waiver. The chair of the waiver committee shall have the authority to determine all other procedural issues that arise.

For cases in which an education-impacting disability is cited as mitigation, the NCAA disability consultant will be invited to participate on the call, and the following procedures shall be used. The staff member assigned the case will present the facts. Then the disability consultant may comment on the student-athlete's education-impacting disability and how it impacted his or her academic performance. Progress-Toward-Degree Waiver Committee members are permitted to ask questions of any participants during the call. After the presentations, the disability consultant will leave the call. Only the committee members and Academic and Membership Affairs staff remain on the call for deliberation and decision. The staff provides assistance to the committee but do not deliberate or determine any waiver. The chair of the waiver committee shall have the authority to determine all other procedural issues that arise.

h. Appeals~~/Reconsiderations~~: After the staff has acted on a progress-toward-degree waiver, the involved institution may appeal the decision to the Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee. Institutions must file notification of its intent to appeal the staff decision within 30 days from receipt of the written staff decision. Institutions may file an appeal for any reason.

Any request for appeal filed after 30 days must include an explanation of why the appeal was not filed within the prescribed time limit. The chair of the Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee shall determine whether any appeal filed after 30 days shall be heard.

Any relief provided by the staff (e.g., partially-approved waiver) in a waiver request that is appealed to the Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee may not be overturned.

The decisions of the Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee are final, binding and shall not be subject to further review by any other authority.

~~**11. Appeals Process.**~~

~~After the committee has acted on a progress-toward-degree waiver, the involved institution may appeal the decision to the Progress-Toward-Degree Waiver Appeals Subcommittee of the Academic Cabinet. The subcommittee determination shall be final, binding and conclusive and shall not be subject to further review, by any other authority.~~

~~The Management Council has authorized the subcommittee to hear all waiver appeals and render a decision on behalf of the cabinet.~~

~~All requests for an appeal of a committee decision must be submitted within 30 days of notification of the decision, and must be based on one of the following grounds:~~

~~a. The committee improperly applied NCAA legislation or official interpretations;~~

~~b. The committee deviated from approved procedures; or~~

~~c. The factual findings of the committee are clearly erroneous.~~

~~Any notification of appeal filed after 30 days must include an explanation of why the appeal was not filed within the prescribed time limit. The chair of the subcommittee shall determine whether any appeal filed after 30 days shall be heard.~~

12. Reconsideration.

After the staff/committee has acted on a progress-toward-degree waiver, the institution may request the staff/committee reconsider its decision if the institution submits new information that was not originally considered by the staff/committee. Cases with new/additional information may not be heard by the cabinet or waiver committee until the waivers staff has reviewed/considered the new information. **If the staff does not consider the additional information to be new, then the case will proceed as appealed.**

13. Recusal.

A committee member or Academic and Membership Affairs staff member shall recuse himself or herself from participating in proceedings (e.g., staffing a case or deliberating as a committee member) of a waiver case when he or she is directly connected with the involved institution, including but not limited to, a member of the committee member's institution or institution's conference. A committee or staff member with a personal relationship or institutional affiliation that reasonably would result in the appearance of bias or prejudice should refrain from participating in any manner in the processing of a waiver request. It is the responsibility of the committee or staff member to remove himself or herself if a conflict exists. Institutional objections to a committee or staff member participating in a review of a case should be raised with and resolved by the chair or the most senior member of the committee as soon as recognized, but will not be considered unless the concern is raised prior to the scheduled teleconference. Exceptions to the recusal policy may be granted by the chair or most senior member of the committee due to time constraints.

14. Confidentiality.

Committee members shall not communicate any information related to specific waiver cases to anyone other than NCAA staff or other committee members. Under no circumstances shall information related to a student's academic record or waiver be communicated with any other person (e.g., media representative, parent, member institution, conference office).

15. Speaking Agent Policy.

The NCAA speaking agent policy is as follows:

"The president of the Association and the chair of the NCAA Executive Committee are the only individuals authorized to speak on behalf of the Association except as outlined below.

"An individual representing a member institution or conference who speaks or opines on an Association issue only has the authority to express the view of that individual or the member institution or conference unless the individual has been designated by the

Executive Committee of the Association as a speaking agent of the Association on that issue. Committee chairs are hereby designated as speaking agents of their committees regarding issues within their committees' jurisdiction on the which there is consensus, except that positions of advocacy on behalf of the committee or the Association to be communicated in writing or orally to persons or entities external to the Association must have prior approval by the NCAA Executive Committee or the president of the Association. For purposes of this policy, 'committees' includes all NCAA committees, cabinets, boards, councils, subcommittees and special or ad hoc groups.

"The president of the Association is hereby granted authority to designate additional speaking agents of the Association."

Committee members are expected to adhere to this policy.

16. Federal Education Right to Privacy Act.

Pursuant to the Federal Education Right to Privacy Act (FERPA) regulations, each student-athlete whose institution is filing a waiver signs under the following statement:

"I give my consent to disclose only to authorized representatives of this institution, its athletics conference (if any) and the NCAA, any documents or information pertaining to my NCAA eligibility. Additionally, I give my consent to the NCAA to disclose personally identifiable information from my education records to a third party (including but not limited to the media) in order to explain the NCAA's decision regarding this waiver request, without such disclosure constituting a violation of my rights under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act."

17. Absences.

Legislated removal from committee (Bylaw 21.7.3).

The chair of the committee is authorized to recommend to the Management Council that a member be replaced if such member is not discharging the member's duties properly. In addition, a member who is absent from two consecutive meetings/teleconferences without reasons approved by the appointing authority (i.e., cabinet) shall be removed from the committee. For purposes of this committee, meetings are defined to include both in-person and teleconferences.

18. Additional Attendance Issues.

The processing of progress-toward-degree waivers is a very time-sensitive process. Student-athletes need timely decisions in order to practice and compete. The staff and committee work to ensure institutions receive waiver decisions as quickly as possible.

Since the committee make many of these waiver decisions, it is imperative that all committee members are present on each call. Lack of a committee quorum can result in decisions being delayed, which is not a desirable outcome.

There may be times that a committee member is unable to attend a call due to other commitments or circumstances beyond his or her control. However, if those circumstances arise, it is the responsibility of the committee member to inform the staff immediately so an alternate call may be scheduled, if needed.

Ms. Joyce Bell
Assistant Commissioner for Compliance
Northeast Conference
399 Campus Drive
Somerset, NJ 08873
Phone: 732/469-0440
Fax: 732/469-0744
E-mail: **jbell@northeastconference.org**

Dr. Tom Cody
Faculty Athletics Representative
Western Illinois University
Educational and Interdisciplinary Studies
115n Horrabin Hall
Phone: 309/298-1229
Fax:
E-mail: **tj-cody@wiu.edu**

Mr. Chris Helms
Associate Athletics Director for Olympic Sports
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
330 Lane Stadium – West Side (0389)
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
Phone: 540/231-6165
Fax: 540/231-9848
E-mail: **helmsc@vt.edu**

Dr. Jesse James
Faculty Athletics Representative
Tennessee State University
3500 John A. Merritt Blvd.
Gentry Center
Nashville, TN 37209-1561
Phone: 615/965-5605
Fax: 615/963-5594
Email: **jjames@tnstate.edu**

Ms. Dawn Martinez
Assistant Director of Athletics
University of New Mexico
Athletics Compliance
Colleen J. Maloof Admin. Bldg.
1 University of New Mexico
MSC11 6340
Albuquerque, NM, 87131
Phone: 505/925-5835
Fax: 505/925-5845
E-mail: **dsheyka@unm.edu**

Mr. Scott Lazenby
Associate Athletic Director for Compliance
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi
6300 Ocean Drive, Unit 5719
Corpus Christi, Texas 78412
Phone: 361/825-2843
Fax: 361/825-3218
E-mail: **scott.lazenby@tamucc.edu**

Mr. Daniel McCarthy
Director of Compliance
University of South Alabama
1209 Mitchell Center
Mobile, AL 36688
Phone: 251/445-7887
Fax: 251/460-6505
Email: **dmccarthy@usouthal.edu**

Ms. Jody Sykes
Assistant Athletics Director, Compliance
University of Louisville
2100 South Floyd Street, SAC 2nd Floor
Louisville, Kentucky 40292
Phone: 502/852-8871
Fax: 502/852-0079
Email: **jody.sykes@louisville.edu**

APPENDIX B

NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet
Directive Regarding the Standard of Review
of Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers

1. Background.

Effective fall 2003 and thereafter, an NCAA Division I student-athlete enrolling in his or her first full-time term of collegiate attendance is required to complete increased minimum progress-toward-degree requirements to earn eligibility for competition. In anticipation of waiver requests seeking relief from these standards, the NCAA Division I Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet Subcommittee on Continuing Eligibility drafted this directive to provide guidance to the NCAA academic and membership affairs staff and the NCAA Division I Committee on Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers as outlined below, with the understanding that both entities may use discretion in the application of this directive. Further, exceptions to this directive may be applied by the staff, the committee and/or the cabinet when warranted by the circumstances of a specific case.

This directive is now reviewed annually by the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet.

2. Guiding Principle.

Institutions seeking a progress-toward-degree waiver on behalf of a student-athlete for relief of NCAA Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(a) (24/36 credit hours), 14.4.3.2 (40/60/80 percentage of degree), 14.4.3.2.1 (33/50/67 percentage of five-year degree), 14.4.3.3.1 (90/95/100 grade-point average), 14.4.3.1-(b) (18/27 hours earned during regular academic year), 14.4.3.1-(c) (six hours earned per academic term) and/or 14.1.10.2 (eligibility for postseason competition—between terms) must present evidence of compelling mitigating circumstances along with a reasonable expectation for the student-athlete to recover academically for the waiver request to be granted. Such waivers will be reviewed under the presumption of a good-faith effort on the part of the student-athlete and his or her institution toward completion of the student-athlete's collegiate degree within five years of the student-athlete's full-time enrollment, unless and until circumstances surrounding the waiver request indicate otherwise.

Additionally, institutions seeking a waiver of full-time enrollment for a student-athlete pursuant to Bylaws 14.1.8.1.8 (12-hour requirement for practice) and 14.1.8.2.7 (12-hour requirement for competition) must present evidence of specific mitigating circumstances as outlined by the legislation along with a reasonable expectation for the student-athlete to maintain appropriate academic progress as dictated by progress-toward-degree

legislation for the waiver request to be granted. Such waivers will be reviewed under the presumption of a good-faith effort on the part of the student-athlete and his or her institution toward completion of the student-athlete's collegiate degree within five years of the student-athlete's full-time enrollment, unless and until circumstances surrounding the waiver request indicate otherwise.

3. Threshold for Review.

The student-athlete's academic record, including any deficiencies, in existence at the time of the waiver shall be reviewed through analysis of the student-athlete's cumulative total of quality points (as determined by the multiplication of grades and credits earned). If the analysis of the student-athlete's quality-point analysis total predicts he or she has less than 25 percent chance of graduating, then the waiver shall be denied by staff for failure to meet the threshold for review of a progress-toward-degree waiver case.

4. Staff Approvals.

The staff is granted the authority to approve or conditionally approve waivers of the progress-toward-degree requirement(s) based on a review of some or all of the following information:

a. A quality-point analysis indicating the student-athlete has a greater than 50 percent chance of graduating within five years of initial full-time collegiate enrollment;

b. A reasonable academic-recovery plan, signed by both the student-athlete and an institutional representative; and

c. Documented compelling mitigating circumstances surrounding the waiver request (Section No. 7).

The staff is granted the authority to approve requests for less than full-time enrollment (not less than nine credit hours) based on a review of some or all of the following information:

a. A quality-point analysis indicating the student-athlete has a greater than 50 percent chance of graduating within five years of initial full-time collegiate enrollment;

b. Documented compelling mitigating circumstances surrounding the waiver request (Section Nos. 7 and 9); and

c. Case precedent as established previously by the Academic/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet Subcommittee on Continuing Eligibility and now by the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet Subcommittee on Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers.

5. Staff Denials.

The staff is granted the authority to deny waivers of the progress-toward-degree requirement(s) based on a review of the following information:

a. A 25 percent (or lower) chance of graduation, based on the student-athlete's quality-point analysis;

b. The absence of mitigating circumstances (Section No. 7);

c. Any previous reviews of the student-athlete's academic progress through the progress-toward-degree waiver process; and

d. Clear case precedent warranting denial of the appeal.

6. Documentation.

Institutions are required to provide the following supporting documentation with waiver requests:

a. Standard documentation (to be provided unless staff indicates otherwise):

(1) A completed progress-toward-degree waiver application;

(2) Letters or statements from the institution and student-athlete explaining the reasons for the deficiency;

(3) Evidence of the compelling mitigating circumstance(s) supporting the waiver request;

(4) A copy of the student-athlete's current official transcript and copies of official transcripts from any previous institutions (print-screen transcripts will not be accepted); and

(5) An academic-recovery plan, designed by the institution, that demonstrates how the student-athlete's individual efforts, course schedule planning (including consideration of academic- and athletics-related time demands) and use of academic resources (including appropriate accommodations for any education-impacting disability) will correct his or her academic eligibility deficiencies. An acceptable academic-recovery plan also will demonstrate that the student-athlete is able to graduate within five years of full-time enrollment. The plan must be signed by both the student-athlete and an institutional representative with academic oversight for the student-athlete.

b. To be provided if needed (or if requested by NCAA staff) to support waiver request:

(1) Description of the designated degree as found in the academic catalog;

(2) Degree audit;

(3) Current course enrollment list;

~~(4) An academic-recovery plan, designed by the institution, that demonstrates how the student-athlete's individual efforts, course schedule planning (including consideration of academic- and athletics-related time demands) and use of academic resources (including appropriate accommodations for any education-impacting disability) will correct his or her academic eligibility deficiencies. An acceptable academic-recovery plan also will demonstrate that the student-athlete is able to graduate within five years of full-time enrollment. The plan must be signed by both the student-athlete and an institutional representative with academic oversight for the student-athlete.~~

(5) An institutional-recovery plan in cases of misadvisement or lack of advisement (Section No. 8); and

(6) Documentation of an education-impacting disability impacting the student-athlete's academic performance (Section No. 9).

7. Mitigating Circumstances.

a. Circumstances which may be considered as compelling mitigating circumstances and supported by objective documentation shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) Hardship;

(a) Situations clearly supported by contemporaneous documentation, which indicate that the student-athlete was unable to complete the progress-toward-degree requirement as a result of significant physical or mental circumstances suffered by the student-athlete, family member or others on whom the student-athlete is dependent;

(b) Extreme financial difficulties as a result of a specific event (e.g., layoff, death in the family) experienced by the student-athlete or by an individual on whom the student-athlete is legally dependent, which prohibit the student-athlete from completing the progress-toward-degree requirement(s). The circumstances must be clearly supported by objective documentation (e.g., decree of bankruptcy, proof of termination) and must be beyond the control of the student-athlete or the individual on whom the student-athlete is legally dependent; and

(c) Natural disasters (e.g., earthquakes, floods);

(2) Restrictive degree programs;

(3) Restrictive transfers;

(4) Military service, Peace Corps or selective service commission or foreign equivalent, official church mission or pregnancy;

(5) Participation in athletics activities as defined by Bylaw 14.2.1.4 (Pan American, World Championships, World Cup, etc.); or

(6) Other unforeseen events and/or circumstances beyond the student-athlete's control.

b. Circumstances that will not be considered as compelling mitigating circumstances may include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) Unreasonable reliance by a student-athlete on misinformation from an institutional staff member (e.g., misadvisement) unless accompanied by the documented assertion of misadvisement (Section No. 8); or

(2) Failure to follow an academic-recovery plan submitted with a previously approved waiver of the progress-toward-degree requirements (which left the student-athlete deficient for future eligibility certification).

8. Misadvisement.

a. Staff approvals.

The staff is granted the authority to approve waivers of the progress-toward-degree requirement(s) that involve the assertion of misadvisement, lack of advisement or misapplication of progress-toward-degree rules based on review of some or all of the following information:

(1) Documented misadvisement;

(2) Reasonable reliance by the student-athlete on the misadvisement;

(3) The student-athlete's deficiency was the result of his or her reliance on the misadvisement;

(4) Reasonable academic-recovery plan for the student-athlete; and

(5) Reasonable institutional-recovery plan **to avoid a similar situation occurring in the future.**

b. Documentation of misadvisement.

(1) A written statement of explanation from the person or persons responsible for providing erroneous information or the individual's supervisor. This statement needs to summarize the information given to the student-athlete.

In the event the responsible individual is unavailable to submit a statement, the institution must submit a statement from the individual's supervisor including an explanation as to (e.g., no longer employed, etc.).

(2) If available, contemporaneous documentation demonstrating misadvice (e.g., notes, phone logs).

(3) A written statement from the student-athlete in question demonstrating whether the student-athlete, in good faith, relied on the erroneous information to his or her detriment. The statement should include a chronology of events.

(4) A written statement from the institution regarding its actions to educate the student-athlete about the progress-toward-degree requirements.

c. Institutional-recovery plan.

(1) Educational initiatives to be conducted by the institution relative to the student-athlete and personnel who have a role in providing academic advisement to student-athletes.

(2) Development of corrective actions to ensure that all student-athletes will receive proper academic advisement relative to the evaluation of each student-athlete's degree program and course selection and the evaluation of the student-athlete's transcript and degree audit to ensure courses are acceptable for satisfying the progress-toward-degree requirements.

(3) The plan must be signed by the athletics representative with academic oversight for student-athletes, the director of athletics and the faculty athletics representative.

9. Education-Impacting Disabilities.

a. If requesting a less than full-time enrollment waiver for a student-athlete with an education-impacting disability, written documentation from an appropriate institutional academic authority (e.g., registrar) that the institution has defined the student-athlete's full-time enrollment to be less than 12 hours to compensate for the student-athlete's disability. Note the staff is limited to approving requests for less than full-time enrollment for not less than nine credit hours. Requests for

enrollment in less than nine credit hours must be made directly to the Division I Progress-Toward-Degree Waiver Committee.

b. A written copy of the institution's policies and curriculum guidelines applicable to all students with education-impacting disabilities. (Note: The Progress-Toward-Degree Waiver Committee will not consider appeals in cases in which the institution does not have an established written policy.)

c. A summary of support services and other accommodations provided by the applicant institution designed to assist student-athletes with education-impacting disabilities, in general, and the student-athlete for whom the waiver is being sought, in particular. This summary normally would be expected to include accommodations provided by the institution with respect to the student-athlete's athletics responsibilities, as well as academic and other support services provided and any institutional accommodations related to adjustments of minimum performance requirements.

d. Full and complete documentation of the student-athlete's education-impacting disability including:

(1) A current diagnosis of the disability, including the results of specific measures or tests that formed the basis of the diagnoses. If specific circumstances of the case indicate that this requirement is unnecessary, a prior diagnosis may be acceptable. (Note: The NCAA staff or committee reserves the right to request a second opinion or diagnosis.); and

(2) A copy of the student-athlete's last individual education plan, if applicable.

e. Contemporaneous medical documentation provided by an individual who is qualified and licensed to diagnose and treat the particular illness (e.g., psychiatrist, psychologist) must be submitted on behalf of student-athletes with psychological or mental health issues (e.g. depression, bipolar disorder).

f. An institution filing a progress-toward-degree waiver for a student-athlete with an education-impacting disability must identify if it previously filed a disability initial-eligibility waiver request for the same student-athlete.

- If the institution previously submitted a disability initial-eligibility waiver request for the student-athlete, the institution must provide a summary of the support services and/or accommodations that the student-athlete has used at the institution. If the support services and/or accommodations provided differ from the support services and/or accommodations that were described in the student-athlete's initial-eligibility waiver request, the institution must provide a written statement explaining why the support services and/or accommodations changed. If the student-athlete did not use any support services and/or accommodations, the institution must provide a statement explaining why the student-athlete did not use available support services and/or accommodations.

NCAA Division I

Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee

Policies and Procedures Manual

Effective: 09-15-2009

Table of Contents

Legislated Duties of the Committee 1

Responsibilities of the Committee 1

Committee Composition and Reporting Lines 1

Committee Terms.....2

Committee Organization 2-3

Committee Appointment and Resignation Policies and Requirements 3-4

Selection of Committee and Subcommittee Chairs 5

Responsibilities 5-6

Teleconference and Voting Procedures 7

Staff Authority and Review Process 7

Decisions of the Staff and/or Subcommittee 8-10

Information to be Considered 11-13

Outside Participation..... 13-14

Appeals/Reconsiderations..... 14-15

Recusal.....15

Confidentiality 15

Conflict of Interest 16-17

Speaking Agent Policy.....17

Federal Education Right to Privacy Act (FERPA) 17-18

Absences 18

Legislated Duties of the NCAA Division I Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee (NCAA Bylaw 21.7.6.1.3.1.1).

The committee shall be responsible for reviewing requests for waivers of the initial-eligibility requirements in accordance with Bylaw 14.3.1.5.

Responsibilities of the Committee.

1. Review cases and render decisions consistent with related legislation and policies and procedures.

2 On an annual basis review and make recommendations to the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet regarding minimum threshold requirements for filing an initial-eligibility waiver.

3. On an annual basis review cases decided by both the staff and subcommittees during the previous academic year to determine if case decisions should continue to be included as case precedent.

4. On an annual basis provide a report of all staff and subcommittee decisions to the cabinet.

5. Study and make recommendations to the cabinet concerning the policies and procedures governing initial-eligibility waivers.

6. Study and make recommendations to the cabinet, on request, regarding portions of the NCAA Division I legislation that relate to initial eligibility.

Committee Composition and Reporting Lines.

Legislated Composition and Reporting Lines (NCAA Constitution 4.9 and Bylaws 21.7.6.1.3.1 and 21.7.6.1.3.1.1)

The Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee shall consist of 20 members appointed by the Academic Cabinet with no subdivision having more than 50 percent representation. The committee reports directly to the cabinet.

Committee Terms.

Legislated Term of Office (Bylaw 21.7.6.1.3.1.2)

Generally, committee members shall be appointed for one four-year term. The member's term of service shall commence on the first day of January following the member's appointment. The committee member may be appointed to an additional term on the committee after three years have elapsed. An individual who has served two terms on the committee may not serve further on the committee.

Committee Organization.

Each committee member will be appointed to one subcommittee, and generally serve the duration of their term on the appointed subcommittee. Each subcommittee generally consists of five members from the Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee.

- **Subcommittees.**

  The following subcommittees facilitate the work of the committee:

Subcommittee	Duty
NCAA Division I Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee Core-Course Subcommittee	Review request for waivers of the initial-eligibility requirements in accordance with Bylaw 14.3.1.5 for student-athletes who have a core-course deficiency.
NCAA Division I Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee Education-Impacting Disability Subcommittee	Review request for waivers of the initial-eligibility requirements in accordance with Bylaw 14.3.1.5 for student-athletes who have a documented disability and who do not meet the initial-eligibility requirements.
NCAA Division I Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee International-Student Subcommittee	Review request for waivers of the initial-eligibility requirements in accordance with Bylaw 14.3.1.5 for student-athletes who have graduated from a nondomestic (international) secondary-school system and who do not meet the initial-eligibility requirements.

Subcommittee	Duty
NCAA Division I Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee Transcript-Change/Grade-Point Average Subcommittee	Review request for waivers of the initial-eligibility requirements in accordance with Bylaw 14.3.1.5 for student-athletes who have a deficiency relative to a qualifying test score, grade-point average and/or involve a change to the academic record that was received by the NCAA Eligibility Center.

The following administrative committee facilitates the work of the committee:

Administrative Committee	Each subcommittee chair shall serve as a member of the Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee's Administrative Committee. One of the subcommittee chairs shall serve as the chair of the Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee. The chair of the waivers committee shall serve as the chair of the Administrative Committee.

Committee Appointment and Resignation Policies and Requirements.

Legislated appointment of committee members (Bylaw 21.7.6.1.3.1.1)

The NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet makes appointments as needed each year to fill vacancies that occur. The Administration Cabinet fills these appointments. A motion and approval is required by the full Administration Cabinet to confirm appointments to the committee.

1. **Appointment Policies.** The Administration Cabinet considers the following in making appointments to the Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee:

a. Appropriate sub-divisional representation.

b. Consideration of an individual's position on campus or at the conference office.

c. Individuals eligible for re-appointment.

d. Consideration of an individual's expertise/background in a particular area or field.

e. Consideration of an individual's expertise in education-impacting disabilities and international student records.

2. <u>Appointment Procedures</u>.

a. A one page information form has been developed on which each nominee provides information regarding institutional/conference position, experience, current or past NCAA committee service, education and qualifications. Submission of other documentation such as resumes is not requested. Such documents, if submitted, are not provided to the Administration Cabinet. No nominee will be considered by the Administration Cabinet unless the information form is submitted.

b. Nominations must be submitted by member conferences. Only nominations submitted in accordance with the deadline will be considered, except in a situation where no nominee meets the specific requirements for the vacancy. In that case, the Administration Cabinet may appoint an individual to fill the vacancy.

c. All nominations are to be sent to the coordinator responsible for committee administration at the NCAA national office and not directly to the members of the Administration Cabinet.

d. Replacements for a conference's original submission will be accepted only if the replacement is received by the chair of the Administration Cabinet at least seven calendar days prior to the initial day of the cabinet's next regularly scheduled meeting.

e. A file of nominees for committee service shall be maintained in the national office for a one-year period and such nominees should be considered for any vacancy occurring on the appropriate committee during that year.

f. The Administration Cabinet will solicit additional nominations when there are no eligible and qualified individuals nominated prior to the deadline.

3. <u>Resignation Policy</u>.

- If a member of the Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee decides that he or she must resign from participating as a member of the committee, the committee member must provide written notice to the NCAA staff member responsible for coordinating Division I Initial-Eligibility Waivers. Once the NCAA staff has received a written notice of resignation the procedures to solicit and appoint a new member will be initiated and a new committee member will be appointed as soon as possible.

Selection of Committee and Subcommittee Chairs.

Committee Chair.

The chair of the committee shall be selected from among the subcommittee chairs. Generally, the chair serves as chair for the remainder of his or her term on the committee. The Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee Administrative Committee shall recommend appointment of a chair to the Academic Cabinet, which shall appoint the chair.

Subcommittee Chairs.

Each subcommittee shall solicit nominations from its members and shall recommend to the Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee Administrative Committee one member to serve as the chair. The Administrative Committee shall appoint all subcommittee chairs. Generally, the subcommittee chairs shall serve as chair for the remainder of his or her term on the subcommittee.

Responsibilities.

1. Chair of the Full Committee.

a. Chair administrative committee calls and in-person committee meetings; and

b. Recommend to the NCAA Division I Management Council that a member of the waivers committee be replaced if such a member is not discharging his or her duties.

2. Subcommittee Chair.

a. Conduct teleconferences and meetings of the subcommittee;

b. Recommend selection of new subcommittee chair;

c. Welcome and assist in transition and training of new subcommittee members;

d. When requested, review cases that do not meet minimum threshold to determine if the case should be considered by the subcommittee; and

e. Contact subcommittee members who are not discharging their responsibilities and recommend to the waivers committee chair that a member of his or her subcommittee be replaced if such member is not discharging his or her duties.

3. Subcommittee Members.

a. Thoroughly review all case materials prior to the teleconference and be prepared to discuss and decide each case.

b. Be present and participate on all scheduled teleconference calls.

c. Communicate to staff if unable to participate on a particular teleconference call.

d. Recuse themselves from cases when appropriate.

e. Adhere to the Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee policies and procedures.

4. NCAA Staff.

a. The staff shall review and process/prepare all initial-eligibility waivers cases.

b. The staff shall render an initial decision for all initial-eligibility waiver cases ~~except cases involving a student with a disability~~ based on the guidelines set forth in the staff review process outlined in this document. ~~For those cases the staff is not authorized to decide (i.e., partial approval and denials of disability waivers) it will prepare the case in accordance with established guidelines for review by the respective subcommittee~~.

c. Provide all information a subcommittee needs to conduct an appeal teleconference.

d. The staff shall present the case on a subcommittee appeal teleconference. During its presentation, the staff shall provide a brief overview of the case, including the mitigating circumstances that the institution and/or student-athlete have raised and applicable case precedent.

e. The staff shall answer any questions regarding the facts of the waiver case and subcommittee policy and procedure, or any questions regarding the subcommittee's deliberation or decision.

f. The staff shall provide the applicant institution with the result of the subcommittee's decision as soon as reasonably possible, but not later than 24 hours after the decision.

Teleconference and Voting Procedures.

Generally, each subcommittee shall meet via teleconference once per week at an established time or as needed. A quorum of more than 50 percent of the subcommittee members present and eligible to vote is needed for the call to proceed. It is vital that all subcommittee members be present on all calls to ensure the timely consideration of waiver appeals.

The subcommittee chair is responsible for conducting the conference call and begins by asking for a motion to approve the minutes (the previous week's cases) and the staff decisions, if any. Once the minutes and staff decisions are approved with any noted revisions, the chair proceeds to the cases for discussion, which are considered individually.

Each case must be moved and seconded, and a vote taken. The chair votes only in the event of a tie or if the chair is needed for a quorum. If a case involves a subcommittee member's institution or an institution from his or her conference or the subcommittee member feels that he or she must recuse himself or herself and the subcommittee member is needed to establish a quorum, the subcommittee member should move the case prior to discussing the case and then recuse himself or herself from discussion or voting on the case.

Staff Authority and Review Process.

The NCAA staff has the authority and is expected to render a decision for all initial-eligibility waiver cases.~~, except for those cases involving a student with an education impacting disability~~.

In special cases in which the student-athlete clearly meets the intent of the initial-eligibility requirements legislation, but is not determined to be a qualifier by the Eligibility Center, the staff has the authority to issue a decision without the member institution filing an initial-eligibility waiver. The staff would approve such cases based on case precedent and reasonable judgment. The subcommittee will periodically review all such staff decisions and maintains the authority to archive case precedent if it believes the staff made an erroneous decision. In such cases the decision would remain in effect, but the case precedent would be archived.

All staff decisions not based on case precedent will be based on the following criteria:

1. Academic readiness of the prospective student-athlete;

2. Mitigating circumstances and whether the mitigating circumstances were within the control of the prospective student-athlete; and

3. Presence of an NCAA, Eligibility Center or high school/school district procedure preventing fulfillment of the initial-eligibility requirements.

Decisions of the Staff and/or Subcommittee.

After reviewing all information the staff and/or subcommittee will render one of the following decisions:

1. **Approval.** The student-athlete's academic record and/or demonstrated circumstances warrant a waiver of the normal application of the initial-eligibility legislation. Once the waiver is approved, the student-athlete is permitted to compete, practice and receive institutional financial aid including athletically related financial aid during his or her first year of collegiate enrollment. In addition, the student-athlete is permitted the opportunity to participate in four seasons of competition.

2. **Denial.** The student-athlete's academic record and/or demonstrated circumstances do not warrant a waiver of the normal application of the initial-eligibility legislation. The student-athlete will be responsible to follow all applicable legislative restrictions (e.g., if a student-athlete is a nonqualifier, he or she would not be permitted to practice, compete or receive institutional financial aid including athletically related financial aid during his or her first year of residence at the intercollegiate institution).

3. **Partial Approval.** (13 core-course standard) The student-athlete's academic record and/or demonstrated circumstances warrant a partial approval of the normal application of the initial-eligibility requirements under the 13 core-course standard. Once the waiver is partially approved, the student-athlete is declared a partial qualifier and permitted to receive institutional financial aid including athletically related financial aid and practice only on campus or at the institution's regular practice facility, but he or she may not compete during the first academic year in residence. Pursuant to Bylaw 14.3.1.5, the subcommittee (and staff) may elect to further limit what a student-athlete may receive, in that the subcommittee may elect to not allow the student-athlete to receive aid or practice during his or her first academic year in residence.

4. **Partial Approval.** (14 or 16 core-course standard) The student-athlete's academic record and/or demonstrated circumstances warrant a partial approval of the normal application of the initial-eligibility requirements for those student-athletes under the 14 or 16 core-course standard. Once the waiver is partially approved, the student-athlete is allowed to practice only on campus or at the institution's regular practice facility and/or receive institutional financial aid including athletically related financial aid during his or her first academic year in residence.

5. **Retest.** If the staff or subcommittee believes it is warranted, it may allow a student-athlete the opportunity to take the SAT or ACT exam on the next available administration of the exam, even if the test date is after the student-athlete's initial date of full-time collegiate enrollment. In addition to allowing a student-athlete the opportunity to retake

the SAT or ACT exam, this may permit a student-athlete's waiver to be approved if the student-athlete receives a qualifying test score.

- **ACT/SAT Retest Procedures.** If the subcommittee provides a student-athlete with the ability to retake the ACT or SAT test, the following procedure will be followed:

  (1) The subcommittee will indicate the result the retest may have on the student-athlete's waiver. (e.g., if a qualifying test score is achieved the student-athlete's waiver will be approved.) Additionally, the subcommittee will indicate whether a qualifying test score must be achieved with a single administration or if the scores from the test can be combined with previous test scores.

  (2) The subcommittee will indicate any specific requirements under which the retest must be administered (e.g., nonstandard administration).

  (3) The NCAA academic and membership affairs staff shall notify the Eligibility Center of any student-athletes who have been granted by a subcommittee the opportunity to retake the ACT and/or SAT exam.

  (4) The academic and membership affairs staff shall notify the applicant institution in the decision letter all conditions and potential results of the waiver based on the test result set forth by the subcommittee as requested. Additionally, the academic and membership affairs staff will inform the institution that the results from the retest must be submitted to the national office and to the Eligibility Center. The Eligibility Center will notify the NCAA staff that the test scores have been received and will request whether it is permitted to use the scores and the result the score has on the waiver (e.g., approve, deny).

  (5) The academic and membership affairs staff will notify the institution of the status of the waiver (no waiver is approved until the institution has received notification from the staff) and will update the waivers database and resubmit the waiver coversheet to be approved by the respective subcommittee.

  (6) If the student-athlete does not achieve a qualifying test score, the institution will be informed that the waiver may be reconsidered by the subcommittee if the test results will reduce the student-athlete's

deficiency. The notice of reconsideration must be submitted by the applicant institution within five days of notification from the NCAA.

6. **Table/Defer.** The staff or subcommittee may table/defer a student-athlete's waiver due to inadequate or insufficient documentation. The case will be heard at the next available opportunity. If tabled by a subcommittee, the subcommittee will direct the NCAA staff to work with the institution to obtain the needed information. In its directive to the NCAA staff, the subcommittee should indicate what information/documents need to be acquired. A case may be tabled for not more than two calls unless the subcommittee agrees that it is unable to render a decision without the requested information. In no case will any waiver be tabled for more than four weeks (calls).

If an institution is unable to obtain the requested information within four weeks it may request an extension from the chair of the subcommittee. The request should include documentation of the institution's efforts to obtain the requested information. If the request is denied the case shall be heard on the next available call. If the extension request is approved, the chair shall provide a deadline for the case to be heard.

7. **Review Minimum Threshold.** When the student-athlete's deficiency is greater than the established threshold value established by the Academic Cabinet, the NCAA staff has the authority to make decisions regarding application of minimum threshold requirements if the circumstances of the waiver are such that the waiver likely would be approved or clearly should be denied.

a. If the staff determines that the waiver would likely be approved, the waiver should be processed in the same manner as a waiver that met minimum threshold standards.

b. If the staff determines that the waiver would likely be denied, the staff shall inform the applicant institution, in writing, that the waiver was denied for failing to meet the minimum threshold requirements. The applicant institution, on receipt of notification from the NCAA staff, may request, in writing, that the chair of the appropriate initial-eligibility waivers subcommittee review the case to determine if the subcommittee will review the staff's denial of the case. The subcommittee is not required to review any case that does not meet minimum threshold requirements, and the chair's decision is final.

c. In cases in which the staff cannot clearly approve or deny the waiver, the staff may consult with the appropriate subcommittee chair to determine whether the waiver should be reviewed by the entire subcommittee. The subcommittee is not required to review any case that does not meet minimum threshold requirements, and the chair's decision is final.

Information to be Considered.

When deliberating the outcome of any initial-eligibility waiver, the staff or subcommittee may consider any information submitted by the applicant institution and student-athlete relative to or affected by the student-athlete's secondary school academic record. This may include, but is not limited to:

1. Secondary-school academic record;

2. SAT and/or ACT scores;

3. Extenuating/mitigating circumstances that may have contributed to the student-athlete's failure to satisfy NCAA Division I initial-eligibility requirements;

4. Letters of recommendation or support;

5. Student-athlete's written comments;

6. For waiver other than disability waivers, case precedent provided by the applicant institution and/or staff; and

7. For student-athletes with a disability, the subcommittee must follow the applicable guidelines.

Although the subcommittee may consider documentation relative to the student-athlete's potential to be successful at a collegiate institution, it cannot consider coursework completed as either a part-time or full-time student at a collegiate institution, unless that coursework was acceptable as work that could be used to satisfy initial-eligibility requirements.

1. Information Related to Misadvisement and/or Misapplication of Initial-Eligibility Rules. An institution should demonstrate that a prospective student-athlete relied, in good faith, on incorrect information given by someone who specifically had authority to do so and who claims responsibility for his or her actions. The institution's chancellor or president is also put on notice regarding the actions of the athletics department staff and provides information related to the steps the institution is taking to rectify the situation. Additionally, the institution is required to put procedures in place to avoid such situations in the future, which benefits prospective student-athletes.

a. The institution must submit a written statement of explanation from the person or persons responsible for providing erroneous information. This statement needs to summarize the information given to the prospective student-athlete.

b. If available, contemporaneous documentation demonstrating the misadvice (e.g., notes, phone logs).

c. A written statement from the student-athlete in question demonstrating whether the prospective student-athlete, in good faith, relied on the erroneous information to his or her detriment.

d. A written statement from the institution regarding its actions in educating the prospective student-athlete and high-school personnel about the initial-eligibility requirements.

Additionally, if the misinformation or misadvisement was provided by institutional personnel, the institution must submit a written plan regarding the steps being taken to avoid such problems in the future. Such a plan may include, but is not limited to:

a. Education sessions with coaches and other personnel who have a role in counseling prospective student-athletes.

b. Early placement of prospective student-athletes on the Institutional Request List to identify potential deficiencies early.

c. Work with a prospective student-athlete's high school to obtain necessary records for certification.

d. No sole reliance on other entities (e.g., high school) for information.

e. Careful evaluation of the prospective student-athlete's transcript to ensure that courses are acceptable and compare courses to the high school's list of NCAA-approved core courses.

f. Review prospective student-athlete's class schedule to ensure the he or she is taking courses to fulfill core-course distribution.

g. Encourage the prospective student-athlete to take SAT and/or ACT in order to meet the initial-eligibility index.

If an institution files a second waiver citing misadvisement, the institution must submit a letter regarding the reasons the plan was not successful. Additionally, the chancellor or president of the institution will be informed in writing. The letter will include a chronology of actions by the individual who provided the misadvice.

2. **Grade Eight Waiver Policy.** Grade eight courses may be accepted without further verification from the high school, provided the following conditions are present:

   a. The grade eight course appears on the high school transcript;

   b. The transcript shows a grade and credit for the course;

   c. The course title on the transcript matches the course title on the high school's list of approved core courses; and

   d. The prospective student-athlete has made appropriate progress to the next level of a particular discipline where a progression is typically seen (e.g., if Algebra I is taken in grade eight, the transcript must show that the individual progressed to a higher level of mathematics in grades nine through 12).

3. **College and Nontraditional Courses.** College and/or nontraditional courses that do not appear on the high school transcript may be accepted, provided the following conditions exist:

   a. The high school certifies in writing that the course would have appeared on the transcript, but for the timing that the course was completed and the production of the student's transcript;

   b. The course satisfies the definition of a core course;

   c. The high school certifies in writing or provides a policy indicating the use of college and/or nontraditional courses is available for any student at the high school;

   d. Inclusion of the course results in the student being certified a qualifier; and

   e. NCAA staff certifies that all other elements of the applicable legislation are satisfied.

Outside Participation.

For those cases in which NCAA enforcement services is involved in the initial-eligibility of a prospective student-athlete, the following procedures shall be used. A maximum of three institutional representatives (including legal representatives), enforcement services and academic and membership affairs representatives may participate in a portion of the waiver proceeding. The student-athlete may participate but is limited to three participants including the student-

athlete, his or her parent or guardian, and legal counsel. NCAA academic and membership affairs staff shall have five minutes to present the case pursuant to normal waiver procedures. The institution, enforcement services and the student-athlete each have up to 10 minutes to present relevant facts and information. Waiver committee members are permitted to ask questions of any participants during the call. After the presentations, the institutional representatives, enforcement services staff, the student-athlete and his or her representatives will leave the call. Only the subcommittee members and academic and membership affairs staff remain on the call for deliberation and decision. The academic and membership affairs staff provides assistance to the subcommittee, but do not deliberate or determine any waiver. The chair of the waiver subcommittee shall have the authority to determine all other procedural issues that arise.

Appeals/Reconsiderations.

1. **Appeals of Staff Decisions.** After the staff has acted on an initial-eligibility waiver, the involved institution may appeal the decision to the respective Initial-Eligibility Waivers Subcommittee, the initial appellate body for all initial-eligibility waivers. An institution may appeal a staff decision for any reason but its intent to file an appeal must be made within 30 days of written notification of the staff's decision.

   Any appeal filed after 30 days must include an explanation of why the appeal was not filed within the prescribed time limit. The chair of the respective Initial-Eligibility Waiver Subcommittee shall determine whether any appeal filed after 30 days shall be heard.

   Legislated Appeals Process (Bylaw 21.7.6.1.3.1.4)

   After the subcommittee has acted on an initial-eligibility waiver, the involved institution may appeal the decision to the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet Initial-Eligibility Waiver Appeals Subcommittee. The cabinet subcommittee determination shall be final, binding and conclusive and shall not be subject to further review by any other authority.

   The cabinet has authorized the Initial-Eligibility Waiver Appeals Subcommittee to hear all waiver appeals and render a decision on behalf of the cabinet.

   All appeals of a subcommittee decision must be appealed within 30 days of notification of the decision and must be based on one of the following grounds:

   a. The subcommittee improperly applied NCAA legislation or official interpretations;

b. The subcommittee took action inconsistent with established precedent (not applicable for disability waivers);

c. The subcommittee deviated from approved procedures; or

d. The factual findings of the subcommittee are clearly erroneous.

Any appeal filed after 30 days must include an explanation of why the appeal was not filed within the prescribed time limit. The chair of the Academic Cabinet Initial Eligibility Waiver Appeals Subcommittee shall determine whether any appeal filed after 30 days shall be heard.

2. **Reconsideration.** After the staff or subcommittee has acted on an initial-eligibility waiver, the institution may request the staff or subcommittee reconsider its decision if the institution submits new information that was not originally considered by the staff or subcommittee. Cases with new/additional information may not be heard by the cabinet until the staff or waivers subcommittee has reviewed/considered the new information.

Recusal.

A committee member or NCAA staff member shall recuse himself or herself from participating in proceedings (e.g., staffing a case or deliberating as a committee member) of a waiver case when he or she is directly connected with the involved institution, including, but not limited to, a member of the committee member's institution or institution's conference. A committee or staff member with a personal relationship or institutional affiliation that reasonably would result in the appearance of bias or prejudice should refrain from participating in any manner in the processing of a waiver request. It is the responsibility of the committee or staff member to remove himself or herself if a conflict exists. Institutional objections to a committee or staff member participating in a review of a case should be raised with and resolved by the chair or the most senior member of the committee as soon as recognized but will not be considered unless the concern is raised prior to the scheduled teleconference. Exceptions to the recusal policy may be granted by the chair or most senior member of the committee due to time constraints.

Confidentiality.

Committee members shall not communicate any information related to specific waiver cases to anyone other than NCAA staff or other subcommittee members. Under no circumstances shall information related to a student's academic record or waiver be communicated with any other person (e.g., media representative, parent, member institution, conference office).

Conflict of Interest.

(Excerpt from the August 2008 NCAA Executive Committee minutes.)

> "The NCAA is a voluntary Association comprised of colleges, universities, conferences and other organizations, and governed through a membership-led committee structure. Within the governance structure, committee members must carefully balance their responsibilities to their respective institutions and/or conferences with the obligation to advance the interests of the Association, the division, or the sport, and ultimately enhance the student-athlete experience. While the fiduciary obligations of committee members to their own institution, their conference, and to the Association ordinarily are not in conflict, it is recognized that as a representative membership organization, committee members' fiduciary obligations are first to their institution, second to their conference, and third to the Association. NCAA committee service involves important ethical and moral obligations. Committee integrity is critical to the decision-making process and includes trust, confidentiality and honesty in all issues and aspects of service and representation. NCAA committee members shall disclose any conflict or potential conflict between their respective personal, professional, institutional, conference, or business interests and the interests of the Association that may affect or otherwise threaten such integrity, in any and all actions taken by them on behalf of the Association, for committee evaluation under this Statement.
>
> In addition to any fiduciary obligation to their institution and conference, committee members also have a fiduciary duty to the Association not to use knowledge or information obtained solely due to service on that committee to the disadvantage of the Association during the term of committee service. Further, a Committee member shall not participate in the committee's discussion or vote on any action that might bring direct or indirect personal financial benefit to the member or any organization (other than the member's institution or conference) in which the member is financially interested. A committee member should also not participate in a discussion or vote for which the member's institution or conference is to be accorded a special benefit beyond benefits shared with other institutions or conferences or is to receive a penalty or disqualification. A violation of either of the above rules by a member of the committee shall not invalidate the action taken by the committee if, following disclosure of the conflict of interest, the committee authorizes, ratifies or approves the action by a vote sufficient for the purpose, without counting the vote of the committee member with the conflict of interest, and the appropriate oversight body approves the action.

A committee member is responsible for advising the chair of any actual or potential conflicts of interest or obligations which he/she may have hereunder, and should recuse him/herself from participating in proceedings, as may be warranted by this policy. Abuse of one's position as a member of a committee may result in dismissal from that position. Where such abuse appears evident, a committee member will be notified by the committee chair and will have the opportunity to present a rebuttal or details of the situation."

Speaking Agent Policy.

(Excerpt from the April 2001 Executive Committee minutes.)

"The president of the Association and the chair of the Executive Committee are the only individuals authorized to speak on behalf of the Association except as outlined below. An individual representing a member institution or conference who speaks or opines on an Association issue only has the authority to express the view of that individual or the member institution or conference unless the individual has been designated by the Executive Committee of the Association as a speaking agent of the Association on that issue. Committee chairs are hereby designated as speaking agents of their committees regarding issues within their committees' jurisdiction on which there is consensus, except that positions of advocacy on behalf of the committee or the Association to be communicated in writing or orally to persons or entities external to the Association must have prior approval by the NCAA Executive Committee or the president of the Association. The president of the Association is hereby granted authority to designate additional speaking agents of the Association."

Federal Education Right to Privacy Act.

Pursuant to Federal Education Right to Privacy Act (FERPA) regulations, each student-athlete whose institution is filing a waiver signs under the following statement:

I hereby authorize representatives of this institution and/or my high school(s) to provide the NCAA with, and identify as such, any nonstandardized ACT or SAT results I have received. I give my consent to disclose only to authorized representatives of this institution, its athletics conference (if any), my high school(s) and the NCAA, any documents or information pertaining to my NCAA eligibility.

> Additionally, I give my consent to the NCAA to disclose personally identifiable information from my education records to a third party (including but not limited to the media) as necessary to correct any inaccuracies reported by the media or related to this waiver, without such disclosure constituting a violation of my rights under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

Absences.

The processing of initial-eligibility waivers is a very time-sensitive process. Student-athletes need timely decisions in order to practice, receive institutional financial aid and compete. The staff and subcommittees work to ensure institutions receive waiver decisions as quickly as possible.

Since the subcommittees make many of these waiver decisions, it is imperative that all subcommittee members are present on each call. Lack of a subcommittee quorum can result in decisions being delayed, which is not a desirable outcome. There may be times that a subcommittee member is unable to attend a call due to other commitments, or to circumstances beyond his or her control. However, if those circumstances arise, it is the responsibility of the subcommittee member to inform the staff immediately so an alternate call may be scheduled, if needed.

Review of Home School Standards and Application of Home School Standards to Nontraditional Coursework

Background.

A secondary-school program recently was placed on the NCAA's "not cleared" list of high schools. Shortly thereafter, the program resurfaced under the same name, self-identified as a home school entity, and at least two prospective student-athletes presented coursework from this program. Further, the program's former director was listed as the home school administrator.

Intent.

This document is designed as a review of the NCAA's academic certification process for home school students, including the process to address nontraditional coursework submitted as home schooling, suggested amendments to the procedure are outlined in this document to ensure the appropriate identification and certification of home school and nontraditional coursework.

Review of Current Home School Standards.

Home-schooled students are required to meet the same requirements as all other prospective student-athletes. As part of their initial-eligibility certification, home-schooled students are required to submit a home-school transcript that includes: course titles, grades, units of credit for courses, the grading scale, and the signature of the home school administrator (the parent or other person who organized, taught and evaluated the home school coursework). Additionally, home school students must submit the following:

1. Proof of high school graduation, including specific graduation date (month/day/year).

2. Evidence that home schooling was conducted in accordance with state laws.

3. A statement of who taught and evaluated the coursework, awarded grades and issued credit.

4. A list of textbooks used throughout home schooling.

5. If your home school coursework was taken through an established nontraditional program (e.g., correspondence, internet, tutoring, etc.) that evaluated coursework and issued transcripts, the program must provide a copy of the prospective student-athlete's transcript and provide contact information so the NCAA Eligibility Center can obtain further information, if necessary.

Although the definition of a home-schooled student is not legislated, the NCAA certifies students presenting home-school coursework using the above standards and the attached home-school checklist, provided the home-school program is directed by the student's parent, relative or legal guardian. The staff also applies the prospective student-athlete review trigger list to all home-

school certifications. Further, if the home-school administrator is someone other than the student's parent, relative or legal guardian, the certification team alerts the high school review staff and engages that team to assist with any necessary core-course review questions.

Summary of Home School Prospective Student-Athletes.

Year	Registrants	On IRLs	Qualifiers	Nonqualifiers
2006-07	689	599	522	77
2007-08	874	758	680	78
2008-09	1046	946	821	125

Academic Profile of Home School Registrants.

Three-Year Average SAT Score	1052
Three-Year Average ACT Score	86
Three-Year Average Core Course Grade-Point Average	3.33

Recommendations.

The current procedure for the certification of home-schooled students includes steps to address coursework from programs that do not follow a traditional home-school model. In order to ensure this procedure continues to appropriately identify and certify home-school coursework and nontraditional coursework, the NCAA staff recommends the following actions:

1. The NCAA Student Records Review Committee should amend its prospective student-athlete review trigger list to include as a trigger any home-school coursework completed under the direction of a home-school administrator other than the prospect's parent, relative or legal guardian.

2. The NCAA High School Review Committee should amend its policies and procedures to permit additional review of any home-school entity for which the administrator is someone other than the prospect's parent, relative or legal guardian.

3. The NCAA Division I Legislative Review and Interpretations Committee should issue an official interpretation clarifying the use of home-school courses under NCAA Bylaw 14.3 to address the changing technological and educational environment.

HOME SCHOOL CHECKLIST

- ☐ Completed student release form (http://www.eligibilitycenter.org)
- ☐ Fee Payment
- ☐ Standardized test score (ACT and/or SAT) must be submitted directly from the testing agency. Note that test scores received on a home school transcript cannot be used by the Eligibility Center. A Student Score Report or scores taken directly from a Student Score Report cannot be accepted by the Eligibility Center for initial-eligibility purposes. The NCAA testing code is 9999.

(Please note that A, B, C, & D must be done in order to use home school transcripts)

- ☐ **(A)** Home School Transcript that includes:
  - ○ Course Titles
  - ○ Course Grades
  - ○ Units of Credit for each course
  - ○ Grading Scale (if numeric grades are awarded) [See example at right]
  - ○ Signature with the title of home school administrator (the parent or other person who organized, taught and evaluated course work)

Grading Scale Example

A	100	90
B	89	80
C	79	70
D	69	60
F	59	0

- ☐ **(B)** Evidence that home schooling was conducted in accordance with state laws **(a signed written statement from the home school administrator verifying compliance with state home school legislation).** Please attach any supporting documentation.
- ☐ **(C)** A signed statement of who managed the home school program: (example; who taught and evaluated the coursework, awarded grades and issued credit.)
- ☐ **(D)** List of textbooks used throughout home schooling (textbook titles, publisher and in which specific course(s) used). See textbook list example.
- ☐ Transcript from any other high school, college, non-traditional program attended (official copy mailed directly from issuing institution)
- ☐ Proof of High School Graduation, including specific graduation date (month/day/year of graduation) [i.e. Standard Diploma, GED, or graduation date on final transcript]

Designation of Certain Initial-Eligibility Bylaws as Common Provisions

Background.

Under NCAA legislation, a common provision is a regulation that applies to more than one of the divisions of the Association. Legislation adopted in 1973 allowed each of the Association's three divisions to adopt or amend any bylaw not inconsistent with the then-current constitution. As the divisions became more independent and eventually federated, the concept of common provisions was codified to identify bylaws that should continue to be consistent across multiple divisions.

A common provision must be adopted separately by each division and must be approved by all applicable divisions to be adopted or amended. In recent years, many of the provisions designated as common have been related to committees that have responsibilities across multiple divisions (e.g, Playing Rules Oversight Panel, Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sport) and where consistent legislation across divisions is critical.

This document reviews whether certain sections of NCAA Bylaw 14.3 (freshman academic requirements) should be designated as common provisions by Divisions I and II.

Discussion and Staff Recommendation

At present, no bylaws within the initial-eligibility legislation are designated as common provisions. Since the federation of the Association, Divisions I and II have developed some differences within the initial-eligibility requirements (e.g., core-course distribution, test-score and grade-point average requirements and core-course time limitation); however, many of the regulations have not been amended and remain consistent between the two divisions. Such bylaws include the definition of core courses, regulations for the use of specific types of courses to meet initial-eligibility requirements (e.g., college courses, Advanced Placement, English as a Second Language), calculation of the core-course grade-point average, test-score specifications (except for minimum test-score requirement), and graduation requirements. Also, Division I recently amended its guidelines for nontraditional courses to be considered core courses, and the Division II governance structure currently is considering the same modifications.

Designating certain bylaws as common provisions will provide a level of consistency within the legislation to benefit prospective student-athletes without minimizing the autonomy of each division to establish its own initial-eligibility requirements. Consistent procedures for the determination of initial eligibility for all prospective student-athletes would benefit prospective student-athletes by providing a single list of NCAA core courses for each core-course provider. Prospective student-athletes would have knowledge that their high school coursework would be treated consistently, regardless of the division of the NCAA institution at which they eventually enroll.

In addition, the use of common provisions would provide a consistent standard for the academic certification staff at the NCAA Eligibility Center to apply in the determination of whether a

prospective student-athlete has fulfilled each division's initial-eligibility requirements. If the divisions were to have different legislation, the Eligibility Center staff would be asked to apply different standards to the same course. This may result in two core-course lists for each institution, leading to duplicate work for Eligibility Center staff and confusion for prospective student-athletes. Consistent bylaws also would provide business efficiencies by eliminating the need for extra programs and procedures to support the different legislative standards.

For these reasons, the staff recommends designating the following bylaws as common legislation for Divisions I and II:

1. Bylaw 14.3.1.2 Core-Curriculum Requirements (definition of a core course);

2. Bylaw 14.3.1.2.2 Nontraditional Courses;

3. Bylaw 14.3.1.2.3 College Courses;

4. Bylaw 14.3.1.2.4 English as a Second Language Courses;

5. Bylaw 14.3.1.2.5 Courses for Students with Education-Impacting Disabilities;

6. Bylaw 14.3.1.2.6 Grade Value of Core Courses;

7. Bylaw 14.3.1.2.7 Pass-Fail Grades;

8. Bylaw 14.3.1.2.8 Repeat Courses;

9. Bylaw 14.3.1.2.9 Multiple High School Attendance;

10. Bylaw 14.3.1.3 Test-Score Requirements;

11. Bylaw 14.3.1.3.2 Combined Test Scores;

12. Bylaw 14.3.1.3.3 Nonstandard Test Administration; and

13. Bylaw 14.3.1.3.4 Test-Score Report

The use of common provisions would remove some divisional autonomy in determining the appropriate initial-eligibility standards. However, this staff recommendation would affect only one bylaw for which the divisions have different legislation: an amendment adopted by Division I and not yet considered by Division II. The recommendation would not affect any legislation related to initial-eligibility requirements (e.g., core-course requirements or time limitation, grade-point average or test score requirements).

If the bylaws are designated as common provisions, any amendments to bylaws so designated would have to be approved by a majority vote in each division to be effective.

Related Legislation.

Common Provisions.

Bylaw 5.01.2 - Approaches to Legislative Process.

The membership of the Association recognizes that certain fundamental polices, practices and principles have applicability to all members, while others are applicable to division groupings of members, based on a common philosophy shared among the individual members of the division and on special policies and concerns that are common to the nature and purposes of the institutions in the division. *(Revised: 1/9/96 effective 8/1/97)*

Bylaw 5.02.1.3 - Common.

A common provision is a regulation that applies to more than one of the divisions of the Association. A common provision shall be adopted by each of the applicable divisions, acting separately pursuant to the divisional legislative process described in Constitution 5.3, and must be approved by all applicable divisions to be effective. Common provisions are identified by the pound sign (#). *(Adopted: 1/14/97 effective 8/1/97)*

Bylaws Recommended for Designation as Common Provisions.

Bylaw 14.3.1.2 - Core-Curriculum Requirements.

For purposes of meeting the core-curriculum requirement to establish eligibility at a member institution, a "core course" must meet all of the following criteria:

(a) A course must be a recognized academic course and qualify for high school graduation credit in one or a combination of the following areas: English, mathematics, natural/physical science, social science, foreign language or nondoctrinal religion/philosophy;

(b) A course must be considered college preparatory by the high school. College preparatory is defined for these purposes as any course that prepares a student academically to enter a four-year collegiate institution upon graduation from high school;

(c) A mathematics course must be at the level of Algebra I or a higher-level mathematics course;

(d) A course must be taught by a qualified instructor as defined by the appropriate academic authority (e.g., high school, school district or state agency with authority of such matters); and

(e) A course must be taught at or above the high school's regular academic level (remedial, special education or compensatory courses shall not be considered core courses). However, the prohibition against the use of remedial or compensatory courses is not applicable to courses designed for students with education-impacting disabilities (see Bylaw 14.3.1.2.1.2).

Bylaw 14.3.1.2.2 - Nontraditional Courses. Effective Date: August 1, 2010.

Courses taught via the Internet, distance learning, independent study, individualized instruction, correspondence, and courses taught by similar means may be used to satisfy NCAA core-course requirements if all of the following conditions are satisfied:

(a) The course meets all requirements for a core course as defined in Bylaw 14.3.1.2;

(b) The instructor and the student have ongoing access to one another for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student throughout the duration of the course;

(c) The instructor and the student have regular interaction with one another for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student throughout the duration of the course;

(d) The student's work (e.g., exams, papers, assignments) is available for evaluation and validation;

(e) Evaluation of the student's work is conducted by the appropriate academic authorities in accordance with the high school's established academic policies;

(f) The course includes a defined time period for completion; and

(g) The course is acceptable for any student and is placed on the high school transcript.

Bylaw 14.3.1.2.3 - College Courses.

College courses may be used to satisfy core-curriculum requirements if accepted by the high school, provided the courses are accepted for any other student, meet all other requirements for core courses and are placed on the student's high school transcript.

Bylaw 14.3.1.2.4 - English as a Second Language Course.

It is permissible to use an advanced-level English as a Second Language (ESL) course to satisfy core-curriculum requirements, provided it is reviewed through the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Waiver process. Other ESL courses taught in disciplines other than English (e.g., social studies) may satisfy a core-course requirement, provided they are qualitatively and quantitatively the same as the comparison course in the regular-course offering.

Bylaw 14.3.1.2.5 - Courses for Students with Education-Impacting Disabilities.

High school courses for students with education-impacting disabilities may be used to fulfill the core-curriculum requirements, even if such courses appear to be taught at a level below the high school's regular academic instructional level (e.g., special education courses), if the high school principal submits a written statement to the NCAA Eligibility Center indicating that the courses are substantially comparable, quantitatively and qualitatively, to similar core course offerings in that academic discipline and the courses appear on the high school's list of approved core courses. Students with education-impacting disabilities still must complete the required core courses and achieve the minimum required grade-point average in the core curriculum. The fact that the title of a course includes a designation such as "remedial," "special education," "special needs," or other similar titles used for courses designed for students with education-impacting disabilities does not, in and of itself, disqualify a course from satisfying core-curriculum requirements.

Bylaw 14.3.1.2.6 - Grade Value of Core Courses.

The following grade values are to be used in determining a student's grade-point average in the core courses: A = 4 quality points, B = 3 quality points, C = 2 quality points, D = 1 quality point. In determining the core-curriculum grade-point average, each grade earned in a course (including all numerical grades) must be converted to this 4.000 scale on an individual-course basis. Pluses or minuses within a grade level shall not receive greater or lesser quality points. A school's normal practice of weighting honors or advanced courses may be used to compute the quality points awarded in those courses and the cumulative grade-point average, provided a written statement verifying the grading policy accompanies the prospective student-athlete's official grade transcript. An honors or advanced course shall receive no greater than 1.000 additional quality point (e.g., A=5.000). In calculating the grade in a weighted honors or advanced course, if a high school does not assign quality points to its courses, quality points shall be added to each course prior to calculating the student's grade-point average and not added to a student's cumulative core-course grade-point average. The core-curriculum grade-point average may be calculated using the student's 16 best grades from courses that meet the distribution requirements of the core curriculum. Additional core courses (beyond the 16 required) may be used to meet the core-curriculum grade-point average, provided the distribution requirements are met.

Bylaw 14.3.1.2.7 - Pass-Fail Grades.

Courses that are awarded pass-fail grades may be used to satisfy core-curriculum requirements. The NCAA Eligibility Center shall assign the course the lowest passing grade that the high school assigns for a pass-fail course.

Bylaw 14.3.1.2.8 - Repeat Courses.

A repeated course may be used only once to satisfy core-curriculum requirements. The best grade in that course may be used to calculate the grade-point average in the core curriculum.

Bylaw 14.3.1.2.9 - Multiple High School Attendance.

For a student-athlete who attends more than one high school, a Form 48-H (core-course form) and an official transcript from each high school the student-athlete attended must be used. However, the NCAA Eligibility Center may receive the official transcript from either the student-athlete's original high school or the high school from which the student-athlete graduated, or an institution's admissions office.

Bylaw 14.3.1.3 - Test-Score Requirements.

The minimum required SAT or ACT score (see Bylaw 14.3.1.1) must be achieved under national testing conditions on a national testing date [no residual (campus) testing, or regional testing dates] except that a state-administered ACT may be used to meet the test-score requirement.

Bylaw 14.3.1.3.2 - Combined Test Scores.

For students using the SAT examination, the highest scores achieved on the critical reading and mathematics sections of the SAT from two different national testing dates may be combined in determining whether the student has met the minimum test-score requirements. For students using the ACT examination, the highest scores achieved on the individual subtests of the ACT from more than one national testing date or state-administered examination may be combined in determining whether the student's sum score has met the minimum test-score requirement.

Bylaw 14.3.1.3.3 - Nonstandard Test Administration.

Students with education-impacting disabilities may use scores achieved during a nonstandard administration of the SAT or ACT. A student who takes a nonstandard SAT or ACT still must achieve the minimum required test score; however, the test is not required to be administered on a national testing date.

Bylaw 14.3.1.3.4 - Test-Score Report.

The minimum SAT or ACT score(s) used for initial-eligibility purposes must be provided to the NCAA Eligibility Center by the appropriate testing agency through an official test-score report.

Bylaw 14.3.5.2 - High School Graduate.

In order to be considered a high school graduate, a prospective student-athlete shall meet all graduation requirements, including academic and nonacademic (e.g., state exit exams, community service, senior project) requirements, as defined for all students by his or her high school or secondary school.

Bylaw 14.3.5.3 - GED Test/Equivalency Diploma.

A prospective student-athlete who does not graduate from high school but who subsequently completes the General Educational Development (GED) test and obtains a state high school equivalency diploma may satisfy the graduation requirement of Bylaw 14.3, but not the core-curriculum or test-score requirement, if the following conditions are met:

(a) Only scores from a GED test taken by the prospective student-athlete on or after the date the prospective student-athlete's high school class would normally have graduated from high school (the last class of which the student was a member while enrolled in high school) shall be used;

(b) The prospective student-athlete must present the state high school equivalency diploma prior to initial enrollment as a full-time, regularly matriculated student in a collegiate institution; and

(c) To qualify for financial aid, practice and competition, the prospective student-athlete must meet the core-curriculum grade-point average and test-score requirements (see Bylaw 14.3.1.1) in addition to presenting a minimum average score of 450 on the five-part GED test.

Bylaw 14.3.5.4 - Advanced Placement.

If the student-athlete is admitted with a minimum of 24-semester hours or a minimum of 36-quarter hours of advanced placement from a College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) examination (or from a similar proficiency examination) and/or concurrent high school/college credit without previous enrollment at a collegiate institution, the student-athlete shall be immediately eligible. Credits earned from extension or summer-session courses may not be counted in satisfaction of this requirement.

Bylaw 14.3.5.5 - International Academic Standards.

A student from a foreign country shall satisfy both the requirements outlined in the NCAA Guide to International Academic Standards for Athletics Eligibility and the test-score requirements set forth in Bylaw 14.3.1.1-(b).

FOOTBALL ACADEMIC WORKING GROUP
FINAL REPORT

BACKGROUND

The current one-year average APR in football (948), while up 18 points since 2003-04, is the second lowest of all sports. In April 2008 President Brand requested the establishment of a working group to examine the academic performance of football student-athletes with the goal of identifying strategies for improvement. Chaired by Joseph R. Castiglione, director of athletics at the University of Oklahoma, the working group is composed of 27 individuals, including Presidents, directors of athletics, commissioners, head coaches and faculty athletics representatives. The working group has had two in-person meetings, made presentations at the AFCA and NCAA Conventions and conducted multiple conference calls as a full group and in various subcommittees.

KEY FINDINGS

Research data and discussion of the working group have generated the following key findings regarding the academic performance of Division I college football student-athletes:

1. APR problems tend to be due to eligibility rather than retention issues. The most recent annual data show football with a 936 eligibility rate which is lower than any other sport and over 20 points lower than the eligibility rate in men's basketball.

2. Incoming freshmen in football have lower high school academic profiles (e.g., core GPA, SAT scores) than any other Division I sport besides basketball. Yet, first year college academic performance is worse than all other sports, including basketball.

3. Summer school enrollment is much higher in FBS than FCS. While 98% of FBS institutions and 94% of FCS institutions have at least one football student-athlete in summer school, 81% of all FBS student-athletes who persist into the next year are enrolled in summer school, compared to only 38% of those FCS student-athletes who persist into the next year. There also seems to be a relationship between athletics department budget and the number of credit hours attempted during summer school in FBS.

4. While football student-athletes miss less class time and spend less time away from school than most other sport groups, they reported greater time demands from their sport than student-athletes in all other sports.

5. APR 0-for-2s are more likely to occur in FBS after student-athletes exhaust eligibility and in FCS after the first year of enrollment. Two-year college transfers are more likely to be 0-for-2s than non-transfers and four-year college transfers.

6. Football student-athletes lose a significant number of eligibility points during the season of competition (i.e. in the fall term). When a first-year football student-athlete loses an e-point in the fall term, he is much more likely to lose additional e-points or become an 0-for-2. There is a similar trend for sophomores and juniors.

7. While there is a correlation between athletic department resources and APR for institutions, there is a much stronger correlation between APR and academic preparation of incoming student-athletes as measured by variables such as high school GPA, SAT scores and percentage of 2-4 transfers on a football squad.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Fall Term Academic Requirement for Future Competition.** Football student-athletes who do not successfully complete 9 credit hours and earn an eligibility point following either the fall semester or quarter, would be ineligible for participation in the first four games the following football season. However, if the student-athlete has successfully completed 27 credit hours by the end of the summer session he may have his penalty reduced to only the first two games of that season.

   Rationale. As noted in the key finding #1, football APR problems tend to be due to eligibility rather than retention and this recommendation will directly impact eligibility as well as academic progress issues. This recommendation also addresses key findings #2 (improving first-year college performance) and #6 (lost e-points in the fall term and subsequent 0-for2s).

   The working group debated whether the minimum academic requirement should be 6 or 9 credit hours; however, research indicated that of those student-athletes who achieved nine credit hours in the first semester of their freshman year and remained in school through at least the third year, over 72 percent graduated from that institution by the end of the fifth year. By contrast, the graduation rate was 51 percent among a similar group that did not achieve nine credit hours in the fall of their freshman year.

   Additional discussion was held as to whether the 9-hour requirement should be applied to only incoming freshmen or continuing student-athletes as well. Research data indicated that the negative impacts of the loss of eligibility are relatively consistent across all academic classes. For example, data show that 44 percent of freshmen who failed to maintain eligibility in the first term also failed to achieve academic eligibility in the second term as compared to only seven percent of those freshmen who were academically eligible after the first term. Similarly, 38 percent of the sophomores who were ineligible after the first term failed again in the second term of that academic year, compared to less than 10 percent of sophomores who were eligible after the first term. These ratios for juniors were 35 percent and seven percent for the respective groups.

The group also noted that data from the latest NCAA Graduation Success Rate (GSR) study indicated that although the football bowl subdivision rate is up nearly three points since 1995, the rate has declined or leveled off in recent years. Therefore, it was the group's opinion that a concerted effort must be made to improve Division I football's graduation rate and that nine credit hours should be the minimum academic requirement. It is hoped that such a policy will put more football student-athletes in position to graduate within four and a half years, which may help with key finding #5 (the significant number of 0-for-2 departures after exhausting eligibility).

Originally the committee considered recommending that if a student-athlete did not earn 9 credit hours during the fall semester he would be automatically ineligible for the following football season. However, various constituent groups expressed concern with the severity of the measure and that a process should be available for the student-athlete to allow him to regain his eligibility as long as he met certain academic performance conditions. Therefore, the recommendation includes a four-game suspension and a provision that allows a student-athlete to restore his eligibility for two games as long as he successfully passes 27 credit hours at the end of the summer session, which would place the student-athlete in a better position to graduate in 4 ½ years.

During the various presentations to constituent groups questions were raised as to whether incoming freshmen could count summer "bridge" credit hours toward the 9-hour first term requirement and the 27-credit hour requirement at the end of the summer session. It was the group's decision that incoming freshmen may not count credit hours earned the summer prior to enrollment to meet the 9-hour fall term requirement. However, it was decided that those credit hours earned prior to enrollment may be counted with the summer hours earned after his freshman year to satisfy the 27-credit hour requirement.

Input from the membership also raised the question as to whether remedial courses could be counted toward the 9-hour and 27-hour requirements. It was the position of the working group that for incoming freshmen only remedial courses could be used to meet the 9-hour and 27-hour requirements.

It should be noted the group considered that in addition to requiring football student-athletes to successfully complete 9 credit hours and earn an eligibility point following either the fall semester or quarter that this same requirement be for the spring semester or term as well. However, it was the consensus of the group that requiring 9 credit hours for the spring semester or term was unnecessary since the normal progress-towards-degree requirements for each student-athlete would address this issue.

In addition to the 27-hour rule, any mitigating circumstances that impact a football student-athlete's ability to satisfy these academic requirements will also be considered through the current Division I progress-towards-degree waiver process. Relief should only be provided

if it can be demonstrated by supporting documentation that the student-athlete was unable to satisfy these academic requirements due to compelling mitigating circumstances outside the control of the student-athlete and that the student-athlete is on track to graduate within five years.

A policy similar to this, which required a baseball student-athlete to be eligible at the start of the fall semester or quarter in order to be eligible to participate in the following baseball season, was implemented for the 2007-08 year in that sport. It appears that this academic requirement has been very effective in raising the eligibility rate in baseball. In fact, the eligibility rate in baseball increased by 18 points in the year after that rule went into effect. The eligibility rate in the spring term (the term directly affected by the rule in the sport of baseball) went up by over 40 points after this rule was enacted.

Possible impact. If a fall standard of 9 credit hours earned plus the E-point was put into place, 11.8% of MFB players at semester schools who have not exhausted their athletic eligibility would have a four-game penalty in the subsequent season. Approximately 17.1% of MFB players at quarter schools would have a four-game penalty the next season of competition. Note that actual numbers would be expected to be much lower due to (a) students who actually dropped out during that term (they show up as not meeting the enhanced standard here) and (b) students changing their fall academic behavior to meet an enhanced standard.

The following results apply to semester squads only (using data from the 2008-09 academic year):

- 54% of those football student-athletes declared ineligible for competition in the next season would result from the failure to earn their E-point. The additional 46% would lose eligibility due to failure to meet the 9 credit requirement.

- The proportion of football student-athletes currently not meeting the enhanced standard is similar in FBS (12%) and FCS (11%).

- Currently, 20% of football student-athletes with eligibility remaining at HBCUs do not meet the enhanced standards.

- Impacts are lower on private institutions as compared to public institutions.

- The current per squad average impact is about 7.5 players per squad. 15% of football squads have 2 or fewer student-athletes below that standard; roughly one-third of squads have 10 or more players below this standard (maximum=23).

2. **Exhausted Eligibility Departures.** The working group recommends to the Committee on Academic Performance (CAP) that the waiver of the contemporaneous penalty for football bowl subdivision student-athletes that are 0-for-2 after exhausting eligibility be eliminated.

   Rationale. The working group noted that this waiver was originally put in place to mitigate the financial aid impact on prospective student-athletes who sign financial aid agreements and issues created when institutions are required to reduce financial aid as part of a contemporaneous penalty. Because these penalties can be deferred until the following academic year, there is little or no impact on PSAs that have already signed NLIs. The working group also noted research indicating the disproportionate number of 0-for-2s in FBS football compared to other sports and that the elimination of this exception may compel student-athletes and institutions to better manage retention and eligibility issues for student-athletes with exhausted eligibility. This recommendation addresses key finding #5. It should be noted that the FCS subcommittee examined this concept and did not make the same recommendations for FCS institutions.

3. **Time Demands.** The group recommends continued study of the football student-athlete time demands to review what activities are accountable during a 20-hour week and what football-related activities occur outside the 20-hour time frame.

   Rationale. It is the group's belief that the recommendations pertaining to fall eligibility and exhausted eligibility departures will help shift the balance between academics and athletics to more of an emphasis on academics. However, the group recognized this is a complex issue and although current regulations exist that address student-athlete time demands more study of this issue should be conducted to discern the difference between mandatory and voluntary time demands. New data will be available in the spring of 2010 and the working group would like to review this data and devote more time to the study of time demands on football student-athletes.

4. **Two-Year College Transfer Requirements.** Given key findings #5 and #7, the working group supports the efforts of the Academic Cabinet in its effort to develop enhanced academic requirements or a required academic year in residence for two-year college transfers and recommends the development of two-four transfer requirements that more accurately reflect the academic preparation most likely to lead to completion of a four-year degree.

   Rationale: Without the necessary data for modeling transfer student-athlete success, the working group was unable to formulate specific, data-driven recommendations to enhance the two-four transfer requirements. However, the Academic Cabinet and Committee on Academic Performance recently implemented measures to collect two-year transfer academic performance data and began a review of potential models in February 2010. Specifically, the working group encourages exploration of concepts such as a core

curriculum for two-year college transfers, more precise specifications regarding remediation completed at the two-year institution and limitations on the number of activity courses permitted to meet transfer requirements.

During the group's review of the academic requirement for 2 year college transfers a significant number of the working group expressed concern with the overall lack of academic preparedness of the student athletes in general. Although it was not the charge of this working group to address academic preparedness in other sports the group believes that this topic should be addressed by the association in the future.

5. **Head Coaches' APR Portfolio.** The working group recommends to the Committee on Academic Performance (CAP) that in addition to attributing APR scores of football student athletes to the head coach, the scores also be attributed to the institution's chief executive officer and director of athletics and that additional institutional information (e.g., student body graduation rate, available resources) be included to provide context.

   Rationale. Institutional characteristics, including academic mission, admissions requirements and available resources all work in concert with support and guidance from coaches, administrators and faculty to facilitate student-athlete academic success. Working group members expressed the importance of an examination of all elements contributing to the APR performance of student-athletes including, but not limited to, the involvement of head coaches. Given the working group's interest in providing additional information through the APR Head Coaches' Portfolio, CAP reviewed this draft recommendation in July 2009 and determined that such elements should not be included at this time, given the additional institutional burden that would be placed on institutions to compile and report the information, as well as the complexities related to programming such reports. However, the committee agreed to reconsider these elements as it explores enhancements to the report at the end of the initial two-year phase-in period.

BEST PRACTICES.

The working group believes that most strategies to improve the academic performance of football student-athletes reside in the sharing and implementation of "best practices" among institutions, instead of national policies and requirements. This is consistent with NCAA Strategic Plan Goal 3.2.

Examples can be gleaned from Academic Improvement Plans recently submitted by institutions seeking to improve their APR scores. There are several institutions have successfully improved their APR scores and their strategies should continue to be shared with the membership. This information is available through a searchable database on the NCAA website and accessible via unique institutional logins and passwords.

The Facilitating Learning and Achieving Graduation (FLAG) program should also be emphasized among the best practices. The FLAG is a tool designed to help campuses assess the risk level of all student-athletes, assign suggested services based on risk factors, and evaluate the overall effectiveness of an institution's support services. While the FLAG program has been presented to the Board of Directors and endorsed by the Academic Cabinet, there will be a three-phased implementation of the program beginning 2009-10. Institutions with football programs should be encouraged to fully participate in this program.

Also, the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics is planning to develop a best practices program for the efficient academic support of football student-athletes. Upon completion, this information should be included in the final collection of FAWG best practices materials.

Finally, it is suggested that these and other resources be made more conveniently available to access on the NCAA website and supported by technology to facilitate the sharing of best practices between member institutions.

Note, however, that the best practices should be viewed as a place for institutions to begin, not end, as they examine their own policies and practices and that all practices may not work at every institution. It should also be noted that these best practices are models used by other institutions but may not necessarily be supported by research data available to the working group.

P.O. Box 6222
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206
Telephone: 317/917-6222

Shipping/Overnight Address:
1802 Alonzo Watford Sr. Drive
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

www.ncaa.org

MEMORANDUM

April 15, 2010

TO: NCAA Division I Conference Commissioners and Senior Woman Administrators.

FROM: Janet Cone, chair
NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Issues Committee.

SUBJECT: Proposed NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Academic/Athletic Development Model.

Since May, 2008, the NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Issues Committee has reviewed data on the academic success of Division I Women's Basketball student-athletes. Based on this review, for the long-term well-being of the sport of women's basketball and the continued academic success of women's basketball student-athletes, the committee has proposed the enclosed academic and athletic development model (refer to Attachment A).

During your upcoming conference meetings, the issues committee requests your assistance in providing this information to your conference membership, including your head women's basketball coaches, soliciting feedback from your membership and submitting the attached feedback document (refer to Attachment B). The committee requests that your conference's feedback be submitted no later than June 15. The issues committee will consider this feedback and modify the proposed model, as appropriate, before submitting final recommendations for formal governance structure consideration.

Thank you for your assistance in obtaining these comments and feedback. The committee looks forward to reviewing the feedback and the continued development of the proposal on behalf of the sport of women's basketball and women's basketball student-athletes.

SND:tnb

cc: NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Issues Committee
Selected NCAA Staff Members

NCAA DIVISION I WOMEN'S BASKETBALL ISSUES COMMITTEE PROPOSED ACADEMIC AND ATHLETIC DEVELOPMENT MODEL (AS OF FEBRUARY 23, 2010)

Background.

In May 2008, the NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Issues Committee received an update on the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP). The NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) data indicated that women's basketball is not in a state of academic crisis. However, the APR in women's basketball is the lowest of all women's sports and trending downward. The intercollegiate athletics experience should provide women's basketball student-athletes with exemplary educational and intercollegiate experiences (NCAA Bylaw 23.01.1). This includes enhancing the ability of student-athletes to earn four-year degrees and their physical well-being and development (NCAA Constitution 2.2). For the long-term well-being of the sport of women's basketball and for the betterment of its student-athletes, the committee examined ways to improve the academic performance of women's basketball student-athletes and to improve the overall academic culture before major problems arise. This document is intended to outline recommendations and rationale for changes in the sport of women's basketball. These changes are offered in an effort to help ensure the academic and athletics experience meets with the stated principles of the NCAA.

Research Findings.

The committee noted the following key data which informed its discussions and recommendations:

1. While many sports are showing positive APR trends, women's basketball appears to be declining in academic performance. While four-year APR data for other sports has increased, these data for women's basketball has remained "flat." In the most recent APR data released, the women's basketball APR average decreased by three points.

2. Eligibility rates in baseball and men's basketball have increased substantially, while the same rate in women's basketball has declined. Data indicates a sharp decrease in the number of baseball and men's basketball student-athletes who left institutions academically ineligible and did not return in the subsequent term (i.e., "0/2"). There has been an increase in the number of "0/2's" in women's basketball.

3. There has been an increase in the number of 2-4 transfers in women's basketball, while the overall number of these transfers has decreased.

4. APR, retention and eligibility rates in the sport of women's basketball are declining.

5. The average grade- point average data appears to have decreased slightly over the past three years.

6. "0/2" rates are now above the overall average and are consistent with men's baseball data. The rate of 2-4 and 4-4 transfers in women's basketball is significantly higher than those rates in other women's sports. Two-year transfers are more likely to become "0/2" departures than nontransfers.

7. Freshman high school grade-point averages and SAT scores appear to have slightly declined since 2005-06.

8. Semester eligibility rates are higher than in men's basketball, but have slightly declined in 2007-08.

9. The total summer credit hours accumulated by student-athletes correlates with the total credits earned and progress toward degree in years one through three. This effect holds even after controlling for the student-athletes' academic background and the resource level of the institution.

10. The summer credit effect appears as strong or stronger as high school academic preparation in predicting progress toward degree.

11. During the 2007-08 academic year, 57.3 percent of incoming freshmen attended summer school, 48.3 percent of two-year transfer students attended summer school and 48.8 percent of four-year transfer students attended summer school.

12. Division I women's basketball student-athletes report spending 36 hours per week on athletics in-season. They also report spending more time away from campus and more missed class in-season than other women's sports. It should be noted that the hours reported include the full range of time spent on athletics activities (e.g., on-court practice, team travel, strength/conditioning, sports medicine treatment).

13. More Division I women's basketball student-athletes than any other sport group reported that their coaches were a significant social and/or emotional source of support while in college.

14. First year outcomes for women's basketball student-athletes indicate that among those who are retained to the second year, ineligibility rates of minority student-athletes are more than double those of nonminority student-athletes. The percentage of minority women's basketball student-athletes not meeting progress-toward-degree requirements for the second year of college is 5.9 percent, while 2.4 percent of nonminority women's basketball student-athletes do not meet the standards.

Key among these research findings the committee noted the positive impact of summer credit hours earned on the achievement of long-term academic success and the negative impact of transferring on long-term academic success.

Guiding Principles.

The committee has developed the following guiding principles which governed its review of the academic performance of women's basketball student-athletes. These principles were developed with particular attention to the NCAA's mission and goals as identified in the Association's constitution. Any identified changes should in the sport of women's basketball:

1. Result in improved academic performance and academic culture. [Reference Constitution 2.2.1 "Overall Educational Experience."]

2. Contribute to the long-term well-being and development of student-athletes. [Reference Constitution 2.2 "The Principle of Student-Athlete Well Being."]

3. Improve the academic performance and academic culture. [Constitution 2.5 "Principle of Sound Academic Standards."]

4. Enhance the coach and student-athlete relationship. [Reference Constitution 2.2.4 "Student-Athlete/Coach Relationship."]

5. Assist with the academic and athletic acclimation of incoming student-athletes into the collegiate environment. [Reference Constitution 2.2.1 "Overall Educational Experience."]

6. Recognize the role of sport in allowing student-athletes to achieve a sense of balance. [Reference Constitution 2.14 "Principle Governing Playing and Practice Seasons."]

Recommendations.

The committee recommends the following three legislative changes and welcomes feedback, input and dialogue among constituent groups throughout the NCAA membership and the women's basketball community.

1. **Summer School Attendance for Incoming Student-Athletes.**

   All incoming freshman and transfer Division I women's basketball student-athletes, who have signed financial aid agreements to receive athletically related financial aid for the ensuing regular academic year, shall be required to attend the institution's summer term prior to initial full-time enrollment. Such student-athletes shall be provided financial aid

and enroll in a minimum of six credit hours and satisfactorily complete a minimum of three hours of acceptable academic degree credit as a prerequisite for eligibility in the fall term.

Exceptions and waiver provisions regarding this recommendation are included later in the document.

2. **Summer Athletics Activities for Incoming Student-Athletes.**

All incoming student-athletes (i.e., freshman and transfers) would be permitted to engage in one hour of countable athletically related activities per week, up to a maximum of 10 total hours, during the entire time the student-athletes are enrolled in the summer term.

a. Current legislation regarding summer school attendance (e.g., financial aid, credit-hour requirement) for continuing student-athletes would remain the same.

b. Consistent with the provisions of Bylaw 13.11.3.9, all student-athletes (incoming and continuing) may engage in voluntary summer workouts conducted by the institution's strength and conditioning coach with department-wide duties and may receive workout apparel (on an issuance and retrieval basis).

3. **Life/Study Skills Component for Incoming Student-Athletes.**

Institutions must provide such student-athletes study skills/life skills education during the summer session for all incoming student-athletes. Time management, first year experience and nutritional education would be included in the life skills curriculum. These could include use of the Facilitating Learning and Achieving Graduation (FLAG) program. FLAG is a tool designed to help campuses assess the risk level of all student-athletes, assign suggested services based on risk factors and evaluate the overall effectiveness of an institution's support services.

Exceptions and Waivers.

There should be exceptions and a waiver process available to incoming student-athletes and member institutions as follows:

1. An exception would be provided to those institutions that do not offer summer school courses for the general student-body. However, such institutions would not be permitted to participate in the summer countable athletically related activities component. Further, institutions that offer summer courses, but do not offer athletically related financial aid (e.g., award only need-based aid), would have two options:

a. To use the previously noted exception applicable to institutions that do not offer summer courses to the general student-body. Institutions electing to use this option would not be required to award summer financial aid, but also would be prohibited from participation in summer countable athletically related activities.

b. Institutions electing to participate in the athletics activities portion of the model would be subject to the mandatory summer aid requirement for those student-athletes who qualify for nonathletically related financial aid to attend the summer session. The summer countable athletically related activities provisions of this model would be applicable to those student-athletes enrolled in the requisite minimum number of hours of acceptable degree credit who are receiving nonathletically related financial assistance covering their own cost of summer school.

2. A waiver from the application of the mandatory attendance requirements for incoming student-athletes would be available when unique circumstances preclude an incoming student-athlete from attending summer school. A student-athlete receiving a waiver of the mandatory attendance requirement would not be permitted to engage in summer countable athletically related activities.

Rationale.

It is clear from the data that women's basketball student-athletes' academic trending data necessitates review and reaction within the Division I governance structure. The membership could decide to wait for additional data, taking a "wait and see" approach. Given that the dynamics in the sport seem to be following trends previously seen in men's basketball, taking no action does not seem like a prudent decision. Increased recruitment of less academically prepared students; increasing professional basketball opportunities; increasing numbers of two-year college transfers; and increased third-party persons involved in the recruiting process could easily lead to the conclusion that absent action to redirect the academic trends, the current downward spiral will continue. Thus, the committee was compelled to respond to these trends with recommendations it believes will enhance the academic well-being of student-athletes.

The recommendations presented are a result of significant discussion and debate by the committee. They are not the only possible solutions, but do focus on key academic behaviors that have proven successful. That is, early academic intervention and support do make a difference in the academic success of student-athletes. These recommendations provide incoming students the opportunity to prepare for the academic rigors of a four-year college experience, while minimally beginning to develop a relationship with their new coaches. Reasonable exceptions are carved out for institutions not offering summer courses or not offering athletically related financial aid.

As noted previously, the total summer credit hours accumulated by student-athletes correlates with the total credits earned and progress toward degree in years one through three. This effect holds even after controlling for the student-athletes' academic background and the resource level of the institution. This summer credit effect appears as strong or stronger as high school academic preparation in predicting progress toward degree. These data help form the basis for the committee's recommendation to require summer school for incoming students and including a study skills element during this first summer.

Financial implications will be discussed as these recommendations are considered. It should be noted that over 50 percent of all incoming women's basketball student-athletes are already attending summer school prior to their first full-time term at a member institution. Thus, the overall additional cost impact for most institutions is mitigated.

Lastly, women's basketball student-athletes more than any other sport group reported that their coaches were a significant social and/or emotional source of support while in college. These data are compelling reasons the committee recommends some limited practice time with coaches only for these newly entering student-athletes. Research confirms that coaches do make a positive difference in the academic outcomes of students and these recommendations strive to enhance this positive effect.

Given the aforementioned women's basketball student-athlete profile, a student-athlete's socioeconomic background may play an important role in the successful transition into college. For many, the time with their coaches and teammates during the summer positively impacts the student-athlete's transition to college. The committee discussed the importance for incoming student-athletes' acclimation to the collegiate environment in order to formulate relationships with teammates and to become familiar with their coaches. The committee noted the role basketball plays in allowing these students to achieve a sense of balance and the role and responsibility that the team and coach has in assisting incoming student-athletes in this transition phase.

Additional Considerations.

The committee will continue its work on the proposed Academic and Athletic Development Model. In particular, the committee will further examine the following issues:

1. The impact of the current playing and practice season model, conference scheduling and team travel on the academic performance of women's basketball student-athletes. *[Note: The NCAA staff is currently gathering data regarding conference scheduling policies including information regarding play dates, travel partner models, type of travel, etc.]* The committee will review conference scheduling models and discuss the impact of economic decisions on the academic performance of women's basketball student-athletes.

2. The impact of the act of transferring on the academic performance of women's basketball student-athletes and engage in a dialogue with the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet in this regard.

3. Legislative proposals and concepts that will impact playing and practice seasons and competition opportunities. The committee is involved in a variety of future strategies discussions relative to the overall "state of the game" and the establishment of priorities that will serve as growth catalysts for the game.

4. Current progress-toward-degree requirements for student-athletes and the impact of amending first year requirements that might better prepare students to meet the 40 percent degree requirement standards entering their third year.

Timeline.

Given the important place women's basketball holds in the overall landscape of Division I and the developing concern regarding the academic performance of women's basketball student-athletes, the committee believes it is imperative to solicit feedback and comments from the Division I membership. The committee will solicit feedback through early 2010 and seek to finalize its proposal in spring 2010 and ask the NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet to sponsor proposed legislative changes for the 2010-11 legislative cycle.

Division I Women's Basketball Issues Committee.

Shelley Appelbaum, Michigan State University;
Ceal Barry, University of Colorado, Boulder;
Beth Bass, Women's Basketball Coaches Association (ex-officio);
Jean Berger, University of Northern Iowa;
Barbie Breedlove, East Tennessee State University;
Donyale Canada, Mid-American Conference;
Amy Champion, University of New Orleans;
Janet Cone, University of North Carolina, Asheville, chair;
Anya Covington, University of Wisconsin, Madison;
Mary DiStanislao, University of Pennsylvania;
Kendra Eaton, North Carolina State University;
Brian Giorgis, Marist College;
Susan Hagens, University of Vermont;
Mary Kay Hungate, Louisiana Tech University;
Teresa Kuehn Gould, University of California, Berkeley;
Muffet McGraw, University of Notre Dame;
Marilyn McNeil, Monmouth University (ex-officio); and
Lisa Stockton, Tulane University.

ATTACHMENT B

NCAA DIVISION I WOMEN'S BASKETBALL ISSUES COMMITTEE
Feedback Instrument

The NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Issues Committee is seeking feedback on the proposed academic and athletic development model. Please provide comments within the document and return to Sue Donohoe (e-mail: sdonohoe@ncaa.org; fax: 317/917-6095) by June 15.

PROPOSAL:	**FEEDBACK:**
1. Summer School Attendance for Incoming Student-Athletes.	

2. Summer Athletics Activities for Incoming Student-Athletes.	

3. Life/Study Skills Component for Incoming Student-Athletes.	

Overall position on proposal.	
General comments or alternative concepts the committee should consider.	

Conference: _____

Individual Submitting Feedback: _____

Date: _____

Nontraditional Courses Completed by Current Student-Athletes to Meet Full-Time Enrollment and Progress-Toward-Degree Requirements

Overview.

NCAA legislation regarding the use of courses or credit that is not earned in a typical face-to-face classroom environment has not kept pace with the technological advances and trends in the delivery of courses at many colleges and universities. Current bylaws use the term nontraditional courses to refer to such courses, which includes delivery by Internet/virtual courses, distance-learning, extension, correspondence, or independent study courses. Nontraditional courses, particularly online courses, are being used with increasing prevalence: the 2009 Sloan Survey of Online Learning found that online enrollments during the 2008 fall academic term had increased 17 percent from the previous year. During the same term, more than 25 percent of students took at least one course online; less than 10 percent of students took a class online in fall 2002.

Current NCAA legislation on this issue has been updated in a piecemeal fashion and does not fully reflect the breadth of instructional formats that collegiate institutions are using to deliver courses to students. A review of such legislation is appropriate given that many students - and therefore many student-athletes - may experience greater educational outcomes from online learning (or another nontraditional course format). In addition, modernizing the applicable legislation will help to ensure that student-athletes are provided a similar opportunity to access the coursework available to all students at an institution.

The NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet recommends the below updates to the legislation governing the use of nontraditional courses to meet full-time enrollment and progress-toward-degree requirements. In developing these recommendations, the cabinet identified the following guidelines:

1. Campus experiences are an integral element of the student-athlete experience; therefore, policies should encourage student-athletes to remain on campus and engaged in the student-body as much as possible;

2. Proposed regulations should address areas where the potential for misuse is greatest; and

3. Impact on institutional autonomy should be minimized.

Recommendations.

<u>Full-Time Enrollment</u>.

To specify that enrollment in a nontraditional course or credit offered by the certifying institution may be used to satisfy the full-time enrollment requirement for competition, provided the following conditions are met:

1. The course is available to any qualified student at the institution;

2. The institution considers enrollment in the course as regular course enrollment for all students;

3. Enrollment in the course occurs within the institution's regular enrollment periods (pre-registration or drop-add period) in accordance with the institution's academic calendar and applicable policies and procedures; and

4. The course is conducted during the institution's regular academic schedule (term time) in accordance with the institution's academic calendar and applicable policies and procedures.

Progress-Toward-Degree Requirements.

To specify that enrollment in a nontraditional course or credit completed at a four-year institution other than the certifying institution may be used to satisfy progress-toward-degree requirements, provided the following conditions are met:

1. The course is available to any qualified student at the institution;

2. The institution considers enrollment in the course as regular course enrollment for all students; and

3. Enrollment in the course occurs within the institution's regular enrollment periods (pre-registration or drop-add period) in accordance with the institution's academic calendar and applicable policies and procedures.

Discussion and Rationale.

Technological trends within postsecondary instruction require a modernization of the language used to refer to various methods of course delivery. Generally, a student-athlete should be permitted to use nontraditional courses to satisfy the full-time enrollment and progress-toward-degree requirements, provided the institution considers enrollment in such a course as regular course enrollment for all students and the course meets other minimum standards to minimize the potential for misuse.

Previous legislative proposals have included provisions regarding the structure of the course (e.g., student-instructor interaction, evaluation of the student's work, grading scale for the course, use of the course for degree credit). In most instances, these elements are appropriately governed by an institution's academic and curriculum authorities. It is important to respect institutional discretion and authority in setting course content and curriculum and to trust institutional integrity with regard to use of nontraditional courses. Therefore, the current

recommendations are limited to the areas where the cabinet feels that the potential for misuse to meet eligibility requirements is greatest.

Some prior legislative proposals have also included a maximum limitation on the number of nontraditional courses or credits that could be used to meet full-time enrollment or progress-toward-degree requirements within a particular academic term. Such limits can be difficult to establish and implement given the diversity of institutional policies and the increasing number of courses and degree programs available only via nontraditional format. Excluding student-athletes from such courses is not conducive to maintaining the opportunity to select from any of an institution's degree programs. Further, the cabinet is more interested in identifying attributes of appropriate courses for meeting NCAA eligibility requirements than in establishing a limit or cap on the types of courses that may be used to meet those requirements.

In addition, the reduction in the number of provisions from previous proposals may help to alleviate the perception that difficulties monitoring nontraditional courses may have contributed to the defeat of earlier legislative proposals.

Timeline.

If the recommendations included in this document are sponsored by the Academic Cabinet as proposed legislation, they will be entered in the 2010-11 legislative cycle, and would be applicable beginning August 1, 2011.

Academic Data Collection for Two-Year College Transfer Student-Athletes

Background.

At its October 2008 meeting, the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance approved the collection of data related to the academic performance of two-year college transfer student-athletes while at their respective two-year institution(s). Such data collection was recommended by several groups within the Division I governance structure who have reviewed the academic performance of two-year college transfer student-athletes, including the NCAA Division I Basketball Academic Enhancement Group, the NCAA Division I Football Academic Working Group, the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet and the NCAA Two-Year College Relations Panel. Each group noted the need for continued research regarding the academic performance of these transfers, particularly while at their two-year colleges.

Effective with the collection of the 2008-09 Academic Performance Census (APC) data in fall 2009, each institution submitting data for the APC also was required to submit data on its two-year college transfers for baseball, men's and women's basketball and football. During the 2008-09 data collection, institutions provided data on all two-year college transfer student-athletes in the 2008-09 cohort. In subsequent years, data for the most recent entering two-year college class will be provided. Further, the identified elements will be collected for at least a two-year period (i.e., data to be submitted fall 2009 and fall 2010). At the end of this two-year period, the Academic Cabinet and Committee on Academic Performance will determine if any changes should be made to the list of data collection elements and/or to the data collection process. This fall's APC data collection will mark the end of the two-year pilot period and, therefore, it is appropriate at this time for the Academic Cabinet and Committee on Academic Performance to consider the collection of this data in future cycles.

Academic Data Collection for Two-Year College Transfer Student-Athletes.

The Academic Cabinet and Committee on Academic Performance approved the following list of academic data items to be collected as part of the APC that will help to identify the academic profile of a successful two-year college transfer.

1. Number and names of two-year college(s) attended.

2. Total number of credits earned at two-year college(s).

3. Total number of English credits earned at two-year college(s) and the number of these credits that were transferable to the four-year institution.

4. Total number of math credits earned at two-year college(s) and the number of these credits that were transferable to the four-year institution.

5. Total number of science credits earned at two-year college(s) and the number of these credits that were transferable to the four-year institution.

6. Total number of physical education activity credits earned at two-year college(s) and the number of these credits that were transferable to the four-year institution.

7. Total number of transferable credit hours applicable toward the student-athlete's declared degree program at the four-year institution at the time of transfer.

8. Total number of remedial credits the student-athlete is required to take at the entering four-year institution, including identification within one of the following subjects:

    a. English.

    b. Math.

    c. Science.

    d. Other.

9. Overall two-year college grade-point average.

10. Four-year institution degree transfer credit grade-point average.

11. Graduation status at the two-year college.

12. Total number of terms of full-time enrollment by the student-athlete at the two-year college where he or she graduated/most recently attended.

13. Total number of credit hours earned at the two-year college where the student-athlete graduated/most recently attended.

14. Total number of credit hours earned by the student-athlete during the academic term (regular or summer) immediately prior to transfer to the four-year institution.

15. Number of seasons of competition used at the two-year college(s).

16. NCAA initial-eligibility status.

Summary of Data Collected Fall 2009.

Sport	Number of 2-4 Transfers	Number of Institutions	Range Per Institution
Baseball	1,423	239	1-22
Men's Basketball	690	227	1-12
Women's Basketball	426	190	1-7
Football	1,422	190	1-28
Total	3,961	336	

Options for Consideration.

Option No. 1: Make the current two-year college transfer student-athlete data collection process a permanent element of the APC for the four sports.

Option No. 2: Continue the two-year college transfer student-athlete data collection process for the four sports for two additional data cohorts (i.e., 2010-11 and 2011-12) with a reassessment at the end of that time.

Option No. 3: Discontinue the two-year college transfer student-athlete data collection following submission of the 2009-10 APC data.

Option No. 4: Continue with a modified two-year college transfer student-athlete data collection on a permanent basis. Possible medications include:

a. Consider eliminating some data fields.

b. Consider additional data fields.

c. Consider reducing the sports for which data is collected.

d. Consider adding sports for which data is collected.

Staff Recommendation.

The staff recommends Option No. 2. This will allow the NCAA research staff and various governance groups to consider additional two-year college transfer student-athlete data as they continue their examination of the academic performance of two-year college transfer students. The two-year extension also will provide data on the outcomes (e.g., graduation) of two-year college transfers in prior cohorts, which may provide additional insights on the profile of a

successful two-year college transfer. Further, at the end of this two-year extension period, the Academic Cabinet and Committee on Academic Performance should reassess this specific data collection in future NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate/APC cycles and determine if such data are still necessary for policy decisions.

Academic Support Plans as a Required Element of Initial-Eligibility Waivers: Follow-Up Discussion

Background.

At its February 2010 meeting, the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet supported the implementation of academic support plans for incoming student-athletes as a required element of initial-eligibility waiver requests. During the February meeting, the cabinet asked the staff to identify the criteria for determining when an academic support plan will be required and, how long these plans will remain effective. Further, the criteria should summarize the minimum requirements of an acceptable plan. The staff has created the following recommendations for the cabinet's consideration.

Recommendations.

1. An academic support plan should be required under the following circumstances:

    a. The prospective student-athlete's academic record does not satisfy the minimum threshold requirements for review of initial eligibility waivers. However, the NCAA staff may exclude additional waivers from this requirement based on an individual's outstanding overall academic record (e.g., student-athletes with a 3.500 grade-point average or a 1000 SAT/85 ACT test score).

        - Minimum threshold for review requires a total deficiency of not more than one core-course unit, or the required core-course grade-point average and corresponding test score that falls within .100 of satisfying the initial-eligibility index.

    b. The prospective student-athlete's core-course grade-point average is less than 2.000.

    c. The prospective student-athlete has a diagnosed education-impacting disability.

    d. The staff determines an academic support plan shall be required, given the prospective student-athlete's overall academic profile.

2. Determining long academic support plans will remain effective.

    Academic support plans submitted as part of an initial-eligibility waiver request should be required to address, at a minimum, the institution's academic support of the impacted student-athlete during his or her first year in residence. Further, it should be noted that if a student-athlete fails to meet applicable progress-toward-degree requirements as a result of a failure to follow an initial-eligibility waiver academic plan, staff may use this information, absent mitigation for such failure, to deny a progress-toward-degree waiver application.

3. Determining the required elements to be included in an academic support plan.

   a. The institution shall submit its assessment of the student-athlete to determine where he or she needs academic support (e.g., Facilitating Learning and Achieving Graduation/Graduation Risk Overview assessment).

   b. The institution shall describe specific campus programs the student-athlete will use to facilitate academic achievement (e.g., summer bridge program, office of disability services, academic advising, etc.)

   c. The institution shall identify mandatory and nonmandatory academic support programs and services available for the student-athlete, including, but not limited to:

      (1) Study hall(s).

      (2) Tutor(s).

      (3) Reoccurring meetings with academic support personnel.

      (4) Reoccurring meetings with coaches.

      (5) An outline of the student-athlete's time commitment to academic services.

      (6) Regular academic advising schedule.

   d. The institution shall include any other information (e.g., team-level academic support, academic incentives, etc.) deemed relevant by the institution or staff.

   e. Signatures of the student-athlete, head coach, and the individual with oversight of academic support acknowledging their agreement to adhere to the academic support plan must be included.

Policies Regarding Academic Certification of Early Enrollees

Because the NCAA Eligibility Center does not track a prospective student-athlete's date of initial collegiate enrollment, it is challenging to accurately track the number of individuals, particularly in the sport of football, who graduated in advance of their expected date of high school graduation and enrolled early at NCAA Division I institutions. However, it may be possible to combine Eligibility Center and NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP) data to determine the scope of this trend. In the past two academic years, the academic and membership affairs staff has processed a total of only four initial-eligibility waivers involving early enrollees in the sport of football.

The following case study was created to illustrate a scenario in which a prospective student-athlete graduated from high school prior to the expected date of his high school class. It is designed to generate discussion on whether the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet feels it is appropriate to further review issues related to early enrollees.

Entering Academic Profile

1. Core-course grade-point average = 3.214; ACT = 86.

2. Lacked one-half (.5) core-course unit in English.

3. Lacked one and one-half (1.5) core-course units in additional core courses.

Circumstances

1. The student-athlete was initially recruited by the institution in 2007.

2. The student-athlete took an official visit in December 2009.

3. During the 2009 fall term, the student-athlete informed the institution that he desired to graduate from high school early to enroll at the institution in January 2010.

4. The institution advised the student-athlete to enroll in three online correspondence courses.

5. The student-athlete completed the courses in the following timeframe:

Course	Shipped	Completed	Grade
English 12	12/16/09	12/29/09	B
Economics	12/15/09	1/4/10	A
Sociology	12/31/09	1/13/10	B

*English 12 – seven lessons submitted 12/29/09.
*Economics – three exams completed 1/4/10.
*Sociology – five lessons completed between 1/9/10 and 1/13/10.

6. The student-athlete completed three units of coursework in three weeks.

7. The courses were invalidated due to a lack of academic soundness.

8. With the inclusion of these courses, the student-athlete presented 16 core courses and would have met the sliding scale requirements.

Waiver Case Outcome

In this particular case, staff partially approved the waiver for the 2010 spring term. In doing so, staff limited the prospective student-athlete to the receipt of athletically related financial aid only for the spring and did not permit the prospective student-athlete to participate in spring football practice. Additionally, staff conditionally approved the waiver for the 2010 fall term, provided the prospective student-athlete completes 12 hours of academic credit at the institution during the preceding spring term.

In its waiver decision, staff recognized the prospective student-athlete's academic readiness for college based on his entering academic profile. Staff also recognized that had this individual remained in high school, he or she would likely have been a qualifier without the assistance of an initial-eligibility waiver. However, in seeking to make this individual "whole" had he remained in high school during the spring of 2010, staff did not feel he should participate in spring football practice, but should be given the opportunity to participate in practice and competition beginning in fall 2010 with his high school class.

Questions for Consideration

1. Should staff merge Eligibility Center and APP data to attempt to determine the scope of early enrollees in the sport of football?

2. Is the staff's conditional-approval approach to waiver cases involving early enrollees the correct approach?

3. If so, are there any further academic requirements to impose on the prospective student-athlete or member institution?

4. Should staff require an academic support plan for all early enrollees?

Initial-Eligibility Test Score Requirement: Test Validity and Notification
- Discussion Document -

Identification of Issue.

NCAA initial-eligibility requirements have included an SAT/ACT test score requirement since 1983 when Proposition 48 was adopted. As early as 1960 some Division I conferences had a test score minimum. While the specific test score requirements have varied over the years, for nearly 30 years the Association has relied in part on test scores to determine freshman academic readiness for college sports. Test scores, much like academic courses, may be subject to fraud and irregularities. The testing agencies responsible for administering the ACT and SAT (ACT, Inc and College Board/ETS, respectively) each have resources devoted to ensuring the validity of test scores and to flagging and in some cases invalidating scores when malfeasance has occurred. The NCAA has historically relied entirely on the testing agencies to determine whether test scores are valid. When scores are invalidated by an agency, they are not used for NCAA purposes.

The invalidation of test scores has been an issue in major infractions cases. In such cases, institutions have raised concerns regarding the scope of potential test score irregularities within the initial-eligibility certification process, as well as, possible public misperceptions regarding the ability of the NCAA to effectively combat instances of test score fraud. This document explores the number of irregularities in the context of overall certifications, the status of the NCAA's current internal process for addressing test score irregularities, the impact of the current relationship with the testing agencies on such processes and possible options for improved monitoring of test score irregularities and increased understanding of, and confidence in, the NCAA's role in handling such issues.

As part of the development of this document, NCAA staff communicated with select member institution staff members, NCAA enforcement staff and NCAA Eligibility Center staff, as well as representatives from both testing agencies. The document is a compilation of findings and sentiments expressed by all involved parties, and is intended to initiate discussions among the NCAA governance structure, which may lead to further action.

Background.

The Eligibility Center is responsible for certifying initial eligibility for all student-athletes wanting to compete for a Division I or Division II college or university. Along with other academic elements, NCAA Division I and II initial-eligibility legislation require a minimum combined score on the SAT critical reading and math sections or a minimum sum score on the ACT to be eligible to receive athletics aid, practice and compete during a student-athlete's initial year of collegiate enrollment. In Division II this is a hard minimum and in Division I this minimum is indexed to the student-athlete's core-course grade-point average. Additionally, while student-athletes are not specifically required under current legislation to have scores for all completed tests provided to the Eligibility Center, any test used for initial-eligibility certification purposes must be provided by the appropriate testing agency through an official score report.

Additional legislation provides for sanctioning of a prospective student-athlete, student-athlete or institutional staff member for failure to provide complete and accurate information to the NCAA, Eligibility Center or an institution's admission office regarding an individual's academic record (e.g., schools attended, completion of coursework, grades and test scores). Further, an institution is responsible for promptly reporting all discrepancies in information used in the student-athlete's initial-eligibility certification to the Eligibility Center. Discrepancies in information include, but are not limited to, corrections, additions, potential academic misconduct with regard to high schools attended, grades, completion of coursework or test scores. Bylaws that address these specific matters are attached for reference with relevant portions bolded.

Therefore, current legislation clearly indicates both the importance of a valid test score in the initial-eligibility certification process and the importance of maintaining the integrity of the initial-eligibility certification process through the use of accurate information. Unfortunately, as only a consumer of a testing agency product (i.e., student test scores), the NCAA does not control and is not currently privy to the internal safeguards used by the testing agencies to ensure the overall integrity of their product. Further, the NCAA and member institutions are often unaware of any specific criteria regarding the triggering of an inquiry or the specific timing associated with the triggering of an inquiry relative to a particular test date. Eligibility Center and NCAA enforcement interaction with the testing agencies suggest that they are reluctant to provide any substantive information regarding such processes either generally or as they relate to a specific student-athlete. As an example, no data regarding overall or percentage of tests identified for review and no data regarding overall or percentage of cancelled scores has been provided in response to requests from the Eligibility Center made as part of this review. Member institution input also indicates a general inability to discern why a particular inquiry has been initiated at that point in time. Additionally, institutions must rely on the student-athlete to provide timely information regarding the initiation of the inquiry, because correspondence is currently directed only to the student-athlete at the address on file with the testing agency, which may result in delays in communicating time sensitive information.

The Eligibility Center has previously attempted to serve as a potential double check to testing agency process by forwarding information from member institutions and other sources (e.g., former student-athletes) regarding potential test fraud to the agencies. Additionally, the Eligibility Center maintained a test inquiry process which identified and forwarded to the testing agencies potential scores for review based on significant increases over previous reported exams. This process resulted in no additional interaction between the Eligibility Center and the testing agencies other than, in some instances, a report back to the Eligibility Center indicating a test cancellation only. Below are some data regarding these inquiries:

- From November 2007 through December 2009, the Eligibility Center identified, packaged and forwarded 4,087 scores for inquiry, of which 2.9 percent (117) were cancelled. The vast majority of these inquiries related to ACT scores.

- During this same time period, the Eligibility Center processed 256,050 total initial-eligibility reviews. When compared to total initial-eligibility reviews, test score inquiries were identified, packaged and sent by the Eligibility Center for 1.6 percent of the total reviews, and resulting cancellations accounted for 0.046 percent of the total reviews.

- After a cost benefit analysis that looked at this percentage total in light of the direct labor, indirect labor and certification operations direct labor costs associated with identifying, packaging and sending inquiries ($26.03 per inquiry and $909.40 per cancellation), the Eligibility Center modified processes beginning in January 2010 to only forward information received from member institutions and other outside sources regarding potential test score irregularities and not conducting its own analysis or flagging particular test scores. This decision noted the greater number of cancellations provided by the testing agencies independent of the Eligibility Center inquiry process (.125 percent of the total reviews) and no firm understanding as to whether the inquiries provided by the Eligibility Center were for scores that would not otherwise have been identified by the testing agencies.

Inquiry data compiled by the Eligibility Center was not available in a format that could efficiently be manipulated to suggest geographical or sport trends. Evidence from the enforcement staff, however, indicates that football and men's basketball have had a limited number of specific instances (less than 15 over the last 10 years) where investigation of entrance exam fraud was warranted. These sports reflect a significant percentage of reviews of other academic record irregularities (e.g., prospective student-athlete reviews) as well. Of the enforcement investigations, three have resulted in infractions cases [Southern Methodist University football (2000), Mississippi Valley State University football and men's basketball (2001) and University of Memphis men's basketball (2009)].

These limited numbers of investigations highlight the difficulty moving from a test cancellation to an investigation of potential fraud based on the lack of shared information regarding the specific reason for cancellation. They do, however, provide a guidepost regarding the potential means by which test fraud may be perpetrated. Two primary scenarios emerge, both of which suggest the influence of individuals associated with a prospective student-athlete:

1. Alternate test taker – another individual provides false identification and completes the ACT or SAT for the student-athlete.

2. Test center improprieties – student-athletes are directed to specific testing facilities where inappropriate assistance may be made available.

These scenarios are also suggested by outside inquiries that have been provided to the Eligibility Center and forwarded to the testing agencies for review. As noted previously, any action regarding a specific test score or test center falls under the purview of the testing agencies and any substantive finding and/or change in security and data integrity processes may not likely be made known, even to the entity making the initial inquiry.

Initiatives for Consideration.

While Eligibility Center data suggests only a limited percentage of the total number of student-athletes who are processed through the initial-eligibility certification process ever have a test score cancelled, and the reason for cancellation may not specifically link to actual fraud, the impetus for this review offers an opportunity for effective change. The following options serve as a foundation for discussion and may be used in tandem to most effectively assist in the reduction of potential fraud in this area and/or any misperception regarding the NCAA's ability to impact this area. Some options are radical in design, while others tend toward maintenance of or minimal departure from the status quo.

1. Reevaluate the need to continue inclusion of test scores in initial-eligibility requirements.

   Pros.

   a. Test score fraud eliminated.

   b. Place the NCAA on the forefront of the debate as to the efficacy of test scores in predicting future academic success.

   Cons.

   a. Potential offsetting increase in academic fraud relative to core-course completion and grade-point average.

   b. Data indicate that the best predictor of early college success includes a combination of academic elements, including test scores.

   c. Test score still used by most member institutions for admissions decisions.

2. Expand current test score limitations regarding administration on a national testing day to include administration at a testing site within a specific location of the student-athlete's permanent residence.

Pros.

- Limit opportunities for potential fraudulent testing behavior

Cons.

a. Limit on potential testing opportunities may not be warranted based on current data.

b. Administrative burden on Eligibility Center and member institutions to track testing locations relative to student-athlete's permanent residence would be significant.

3. Expand test reporting requirements to specifically include provision of scores for all attempted tests through an official test score report.

Pros.

- Ability to compare score discrepancies for all student-athletes

Cons.

- Financial burden associated with additional score reporting not warranted based on current data.

4. Engage in high level discussions with the testing agencies to enhance the relationship between the NCAA national office and the testing agencies and allow for future collaborations regarding mutual assurance of test score integrity and inquiry processes that center on effective communication with all potentially impacted parties (e.g., member institutions, prospective student-athletes, student-athletes, Eligibility Center).

Pros.

a. More complete understanding of processes and impact of information sharing.

b. Ability to properly educate membership regarding potential review factors and timing of reviews.

c. Increased public perception of integrity of test scores and commitment to eliminate fraudulent behavior over time.

d. Redundant communication resulting in timely response to inquiries.

Cons.

a. Potential and historical resistance from testing agencies to share information and collaborate on fraud issues.

b. Increased initial public perception of a general lack of test score integrity which may not be warranted based on the limited number of cancelled scores.

5. Direct appropriate NCAA staff (e.g., enforcement, student-athlete reinstatement) to increase official tracking of cases concerning potential entrance exam fraud and/or increase prospective student-athlete and student-athlete only investigations of unethical conduct legislation based upon test cancellation.

Pros.

a. Greater ability to track scope of issues over time which could facilitate a better overall understanding of the extent to test score fraud occurring.

b. Increased implementation and enforcement of Bylaw 10.1.

Cons.

- Costs associated with requisite increase in manpower may not be warranted based on number of test score cancellations and limited information as to the reason for cancellation.

6. Target educational efforts to member institutions, the media and prospective student-athletes regarding test integrity resting with the testing agencies and not the NCAA.

Pros.

a. Eliminate misperceptions.

b. Equate NCAA and member institution admissions relationship with testing agencies.

Cons.

a. Scope of messaging required to move current perceptions unknown.

b. Potential perception of NCAA "scapegoating" testing agencies.

7. Create clearer obligations for student-athletes to promptly forward all testing inquiries to their member institution and the Eligibility Center through specific provisions in the student release form provided to the Eligibility Center and the Student Athlete Statement signed prior to competition for the certifying institution. Evaluate modification of unethical conduct legislation regarding failure of timely notice.

Pros.

a. Creates a clear obligation for student-athletes to provide test score inquiry information to member institution and NCAA.

b. Institutional assistance is available to student-athletes regarding navigating process, exploring options and advocating positions in a timely manner.

c. Relative low cost to implement.

Cons.

- Student-athletes address changes and lost mailings could lead to significant consequences for student-athletes.

8. Reanalyze the cost benefit, including public relations costs, of relying exclusively on the testing agencies to maintain the integrity of their product by creating a separate procedure for the NCAA to invalidate test scores for eligibility purposes or by reinstituting a process for the Eligibility Center to flag scores to testing agency for review.

Pros.

a. Built-in redundancy by having both the NCAA and the testing agencies reviewing suspect scores.

b. Increased perception of NCAA vigilance.

Cons.

a. Increased labor costs, which could be significant.

b. Efficiency loss given lag time of testing agencies and their past lack of response.

c. Potential implications of increasing triggers to capture full scope of student-athletes (e.g., triggers for only one test score).

d. Previous experience with testing agencies response to inquiries provides no assurance that any inquiries were for scores that would not otherwise be reviewed per testing agency protocol.

e. The NCAA would be making determinations about test score validity contrary to the testing agencies. This could have legal ramifications.

9. Target educational efforts toward prospective student-athletes regarding the risks associated with engaging in academically suspect behavior, including the potential legal implications associated with academic fraud.

Pros.

a. Increased awareness of prospective student-athletes.

b. Relative low cost to implement.

Cons.

- Difficulty in making a significant difference given these cases often involve significant outside adult influences on the student who are encouraging the fraud.

10. Evaluate increased opportunities for recruiting contact earlier in a prospective student-athletes academic career for purposes of assessing academic preparedness and decreasing nonscholastic influences in the recruiting process.

Pros.

a. Increased emphasis on academic preparedness at point in time when prospective student-athletes can take advantage of multiple testing opportunities.

b. Possible decrease of influence from individuals that may suggest academically suspect and potentially fraudulent alternatives to meeting initial-eligibility requirements.

Cons.

a. Increased intrusion in the lives of prospective student-athletes.

b. Limited impact relative to late recruited student-athletes.

Staff Recommendations for Consideration.

Based on the current information available for analysis, the following present a combination of options that could limit the opportunities for successful test score fraud while creating the most informed environment for all entities affected by applicable testing integrity processes:

1. Initiate a high level conversation between the NCAA president, select college presidents, and testing agency leaders. The goal of the discussions could be as follows:

   a. Determine the testing agencies understanding of their responsibility in ensuring the integrity of the test scores used by member institutions in admissions decisions, as well as the NCAA relative to initial-eligibility certification;

   b. Determine how the testing agencies investigate potential fraud issues and related test score inquiries to ensure test score integrity

   c. Evaluate mechanisms where entities that have made admission and/or eligibility decisions based on previously reported test scores are allowed to request direct communication regarding the initiation of the inquiry process;

   d. Determine the feasibility of future assistance the NCAA, Eligibility Center and/or member institutions may provide to assist in enhancing the integrity of the test score product without creating unnecessary redundancies; and

   e. Encourage the testing agencies to disclose test score inquires to all official score recipients (i.e., member institutions, NCAA, NCAA Eligibility Center) at the same time the student is notified.

2. Create clear obligation language for student-athletes regarding communication of testing inquiries to their member institution and the Eligibility Center in a timely manner. This

language could be broadened to include inquiry of any academic credential. It would be included in the student release form provided to the Eligibility Center and the Student Athlete Statement signed prior to competition for the certifying institution.

3. Amend Bylaw 10.1 to include the requirement that students report any test score inquiry to their member institution and the Eligibility Center immediately on receipt of the inquiry. This would require legislation change.

4. Create a new, more transparent process for the Eligibility Center to raise test score issues with the testing agencies, which ensures such inquiries are readily apparent to member institutions. Inquiries should be reflected as a hold code on the student-athlete's certification and specific criteria for inquiries should be provided to Institutional Request List institution(s) on request. Additionally, the process should include procedures allowing for an institution to assume the risk associated with authorizing use of the inquired test score in final certification while the inquiry is pending.

ATTACHMENT

NCAA Division I Selected Bylaws

NCAA Division I Bylaw 10.1 (Unethical Conduct).

Unethical conduct by a prospective or enrolled student-athlete or a current or former institutional staff member (e.g., coach, professor, tutor, teaching assistant, student manager, student trainer) may include, but is not limited to, the following: *(Revised: 1/10/90, 1/9/96, 2/22/01)*

(a) Refusal to furnish information relevant to an investigation of a possible violation of an NCAA regulation when requested to do so by the NCAA or the individual's institution;

(b) Knowing involvement in arranging for fraudulent academic credit or false transcripts for a prospective or an enrolled student-athlete;

(c) Knowing involvement in offering or providing a prospective or an enrolled student-athlete an improper inducement or extra benefit or improper financial aid; *(Revised: 1/9/96)*

(d) Knowingly furnishing or knowingly influencing others to furnish the NCAA or the individual's institution false or misleading information concerning an individual's involvement in or knowledge of matters relevant to a possible violation of an NCAA regulation; *(Revised: 1/16/10)*

(e) Receipt of benefits by an institutional staff member for facilitating or arranging a meeting between a student-athlete and an agent, financial advisor or a representative of an agent or advisor (e.g., "runner"); *(Adopted: 1/9/96, Revised: 8/4/05)*

(f) Knowing involvement in providing a banned substance or impermissible supplement to student-athletes, or knowingly providing medications to student-athletes contrary to medical licensure, commonly accepted standards of care in sports medicine practice, or state and federal law. This provision shall not apply to banned substances for which the student-athlete has received a medical exception per Bylaw 31.2.3.5; however, the substance must be provided in accordance with medical licensure, commonly accepted standards of care and state or federal law; *(Adopted: 8/4/05, Revised: 5/6/08)*

(g) Failure to provide complete and accurate information to the NCAA, the NCAA Eligibility Center or an institution's admissions office regarding an individual's academic record (e.g., schools attended, completion of coursework, grades and test scores); *(Adopted: 4/27/06, Revised: 10/23/07)*

(h) Fraudulence or misconduct in connection with entrance or placement examinations; *(Adopted: 4/27/06)*

(i) Engaging in any athletics competition under an assumed name or with intent to otherwise deceive; or *(Adopted: 4/27/06)*

(j) Failure to provide complete and accurate information to the NCAA, the NCAA Eligibility Center or the institution's athletics department regarding an individual's amateur status. *(Adopted: 1/8/07, Revised: 5/9/07)*

Bylaw 14.1.2 (Validity of Academic Credentials).

As a condition and obligation of membership, it is the responsibility of a member institution to determine the validity of the information on which the eligibility of a student-athlete is based. Therefore, it is the responsibility of a member institution to determine whether a transcript is valid for purposes of applying appropriate NCAA legislation to the eligibility of a student-athlete when the institution receives notification, or otherwise has cause to believe, that a student-athlete's high school, preparatory school or two-year college transcript is not valid.

Bylaw 14.1.2.1 (High School Review Committee).

The High School Review Committee shall have the authority to establish policies and procedures related to the academic review of high schools and to determine the validity of a high school (e.g., core courses, curriculum, grades) for the purpose of meeting initial-eligibility requirements. A review may result in a determination that a high school shall not be used for the purpose of meeting initial-eligibility requirements. The policies and procedures for the review and determination of the validity of a high school shall be approved by the Academics Cabinet. (See Bylaw 21.6.4.) *(Adopted: 1/8/07, Revised: 11/1/07 effective 8/1/08)*

Bylaw 14.1.2.2 (Student Records Review Committee).

The Student Records Review Committee shall have the authority to establish policies and procedures related to the review of a prospective student-athlete's academic credentials and to determine the validity of a prospective student-athlete's academic credentials for the purpose of meeting initial-eligibility requirements. A review may result in a determination that a prospective student-athlete's academic credentials shall not be used for the purpose of meeting initial-eligibility requirements. The policies and procedures for the review of academic credentials and the determination of the validity of such credentials shall be approved by the Academics Cabinet. (See Bylaw 21.6.5.) *(Adopted: 1/8/07, Revised: 11/1/07 effective 8/1/08)*

Bylaw 14.1.2.3 (NCAA Eligibility Center).

An institution shall use the NCAA Eligibility Center approved by the Executive Committee to determine the initial eligibility of a student-athlete. *(Adopted: 1/19/93 effective 8/1/94 for student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after 8/1/94, Revised: 1/10/95, 3/10/04, 4/27/06; for those student-athletes whose initial collegiate enrollment occurs in the 2006-07 academic year and thereafter, 1/8/07, 5/9/07)*

Bylaw 14.1.2.3.1 (Institutional Responsibility).

An institution is responsible for promptly reporting all discrepancies in information used in a student-athlete's initial-eligibility certification to the NCAA Eligibility Center. Discrepancies in information include, but are not limited to, corrections, additions, potential academic misconduct with regard to high schools attended, grades, completion of coursework or test scores. *(Adopted: 4/27/06, Revised: 5/9/07)*

Bylaw 14.3.1.3.4 (Test-Score Report)

The minimum SAT or ACT score(s) used for initial-eligibility purposes must be provided to the NCAA Eligibility Center by the appropriate testing agency through an official test-score report. *(Adopted: 4/27/06 effective 8/1/07 for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after 8/1/07, Revised: 5/9/07)*

The New York Times

February 18, 2010

Plan Would Let Students Start College Early

By SAM DILLON

Dozens of public high schools in eight states will introduce a program next year allowing 10th graders who pass a battery of tests to get a diploma two years early and immediately enroll in community college.

Students who pass but aspire to attend a selective college may continue with college preparatory courses in their junior and senior years, organizers of the new effort said. Students who fail the 10th grade tests, known as board exams, can try again at the end of their 11th and 12th grades. The tests would cover not only English and math but other subjects like science and history.

The new system of high school coursework with the accompanying board examinations is modeled largely on systems in high-performing nations including Denmark, Finland, England, France and Singapore.

The program is being organized by the National Center on Education and the Economy, and one of its goals is to reduce the numbers of high school graduates who need remedial courses when they enroll in college. More than a million college freshmen across America must take remedial courses each year, and many drop out before getting a degree.

“That’s a central problem we’re trying to address, the enormous failure rate of these kids when they go to the open admission colleges,” said Marc S. Tucker, president of the center, a Washington-based nonprofit. “We’ve looked at schools all over the world, and if you walk into a high school in the countries that use these board exams, you’ll see kids working hard, whether they want to be a carpenter or a brain surgeon.”

The 100 or so high schools participating in the initiative are pioneers in a pilot project that organizers hope will eventually spread to all schools in those states, and inspire other states across the nation to follow suit.

High school students will first begin the new coursework in fall 2011 in schools in Connecticut, Kentucky, Maine, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and Vermont.

Kentucky's commissioner of education, Terry Holliday, said that high school graduation requirements there have long been based on having students accumulate enough course credits to graduate.

"This would reform that," Mr. Holliday said. "We've been tied to seat time for 100 years. This would allow an approach based on subject mastery — a system based around move-on-when-ready."

The new system aims to provide students with a clear outline of what they need to study to succeed, said Phil Daro, a Berkeley-based consultant who is a member of an advisory committee for the effort.

School systems like Singapore's promise students that if they study diligently the material in their course syllabuses, they will do well on their examinations, Mr. Daro said. "In the U.S., by contrast, all is murky. Students do not have a clear idea of where to apply their effort, and the system makes no coherent attempt to reward learning."

Four years ago, a bipartisan panel of national education and other policy experts, assembled by the national center, recommended a far-reaching redesign of the American educational system, including the adoption of board examinations in high schools.

Other recommendations of the 2006 panel included giving states, rather than local districts, control over school financing, and starting school for most children at age 3. Mr. Tucker said that the board examination project was the broadest effort at putting the panel's proposals into effect so far.

"One hope is that this board exam system can prepare students to move on to careers, to higher ed and technical colleges and the workplace, sooner rather than later," said Howard T. Everson, a professor of educational psychology at the City University of New York, who is co-chairman of the advisory committee.

States that participate in the pilot project on board examinations will pick up to five programs of instruction, with their accompanying tests, for use by the participating high schools. Those programs already approved by the national center include the College Board's Advanced Placement, the International Baccalaureate Diploma, ACT's QualityCore and the International General Certificate of Secondary Education programs offered both by Cambridge International and by Pearson/Edexcel.

The New York Times

February 8, 2010

For Students at Risk, Early College Proves a Draw

By TAMAR LEWIN

RAEFORD, N.C. — Precious Holt, a 12th grader with dangly earrings and a SpongeBob pillow, climbs on the yellow school bus and promptly falls asleep for the hour-plus ride to Sandhills Community College.

When the bus arrives, she checks in with a guidance counselor and heads off to a day of college classes, blending with older classmates until 4 p.m., when she and the other seniors from SandHoke Early College High School gather for the ride home.

There is a payoff for the long bus rides: The 48 SandHoke seniors are in a fast-track program that allows them to earn their high-school diploma and up to two years of college credit in five years — completely free.

Until recently, most programs like this were aimed at affluent, overachieving students — a way to keep them challenged and give them a head start on college work. But the goal is quite different at SandHoke, which enrolls only students whose parents do not have college degrees.

Here, and at North Carolina's other 70 early-college schools, the goal is to keep at-risk students in school by eliminating the divide between high school and college.

"We don't want the kids who will do well if you drop them in Timbuktu," said Lakisha Rice, the principal. "We want the ones who need our kind of small setting."

Results have been impressive. Not all students at North Carolina's early-college high schools earn two full years of college credit before they graduate — but few drop out.

"Last year, half our early-college high schools had zero dropouts, and that's just unprecedented for North Carolina, where only 62 percent of our high school students graduate after four years," said Tony Habit, president of the North Carolina New Schools Project, the nonprofit group spearheading the state's high school reform.

In addition, North Carolina's early-college high school students are getting slightly better grades in their college courses than their older classmates.

While North Carolina leads the way in early-college high schools, the model is spreading in California, New York, Texas and elsewhere, where such schools are seen as a promising approach to reducing the high school dropout rate and increasing the share of degree holders — two major goals of the Obama administration.

More than 200 of the schools are part of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation's Early College High School Initiative, and dozens of others, scattered throughout the nation, have sprung up as projects of individual school districts.

"As a nation, we just can't afford to have students spending four years or more getting through high school, when we all know senior year is a waste," said Hilary Pennington of the Gates Foundation, "then having this swirl between high school and college, when a lot more students get lost, then a two-year degree that takes three or four years, if the student ever completes it at all."

Most of the early college high schools are on college campuses, but some stand alone. Some are four years, some five. Most serve a low-income student body that is largely black or Latino. But all are small, and all offer free college credits as part of the high school program.

"In 27 years as a college president, this is just about the most exciting thing I've been involved in," said John R. Dempsey, the president of Sandhills. "We picked these kids out of eighth grade, kids who were academically representative at a school with very low performance. We didn't cherry-pick them. Their performance has been so startling that you see what high expectations can do."

Initially, the prospect of two years of college at no cost was less appealing to Ms. Holt than to her mother, Simone Dean, an Army mechanic at nearby Fort Bragg.

"I didn't want to do it, because my middle school friends weren't applying," Ms. Holt said. "I cried, but my mother made me do it.

"The first year, I didn't like it, because my friends at the regular high school were having pep rallies and actual fun, while I had all this homework. But when I look back at my

middle school friends, I see how many of them got pregnant or do drugs or dropped out. And now I'm excited, because I'm a year ahead."

Because most of the nation's early-college high schools are still new, it is too soon to say whether strapped states will be impressed enough to justify the extra costs of college tuition, college textbooks and academic support,

A recent report from Jobs for the Future, a nonprofit group that is coordinating the Gates initiative, found that in 2008, the early-college schools that had been open for more than four years had a high school graduation rate of 92 percent — and 4 out of 10 graduates had earned at least a year of college credit.

With a careful sequence of courses, including ninth-grade algebra, and attention to skills like note-taking, the early-college high schools accelerate students so that they arrive in college needing less of the remedial work that stalls so many low-income and first-generation students. "When we put kids on a college campus, we see them change totally, because they're integrated with college students, and they don't want to look immature," said Michael Webb, associate vice president of Jobs for the Future.

The first early-college high schools — Bard College at Simon's Rock, a residential private liberal-arts college in Great Barrington, Mass., and Bard High School Early College, a public school in New York City — were selective schools intended to cure the boredom that afflicts many talented high school students.

"The philosophy behind the school was that the last two years of high school are not engaging, and we would set up something that would make them intellectually exciting." said Ray Peterson, the principal of Bard High School Early College.

But at the City University of New York's early-college schools, the emphasis is less on preventing the senior slump than on aligning high school with college.

"Our students are actually planning for college-level coursework from their first day in the school," said Cass Conrad, executive director for school support and development at CUNY, which has a dozen early-college high schools. "And their teachers plan backwards from college, to make sure they'll know what they need to be successful in college-level classes."

In the pine woods of North Carolina, SandHoke students start in a small Hoke County school down the road from a turkey-processing plant, and begin traveling to the Sandhills campus, nestled among the golf courses of Moore County, only as seniors. Their first college class, in 10th grade, is a user-friendly communications course taught by Cathleen Kruska, a high-energy teacher who had them discussing job interviews, learning which kinds of questions are legally permissible and doing mock interviews.

Ms. Kruska teaches the same course to college students at Sandhills, and said the only difference was that the high school students were needier.

These days, aspirations run high. Ms. Holt, for example, is aiming for medical school. She was disappointed last semester to get three B's and two A's.

"That's not what I was hoping for," she said, "and I'm going to work harder this semester."

Her high standards have affected the whole family.

"My 13-year-old is going to apply to SandHoke for next year," Ms. Dean said. "And I'm actually learning from Precious. When I'm done with the military, I want to get my degree."

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction:

Correction: February 9, 2010
An article on Monday about programs that allow students to earn high school diplomas and up to two years of college credit in five years at no cost misstated the name of one of the country's first early-college high schools, which is now a private liberal-arts college in Great Barrington, Mass. It is Bard College at Simon's Rock, not Simon's Rock at Bard College. The article also misstated the given name of the president of Sandhill Community College in Raeford, N.C., which has an early-college high school. He is John R. Dempsey, not Rick.

More private colleges court community college transfers

By David Moltz, Inside Higher Ed

Community college transfer students are no longer being courted only by the usual suspects. More private institutions, of every ilk, are aggressively recruiting students from two-year colleges, hoping to bolster and diversify their enrollments and capitalize on the belt-tightening of regional public universities.

"I see more and more privates getting out there and recruiting transfers, whereas there really weren't that many out there even just a few years ago," says Brenda Doran, director of transfer admissions at Bryant University, a small, tuition-driven independent institution in Rhode Island that has traditionally relied on community college transfers to meet its enrollment goals. "As with any competition, you just have to be more aggressive than you were in the past."

Not so long ago, Doran and her colleagues from Bryant were among only a handful of private institutions in the Connecticut, Rhode Island and Massachusetts area that actively recruited at local community colleges. Now, competition for these area students is coming not only from other small, tuition-driven private institutions — such as Salve Regina University, in Rhode Island, and Sage College of Albany, in New York— but from some of the sector's elites. Thus, while Bryant has long had an admissions staff position dedicated to the recruitment of community college students, institutions such as Amherst Collegehave recently added such positions, thanks to grant funding from groups such as the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation.

"How do I view it?" asks Doran, who previously worked as a transfer coordinator at a community college. "I'm not sure. Though not everyone will make it, everyone deserves a chance to make it into an institution like that. … Putting on my institutional hat, though, there might be some jealousy. I want that student."

So why is it that, in the midst of a deep recession — when some small colleges feared that they might have to shut their doors— many private institutions are flocking after community college transfer students? The answer varies, depending on the financial standing of the institution.

For well-endowed private institutions, such as the University of Southern Californiaand New York University— both of which have ratcheted up community college recruitment recently — seeking qualified two-year transfer students improves their demographic mix.

"It helps the selective privates with their diversity, in terms of race and socioeconomic status," says Josipa Roksa, a sociology professor at the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education who does some community college research. "To get students in certain income brackets, it matters. Oftentimes it's easier to recruit at community

colleges than at challenged high schools. For those who value diversity, whether it's because of the [college] rankings or their mission, this is where you go."

This push for diversity drives the recruitment of community college students at places like Southern California — where only 13% of undergraduates are Latino, compared to 48% of residents in its home city, Los Angeles.

"We've been working hard to get minority students from the surrounding area," says Tatiana Melguizo, professor at USC's Rossier School of Education. "If you look at the first-time freshman students we admit, they're not as diverse. Still, the university has alternative ways of accepting transfers to bring in the kind of diversity that they can't get up front. Community college transfers were the best deals. They're motivated, they're more likely to graduate, and they're relatively cheap" for the college to educate.

Smaller, more tuition-driven independent institutions, however, often have a more practical reason for actively pursuing community college transfer students: the tuition revenue they bring.

"They really need to bring in fresh students who'll be able to pay for four years," Melguizo says of many tuition-driven private institutions. "But, if they can get transfers, who get financial aid from the government and other sources, they can at least get two years. And still, community college transfers don't always take two years. Some stay longer. These institutions are discovering that this is a good way, in terms of cost effectiveness, to bolster their enrollments. These students are appealing, in that you know you don't have to put so many resources to support them at the beginning as you would a native student."

But this brand of enrollment boosting and budget balancing needn't seem so calculated, say some community college observers. Rod Risley, executive director of Phi Theta Kappa, a community college honors society, concurs that financial considerations have driven most of the recent two-year recruitment by private institutions. He argues, however, that this is a compliment to these students.

"The persistence among community college students at these four-year institutions is very high, and they're doing the job filling those junior- and senior-year spots," Risley says. "These colleges wouldn't go after these students if they weren't successful."

While still anxious about the slumping economy's impact of their enrollments, some private institutions see opportunity in the recent recruitment competition with their public counterparts. Melguizo notes that some smaller private institutions in California, for example, are positioning themselves to appeal to community college students who have been barred from transferring to a University of Californiaor a California State Universityfor an indefinite period of time due to the state's budget crisis. For example, Notre Dame de Namur University and Holy Names University, both in the San Francisco Bay area, are among the small, private institutions that have seen their enrollments grow because students are finding it increasingly difficult to enroll in one of the state's

public institutions.

Even private college officials in states that do not have the pronounced enrollment and budget troubles of California see an opportunity. Doran notes that Bryant will continue to focus on transfer students, especially given the simultaneous enrollment boom and budget cuts at nearby public institutions like the University of Rhode Island and the University of Massachusetts.

Other private institutions just want to make sure they stay in the game. Brandon Miller, assistant vice president for student success at Baylor University, says his institution's further expansion into community college recruiting is driven by the concern that if students in Texas are not made aware of their institution, they might think the ballooning Texas A&M and University of Texas systems are their only choices. In the past year, he notes, Baylor added two transfer admissions officers, one of whom logged more than 6,000 miles last year visiting community colleges around the state and country to recruit students.

Though many private institutions have been more public with their desire to win community college students, researchers caution that there is currently no way to know how successful their efforts have been. Roksa says that large federal and state data sets often do not distinguish whether community college students transfer to private or public institutions.

"The percentage of those students who transferred to private institutions used to be so low — around 15% to 20% — that it was often said, 'Well, we can just disregard them because our public policy doesn't influence them,' " says Roksa, who believes such research could be helpful to officials at all kinds of colleges. "So, it's not clear whether this is something that's true for most privates or even increasingly true for most privates. Still, if the publics are losing students to privates, it's time to say, 'What's going on here?' "

The Power of Professors

Brad Wolverton
The Chronicle of Higher Education
April 12, 2010

Wouldn't it be ironic if the NCAA's well-intended academic-reform efforts were leading to more cases of academic fraud? That's one of the arguments Gerald S. Gurney makes in an interesting commentary that got lost in the Butler buzz last week.

Mr. Gurney, outspoken president-elect of the National Association of Academic Advisers for Athletics, says 33 cases of major infractions related to academics have been reported since 2003, when the NCAA began its latest push to improve players' graduation rates. A comment from Paul Dee, chairman of the Division I Committee on Infractions, who has seen his share of those cheating scandals, led Mr. Gurney to look into it.

As he sees it, the problem started when the NCAA set out to increase access for economically disadvantaged athletes, creating an essentially open admissions process. That led to many more special admits, especially in football and men's basketball, in which players often have far lower SAT scores than other students.

As the academic profile of the overall student body has improved on many campuses, it has left some athletes feeling like impostors, Mr. Gurney says: "At-risk student-athletes are often caught in the twin pincers of underpreparedness and increased demands for academic performance in order to remain eligible to compete."

Of course, this is why athletics departments have people like Mr. Gurney, senior associate AD for academics and student life at the University of Oklahoma. He and other academic advisers for athletes are the miracle workers in college sports, often directing players to choose majors that keep them suited up.

But as the overall student population keeps getting smarter, and athletes in the big revenue sports keep falling behind, college sports is going to need a better solution. Mr. Gurney calls for changes that only faculty members have the power to provide.

That sounds great on paper, but professors don't always care so much about sports. A few years ago the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics polled more than 2,000 faculty members at Division I-A institutions. They rated intercollegiate athletics 12th out of 13 areas of priority, just ahead of Greek life.

THE CHRONICLE
of Higher Education

April 5, 2010

Professors Must Speak Out: Colleges Can No Longer Afford Athletics as Usual

By Gerald S. Gurney and Jerome C. Weber

Basketball fans will focus tonight on the National Collegiate Athletic Association's men's championship game, but amid the excitement of such competition, attention must be paid to how big-time college sports still operate in ways counter to higher education's aims. Although the NCAA celebrates rising graduation rates in Division I sports and the results of other academic reforms, many of those changes have inadvertently led to other thorny problems. What's urgently needed are far-reaching changes that only the greater involvement of faculty members can bring.

The recent economic downturn has exacerbated the long-term tensions and issues surrounding campus athletics. While the NCAA considers expanding its money-making postseason basketball tournament from 65 to 96 teams and renegotiating its television contract, a growing number of students and faculty members are questioning the cost, purpose, and appropriateness of the intercollegiate athletics enterprise. Most major athletics programs operate with a deficit and drain their institutions of revenue. Students who face constantly rising tuition are beginning to ask how much of their money is being used to support athletics programs as opposed to their education.

Some institutions have decided to drop programs, move to less competitive (i.e., less costly) divisions, or eliminate football, by far the most expensive sport. Yet on many campuses, spending continues unabated, facilities are made more lavish, coaches' contracts continue to escalate, and, according to the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics report "College Sports 101," only 20 to 30 colleges can support their athletics programs without direct subsidies, typically in the form of institutional loans and student fees.

In addition to piling up debt, many athletics programs are awash in academic scandal. The NCAA credits its academic-reform efforts for the rise in its "Graduation Success Rate" of 78 percent. But the fact is that student-athletes generally do well in their studies, with the glaring exception of those in men's basketball and football—the two "revenue sports" associated with almost all of the publicity,

visibility, notoriety, and fraud in intercollegiate athletics. Binghamton University, for instance, part of the State University of New York, recently spent close to $1-million to investigate academic improprieties related to its men's basketball program. The arrests of players on felony charges involving drugs, assault, and shoplifting led in part to the suspensions of six players, the resignation of the athletics director, and the suspension on paid leave of the coach. An adjunct sociology professor, asserting she was pressured by coaches to give preferential treatment to basketball players, was terminated and later reinstated by the university. In January 2010, Georgia Southern University was placed on two years' probation for academic violations that included a men's basketball coach taking an examination for a player—which, in academic terms, might be considered a capital crime.

Paul Dee, chairman of the NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions and a sports-law professor at the University of Miami, has expressed his concern about the growing number of academic-fraud cases that his committee sees. It seems that cases of academic dishonesty and fraud have actually increased in tandem with the NCAA's attempts at academic reform. In fact, since the beginning of such efforts at reform, in 2003, as many as 33 cases of major infractions related to academics have occurred.

How might NCAA reforms and academic fraud have a cause-effect relationship? To increase access to higher education for economically disadvantaged student-athletes, the NCAA, albeit well-intentioned, has created the possibility of essentially open admissions. That has resulted in many of those students' being academically unprepared for college. As "special admits," prospective high-school student-athletes can now qualify for eligibility without correctly answering a single question on a standardized examination. And many admissions officers fear rampant grade inflation on the transcripts they review. Yet, according to the findings of a Knight Commission study released in October 2009, most college presidents are reluctant to unilaterally impose controls on athletics or raise standards, because of pressure from popular coaches, donors, and trustees who fear their teams might be put at a disadvantage. Some coaches have even threatened to leave if their institutions do not lower admissions requirements to match the NCAA's initial-eligibility rules.

Once at the university, underprepared, at-risk student-athletes often feel as if they are impostors who do not belong among students far better prepared for the demands of college work. At-risk student-athletes are often caught in the twin pincers of underpreparedness and increased demands for academic performance in order to remain eligible to compete.

Is it any wonder that such pressures result in academic misconduct? To limit the risk of the NCAA's imposing penalties on them for not progressing academically, at-risk student-athletes often cluster in majors likely to ensure athletic eligibility, or sometimes engage in cheating, plagiarism, and other forms of academic fraud. The entire culture surrounding big-time sports encourages such actions. The student-athlete is usually aware that officials of his college, beginning with the coach who recruited him, are engaging in a deception designed to use his athletics talent for entertainment purposes, often regardless of whether he gains the broader benefits of higher education. But every time a student is admitted under essentially false premises, the institution gives away a small piece of its integrity—an action that is inimical to the long-term well-being of the institution and of higher education in general.

The NCAA, understandably, represents its own interests and those of its athletics constituents, not the educational interests of colleges and universities. Thus it can't be depended upon to make the fundamental changes that are needed. True athletics reform requires a new and better model of shared decision-making, one that calls on faculty members and faculty senates to participate far more in the debate on athletics reform on their campuses and on the national scene.

Specifically, faculty members should:

Gain more control over special admissions. Professors should ensure that student-athletes accepted by their institutions bring the necessary competencies to the classroom. That is not to say that colleges should do away with special-admissions options, but rather that they should ensure that admissions decisions reflect more than the interests of the football and men's basketball coaches. If faculty senates do no more than establish appropriate athletics admissions standards for their own institutions, that could go a long way toward real academic reform.

Select the faculty athletics representative. That important appointment should no longer typically be made by the president, but by the faculty senate or another body that reflects the faculty's will. In addition, term limits should be put in place. In some instances, the representative remains in that position for decades, when five years might be a reasonable period for any one person to serve. Apart from other considerations, it seems unreasonable to expect a person to spend years being entertained by the athletics department, yet at the same time remain uninfluenced by athletics interests—especially when they run counter to those of the institution.

Work more forcefully through independent faculty-based organizations. Those groups include the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics and the Drake Group, which represent a variety of

positions on important topics such as academic integrity in athletics, athletics-related financial aid, and athletics-department debt.

Further, whomever is selected to lead the NCAA should engage its member institutions and the faculty-based organizations in determining how intercollegiate athletics can better support both campus priorities and student-athletes. The aim should be for the athletics program to serve the institution, not the other way around.

Athletics reform has not achieved its desired goals, but is not too late to reshape a more responsive and responsible intercollegiate athletics. The inclusion of the academic side of the university could offer a refreshing redirection for competitive big-time college sports. Expenditures for athletics facilities would take their place in line with other campus priorities, understanding that donors will always have preferences as to how their dollars are to be used. A student-athlete who is a step slower in the 40-yard dash but better prepared academically could compete with the expectation of graduating, reaping the benefits of a college education, and enhancing his life and the life of his community.

Meanwhile the games would remain competitive. Ohio State University and the University of Michigan would still battle on the last Saturday of the football season.

And the Final Four basketball fans would still come out in throngs.

Gerald S. Gurney is senior associate athletics director for academics and student life and an adjunct professor of education at the University of Oklahoma, and president-elect of the National Association of Academic Advisers for Athletics. Jerome C. Weber is a professor of education at the university.

Canisius basketball program plays at an up-tempo pace in classroom

Rodney McKissic
Buffalo News
May 22, 2010

Tom Parrotta laid out his demanding academic acceleration path for the Canisius College men's basketball program starting with his first recruit: attend both sessions of summer school each year and you finish with four years on the court and a master's degree.

Four years later, guard Frank Turner has his master's degree. All six of the juniors on this year's team — Julius Coles, Elton Frazier, Robert Goldsberry, Rishawn Johnson, Greg Logins and Tomas Vazquez-Simmons — have their bachelor's and plan on getting their master's degrees in four years as well.

Student-athletes graduating in three years is not unprecedented — former NFL quarterback Bernie Kosar (Miami) and former Turner-Carroll guard Leonard Stokes (Cincinnati) did it — but what is extraordinary is the number of players doing it at Canisius. In a time when NCAA schools are in an endless mission for academic reform, the school has raised the bar.

"No. 1, a lot of the credit has to go to Canisius for having the academic structure and resources in place for them to succeed," Parrotta said. "Second, the credit has to go to the guys. If they don't take the academic part of it seriously they would never be at the point where they are now."
. . .

Turner has been the program's on-court leader and classroom pioneer, but the latter role makes him uncomfortable.

"I'm kind of a humble guy and people are telling me, "You started this and people are looking up to you,' " said Turner, who graduated with a master's in sports administration last week. "It hasn't settled in yet."

Turner has been bucking the odds his entire life. His mother lived in one Atlantic City project and his father another but Turner was raised by his grandmother in Bungalow Park.

He ran with a tight group of friends who always supported him.

"I never had those friends who tried to get me to do bad things," Turner said. "I never had anyone who tried to get me to smoke or drink and I had friends who did it every day."

But when he entered high school he began hearing that he wasn't good enough to play varsity basketball, that at 5-foot-10 he was too small.

"They said I wouldn't be any different from any other Atlantic City athlete, which was to get a lot of hype but end up failing out of school and doing nothing with my life," Turner said. "I remember people saying I wouldn't play Division I basketball."

He not only played, he excelled, leaving Canisius with more than 1,700 points, 600 assists and 500 rebounds. Turner will continue proving doubters wrong by playing overseas. He's had interest from teams in Germany, France, Italy and one from Belgium, where former Canisius forward Darnell Wilson is playing.

Just as he did with his basketball career, he saw what was in sight academically, attacked and finished strong. After his last game at Canisius, Turner whispered to Parrotta, "That's pretty good stuff. You told me I'd graduate with my master's four years ago and you kept your word."

No, Parrotta said, you kept yours.

. . .

There are parts of White Plains mean enough to break your heart. Rishawn Johnson calls White Plains home.

"White Plains has its suburbs and every place has its 'hoods and ghettos and that's where I'm from," Johnson said. "A lot of people there weren't always the best people to be around."

Johnson lived on Ferris Avenue, a free throw away from the notorious Lexington Project, and one of the most dangerous streets in White Plains. When he was younger, White Plains' hard edge started digging into Johnson.

"It gets bad," he said. "Things are getting better but when I was in sixth grade through 11th grade, things were getting bad and I started hanging out with the wrong crowd."

Johnson hung out with sets from both the Crips and the Bloods. Johnson said he never sold drugs but he started hanging with those who peddled destruction. He could have easily ventured down that path had it not been for lessons learned by his father, Richard, and older brother, Richard, Jr.

His father spent two years in prison for conspiracy to distribute crack and at 16, his brother began a 7½-year stretch for armed robbery. As he watched his mother, Lisa, hold the family together, Johnson vowed he wouldn't suffer a similar plight. He is the first person from his family to earn a college degree.

Johnson is giving up his final season of eligibility at Canisius and hopes to attend either Division II C.W. Post or Post University (Conn.) next fall and pursue a master's degree in education and instructional design and technology.

"Obviously I had some people pave the way for me," he said. "But I feel I've paved the way for someone else in my family. I went past my bar that was set. It almost feels like I'm on top of the world."

. . .

Elton Frazier was 13 years old when his teachers at T. Aaron Levy Middle School in Syracuse had had enough: They sat him in a room and informed the youngster he wasn't worth saving.

"Every teacher was giving up on me," Frazier said. "They were saying, "Push him through, he'll never get the work.' "

Disgusted by what she was hearing, Frazier's resource teacher stood up and said, "Elton I'm ... not ... giving ... up ... on ... you."

"I'll never forget her," Frazier said.

She believed Frazier's was a soul worth saving, but he had to uphold his end.

Frazier was outwardly aloof but inwardly wanted to thrive in school. But if he didn't comprehend the work he would grow frustrated and shut it down. He was hurt by what the teachers said but it served as a challenge to excel in school.

"To see all these teachers that I see every day, that I talked to a lot, to see them give up on me — I just wanted to prove them wrong," Frazier said.

The more he tried and the more questions he asked, the easier the schoolwork became. His resource teacher provided approval. Frazier's grades improved tremendously but whenever he regressed, his mother, Gloria Martin, clamped down by yanking his favorite possession: basketball.

"I was supposed to play high school basketball when I was in eighth grade, but my mother said, "No basketball without grades,' " he said. "That motivated me, too. I wasn't happy at the time but I'm glad she did what she did."

The last time he was home, Frazier ran into the lone teacher at Levy Middle School who didn't give up on him. Frazier told her he was graduating in three years and she smiled. He hugged her and said, "Thank you."

"Without her," Frazier said, "I would have given up."

. . .

Tomas Vazquez-Simmons thought Parrotta's summer school pitch was a recruiting ploy geared toward his mother and planned on spending his summers in his native Rochester. Then he arrived at Canisius and realized Parrotta was serious.

"I was 17 and I was like, "Man, I have to forfeit my whole summer every year,' " Vazquez-Simmons said. "My mother put it into perspective for me: I would be getting my degree in three years and get an early start on my master's."

The first two summers were difficult because he loved being home. Vazquez-Simmons rarely got into trouble and was usually over a friend's house or part of the Mind, Body and Soul Program at the local YMCA which ran until 9 p.m.

"There wasn't very much time to run the streets," he said.

He enjoyed his time as a freshman at Canisius but missed his friends.

"I used to tell them I wouldn't be home until the end of the summer and I'll be home for about three weeks," Simmons said. "But if you want to come to Buffalo I'm always here. It was hard."

Looking back, Vazquez-Simmons calls the decision to attend summer school the best he's ever made.

"It definitely prepares you better for the future," said Vazquez-Simmons, a sociology major. "It's great to have a bachelor's but nowadays jobs require further education than that."

Vazquez-Simmons' first field of choice is professional basketball and then, "network like crazy," to find a job when his playing career ends. Summers away from Rochester aren't so unpleasant anymore.

"People ask me all the time when am I coming home," he said. "I tell not anytime soon."
. . .

There was a time when Robert Goldsberry would have preferred to be known as Robert Smith, Joe Cool, anything but Goldsberry.

Goldsberry, the youngest of four children who excelled in academics and athletics, was having difficulty bearing the weight of expectations as a high school freshman. His parents were teachers at the Tipp City, Ohio, school and he constantly heard about his siblings achievements.

"I was done, I didn't want to be part of it," he said. "I just wanted to stay under the radar and just get things done. It was nerve-racking to have people watching me to make sure I was doing the right thing."

He wanted to play varsity as a freshman but the coach, Matt Pond, wouldn't allow it and they bumped heads.

"After that I just didn't want to do it," Goldsberry said. "I didn't want to live up to the expectations my family put forth. But that's why I wanted to come to Canisius, maybe not so much to be out from under the radar but to find out who I am."

One sister, Ashley, played basketball at Findley University in Ohio, and another, Lindsay, played basketball at Bowling Green. His brother, John, played at UNC Wilmington and now plays professionally in Germany.

Goldsberry's grandfather, Alonzo, played in the NFL and his father, Frank, played football at Ball State. Goldsberry's uncle, Brady Hoke, is the football coach at San Diego State. Goldsberry's father demanded excellence, especially from his youngest.

"He's a tough dude," Goldsberry said. "Nothing is good enough for him but if you try hard, I guess he will accept that. He's never satisfied. He was very close to his father and he's always felt that you should never want to disappoint your father."

Even today when his father attends games, there's friction.

"I ask him how did I do after the game and he'll say, "Oh, fine,' " Goldsberry said.

"There's always something you can do a little bit better, which is somewhat normal. But he and I have definitely bumped heads."

But by graduating in three years and leaving Canisius with a master's, Robert and Frank share a special bond. They will be the only two members in the family with a master's.

"We never agree on anything except golf," Goldsberry said. "Now, finally, we have something we both can agree on."

. . .

When Greg Logins was at Sodus High School you could pencil him in for 20 points and five boards, but the only college offers he received were from Division III schools.

While he thrived on the court, he struggled with the ACT and SAT. After going through what he called a hard process, he learned he suffered from test anxiety.

In hopes of gaining more exposure for an athletic scholarship and to improve academically, Logins enrolled at The Kent School, a prep school in Kent, Conn.

Logins took college level courses at Kent while learning how to balance basketball and academics. Logins was better prepared to tackle the rigors of college because of his year there.

"It changed me a lot," he said. "I went to a prep school to better my education and work on my SAT scores. I finally got through that hump and was able to come here."

Logins took an economics course last semester that will be credited toward work on his Sports Administration master's degree, which he will receive next May.

"It's all online so I will have plenty of time in the gym to work on my game," he said. "It's all about getting better."

. . .

Julius Coles grew up in East Harlem more concerned about staying alive than graduating from college.

"You have the gang bangers, the drug dealers, everything an urban city has to offer," Coles said. "You have your crack heads, gun shots.

"My group of friends, of maybe the 10 of us growing up, I'd say only one other one went to college. The others dropped out, some are selling drugs. They got caught up in the street life."

Coles stayed away from trouble at the local Boys Club, where he swam and played ping-pong in addition to basketball.

"That kept me away from all the bad things that were going on in the neighborhood," he said.

He was raised primarily by his mother, Sonya Pittman, and grandmother. Coles' father, Julius, Sr., was in jailed for 19 years for murder and gun possession. He wasn't released from the Fishkill Correctional Facility in Beacon until his son's freshman year at Canisius.

"He wasn't in my life, but I talked to him and visited him," Coles said. "I kind of knew what was going on."

Through the Boys Club, Coles earned a scholarship to Blair Academy. Shortly after accepting the scholarship to Blair, one of his closest friends, Brandon Shackelford, was arrested for selling drugs.

"We both dreamed of going to prep school playing basketball, going to college and playing professionally," he said. "After that happened I was like, "Man, I don't know.' "

His mother convinced him to attend Blair but he had difficulty adjusting. Blair is located in Blairstown, N.J., a town of 5,747 that is 98 percent white.

"It was terrible," he said. "The work was way advanced and the socioeconomic status — there was a big gap between me and the other kids. It was a predominantly white school and the other kids didn't understand where I was coming from. All they knew [about Harlem] was what they saw on TV. I had to deal with those stereotypes."

During a holiday break, Coles returned to Harlem with the intention of staying when he ran into Shackelford, who was out of jail. They had a long talk.

"You're living the dream," Shackelford said. "This is what we dreamed of doing. This is the opportunity of a lifetime. Just because things aren't going well, stick with it."

Coles followed his friend's advice, which was a good thing. Earlier this year two of his friends from East Harlem got shot. One was killed by a wound to the head and the other was hit in the leg.

Coles feels blessed that he didn't become another statistic.

"I thought I was only going to finish high school," he said. "Now to finish with a bachelor's in three years is something I have over my peers."
. . .

Parrotta is turning into an academic madman. Four years ago the three-year plan to graduation was merely on paper; now it's reality.

Getting a four-year degree in three years at Canisius, "should be a layup," he said, so now he's trying to reach even higher. Two players on the roster, sophomore Gaby Belardo and freshman Reggie Groves, will be at the school for five years, Belardo because he transferred from South Florida and Groves because he missed nearly his entire freshman season with a knee injury. Parrotta wants to raise the bar higher.

"We could be talking about doctorate programs with them and when we start talking about doctorates then it's a real story," he said. "I don't even know how long that takes but that would really be something."

Through perseverance, seven young men have already proven anything's possible.

Checking In on the Tutors

Brad Wolverton
The Chronicle of Higher Education
May 21, 2010

As any academic adviser will tell you, there's no foolproof way to ferret out academic impropriety in athletics departments. But the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics has just introduced a certification program that could help more institutions arm themselves against potential problems.

This week the University of Oklahoma became the first institution to meet N4A's certification requirements. The association's president-elect, Gerald S. Gurney, who oversees the academic advising program for athletes at Oklahoma, has been a leader in this area for years. He spoke to us about what the program hopes to accomplish.

Q. Was this program created because of an increase in academic violations in athletics?

A. It grew out of a partnership with the NCAA and started about three years ago. The NCAA realized that academic reform would not and could not succeed without people on the front line working with student-athletes on their academic goals ... We want to encourage all our institutions to have in place academic-support programs that exhibit institutional control and the type of training for our professionals in the field to be able to protect institutions from the potential of academic violations. Is there a guarantee that meeting the standards of program certification will prevent academic violations? No. But it's a step in the right direction in demonstrating an institution's commitment to performing academic services that are both effective and ethical.

Q. Who reviews the programs, and what are they looking for?

A. We have about 20 consultants. All of them are directors or people with a lot of experience working in academic-support programs across the country. The person who reviews each program must come from outside the school's conference. The kinds of problems they're looking for are the ratio of student-athletes to advisers. We want a ratio of at least 150 to 1. In tutoring, we want to ... ensure that tutors are being offered for all student-athletes, and that tutors are acting ethically and understand the boundaries of what is proper tutoring versus potential academic dishonesty. With learning specialists, is there a handbook? Do you understand issues of fraternization? Are policies in place that might prevent violations pertaining to online courses?

A. Do you think most programs are meeting N4A's standards?

A. [Bowl Championship Series] schools and most Football Bowl Subdivision schools are meeting them. With respect to the Football Championship Subdivision, they have a good ways to go ... because of their limited budgets. One reason why we have this certification program is

to assist those institutions—to help them develop their programs to a point where they can be more effective in graduating student-athletes and providing student-athletes with sound academic support. Once you accept a student-athlete who may not be as competitive as the rest of the student body, you have an institutional responsibility to assist them on their academic goals.

The Downside of Summer School

Brad Wolverton
The Chronicle of Higher Education (Players Blog)
May 24, 2010

Summer school is attracting more and more athletes, and not just football and basketball players. Upside: Players can focus on their studies easier than during the season and stay on top of the NCAA's progress-toward-degree requirements. Downside: They earn their degrees faster.

Ordinarily that's nothing to complain about, but some academic advisers say it can cause problems, particularly when players are redshirted. When that happens, athletes often finish their degrees before exhausting their eligibility, says Sandra K. Meyer, assistant director of the Morgan Academic Support Center for Student-Athletes at Penn State University. To use their remaining eligibility, athletes in the Big Ten Conference, for example, must enroll in another baccalaureate program or start graduate school.

"I had a student-athlete who took nine credits of graduate courses in the fall and got a D in every one because the GPA didn't matter for eligibility," Ms. Meyer says. "Then the student-athlete took three more graduate courses in the spring. When the season was over, the athlete dropped two of the three courses. And because the student was on athletics aid, the athletics department lost an APR eligibility point."

Not all players leave their institutions in such a bind. But Ms. Meyer, who has been at Penn State for 23 years, says she's seen a growing number of athletes forced to enroll in new degree programs to be eligible for their final season.

"What do we do with kids in these situations?" she says. "Perhaps this is something the NCAA needs to examine more closely."

NCAA decertifies selected nontraditional secondary education courses

May 25, 2010 8:31:56 AM

By Gary Brown

The NCAA News

The NCAA has begun identifying nontraditional courses from various secondary education programs that do not meet the parameters of recently adopted Division I legislation regulating such courses.

Nontraditional courses include online, virtual, independent study, correspondence, individualized instruction and courses taught through similar means, which would also include software-based credit recovery courses.

Courses identified thus far as insufficient include those from BYU Independent Study and American School (two of the programs most frequently submitted to the NCAA Eligibility Center). Courses that meet (as well as those that do not meet) core-course requirements for eligibility purposes are updated on the NCAA Eligibility Center Web site.

Division I adopted legislation earlier this spring (Proposal No. 2009-64) requiring nontraditional courses considered as core to include regular access and interaction between an instructor and student for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student throughout the duration of the course.

The legislation became necessary as nontraditional courses became more prevalent, which made determining initial eligibility for prospective student-athletes more difficult. In particular, the variance of interaction and instruction between teacher and student in many online courses raised concern about whether these courses are academically sound and meet the NCAA definition of a core course. Additionally, the sometimes abbreviated timeframe for completion of such courses was of concern.

Proposal No. 2009-64 originated from the Division I Academic Cabinet after consultation with the NCAA Student Records Review Committee and NCAA High School Review Committee. The legislation helps ensure that acceptable nontraditional courses allow students to demonstrate that their work was completed in a manner consistent with the intent and design of the core-course curriculum requirements.

“To have a course approved as ‘core,’ the high school or secondary school program needs to demonstrate that there was ongoing access and regular interaction between the student and the instructor for the entire course,” said Kevin Lennon, NCAA vice president of academic and membership affairs. “Students cannot self-pace or teach themselves a core course.”

The interaction between teacher and student may include telephone conversations, electronic mail, instant messaging and other forms of electronic communication between the student and instructor. That interaction should include feedback on assignments and course assessments by the instructor to the student, and the opportunity for the instructor to provide individual instruction to the student.

Even if the student does not request that interaction, the course will not be approved as meeting

the standards of Proposal No. 2009-64 unless the course is designed to require it.

The legislation also reduces the opportunities for prospects to complete courses in a condensed timeframe. While Proposal No. 2009-64 does not prescribe a timeframe in which a nontraditional course must be completed, the entity offering the course must establish a defined period for completion of the course.

Because the effective date of the new legislation is August 1, 2010, students who complete a course identified as insufficient before then may still have that course evaluated on a case-by-case basis. However, such courses completed on or after August 1 may not be used for Division I initial-eligibility certification.

As of now, these decisions do not apply to students seeking to use these courses for eligibility to compete at Division II institutions. The Division II Presidents Council at its April meeting tabled a proposal that is identical to the Division I legislation and will review the measure again in June.

Division I requires prospective student-athletes to complete 16 core courses in high school to be initially certified. Currently, Division II requires 14 core courses but will require 16 starting in 2013.

For questions and answers about this decision, click here (see next page).

Nontraditional courses: How Division I Proposal No. 2009-64 changes the initial-eligibility equation.

Question: What are nontraditional courses?

Answer: Those taught via the Internet, distance learning, independent study, individualized instruction, correspondence, and courses taught by similar means, including software-based credit recovery courses. Such courses may be used to satisfy NCAA core-course requirements provided they meet NCAA parameters.

Question: What is a core course?

Answer: Core courses are courses that prospective student-athletes must take in high school to be eligible to participate in Divisions I and II. Core courses are primarily English, math, foreign language, social studies and science classes with an emphasis on college preparation. To play in Division I, high school graduates must complete 16 core courses with a minimum 2.0 GPA.

Question: Why is 2009-64 so important?

Answer: Because more and more prospective student-athletes are turning to nontraditional courses to satisfy core-course requirements. This legislation helps to clarify what nontraditional courses are acceptable for use. It applies to prospects initially enrolling for college on or after August 1, 2010.

Question: What is the intent of Proposal No. 2009-64?

Answer: It amends the conditions a nontraditional course must meet. A nontraditional course must now be one in which:

* The instructor and the student have ongoing access to one another and regular interaction with one another for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student throughout the duration of the course;

* The student's work (for example, exams, papers, assignments) is available for review and validation; and

* A defined time for completion of the course is identified by the high school or secondary school program.

Question: Why the change?

Answer: The recent increase in the prevalence of nontraditional courses has created a number of challenges in determining initial eligibility for prospects, particularly related to ensuring that courses are academically sound and meet NCAA requirements for a core course. In the end, the Division I membership wants to ensure incoming student-athletes are prepared to succeed in the college classroom.

Question: What constitutes ongoing access and regular interaction for purposes of teaching,

evaluating and providing assistance to the student throughout the duration of the course?

Answer: To have a course approved as "core," the high school or secondary school program must demonstrate that there was ongoing access and regular interaction between the student and the instructor for the entire course. The minimum expectation in this regard is that the course must include instruction from an instructor throughout the duration of the course.

Question: Does this mean students can no longer self-pace or teach themselves?

Answer: Yes. Requiring a course to be taught by an instructor enhances learning and reduces the opportunities for prospects to complete courses in a condensed timeframe.

Question: What if the student doesn't need or request any interaction?

Answer: If the course, as designed, does not require any interaction between the student and the instructor, it will not meet the definition of a core course. If the course is designed with interaction as a requirement but it is determined the prospect did not interact with an instructor throughout the course, the course will be invalidated.

Question: Is there a defined minimum period for completing a nontraditional course? For example, if the defined minimum period is four weeks and the course satisfies all other requirements in the proposal, may the course be used to meet initial-eligibility standards, even if completing the course in four weeks seems ambitious?

Answer: If the high school or secondary school program indicates the nontraditional course may be completed in a condensed timeframe (for example, four weeks), it may be determined that the course is not four-year college preparatory and, therefore, is not a "core" course. However, if the course meets the definition of "core," it may permissibly be completed in four weeks per the high school or secondary school program's direction.

Question: How will nontraditional courses completed before August 1, 2010, be considered for initial-eligibility purposes?

Answer: If a nontraditional course is completed before August 1, 2010, it will be evaluated using the legislative standards in place before the adoption of the proposal. Nontraditional coursework completed by August 1 may be subject to a review if there is some question as to whether it meets the pre-August 1 requirements for approval. The coursework, however, does not have to meet the additional guidelines outlined in the newly approved proposal.

Question: What if a prospective student-athlete is taking a nontraditional course and does not finish before August 1?

Answer: If nontraditional coursework is completed on or after August 1, 2010 (even if a prospect enrolled in the course before August 1, 2010), the requirements of Proposal No. 2009-64 will apply to the coursework.

Question: What happens if the nontraditional coursework does not meet the new parameters?

Answer: An institution may request an initial-eligibility waiver on behalf of the prospective student-athlete. In addition, high schools will have the opportunity to appeal a determination

that the course does not meet the parameters. This appeal goes to the High School Review Committee, a committee made up of both NCAA member representatives and representatives from the secondary school community.

Question: Can prospects take nontraditional courses while attending traditional high school?

Answer: Yes, but the prospect needs to be careful. For example, if an individual completes eight nontraditional courses in a condensed timeframe while attending traditional high school and participating in secondary school athletics, it may be determined that even though the eight courses were completed within the appropriate timeframe identified by the high school or secondary school program, completion of those courses was not academically sound. In this case, the eight courses would likely be invalidated through a review process.

Question: Will the NCAA publish a list of accepted courses for a nontraditional high school or program, and will nontraditional courses appear on a high school or secondary school program's list of NCAA courses?

Answer: Yes for both questions, provided the school's course offerings satisfy the requirements in Proposal No. 2009-64.

Question: How will a prospect or member institution know if courses from a particular nontraditional program may be used for a student's certification?

Answer: If all courses from a particular nontraditional academic school or program are deemed "not core" under the parameters of this legislation, this will be noted under the heading "denied courses" on the program's list of NCAA courses available on the Eligibility Center Web site.

NCAA cracks down on correspondence courses

ALAN SCHER ZAGIER
The Associated Press
May 25, 2010

The NCAA has a message for would-be college athletes hoping to use online courses to bolster their high school transcripts: proceed with caution.

The organization announced Tuesday that it will stop accepting course credit from two virtual schools based in Utah and Illinois as part of a move to strengthen high school eligibility standards in Division I.

That means no more high school credit from Brigham Young University's independent study program. The school in Provo, Utah, has previously been targeted by NCAA investigators and federal prosecutors pursuing claims of academic fraud at Missouri, Kansas, Mississippi, Nicholls State and Barton County Community College in Kansas.

Also on the prohibited list is the American School, a correspondence program based in Lansing, Ill.

New NCAA rules approved last month require "regular access and interaction" between teachers and students in the 16 core courses required to establish initial eligibility for new college athletes.

The changes don't affect NCAA Division II schools. An oversight panel from that division declined to endorse the proposed change but will consider the measure again in June.

"We want to make sure that student-athletes are qualified for college coursework," said NCAA spokesman Chuck Wynne. "Students cannot teach themselves, and they cannot pace themselves. The courses need to have a certain amount of rigor."

Such interaction doesn't have to include face-to-face contact, according to the NCAA. Telephone conversations, e-mail exchanges and instant messages are acceptable provided the student receives specific comments and individual instruction.

The new rules don't specify a minimum course length but instead require schools to "establish a defined period for completion of the course."

The changes are effective Aug. 1. Students currently enrolled in the BYU and American School programs can still petition the NCAA for course approval.

A BYU spokeswoman said the school's independent study program hopes to work with the NCAA on potential improvements that could land it back on the list of approved online schools.

"We've always had a good relationship with the NCAA," spokeswoman Carri Jenkins said. "We have worked very hard to make our courses as rigorous as any high school course."

American School principal Marie Limback called the NCAA's decision "shortsighted and a misunderstanding of the education we provide."

"There's no question about the rigor and level of education we provide," she said of the 113-year-old school based in suburban Chicago. "It's a disappointment for distance education."

In Missouri, the BYU program is best known as the school that provided former Tiger basketball player Ricky Clemons with nine of the 24 summer school credits he needed to enroll as a junior college transfer in 2002.

While BYU said it found no evidence of cheating on Clemons' part, questions about his enrollment and subsequent findings of more than 40 violations led to three years of NCAA probation under former coach Quin Snyder.

Wynne said that other virtual schools could be added to the NCAA's decertification list.

"It's an ongoing process," he said.

International Association for K-12 Online Learning Responds to Article on Correspondence Courses

Susan Patrick
The Chronicle of Higher Education
June 1, 2010

Dear Editor:

As the leading non-profit, membership organization representing the online learning providers in K-12 education, I wanted to respond to the article published May 26, 2010 titled “NCAA's Technological McCarthyism” by Diane Auer Jones.

With K-12 online learning growing at 30% annually, new educational opportunities are being made to students with an unprecedented flexibility. One in four college students takes an online course, according to the Sloan Consortium, thus making the acceptance level for college-readiness another prime reason to offer online courses in high school.

Online learning programs in K-12 education are held to the same standards of accountability as traditional courses: accreditation, standardized tests and end of course exams. Many online learning programs for high school online courses are holding themselves to a higher standard of quality than many traditional classrooms.

Online learning environments are more transparent than their traditional classroom counterparts. Online learning is data-rich – collecting every interaction in an online learning environment. And the results show. The U.S. Department of Education research study of online learning released on June 26, 2009 states, “Students who took all or part of their class online performed better, on average, than those taking the same course through traditional face-to-face instruction.”

With regard to the NCAA decision, the Jones’ article doesn’t cover what aspects of the courses or programs were problematic. In reviewing the national quality standards, there are a number of important aspects of quality, such as faculty to student interaction, communication and collaboration to enhance learning using data-driven instruction. However, not all online courses are created equal, and the NCAA should, and must, have the ability to review these courses to make sure that their method of delivery meets the standards that have been put in place by its member institutions. In analyzing its policies and drafting this new legislation, the NCAA actually used iNACOL’s National Standards of Quality for Online Courses as a guidepost for its decision-making. So to argue as Jones did, that the NCAA is somehow ignorant or indifferent to the multitude of laudable online learning programs available for high school students, is misguided.

It wasn’t mentioned that the NCAA approves hundreds of high school online courses annually from a variety of our members’ K-12 online learning programs. This isn’t a debate about the brick-and-mortar delivery medium versus online medium for courses.

Online learning has the transparency of learning management systems that record every student to teacher interaction and a record of the quality of the work a student performs. Looking closer, perhaps the question should be asked, "How many online high school courses does the NCAA accept?"

In addition, I am inviting the NCAA to participate in a web-based presentation with online learning institutions to discuss how their programs are evaluated for quality and college-readiness. This should be an interesting discussion. In our work with the NCAA, the NCAA has been pro-active in reaching out to the secondary school community to make sure that the standards adopted by its member institutions are available to secondary school administrators at both brick and mortar schools as well as online learning programs. NCAA representatives attended, engaged in meetings with programs and made presentations at our last three Virtual School Symposium (VSS) annual conferences and also presented in a special webinar on NCAA High School Eligibility and online courses.

Online learning works and is providing solutions to challenges facing K-12 schools now. From keeping students in school and on-track through online credit recovery to accelerating a students' college readiness by earning college credits in the local high school through online dual enrollment, schools are finding new, innovative ways to help students re-engage in academics and learn critical technology literacy skills at the same time. Remember, 40% of high school students who do graduate and enter college require remediation in math and writing.

Perhaps this isn’t McCarthyism as much as a Sherlock Holmes approach to reviewing 15,000 high school courses, both online and face-to-face, with a fine tooth comb and magnifying glass. I applaud the NCAA for striving to ensure that its student-athletes are arriving on campus with the tools that they need to succeed academically. To chastise the association for providing more stringent requirements in areas where it has seen consistent abuses is foolish. I hope the result of their recent policy changes is all programs being held to a higher level of quality to ensure our students are college-ready and better prepared.

Sincerely,

S. Patrick