REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISON I ACADEMIC CABINET
SEPTEMBER 13-14, 2010, MEETING

KEY ITEMS.

1. **Review of NCAA Division I Academic Eligibility Requirements for Prospective Student-Athletes.** The NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet continued its discussion of possible changes to the initial-eligibility and 2-4 transfer requirements. After considering several potential modifications, the cabinet does not recommend changes to the initial-eligibility requirements at this time. The cabinet noted that additional time will allow for full consideration of data not yet available.

   With regard to 2-4 transfer requirements, the cabinet considered key research findings regarding the academic performance of two-year college transfers entering Division I institutions. Based on the data reviewed, the cabinet developed concepts for membership and two-year college input. The cabinet presents the draft concepts as a package for feedback. The package strives to balance principles of increased academic success, simplicity of administration, access to higher education and opportunity for those prospective student-athletes who are academically underprepared. The package includes enhanced academic standards for both qualifiers and nonqualifiers and the concept of a year of academic readiness.

2. **Recommendation for an Alternative Proposal for NCAA Division I Proposal No. 2010-58 – Eligibility, Financial Aid and Playing and Practice Seasons – Summer Academic Preparation and Acclimatization – Men's Basketball.** The cabinet recommends the NCAA Division I Board of Directors consider an alternative proposal for Proposal No. 2010-58. Proposal No. 2010-58, establishes a summer academic preparation and college acclimatization model for incoming and continuing men's basketball student-athletes. The cabinet's alternative proposal increases the requirement of completing three hours of acceptable degree credit during the summer prior to enrollment to six hours.

ACTION ITEMS.

1. **Legislative Items**.

   - **Request for Noncontroversial Legislation to Create an Exception to Full-Time Enrollment for Student-Athletes Engaging in Cooperative Educational Experiences Involving Work Experience.**

     (1) Recommendation. The cabinet recommends the NCAA Division I Legislative Council adopt noncontroversial legislation to specify that a student-athlete engaging in a required cooperative education experience

involving work experience or a student-athlete participating in a cooperative educational experience involving work experience combined with enrollment in at least six credit hours at the certifying institution be exempted from the application of full-time enrollment for competition legislation provided the student-athlete is considered to be enrolled in a full-time program of studies by the certifying institution and otherwise meets all applicable progress-toward-degree requirements.

(2) Effective Date. Immediate.

(3) Rationale. This proposal seeks to incorporate current guidelines that have resulted in the approval of all waivers of this provision filed over the past three years. The recommendations decreases bureaucracy by allowing institutions who have cooperative educational work experience programs to mange full-time enrollment for competition without the need to request a waiver, while maintaining the applicability of other progress-toward-degree requirements.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. Potential minimal institutional cost savings by eliminating the writing and processing of waiver requests.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- None

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. Legislative – Comments on Proposals to be Initially Considered by the Legislative Council in January 2011.

a. Proposal No. 2010-12 -- Legislative Process -- Amendment Process – Membership Override of Legislative Changes – Legislative Council or Board of Directors Review – Override Voting. The cabinet supports Proposal No. 2010-52, which would eliminate the requirement that the override voting process on actions taken by the Legislative Council or Board must occur at the annual Convention. The cabinet noted the potential institutional cost savings, as well as the potential opportunity for a more representation in the voting process. The cabinet encouraged the NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet and

Legislative Council to consider using technology to allow for continued discussion and comments regarding override proposals (e.g., webcasting or video conferencing).

b. **Proposal No. 2010-25 – Amateurism and Awards, Benefits and Expenses – Use of Agents – Benefits, Gifts and Services – Career Counseling and Internship/Job Placement Services.** The cabinet opposes Proposal No. 2010-25, which would allow a student-athlete to use career counseling and internship/job placement services available exclusively to student-athletes, provided the student-athlete is not placed in a position in which the student-athlete uses his or her athletics ability. The cabinet noted the opportunity for student-athletes to use career counseling and internship/job placement services available to students generally at any time. Further, the cabinet noted the additional monitoring associated with internship/job placement and potential for placement based exclusively on athletics reputation contrary to extra benefit or preferential treatment legislation.

c. **Proposal No. 2010-35 – Recruiting – Basketball Evaluations – Women's Basketball – Nonscholastic Evaluations During Academic Year – National Standardized Testing Weekends.** The cabinet supports Proposal No. 2010-35, which would specify that in women's basketball, evaluations at nonscholastic events during the academic year evaluation period shall not occur during any weekend (including Friday, Saturday and Sunday) during which the PSAT, SAT, PLAN or ACT national standardized tests are administered. The cabinet noted that the change alleviates potential conflicts that may result in a prospective student-athlete having to forego an opportunity to take a standardized test.

d. **Proposal No. 2010-52 – Eligibility – Graduate Student/Postbaccalaureate Participation – One-Time Transfer Exception – Final Year of Eligibility – Nonrenewal of Athletics Aid At Previous Institution – Baseball, Basketball, Football and Men's Ice Hockey.** The cabinet supports Proposal No. 2010-52, which allows a graduate student enrolled in an institution other than the institution from which he or she previously received a degree to participate in intercollegiate athletics, provided the student-athlete meets the conditions of the one-time transfer exception (other than the sport restrictions), has one season of competition remaining and the student-athlete's previous institution did not renew his or her athletically related financial aid. The cabinet noted that allowing student-athletes who have graduated and are in their last year of eligibility the opportunity to transfer and use the one-time transfer exception when their previous institution has chosen not to renew athletics aid is in the best interest of student-athlete well-being. Further, the cabinet noted the limited applicability of

the proposal due to the threshold requirements and noted that creating this exception is a less bureaucratic option to the current waiver processes.

e. Proposal No. 2010-53 – Eligibility – Seasons of Competition: Five Year Rule – Delayed Enrollment – Seasons of Competition – Sports Other Than Men's Ice Hockey and Skiing – Exception – National/International Competition. The cabinet supports Proposal No. 2010-53, which would specify that in sports other than men's ice hockey and skiing, a prospective student-athlete's participation in specified organized national/international competition shall be exempted for a maximum of one year from the application of the delayed enrollment, seasons of competition legislation. The cabinet noted that this legislation affords prospective student-athlete's the ability to adequately pursue the Olympics (or other elite international competition). The cabinet encourages the NCAA Division I Amateurism Cabinet to examine delayed enrollment and elite tryout legislation on a global level to ensure consistency of application.

f. Proposal No. 2010-54 – Eligibility – Seasons of Competition: Five-Year Rule – Hardship Waiver – First Half of Playing Season Calculation – Tennis. The cabinet opposes Proposal No. 2010-54, which would specify that the first half of the season calculation for purposes of a hardship waiver in the sport of tennis be based on the number of days in the season that concludes with the NCAA championship. The cabinet noted that fall competition in the sport of tennis does count in the consideration for individual qualification for the NCAA championship. The cabinet did not see a compelling reason to create an exception to the application of the hardship waiver for the sport of tennis.

g. Proposal No. 2010-57 – Eligibility – Freshman and Transfer Academic Requirements – Participation Prior to Certification – Recruited Student-Athlete – 21-Day Period. The cabinet opposes Proposal No. 2010-57, which would increase the temporary certification period for a recruited student-athlete from 14 days to 21 days. The cabinet recommends that the sponsor modify Proposal No. 2010-57 to allow for the continuation of expenses incidental to participation during the extended certification period, but not allow for practice beyond the current 14-day period. The cabinet would support the proposal if modified as it addresses student-athlete well-being concerns. The cabinet noted the high volume of certifications processed by the NCAA Eligibility Center, but also noted delays in certification due to circumstances within the control of the recruited prospective student-athlete and institution. The cabinet noted that the proposal as written may limit improvements relative to timely submission of required certification documentation.

h. Proposal No. 2010-58 – Eligibility, Financial Aid and Playing and Practice Seasons – Summer Academic Preparation and Acclimatization – Men's Basketball. The cabinet opposes Proposal No. 2010-58 as written, which would establish a summer academic preparation and college acclimatization model for incoming and continuing men's basketball student-athletes. Specifically, the cabinet does not support requiring enrollment in six hours during the summer prior to full-time enrollment while only requiring successful completion of three. The cabinet requests the Board consider an alternative proposal for Proposal No. 2010-58. The cabinet generally supports the overall package of elements outlined in this proposal; however, the cabinet's alternative proposal increases the requirement of completing three hours of acceptable degree credit outlined in the proposal to six hours. The cabinet noted that limiting successful completion to three hours for incoming student-athletes does not provide the appropriate academic foundation regarding the pursuit of successful completion of courses undertaken. The cabinet does support the other components of the proposal and noted a summer academic preparation and college acclimatization model will have a positive impact on the men's basketball cultural.

i. Proposal No. 2010-59 – Eligibility – Progress-Toward-Degree Requirements – Eligibility for Competition – Fulfillment of Credit Hour Requirements – Fall Term Academic Requirement for Future Competition – Football. The cabinet supports Proposal No. 2010-59, which would specify that a football student-athlete who does not successfully complete nine semester hours or eight quarter hours of academic credit during the fall term and earn the NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) eligibility point for the fall term shall not be eligible to compete in the first four contests against outside competition in the following playing season. Further, to specify that the student-athlete may regain eligibility to compete in the third and fourth contests of that season, provided he or she successfully completes at least 27 semester hours or 40 quarter hours of academic credit before the beginning of the next fall term. The cabinet noted data that demonstrates the importance of football student-athletes earning nine credits during the fall term in relation to likelihood of graduation. Further, the cabinet noted the importance of maintaining a level of ineligibility for contests as a means to facilitate behavior change during the fall term.

j. Proposal No. 2010-61 – Financial Aid – General Principles – Eligibility of Student-Athletes for Institutional Financial Aid – Exception – Part-Time Enrollment After Exhausted Eligibility. The cabinet supports Proposal No. 2010-61, which would specify that an institution may provide institutional financial aid to a student-athlete who has exhausted eligibility and is enrolled in less than a minimum full-time program of studies, provided the student-athlete is carrying the courses necessary to complete degree requirements, or the student-

athlete is carrying all the degree-applicable courses necessary to complete his or her degree requirements that are offered by the institution during that term. The cabinet noted the promotion of student-athlete well being by providing an additional opportunity for a student-athlete to receive athletics aid without the need to engage in unnecessary enrollment as a full-time student and/or submission of a waiver. The cabinet also noted the lack of competitive equity concerns since the proposal only applies to student-athletes who have exhausted eligibility.

k. **Proposal No. 2010-73 – Financial Aid – Counters and Equivalency Computations – Required Grade-Point Average to Qualify for Exemptions of Counter Status and Countable Institutional Aid – Reduction from 3.300 to 3.000.** The cabinet supports Proposal No. 2010-73, which would specify that in football and basketball, the necessary cumulative grade-point average at the certifying institution to meet the "institutional academic aid only" exception to counter status be reduced from 3.300 to 3.000; further, to specify that the necessary cumulative transferable grade-point to exempt institutional financial aid awarded to transfer student-athletes and institutional academic scholarships based solely on the recipient's academic record at the certifying institution from team limits be reduced from 3.300 to 3.000. The cabinet noted the benefit of maintaining consistency amongst exemptions and the establishment of a national standard generally in line with institutional thresholds.

l. **Proposal No. 2010-86 – Playing and Practice Seasons – General Playing Season Regulations – No Missed Class Time in Conjunction with Nonchampionship Segment Competition – Baseball, Cross Country, Field Hockey, Lacrosse, Soccer and Volleyball.** The cabinet supports Proposal No. 2010-86, which would specify that in baseball, men's and women's cross country (without indoor or outdoor track and field), field hockey, men's and women's lacrosse, men's and women's soccer, and men's and women's volleyball no class time shall be missed in conjunction with competition during the nonchampionship segment, including activities associated with such competition (e.g., travel and other pregame or postgame activities). The cabinet noted additional time available for academic focus and the potential for student-athlete academic improvement by limiting athletic time demands during the nonchampionship segment.

m. **Proposal No. 2010-87 – Playing and Practice Seasons – Nonchampionship Segment – Travel Restrictions – Cross Country, Field Hockey, Soccer, Softball and Volleyball – Hawaii of Alaska Exception – Once in Four Years.** The cabinet supports Proposal No. 2010-87, which would specify that in men's and women's cross country (for institutions without indoor or outdoor track and field), field hockey, men's and women's soccer, softball and men's and women's

volleyball, once every four years, an institution may use any form of transportation for travel to Hawaii or Alaska for nonchampionship segment competition. The cabinet noted the potential alleviation of athletics time demands on student-athletes in Alaska and Hawaii during the nonchampionship segment and the corresponding additional time for academic focus. Further, the cabinet noted the limited impact on the athletics time demands of student-athletes from other institutions due to the once in four year component of the exception.

n. Proposal No. 2010-88 – Playing and Practice Seasons – Nonchampionship Segment – Cross Country, Field Hockey, Women's Lacrosse, Soccer, Softball and Volleyball – Two Dates of Competition – One Away-From Home Date. The cabinet opposes Proposal No. 2010-88, which would specify that in men's and women's cross country, field hockey, women's lacrosse, men's and women's soccer, softball, and men's and women's volleyball an institution is limited to two dates of competition during the nonchampionship segment, of which only one date may be an away-from-home. The cabinet noted that athletics time demands may be limited through more effective means, including the elimination of missed class time. Finally, the cabinet noted reduction of dates of competition may result in increased hours of competition during the remaining dates resulting in student-athlete welfare concerns.

o. Proposal No. 2010-99 – Playing and Practice Seasons – Foreign Tours and Competition – No Institutional or Conference Foreign Tours. The cabinet opposes Proposal No 2010-99, which would specify that an institution or conference shall not sponsor or participate in a foreign tour. The cabinet noted the cultural and academic benefits associated with travel to foreign countries and the limited ability for student-athletes to engage in experiences abroad due to their athletics commitments. The cabinet noted the ability of member institutions to ensure academic and cultural components are incorporated into athletic foreign tours.

2. Nonlegislative.

a. Review of Division I Academic Eligibility Requirements.

Background.

In the most recent academic reform efforts, the Board implemented significant and sweeping measures designed to support student-athletes in their academic pursuits. Specifically, the Board adopted enhanced academic eligibility requirements, implemented measurements of academic performance and instituted

a system of recognition for high achievers and penalties for academic underperformance. These initiatives were developed for the specific purpose of increasing student-athlete graduation rates and the Board committed to future evaluations of the effectiveness of these measures.

To this end, the cabinet is responsible for evaluating the effectiveness of academic eligibility standards, including initial-eligibility and transfer regulations. The cabinet continued its discussion of possible changes to initial-eligibility and two-year college transfer standards. These discussions are preliminary and the cabinet will seek feedback from the membership, governance structure, and two-year college community over the next several months before drafting proposed legislation. The cabinet anticipates sponsoring legislation for the 2011-12 legislative cycle regarding changes to the 2-4 transfer student requirements.

The cabinet will review all feedback and comments it receives on the proposed 2-4 transfer concepts during its February meeting. Comments and suggestions may be provided to NCAA staff liaisons Jennifer Strawley and Diane Dickman.

Lastly, the cabinet has spent considerable time reviewing data in its efforts to thoughtfully consider possible changes to either initial-eligibility or 2-4 transfer requirements. The data has been significant, informative, and the basis for many of the concepts noted in this report.

Initial-Eligibility Standards.

Goals and Principles.

The Academic Cabinet's goals for the current review of the initial-eligibility standards are summarized as follows:

(1) Strive to maximize the first-year academic success of student-athletes, which is strongly predictive of eventual graduation from college;

(2) Preserve institutional responsibility for admissions decisions for prospective student-athletes; and

(3) Encourage prospective student-athletes to balance their self-identities as students and athletes.

The Academic Cabinet's guiding principles for its review of initial-eligibility standards are summarized as follows:

(1) Initial-eligibility standards should strive to maximize first-year college academic success, putting student-athletes on track to graduate in a reasonable timeframe while minimizing adverse impact on minority and low-income prospective student-athletes.

(2) NCAA rules shall be minimally acceptable standards, with continued reliance on member institutions to make admissions decisions that are most appropriate for determining academic success locally.

(3) Consideration should be given to the most recent NCAA academic data, changing secondary school standards and the national secondary school environment.

(4) Any new standards should be relatively simple and nationally applicable to assist prospects and high schools in understanding the rules and to provide for consistent application throughout the United States and abroad.

(5) Changes in initial-eligibility standards should be able to be implemented with relatively minimal increased chance for operational error and little to no increased bureaucracy for member institutions and high schools.

(6) New requirements should not create or expand opportunities for misrepresentation of prospective student-athletes' academic abilities or credentials.

Recommendation Regarding Initial-Eligibility Standards.

After considering several potential modifications, the cabinet determined that at this time, it does not recommend changes to the initial eligibility requirements. The cabinet noted that additional time will allow for full consideration of data not yet available including: (1) The impact of the increase to 16 core courses; (2) Data regarding core course taking patterns which should be available in June 2011; and (3) The impact of the APR and NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP) standards.

The cabinet did note that among current qualifiers, student-athletes with the lowest high school core grade-point averages in aggregate have the lowest academic success in college. Thus, any future change to the initial-eligibility standards could consider increasing the core grade-point average minimum above the current 2.000. The cabinet noted this could be considered in conjunction with

a tiered eligibility standard (e.g., athletics aid and practice based on an established grade-point average and competition based on a higher standard).

Two-Four Transfer Requirements.

Goals and Principles.

In its continued review of 2-4 transfer regulations, the cabinet identified the following goals to guide its review:

(1) Establishment of 2-4 transfer academic requirements that lead to enhanced first-year academic success at the four-year institution.

(2) Establishment of 2-4 transfer academic requirements that improve academic success and graduation of 2-4 college transfer student-athletes at four-year institutions and have these outcomes more closely mirror that of nontransfer student-athletes.

(3) Establishment of 2-4 transfer academic requirements that provide greater opportunity for academically underprepared student-athletes to gain the academic skills and preparation necessary to be academically successful and graduate from a four-year institution.

The cabinet also established the following guiding principles for its review of 2-4 transfer regulations.

(1) Two-four transfer academic requirements should strive to emphasize the requirements which are needed to prepare a student-athlete academically to be successful at an NCAA institution.

(2) Two-four transfer academic requirements should maximize first-year college academic success when transferring to a four-year institution, ensuring that student-athletes are on track to graduate in five years and minimizing adverse impact on minority and low-income student-athletes.

(3) Two-four transfer academic requirements should be based on a standard that data indicate yields similar ineligibility standards to those of nontransfer student-athletes. Specifically, when examining the data, the standards should be set with benchmarks that yield ineligibility rates and APR rates similar to the rates of nontransfer students. These indicators can then be used as means to ultimately predict graduation.

(4) Two-four transfer regulations are minimal standards set for eligibility to compete, receive athletics aid and practice. There is a continued reliance on member institutions to make admissions decisions regarding 2-4 transfers that are appropriate for determining academic success locally.

(5) Data driven decisions used to assist in predicting academic success and eventual graduation should provide overall guidance in any possible changes to the 2-4 transfer regulations.

(6) Changes in 2-4 transfer regulations should consider simplicity of application for member institutions, two-year institutions and two-year college student-athletes. This includes preferring existing, well established academic elements, in lieu of creating new components whenever possible.

(7) The academic skills and preparation of qualifiers and nonqualifiers should be considered in any changes to the 2-4 transfer requirements.

Package of Concepts for Comment.

Two-four transfer regulations should be designed to identify those prospective student-athletes who are academically prepared to be successful at an NCAA institution and foster additional support for student-athletes who are academically underprepared. With this philosophical underpinning, the cabinet considered possible changes to both the qualifier and nonqualifier 2-4 transfer regulations as well as a concept of a year of academic readiness.

These concepts were considered as a package and the cabinet encourages constituents to consider the components together. In total, the concepts presented set minimum standards that reflect the academic preparation needed to succeed at an NCAA Division I institution while also providing opportunities for student-athletes who are academically underprepared on enrollment at a two-year institution sufficient time to meet 2-4 transfer requirements and be academically successful on transfer to an NCAA Division I institution.

***Key Research Findings*.**

The following research findings informed the cabinet's discussions and draft concepts regarding 2-4 transfers.

Finding: Current academic performance of two-year college transfers on entering Division I institutions.

(1) Data indicate that transfer student-athletes from two-year institutions enter Division I institutions with lower high school grades and test scores than any other group of student-athletes.

(2) The 2008-09 APR of two-year college transfers was 926, compared to 971 for student-athletes entering Division I directly from high school and 949 for transfers from four-year colleges.

(3) Two-year college transfers leave college ineligible at higher rates than any other group of student-athletes, in particular, on exhaustion of athletics eligibility.

(4) Although 2-4 transfer graduation rates have trended up in the last decade, they still lag behind those of student-athletes who enter a Division I institution directly from high school.

Finding: Predictive Power of Two-Year College Grade-Point Average.

(1) Data indicate that among two-year college transfers, grade-point average at the two-year institution (whether grade-point average in transferable or overall coursework) is the strongest predictor of first-year academic success at the four-year college.

(2) Predicted ineligibility rates and APR "0/2" rates (students who leave college while academically ineligible) decrease significantly as a function of increased two-year college grade-point average.

(3) For two-year college transfer student ineligibility or APR "0/2" rates to mirror in aggregate those of college freshmen, the current 2.000 transferable grade-point average standard for transfers would have to be increased.

Finding: Academic Success as a Function of High School Academic Qualifier Status.

- Academic performance at the two-year college is more predictive of four-year college success than high school academic performance. Division I academic nonqualifiers out of high school comprise a large portion of the two-year college student-athlete transfer population and tend to present similar academic struggles at the two-year school and subsequent four-year college.

Finding: Physical Education Activity Credits.

- The number of physical education activity courses taken at the two-year college has a statistically significant and independent negative relationship with academic success at the four-year school. In other words, among students with similar two-year college grade-point averages, those students with fewer physical education activity credits tend to have significantly better academic performances in their first year at the four-year institution.

Finding: Impact of Taking Core Academic Courses at the Two-Year College.

(1) Data indicates that student-athlete transfers with more core academic course taking (particularly in science and math) perform better at the four-year institution.

(2) Although 77 percent of nonqualifiers are already completing the combination of six transferable credits of English, three math and three science, 14.7 percent of those who do not take those classes are ineligible at the four-year college by the end of their first year (versus 8.5 percent among those taking the courses). Whereas 4.9 percent of those who complete this core departed the four-year school ineligible by end of the first year, 10.2 percent of those not taking the core credits were academically unsuccessful.

Possible Changes to 2-4 Transfer Student Academic Requirements for Student-Athletes who are Qualifiers.

The cabinet seeks comment on the following concept for qualifiers:

(1) Increase transferable grade-point-average requirement from the current 2.000 to 2.500.

(2) Expand NCAA Division I Bylaw 14.5.4.1.2 to all sports. This is the current men's basketball limitation of two hours of physical education activity courses that may be used to fulfill the transferable degree credit and grade-point average requirements. The exception noted in the bylaw for a physical education degree program or a degree program in education that requires physical education activity courses would be maintained for all sports.

(3) All other 2-4 transfer regulations for qualifiers would remain in place. This includes the student having spent at least one full-time term at the two year college [Bylaw 14.5.4.1-(a)] and satisfactorily completing an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours of transferable-degree credit [Bylaw 14.5.4.1-(c)] per term.

(4) The increase to the grade point average and the limit on physical education activity courses would also apply to 4-2-4 transfers.

Possible Changes to 2-4 Transfer Student Academic Requirements for Student-Athletes who are Non-Qualifiers.

The cabinet seeks comment on the following concept for nonqualifiers:

(1) Increase transferrable grade-point-average requirement from the current 2.000 to 2.500 for competition purposes only. Although data clearly supports an increased grade-point average, to continue to provide access to higher education for student-athletes who do not meet the increased grade-point average, athletics aid and practice may be provided for student-athletes who achieve the current 2.000 transferable grade-point average and meet all other requirements noted in Item Nos. (2) through (5).

(2) Require completion of the following transferable core curriculum at the two-year institution: six credits of English, three credits of math and three credits of science. This adds three credits of science to the current core requirement [Bylaw 14.5.4.2-(b)].

(3) Expand Bylaw 14.5.4.2.4 to all sports. This is the current men's basketball limitation of two hours of physical education activity courses that may be used to fulfill the transferable degree credit and grade-point average requirements. The exception noted in the bylaw for physical education degree program or a degree program in education that requires physical education activity courses would be maintained for all sports.

(4) Eliminate the current three semester/four quarter attendance requirement [Bylaw 14.5.4.2-(c)].

(5) Continue to require the following: completion of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferrable degree credit [Bylaw 14.5.4.2-(b)]; limitation on the use of hours earned during the summer terms (Bylaw 14.5.4.2.1); completion of an Associate of Arts degree from the two-year institution [Bylaw 14.5.4.2-(a)].

***Year of Academic Readiness for Two Year College Student-Athletes at Two-Year Institutions*.**

Background.

Representatives from the two-year college community have indicated that for certain student-athletes who enroll at the two-year institution academically underprepared, it is extremely difficult for the student-athlete to successfully complete the courses needed to meet NCAA transfer standards or needed to ensure the student-athlete is academically prepared to transfer to an NCAA Division I institution. Specifically, student-athletes who need significant remediation or courses taught at a level below those transferable to an NCAA institution are sometimes attending two-year colleges part time for a semester or two in order not to trigger the "NCAA clock." The year of academic readiness provides an alternative path for academically underprepared student-athletes that would better prepare the student-athletes for success at an NCAA Division I institution. The year of readiness would allow students to receive some forms of financial aid by attending a two-year college full time (e.g., Pell Grants) and taking remedial and other basic academic courses.

The cabinet seeks comment on the following concept for year of academic readiness.

(1) Provides an option for academically underprepared student-athletes who require a longer period of enrollment at the two-year institution in order to be academically prepared for enrollment at an NCAA Division I institution.

(2) Occurs during the student-athletes initial year of college enrollment which for this purpose must occur at a two-year institution.

(3) Prohibits competition during the first year of collegiate enrollment at the two-year institution.

(4) For such students the start of their five-year clock would be delayed during the first year of enrollment at the two-year institution for the purposes of the five-year period of eligibility and purposes of progress toward degree.

(5) The cabinet did not determine how student-athletes would be identified for this option. The cabinet considered the following possible triggers that would permit the year of academic readiness: (a) Enrollment in a

specified number of remedial hours; (b) Status as a nonqualifer; (c) Some other academic identification; or (d) Lack of competition during the first year of two-year college enrollment. The cabinet determined that it was important to obtain input from the two-year college community and the membership on this issue before finalizing a recommendation.

Rationale for Two-Year Transfer Concepts.

In summary, the cabinet presents these two-year transfer concepts for membership and two-year college community feedback before it finalizes any recommendations. The cabinet noted that this initial package of concepts strives to balance principles of increased academic success; simplicity of administration; access to higher education; and opportunity for prospective student-athletes who are academically underprepared. The cabinet will consider all input it receives during its February meeting.

The cabinet based its concepts on research and some of those key findings have been presented. Key elements of the package such as an increased grade-point average requirement, reduction in physical education activity courses, a core curriculum requirement and a year of academic readiness result in a balanced set of standards that will meet the established goals and principles.

b. **Discussion of Issue Coordination amongst Cabinets/Councils.** In reviewing the update from the Division I Communications and Coordination Committee, the cabinet noted the predominance of the report out function of this committee. The cabinet discussed options regarding better use of this group as a discussion forum in light of current issues that may impact several cabinets/councils. Suggestions regarding better facilitation of this goal included the use of written summaries to allow for a segment of committee meeting time to be devoted to questions raised by each cabinet/council, as well as a recommendation of an in-person meeting of cabinet/council chairs.

c. **Discussion of Cabinet and Council Representation.** The cabinet discussed the need to ensure appropriate representation of faculty athletics representatives and directors of athletics on all cabinets, councils and committees. The cabinet noted the concerns raised by the administrative cabinet in meeting these requirements and discussed methods to better facilitate the development of an adequate pool of candidates for the Administrative Cabinet. The cabinet discussed options regarding better education of cabinet/council roles with potential candidates to limit self-selection away from cabinet/council positions, development of a process of colleague identification by current cabinet/council members as a means of augmenting the candidate pool, and engagement of groups such as the IA FAR

and FARA to develop additional strategies to engage potential cabinet/council candidates.

d. **Results of Comprehensive Academic Support Services Survey. The cabinet reviewed the results of a comprehensive study of academic support resources and practices for student-athletes at Division I institutions.** The cabinet reviewed the results of a comprehensive study of academic support resources and practices for student-athletes at Division I institutions. The cabinet noted the relationship between institutional academic support budgets and services and year-end cumulative grade point-average. The variation in first-year academic outcomes is largely explained by the incoming individual academic characteristics and demographics of the student-athlete. It is important to note that while the data demonstrate the importance of the individual in their outcomes, there still is evidence that institutional behavior, including budget, can have an effect on student outcomes. Full survey results are available in the cabinet's materials.

e. **Report from the NCAA Eligibility Center.** The cabinet received its annual update from the NCAA Eligibility Center, including an overview of academic certification activity to date for the 2010-11 academic year and the implementation of policies and operations related to recently adopted legislation (e.g., Proposal Nos. 2008-21 and 2009-64). In addition, the NCAA Eligibility Center staff noted processing efficiencies, including improvements in Institutional Request List management by member institutions and the continued impact of missing or incomplete information on the processing of academic certification.

f. **Review of Legislation Regarding Co-Ops, Internships, and Student-Teaching.** The cabinet noted that the legislation should appropriately distinguish between cooperative educational exchange programs and cooperative education programs involving work experience and requested an editorial revision of the bylaws to reflect this distinction. Additionally, the cabinet noted the variety of terminology used to describe similar programs across member institutions and requested an editorial revision to include internships, practicums, and student teaching to applicable legislation referencing cooperative education programs involving work experience. Finally, the cabinet reviewed waiver requests for relief of the 18/27 hour requirement citing cooperative educational experience involving work experience. The cabinet supported the continued practice of granting these waivers when misadvisement provided from the institution results in the student-athlete not meeting the 18/27 hour requirement.

g. **Results of Core-Course Requirements National Review.** NCAA research staff provided the cabinet with data regarding a review of state high school graduation credit requirements and course requirements/recommendations among Division I

member institutions for student admission in comparison to current NCAA core course requirements for initial-eligibility certification. Results indicated some variability, but a significant majority of states have graduation requirements that meet or exceed the number of NCAA core-course credits required and in specific subject areas for initial-eligibility certification. Similar results were noted regarding student admission course requirements/recommendations. It was also noted that there is considerable variation in the number of high school core courses available to students based on certain demographic characteristics of the school.

Committee Chair: Carolyn Callahan, University of Virginia, Atlantic Coast Conference
Cabinet Liaisons: Diane Dickman, Academic and Membership Affairs
Alex Smith, Academic and Membership Affairs
Jennifer Strawley, Academic and Membership Affairs