

A G E N D A

National Collegiate Athletic Association

Division I Academic Cabinet

Dial-in number: 866/590-5055

Passcode: 8666120

April 19, 2012
2 p.m. Eastern time

Pre-Meeting Teleconference.

1. Welcome and announcements. (Herman Holt)
2. Discuss possible delay to initial-eligibility legislation. [Supplement No. 1] (Jenn Strawley)
3. Letter from California Community College Counselors/Advisors Academic Association for Athletics requesting delay to two-year legislation. [Supplement No. 2] (Diane Dickman)
4. Other business.

Jennifer,

First thank you for allowing the membership the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the time-line for implementing the initial eligibility requirements. I have two concerns as it relates to the 10 core-course requirement by the start of their senior year.

1) How will this be applied in cases where the student has enrolled in high school course work during their 7th and 8th grade years? For example, I am noticing a trend that more and more students are enrolling in high school classes prior to the 9th grade. The high schools are applying these courses for graduation, therefore, I am concerned that high school guidance counselors will include these classes as part of the 10 core courses. Thus, this could potentially increase the amount of waivers from the membership.

This is due to the fact that the membership generally does not start evaluating transcripts until the prospects senior year (when they are allowed to make official visits). We need to clarify with high schools what counts in the 10 core courses, and also need to clarify 7th and 8th grade coursework. I am concerned that this will unfairly penalize students because they are actually to enhance their academics by taking classes earlier in their career. Therefore, we should consider allowing these classes to be included in the initial-eligibility certification process in some fashion.

2) How will the 10 courses be addressed for individuals with an educational impacting disability (learning difference)? As an individual who has an EID and is working on a doctorate degree in Educational Leadership Studies, and whose wife teaches special education I have a unique perspective on this issue. We cannot require this to be applied for students with diagnosed EID's. I would not have meant the 10-course requirement following my junior year in high school. The reason was due to the fact that I was enrolled in remedial (one-one-one instruction for English, math, and study skills during my first two years of high school). However, in order to prepare myself for college this was my only option as I needed to determine how my learning difference would impact my education for high school and beyond. Students in these situations have enough to worry about and adding this 10-core course requirement will put undue and unnecessary pressure on these students. As you aware, EID's affect students in various ways, and at least in my case, I wasn't fully "comfortable" with my EID or successful academically until my junior year of high school.

However, I went on to graduate high school with honors. I enrolled in college and played basketball as a walk-on at Western Carolina University. I earned my master's at West Virginia University (WVU) and I am working on my dissertation to complete my doctorate from (WVU). I can't imagine what would have happened to me if I was deemed a non-qualifier because I did not meet the 10 core course requirement. I feel before this 10-course requirement is applied we should thoroughly address this for EID students and make adjustments accordingly. This is a "slippery slope" if the rule is adopted as is without an exception for students with learning differences.

I hope this helps and thanks again for allowing us to provide feedback as it relates to the new initial eligibility requirements.



Chad Wall
Assistant Athletic Director

VCU Athletics
1200 West Broad Street
P.O. Box 843013
Richmond, VA 23284
(O): 804.828.7618 (F): 804.827.6215

VCUATHLETICS.COM

Diane and Jen,

You may have received feedback from the University of Oklahoma on this issue. However, we discussed this in our Executive staff meeting last week and I wanted you to know that we support the delay. However, I also wanted to communicate to you the fact that we support the increased requirements and in concept, we all feel the sooner implemented the better. Our concern only relates to the fact that we feel in principle, such a change should not impact PSAs who are currently in the system. The delay is reasonable in order to provide adequate time to properly educate all of the various constituencies upon whom PSAs depend for advice.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond and please contact me if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Best.

Connie Dillon
Faculty Athletics Representative
University of Oklahoma

Jen,

On behalf of our institution (and specifically Athletic Director Steve Pederson and FAR Dr. Susan Albrecht) we are writing to express our support in delaying the effective date for the new initial-eligibility legislation to August 1, 2016. In our immediate efforts to educate local high schools administrators on the enactment of the legislation, much of the negative feedback we received was not necessarily directed towards the changes, but more so the fact that the legislation impacted freshmen students already enrolled within a high school curriculum. The concerns related to this group are magnified in that there are specific requirements that must be met prior to the start of year 4 (which seemingly provides for an even shorter turnaround time for this group).

It seems appropriate to delay the legislation so that high schools have had a chance to become educated and familiar with the requirements of the new legislation prior to the enrollment of the first class for which it impacts. This may also decrease the amount of waivers the NCAA staff will have to review for the incoming class of 2015.

Hope you are well and I imagine I will bump into you somewhere this summer!

Thanks,
Dan

Dan Bartholomae
Associate Athletic Director/Compliance & Sport Services
University of Pittsburgh

Dave Blank,

Thank you for your feedback.

Title: Director of Athletics,

Comment:

I would recommend that careful consideration be given to the timing of the implementation of this new policy. High schools should be given ample notice and all members will need some educational time to make sure the implementation is done in a manner that allows recruits to be properly educated and prepared for maximum ability to be eligible immediately.

Hi Jen,

EWU is in favor of delaying the implementation of the new initial eligibility requirements for the class graduating in 2016. This will allow us more time to educate the high schools on the upcoming changes, and doesn't affect the freshman class that is currently in school, who were not even aware that these changes were going to be made when they scheduled their courses. It could put them at an unfair disadvantage.

When we implement the new 2 year JUCO requirements, it doesn't affect the students already in school (the implementation begins for student enrolling in college Fall 2012). This has usually been the standard with other implementations of the initial eligibility requirements and should stay the same whether in high school or a junior college.

Thanks!



Don Ross, Ph.D.

Associate Director of Athletics
207 Physical Education Building
dross@ewu.edu goeags.com

EWU Athletics
Cheney, WA 99004 509.359.7436

Hi Jennifer,

Iowa State University (ISU) would like to request that the increased initial eligibility standards are delayed from taking effect until 2016. ISU fears the membership did not have time to properly educated this year's high school freshmen.

Thank you,

Dustin M. Gray
Assistant Athletics Director for Compliance
Iowa State University

Diane,

Central Michigan University supports delaying the effective date for increased Division I initial-eligibility requirements until 2016.

While we have already begun educational outreach to local high schools, we do not feel that the information was explained to the high schools early enough to allow for proper planning for this freshmen class. By the time the new standards were announced, it was too late to change fall courses. We also noticed that some of the Michigan high schools did not hear about the new standards until our staff spoke at the MIAAA Conference last month. By that point, these prospects had two semesters of coursework that were not scheduled with the new standards in mind.

Thank you for allowing us to provide feedback on this changes.

Elise Paulson

Elise Paulson

Compliance Coordinator

Central Michigan University | Intercollegiate Athletics

Glada Horvat,

Thank you for your feedback.

Title: Senior Associate Athletic Director,

Comment:

I believe the implementation of the new requirements should be effective for the class that begins in Fall 2016. This will keep from penalizing 9th graders who started the year without the knowledge of increased standards. Everyone who starts high school this fall can be held to the new standards and make their academic decisions accordingly. It is a fair thing to do.

Good afternoon, Diane:

I wanted to inform you of the Big Sky Conference's support of delaying implementation of the new initial-eligibility requirements until 2016. This will allow conferences and our member institutions to better educate our secondary schools, while will give future prospects a better understanding of the academic requirements for future NCAA participation.

I have also instructed our institutions to voice their support of the delayed implementation.

Please let me know if you need anything further from me.

Thanks!

Jayne

Jayne Nadolski
Assistant Commissioner-Compliance/SWA
Big Sky Conference

Jim Hoffman,

Thank you for your feedback.

Title: Director of Compliance,

Comment:

From reading the article, it seems that the main focus of altering the rule may involve changing the effective date. I don't see any point to that--the effective date in place is perfect; it's far away enough so that PSA's well into their high school careers don't have to change their ways, and it's soon enough to be able to fix the academic issues which are present in some student-athletes. I am a bit concerned about the size of the jump in standards though. I'm sure the scale was arrived at after extensive research of the profiles of typical graduates as opposed to non-graduates, but I dread 2015 becoming the year where records are broken for number of signed PSA's whose NLI's are invalidated due to not being certified. The first year, whenever it is, will have a shock effect. The same happened when we went from 25/50/75 to 40/60/80 for continuing eligibility; in that first year, the jump from 25 to 40 percent after two years caught a lot of student-athletes off guard and necessitated a spike in summer school courses. (Some of my coaches were vocal in complaining that this rule change was ridiculous, unfair, discriminatory against student-athletes, and all kinds of negative things.) Then after a year we all accepted it, moved on, everybody exceeds 40 percent, and we looked back in amazement wondering how anybody could have ever missed the 25 percent benchmark and why the jump to 40 percent seemed so controversial.

To Whom it May Concern:

While I am generally in favor of the initial eligibility rule changes currently set to commence enforcement August 2015, I strongly believe delaying their implementation by one year until August 2016 is appropriate. While our coaching staffs and compliance staff are working hard to get the word out to secondary schools, more time is needed to ensure the message has truly been received and understood. Change is difficult for any organization, and it is especially difficult when the consequences are delayed, as is the case for secondary schools relative to these rules. Our staff finds that many public school districts are understaffed and overworked, and they are doing all they can to simply deal with the crises and daily tasks of immediate concern. We believe it is going to take some additional time for there to be a more thorough educational effort to be implemented, and to prevent potential prospective student-athletes who could otherwise succeed at our institution, from getting caught ineligible due to the system's failure to effectively structure their individual educational paths.

Thank you for soliciting and for listening to our feedback and concerns. Rest assured, we are working hard to prepare ourselves and our prospective students for these changes; we simply need more time to do it effectively.

Sincerely,
Joseph R. Castiglione

Joel,

Thank you for your feedback.

Title: McMullen,

Comment:

We have already begun educating high schools in our area about the new rule changes and their effective date. I believe that that the current implementation date will not be problematic for PSA's.

Hi Jen,

I received an email from Joey D suggesting that we should email you any comments regarding the possibility of delaying the effective date for the increased initial-eligibility requirements.

West Virginia University supports delaying the effective date until 2016. Current high school freshmen could be adversely impacted by an effective date of 2015 since the changes were adopted in Fall 2011 after their freshman year commenced. As a result, it's possible high school freshmen were not adequately prepared for the changes. In the event they weren't enrolled in the appropriate core courses at the time of the change, we could see an increase in waiver requests if the effective date is not changed. Delaying the effective date is reasonable to ensure that prospective student-athletes who will be impacted by the new rules have the opportunity to prepare for the increased standards.

If you would like to discuss this further, feel free to give me a call.

Thanks!

Keli

Keli Cunningham
Associate Athletics Director
West Virginia University

Kelly Webb,

Thank you for your feedback.

Title: Assistant Commissioner,

Comment:

The general consensus among our Conference compliance administrators and academic support personnel was that delaying the effective date for this legislation would be beneficial. Pushing the effective date back to 2016 would provide more time to educate the high school community. We want to ensure prospective student-athletes fully understand and correctly apply the new initial-eligibility requirements.

Jen and Diane:

The University of Texas is fully supportive of postponing the effective date of the increased initial eligibility standards legislation to be effective 8/1/16 instead of 8/1/15. We believe that it is in the best interest of the prospective student-athletes and institutions to enable sufficient time to educate.

Currently, based on our conversations with our coaches, individuals at UIL and Texas High School Coaches Association information has not reached the prospective student-athletes that are current freshman. Allowing us the remainder of this year and summer to do an educational push with various coaches clinics, academic counselor associations, etc. we believe would help minimize the amount of waiver cases that might arise should we move forward with the current effective date.

Thank you in advance for consideration and please let us know if there is anything we can do to provide further feedback and/or assist in educational outreach.

Sincerely,

Lori Smith, CCEP
Assistant Athletics Director
Athletics Risk Management & Compliance Services
The University of Texas at Austin

Diane and Jennifer,

As requested by the Committee on Academic Performance, the University of Missouri wishes to express support to delay the effective date of the increased initial-eligibility requirements until 2016. We believe that to do so will reduce the potential for future waivers in 2015 based upon lack of knowledge or less time to fulfill the increased requirements than those entering college on or after August 1, 2016.

We know that there is a plan in place for sharing the new standards throughout the high school community. This will be a daunting task. If it hasn't already been considered, we also recommend that messaging on this matter be shared at summer certified events in men's and women's basketball.

Thank you for your work on this matter.

Sincerely,
Mitzi

Molly Sullivan,

Thank you for your feedback.

Title: Asst. AD Compliance,

Comment:

Loyola University, Chicago supports the delay in the effective date for the new initial eligibility requirements. We have concerns about the effectiveness of education by the NCAA to the high schools. If this task falls to the institutions it would be beneficial to have one more year to educate the high schools and their constituents. We are also concerned that with the adoption in October that high schools would have lost one semester, maybe even a year, in getting the 10 core courses in the first two years of high school enrollment. Our additional concern is that high schools that require theology classes will be at a disadvantage since those classes are not considered core courses.

Proposed NCAA changes : An unintended consequence?

*Portia H. Shields, Ph.D.
President, Tennessee State University*

When Bear Bryant fielded his first integrated football team in 1970 he changed the complexion and level of play throughout the southern United States. Recent legislative actions by the Division I Board of Directors and ongoing conversations by the NCAA, pose the threat of reversing racial progress not only in Division I sports for African Americans and other minorities, but college attendance for student athletes in general. Mission centered Colleges and Universities especially Historically Black Colleges and Universities(HBCU'S) and public access institutions will suffer the greatest loss but small colleges in most conferences and even big schools whose recruits apply with variable college preparation will be negatively impacted as well. And, the question is why this legislation now and how does it improve matters for the NCAA or for our institutions of higher learning?

Let's see what's proposed and then, the most likely consequence, intended or not.

Currently, the Division I governance structure is reviewing the concept of the Year of Academic Readiness. This concept would permit prospective student-athletes who are determined by NCAA not to be academic "qualifiers" the option of delaying the start of their athletic "eligibility clock" during the initial year of enrollment at a two-year college, which would allow them to engage in academic remediation. During their time at the two-year schools (five semesters minimum), students would also be expected to complete at least 48 semester hours of transferable credit, with a specified number of credits in English, Math and Science, earn a minimum 2.5 GPA and graduate. Never mind that while enrolled at the two-year college, these students, keen on getting their "game on" at four-year institutions, don't want to delay, but, that they would achieve the expected outcome is indeed a question to ponder. In other words, without intentional and personalized tutoring, counseling and

advising, which are difficult for colleges to provide, an unintended consequence is that they could just drop out. Moreover, some sad facts on community colleges militate against putting so much emphasis on them.

A recent review of two-year colleges showed, nationally, a 15% graduation rate in six years. In Texas 12% of African Americans graduated in six years. At one Dallas two-year college, 160 African Americans enrolled taking a full load. Six years later, seven of them had earned a degree, a few had transferred to technical college or four-year institutions, but 81% had dropped out. Graduation rates at four-year colleges, while not near where they should be nationally (57%), show that students who attend them are more than twice as likely as those who begin at a two-year college to earn a degree in six years. The rate for African Americans was 43% overall and for African American males, 33%. The more selective the schools, the better academically prepared students, including minorities do; but, also, the more selective the school, the fewer the number of

minorities eligible to enroll. Nevertheless, students who made just average grades and less than stellar test scores cannot be expected to measure up in academics against those whose parents make certain their children have the necessary resources and experiences including SAT prep. These almost ensure that students will adjust to the rigors of college life with relative ease.

So what is the alternative for students who want to begin D-I play? At Tennessee State University (TSU), all freshman students are invited to academic boot camp for four weeks right after high school graduation. Those who come take one core course, pick up technology, study and time management skills, and provide service to the community. In addition, they hear from speakers who made it against the odds, and academically successful TSU Students mentor them. At the end of the program, they are advised and receive their academic schedules before returning home for the remainder of the summer. Eighty-six percent of the boot campers returned in fall 2011 and the spring 2012 retention rate was 99%.

Additionally, at its October 2011 meeting, the Division-I Board of Directors revised academic requirements for entering freshman (enrolling on or after August 1, 2015) to be eligible for financial aid, practice and competition during the first academic year in residence. As part of this change, the Board established an “academic redshirt” standard, premised on an increased sliding GPA and test score scale. For example, A 2.3 GPA would require a 1080 SAT score to play, yet, a student with a 2.3GPA with 900 would practice and receive a scholarship, but not play. Which coaches could afford to “sit” scholarships on the bench and field competitive teams? The following was noted by NCAA when proposed: “these concepts represent a philosophical shift requiring demonstration of academic success in order for a student-athlete to compete in the initial year of enrollment.” Under this “shift” into academic sinking sand as I see it, students at HBCUs and other small institutions would have to muster superior GPAs because at these schools, 75% of students, on average, scored lower scores than those that will be required in 2015. The majority of small school

athletes are the same students who spent time in high school play and practice, mainly in under-resourced schools and did not have the advantage of preparatory standardized assessment classes. An unintended consequence could be that these prospective student-athletes would not even try to go to college at all, since they would know they could not meet the new standards. If this standard didn't convince them, then the other concept that was also adopted in October, which requires the prospective student-athlete to complete all but 10 core courses by the start of their senior high school year, will certainly slow their ambitions down.

A quick review of the freshmen student-athletes at TSU in all sports reveals that, if the new rules were applicable today, although they meet Tennessee Board of Regents standards of eligibility, only 31 out of 50 student athletes would be eligible to compete immediately. Nineteen would be able to practice and receive aid only. Out of 21 freshmen football players only 9 would be eligible to play or practice and receive aid. Although minority serving institutions and small

D-I Colleges will be hardest hit, higher education options for the students who desire to attend these schools as well as those wanting to compete at larger institutions will diminish exponentially. And then, where will the students go and what will they do, with no hope of college and no dream to seek?

Now what GPAs did our boot campers bring from high school last summer? They started at 1.9 and went to 4.0, but at the end of the summer, 100% of the students passed the core course and 99% of them are still in college.

In addition, and as a result of the Division-I memberships' request to override Proposal No. 2011-96, the Division-I governance structure is currently exploring the concept of allowing institutions to provide student-athletes with miscellaneous grants up to \$2,000. It is not clear what the miscellaneous grants would provide except enough dollars to price minority serving and small institutions out of the market or cause these institutions to get that money from students who don't play sports, in the form of fees. It would seem to

be a better plan to redirect some of the D-I money to assist small and minority serving institutions in providing bridge programs, additional counseling, advising and mentoring necessary to help student-athletes do better academically at both two and four year colleges. Perhaps, with sure funding from NCAA, boot camps would spring up around the country. At TSU, our full scholarship students receive tuition, room board and books. They volunteer to read to elementary children; they cut each other's hair and they study together, under the watchful eyes of coaches. They know that if they need some small things like ramen noodles, soap or a toothbrush, they can do what the rest of our students do; go to the Tiger Pantry, where these items are provided at no cost.

Now, it's important to raise standards. And I am convinced our students can meet them given the proper instruction and resources as TSU is experiencing these positive outcomes. Moreover, the state's recent Complete College Tennessee Act (CCTA) ties state funding to graduation rates. This wake-up call has all state

institutions creating strategies, evaluating results and implementing changes to meet the desired outcomes we know can be achieved for all students, including athletes. Without help though, raising requirements have little benefit but only serve to exclude. At TSU, some of the student-athletes would be able to meet the standards; others would not. But, taking a look at historical data, we find that the graduation rate of student-athletes at TSU is higher than that of the entire student body and most institutions across the country at 73%. Let's see why. First, they are required to study; they have to go to bed on time; they are constantly checked on as in, if "you skip class, you don't play"; they have a social network; and they belong to other campus organizations. Moreover, coaches follow up with faculty on each athlete's progress. Recently our football coach heaped praise on a biology professor, who tutors freshmen because all his freshmen players passed the class.

I believe the impact of these recently adopted proposals will virtually eliminate competitiveness among all small institutions, for

good athletes, as in, student-athletes who could meet the standards will attend a university capable of providing the proposed miscellaneous grants and more. And, why wouldn't they? The others will have to take their dreams elsewhere. As important, these legislative changes have the potential to destroy the image of minority serving and small D-I institutions at the same time. "If you're here, it must be because you could not get there". Is that the message NCAA and D-I wants to send? If so, they must be prepared for the consequence that the complexion of the game will change back to a re-segregated team structure. Is that the consequence intended? I certainly hope not. When I watch sports or attend games now, I contemplate how the new changes will alter not only college sports, but professional ranks too. But, the most important question about the majority of academic talent who don't have access to SAT training, private tutors, mentors or role models is, why deny them an opportunity? HBCU's stress this point: It's not how they look when they come in, but how they look when they leave for they know that the scores reflect experience related to

achievement more than academic quality and potential. If we deny the less than academically prepared students, whom I view as academic raw talent that has not yet been fully developed, an opportunity to succeed, we will find more and more minorities on street corners and perhaps, in our ever growing penal systems.

Bear Bryant was inspired to bring Black players to “Bama” by the need to succeed in football. For poor and minority youth, the reasons are the same. Students who are talented in sports stay in school and go to college for one purpose only: to succeed in life and, well, perhaps to join the NFL, NBA, or some other professional league, if that’s possible. They should not be penalized for being of minority decent or born in families of lower socio-economic means, which thus far has translated into unequal educational opportunity in America. It’s a mother’s mantra: “Everyone won’t get to the pros my son,” she said, “but everyone can get a house and a good honest job if they go to college.” To that mantra, the NCAA’s response so far has signaled—“Just a minute, not so fast.”

Shalini Shanker,

Thank you for your feedback.

Title: Assistant AD for Compliance,

Comment:

I do not think that it is necessary to delay the effective date for the new initial eligibility standards. Even if it is postponed, some students will fail to meet the standards so it is irrelevant if it is effective in 2015 or 2016.

Diane and Jennifer-

Please accept this email as feedback from our institution regarding the implementation of increased Division I initial-eligibility requirements. Kansas State University supports delaying the implementation until 2016. Our institution agrees that the timeframe for implementation did not allow for information to be provided to prospective student-athletes and secondary educational institutions in enough time to assist with the preparation needed for the increased requirements.

Thank you for your consideration of our feedback and please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jamie Vaughn

TO: President Mark Emmert, NCAA and President Walter Harrison, Chair Division I Committee on Academic Performance.

FROM: President Evans Roderick, California Community College Association of Academic Advisors/Counselors for Athletics (3C4A) on behalf of the entire 3C4A Membership

DATE: April 15, 2012

RE: Implementation of New Two-year College Transfer Requirements effective August 1, 2012 (Proposal Nos. 2011-69) Extension Request to August 1, 2013

The members of the California Community College Association of Academic Advisors/Counselors for Athletics (3C4A) are committed to the academic success and support of the student athletes on our campuses. We are in favor of academic reform within the NCAA and applaud their efforts to improve the 2-year college transfer graduation rates. However; we are humbly requesting the NCAA delay the implementation of the new academic transfer requirements by one year until August 1, 2013 for the following reasons:

- 1.) The original discussions included a year of "Academic Readiness" for the 2-year college student athlete (Proposal 2011-65), but this concept has now been tabled by the NCAA for further discussion; this was intended to be an avenue to prepare our students for the increased standards. We were hoping to have this year included with the new academic transfer requirements as part of a "packaged deal."
- 2.) Our current "gray-shirt" students who started in our 2-year colleges in 2011 were advised to stay under 12 units and not start their "clock," but now these students will be adversely effected and will be forced to meet these higher standards when they enroll fulltime next academic year.
- 3.) An extra year before implementation would help us inform incoming high school graduates of the higher standards; therefore allowing us to better prepare them for the next level.
- 4.) The NCAA has already moved the implementation of the new initial eligibility requirements for high school students from 2015 to 2016, so there is already a precedent for increasing the time for implementation.
- 5.) The current economic crisis in California and in the nation is making it harder for students to get the classes they need to graduate and transfer on, so an extra year of information prior to implementation would be academically benefit students to achieving their goal.

In summary, the 3C4A, on behalf of its 103 member institutions and 53 dues paying members, requests that the NCAA delay the implementation of Proposal Nos. 2011-69 to August 1, 2013. Please contact President Evans Roderick by phone at (626) 222-8058 or by e-mail at ERoderick@MtSAC.edu with any questions. We look forward to hearing from you.

Respectfully submitted,

President Evans Roderick and all members of the 3C4A