

# A G E N D A

## National Collegiate Athletic Association

### NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification

NCAA National Office  
Indianapolis, Indiana

April 12-13, 2012

1. Welcome, introductions and announcements.
2. Review the agenda and meeting schedule. [Supplement No. 1]
3. Review the NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification philosophy statement.

**Background:** At the beginning of each meeting, the committee reviews its philosophy statement:

"The NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification is charged by the NCAA Division I membership to assist institutions in identifying mechanisms to ensure intercollegiate athletics programs are operating to their fullest potential. The committee and a team of an institution's peers will provide an objective evaluation of the institution's athletics program based on operating principles adopted by the membership. The certification program is designed to help an institution improve. The committee will allow ample time for an institution to consider its programs, identify deficiencies and take steps to correct them. However, if an institution does not make a good-faith effort to conduct an honest, straightforward, accurate self-study or the self-study reveals deficiencies in the intercollegiate athletics program, the committee will require the institution to take appropriate corrective actions. The committee will monitor the effectiveness of the certification program to ensure the NCAA's fundamental commitment to integrity in intercollegiate athletics is supported through the committee's actions and that the program continues to emphasize applicable principles of the Association."

4. Review the committee's report to the NCAA Division I Legislative Council from the February 2012 meeting. [Supplement No. 2]

5. Discuss institutional feedback.

**Background:** The staff asked committee members to talk with at least one individual in each of the focus areas of the new program to obtain feedback on the concepts presented at the February meeting.

6. Review communication plan for Institutional Performance Program. [Supplement Nos. 3a and 3b]

**Background:** The staff felt it was important for the committee to see what groups and organizations had received presentations about the new program since the last meeting and to discuss questions and feedback.

7. Review proposed legislation for the new program. [Supplement No. 4]

**Background:** The new program will require legislative action in order for details of the program to be included in the NCAA Division I manual. The committee is asked to review and approve the proposed legislation before it is sent out for membership feedback.

8. Discuss report for NCAA Division I Board of Directors meeting. [Supplement No. 5]

**Background:** At the Board of Directors meeting in January 2012, the committee was asked to provide an update regarding the progress and development of the new program. The committee will discuss items it is prepared to share with the Board at its next meeting in April.

9. Subcommittee discussion summaries.

- a. Inclusion diversity. [Supplement Nos. 6a, 6b and 6c]
- b. Inclusion gender. [Supplement Nos. 7a and 7b]
- c. Academics. [Supplement Nos. 8a, 8b and 8c]
- d. Fiscal management. [Supplement Nos. 9a, 9b and 9c]
- e. Student-athlete experience. [Supplement Nos. 10a and 10b]

10. Review of future meeting dates and sites.
  - a. July 18-20, 2012: Indianapolis, Indiana.
    - (1) Wednesday, July 18: Travel to meeting.
    - (2) Thursday, July 19: Subcommittee meetings/working groups meet in morning, full committee meets in afternoon.
    - (3) Friday, July 20: Full committee meets until noon; return travel after 2 p.m.
  - b. February 20-22, 2013: Indianapolis, Indiana.
    - (1) Wednesday, February 20: Travel to meeting.
    - (2) Thursday, February 21: Subcommittee meetings/working groups meet in morning, full committee meets in afternoon.
    - (3) Friday, February 22: Full committee meets until noon; return travel after 2 p.m.
11. Other business.
12. Adjournment.

**REPORT OF THE  
NCAA DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION  
FEBRUARY 23-24, 2012, MEETING**

**KEY ITEMS.**

1. **Certification deliberations.** The NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification engaged in deliberations and determined a number of Division I institutions to be certified pursuant to the athletics certification program.
2. **Update on Institutional Performance Program.** The committee received an update from each subcommittee and provided feedback related to the direction of the Institutional Performance Program.

**ACTION ITEMS.**

- **None.**

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.**

1. **Update from Institutional Performance Program subcommittees.** The committee received an update on the work of each subcommittee: (1) academics; (2) fiscal management; (3) inclusion diversity; (4) inclusion gender; and (5) student-athlete experience. The committee members were encouraged with the work of the subcommittees and provided feedback in the five areas of the new program. The committee also recommended that the membership should receive regular updates, possibly through the development of a web-based system, on the progress of the subcommittee working groups. Further, the committee agreed to gather feedback from its respective campuses and conference offices.
2. **Cycle 3 certification decisions.** The committee engaged in deliberations regarding the Cycle 3 athletics certification status of 13 institutions.

The following 12 institutions were certified:

- a. Arizona State University;
- b. Alcorn State University;
  - Recusal: Fred Washington

- c. Samford University;
  - Recusal: A.J. Grube
- d. Loyola University Maryland;
  - Recusal: Tracey Flynn
- e. University of North Carolina, Asheville;
  - Recusals: A.J. Grube, Nina King, Gary Overton
- f. University of Northern Iowa;
  - Recusals: Casey Comoroski, President Joanne Glasser
- g. Northwestern State University;
- h. University of Tennessee at Chattanooga;
  - Recusal: A.J. Grube
- i. Santa Clara University;
  - Recusals: Roger Caves, Sarah Wilhelmi
- j. Southeast Missouri State University;
  - Recusals: Casey Comoroski, Beth DeBauche, President William Perry
- k. University of Albany; and
- l. University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
  - Recusals: A.J. Grube, Nina King, Gary Overton

The following institution was certified with conditions:

- University of Hawaii, Manoa.

The following institutions are reclassifying and were determined to have successfully completed the self-study process:

- a. Bryant University;
- b. Presbyterian College;
- c. Seattle University;

- d. Southern Illinois University Edwardsville;
  - e. University of North Dakota; and
  - f. University of South Dakota.
3. **2012 NCAA Convention session feedback.** The staff and various committee members updated the full committee on the education session provided to the membership at Convention specific to the development of the Institutional Performance Program.
4. **Discussion of legislative issues for the Institutional Performance Program.** The committee discussed unresolved questions related to the legislative structure of the Institutional Performance Program including the duties of the committee and accountability measures. The committee also received notice of what legislative action will be required in order for details of the new program to be included in the NCAA Division I Manual. Lastly, the committee approved the creation of an operations subcommittee and identified committee members Beth DeBauche (lead), Sarah Wilhelmi and Tracey Flynn to serve on the subcommittee.
5. **Discussion of Institutional Performance Program for reclassifying institutions.** The committee agreed to delay the in-person orientation visit with all reclassifying institutions from April 2012 to summer 2012. The committee determined that the delay would enable the orientation visit materials to be structured with the developments of the Institutional Performance Program.
6. **Review of the committee's philosophy statement.** The committee reviewed and approved its current philosophy statement. The committee reviewed initial draft concepts to restructure its philosophy statement in association with the development of the Institutional Performance Program to ensure it is consistent and aligned with the enduring values of the Association.
7. **Discussion regarding committee policies and procedures for the Institutional Performance Program.** The committee reviewed and provided feedback regarding the suggested framework of a new Institutional Performance Program policies and procedures manual and discussed outstanding questions within the document.

8. **July 27-29, 2011, committee meeting report.** The committee reviewed and approved its July meeting report and took no action.
9. **July 28 and September 30, 2011, executive subcommittee and committee teleconference meeting reports.** The committee reviewed and approved its July and September teleconference meeting reports and took no action.
10. **Update on NCAA Division I Board of Directors meeting.** The committee received an update from the Board's January 2012 meeting regarding the status of the development of the Institutional Performance Program.
11. **Update on new committee members.** The committee received an update on the status of the vacancies, reappointment opportunities and newly appointed members.
12. **Review of future meeting dates and sites.**
  - a. April 12-13, 2012: Indianapolis.
  - b. July 18-20, 2012: Indianapolis.
  - c. February 20-22, 2013: Indianapolis.

*Committee Chair: Joanne Glasser, Bradley University, Missouri Valley Conference*

*Staff Liaisons: Troy Arthur, Academic and Membership Affairs  
Mira Colman, Academic and Membership Affairs  
Charnele Kemper, Academic and Membership Affairs  
Matt Maher, Academic and Membership Affairs  
Abbie Renaker, Academic and Membership Affairs  
Danielle Teetzel, Academic and Membership Affairs*

<b>February 23-24, 2012</b>	
<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Absentees</b>
Anthony Archbald, Princeton University	John Dunn, Western Michigan University
John Balog, Jacksonville University	
Henry Brooks, University of Maryland, Eastern Shore	
Roger Caves, San Diego State University	
Casey Comoroski, Missouri State University	
Beth DeBauche, Ohio Valley Conference	
Tom Douple, The Summit League	
Amy Folan, University of Texas at Austin	
Tracey Flynn, Quinnipiac University	
Joanne Glasser, Bradley University	
Angela (A.J.) Grube, Western Carolina University	
Nina King, Duke University	
Gary Overton, East Carolina University	
William Perry, Eastern Illinois University	
Judy Van Horn, University of South Carolina	
Fred Washington, Prairie View A&M University	
Sarah Wilhelmi, West Coast Conference	
<b>Other Participants</b>	
Nicole Bracken, Dan Calandro, Danielle Ghiloni, Kevin Lennon, Binh Nguyen, Todd Petr, Dave Schnase.	



## Institutional Performance Program Communication Plan

<b>NCAA Division I Conference</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Ohio Valley Conference (In-person)</b>	February 28 - 29
<b>Southeastern Conference (In-person)</b>	February 28 - 29
<b>Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference (Webinar)</b>	March 13, 2012
<b>Big South Conference (Webinar)</b>	March 14, 2012
<b>Atlantic 10 Conference (Webinar)</b>	March 20, 2012
<b>Big West Conference (Webinar)</b>	March 22, 2012
<b>Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference (Webinar)</b>	March 27, 2012
<b>West Coast Conference (Webinar)</b>	March 28, 2012
<b>Big Sky Conference (Webinar)</b>	April 5, 2012
<b>Big Ten Conference (Webinar)</b>	April 9, 2012
<b>Big Ten Conference (Webinar)</b>	April 10, 2012
<b>Southern Conference (In-person)</b>	June 1, 2012
<b>Colonial Athletics Conference (Webinar)</b>	Spring 2012
<b>Mid-American Conference (Webinar)</b>	Spring 2012
<b>Western Athletic Conference (Webinar)</b>	Spring 2012
<b>Mountain West Conference (Webinar)</b>	Summer 2012
<b>America East Conference (Webinar)</b>	Summer 2012
<b>Atlantic Coast Conference (Webinar)</b>	Summer 2012
<b>Atlantic Sun Conference (Webinar)</b>	Summer 2012
<b>Big East Conference (Webinar)</b>	Summer 2012
<b>Conference USA (Webinar)</b>	Summer 2012
<b>Great West Conference (Webinar)</b>	Summer 2012
<b>Horizon League (Webinar)</b>	Summer 2012
<b>Missouri Valley Conference (Webinar)</b>	Summer 2012
<b>Ohio Valley Conference (Webinar)</b>	Summer 2012
<b>Pac-12 Conference (Webinar)</b>	Summer 2012
<b>Patriot League (Webinar)</b>	Summer 2012

<b>Division I Conference</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Southeastern Conference</b>	Summer 2012
<b>Southland Conference</b>	Summer 2012
<b>Southwest Athletic Conference</b>	Summer 2012
<b>Sun Belt Conference</b>	Summer 2012
<b>Professional Group</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education (NADOHE) (In-person attendance at conference)</b>	March 12 - 14, 2012
<b>NCAA Equity and Inclusion Forum</b>	April 29-May 1, 2012
<b>NCAA Regional Rules Seminar (Anaheim)</b>	May 14-18, 2012
<b>College and University Auditors of Virginia Annual Conference</b>	May 21-22, 2012
<b>NCAA Regional Rules Seminar (Atlanta)</b>	June 4-8, 2012
<b>National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics (N4A)</b>	June 7, 2012
<b>College Athletic Business Management Association (CABMA)</b>	June 22-25, 2012
<b>Minority Opportunities Athletic Association (MOAA)</b>	June 24-25, 2012
<b>National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics (NACDA)</b>	June 25-28, 2012
<b>National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO)</b>	July 28-31
<b>National Association of Collegiate Women Athletics Administrators (NACWAA)</b>	October 7-10, 2012

**NCAA Division I Institutional Performance Program  
Question and Answer Document**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>1</b>	You say that 80 percent of the data is already collected by the NCAA. When is the other 20 percent going to be due and during what time of the year?	<p>The committee is working on identifying the other 20 percent and when it has been determined, the NCAA will communicate that information to the membership.</p> <p>The data will be collected on a rolling basis throughout the year and then will be released to the institution at a set time.</p>
<b>2</b>	How will the benchmarks be determined?	The benchmarks will be determined by the committee and then approved. Once the benchmarks have been determined, communication will go out to the membership.
<b>3</b>	What information will the report card include?	The committee has discussed aggregate information broken down by subdivisions and conferences, but details have yet to be determined.
<b>4</b>	What is the time frame for review?	It has been recommended as a yearly process, but this has yet to be determined.
<b>5</b>	What is the committee's view on institutions that are in the middle of implementing plans for improvement from the previous athletics certification process?	Institutions should continue to complete and implement the plans for improvement.

<b>6</b>	Is the new process or is the IPP subject to open record laws?	No final decision has been determined.
<b>7</b>	What happened to the compliance piece of the old program?	Although rules compliance is currently not one of the focus areas, the committee continues to discuss this issue.
<b>8</b>	Would the benchmarks take into consideration institutional mission and purpose statements?	The committee is working to incorporate an institution's mission and purpose as it relates to measurements and benchmarks. A final decision has yet to be determined.
<b>9</b>	Why is financial data included in the new IPP program when we already have the financial dashboards?	The fiscal management area of the IPP program will look at only key indicators to assess the financial health of an institution's athletics department. The current financial dashboard indicator will provide more detailed information to institutions, but the IPP system will provide more of a chancellor/president view.
<b>10</b>	Will EADA be a part of the new IPP system?	The initial thought is no, but the plan is for information that pertains to the EADA to be transferrable to the EADA.
<b>11</b>	Who will review the data that is being submitted by the institutions?	The NCAA Research staff as well as other selected NCAA staff members.

<b>12</b>	How much of the information will be made public?	This is yet to be determined and the committee is looking for membership feedback.
<b>13</b>	Will the new student-athlete surveys need to be approved by each institution's review board?	The NCAA Research staff is looking at the process in which to have the survey approved by the institutional review boards.
<b>14</b>	Will the survey for student-athletes be mandatory?	Yes, the committee will recommend to the NCAA Division I Board of Directors that the survey be mandatory in order to provide the membership the most complete data.
<b>15</b>	How would the NCAA collect data for student-athletes with disabilities?	This is still under discussion, but the committee believes that in order to understand the spectrum of diversity, collecting this information would be helpful.
<b>16</b>	How will the student-athlete survey be administered? How will we deal with small squad sizes? Should we administer the survey before season or at the end of the season?	It has been discussed to possibly administer it during mandatory study halls or at the beginning of the year. A final decision has yet to be determined.