

# A G E N D A

## National Collegiate Athletic Association

### NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification

NCAA National Office  
Indianapolis, Indiana

July 19-20, 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 April 2012 meeting. [Supplement No. 2]

5. Update from April 2012 meeting of the NCAA Division I Board of Directors. [Supplement No. 3]

**Background:** During its April meeting, the committee approved a recommendation to the Division I Board of Directors to delay the implementation of the start of the Division I Institutional Performance Program by one year. During its meeting, the Board agreed to delay the implementation of the program and stagger the areas of focus to allow for a seamless transition by the membership. Further, the Board noted the delay would allow for more feedback by the membership and any adjustments to the Division I philosophy may be considered by the Board after the post-presidential retreat working groups.

6. Timeline for implementation of new program. [Supplement Nos. 4a, 4b, 4c and 4d]

**Background:** The staff has developed a timeline which outlines the rollout of the various components of the new program. The timeline includes possible legislative action dates as well as internal milestones that will need to be realized in order to meet due dates for implementation.

7. Review of feedback received from conference meetings, webinars, regional seminars and in-person external group meetings. [Supplement No. 5 to be distributed during the meeting]

**Background:** Over the course of the past several months, the staff and committee have solicited feedback from a variety of groups relative to plans for the Institutional Performance Program. During this time, the staff also conducted a variety of educational sessions. Attached is a summary of general themes the staff has received about plans for the new program.

8. Update on NCAA Rules Working Group. [Supplement No. 6 to be distributed at meeting]

9. Subcommittee discussion summaries.

- a. Student-athlete experience. [Supplement No. 7 to be distributed at meeting]

- b. Diversity. [Supplement No. 8 to be distributed at meeting]

- c. Gender. [Supplement No. 9 to be distributed at meeting]
  - d. Academics. [Supplement No. 10 to be distributed at meeting]
  - e. Fiscal management. [Supplement No. 11 to be distributed at meeting]
10. Deliberations. [Supplement No. 12]
- a. Cycle 3, Class 1 institution.
    - (1) Active Class 1 institution with spring 2012 evaluation visit.
  - b. Cycle 3, Class 3 institutions.
    - (1) Active Class 3 institutions with further written required action.
    - (2) Active Class 3 institutions with delayed submission of self-study report.
11. Update on NCAA Enforcement Working Group. [Supplement No. 13 to be distributed at meeting]
12. Review and discuss draft of new philosophy statement. [Supplement No. 14]
- Background:** With the development of the Institutional Performance Program underway, the committee believes it is important to begin discussions about what the philosophy will be for the new program. A draft philosophy statement has been created to allow for discussion and reaction.
13. Update on reclassifying institutions in new program. [Supplement No. 15]
- Background:** During its July 2011 meeting, staff reviewed a draft of the orientation agenda for reclassifying institutions and engaged the committee in discussions specific to the timing, format, length, required participants and materials for the orientation. The committee agreed April 2012 is an appropriate time to conduct an orientation with any reclassifying institutions needing to participate in a preliminary orientation during 2011-12 and it is appropriate for this preliminary orientation to be conducted in-person versus through technology. In addition, the committee noted staff should provide a list of

individuals required to participate in the preliminary orientation. Further, the committee agreed the material used for reclassifying institutions should be structured after the materials being developed for the new program applicable to active Division I institutions that will be going through the new program August 2013. Finally, the committee approved the draft preliminary orientation agenda with recommended edits specific to adding a discussion on integrity to the agenda, the current “Top 10 Issues” document and some structural and editorial revisions. In February 2012, the NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet approved the committee’s recommendation to delay the preliminary orientation for reclassifying institutions to fall 2012. Additionally, in April 2012, the NCAA Division I Board of Directors approved a one-year delay in the implementation of the new program. Given this new timing, staff recommends the committee approve the University of Nebraska, Omaha to participate in the former athletics certification program as part of the reclassification process and approve the attached agenda for the preliminary orientation to be conducted during fall 2012.

14. Review of new subcommittee members. [Supplement No. 16]
15. Review of future meeting dates and sites.
  - a. 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.
16. Other business
17. Adjournment.

**REPORT OF THE  
NCAA DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION  
APRIL 12-13, 2012, MEETING**

**KEY ITEMS.**

1. **Report for NCAA Division I Board of Directors meeting.** The NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification approved several recommendations for review by the NCAA Division I Board of Directors. The committee requested a one year delay in the implementation of the NCAA Division I Institutional Performance Program.
2. **Subcommittee consent packages.** The subcommittee chairs reported out to the full committee on potential areas for data collection in the new program. The committee approved consent packages for data in the following subcommittees: (1) academics; (2) fiscal management; (3) diversity; (4) gender inclusion; and (5) student-athlete experience.

**ACTION ITEMS.**

**1. Legislative Items.**

- **None.**

**2. Nonlegislative Items.**

**a. Delay implementation of Institutional Performance Program by one year.**

- (1) Recommendation. The committee approved a one year delay in the implementation of the Institutional Performance Program.
- (2) Effective Date. Beginning with data collection in the 2013-14 academic year.
- (3) Rationale. The committee believes that by delaying the implementation of the Institutional Performance Program one year would allow the committee the opportunity to align priorities of Division I with the new program. Further, it would permit more time to get feedback from the membership.
- (4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.
- (5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

**b. Approval of subcommittee consent packages.**

- (1) Recommendation. The committee approved consent packages from the following subcommittees: (1) academics; (2) fiscal; (3) diversity; (4) gender inclusion; and (5) student-athlete experience. The approval of the consent package allows the committee to start collecting data and assessing its effectiveness as a measurement.
- (2) Effective Date. Immediate.
- (3) Rationale. The consent packages allow the committee to gather data for the new program while still seeking feedback from the Division I membership.
- (4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.
- (5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

### **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.**

1. **Review the committee's report to the NCAA Division I Legislative Council from the February 2012 meeting.** The committee reviewed and approved its February meeting report and took no action.
2. **Discuss institutional feedback.** The committee provided feedback from the membership and shared their findings with the group related to the framework of the program and the specified areas of review. Comments were specific to the overall Institutional Performance Program as well as the specific subcommittees: (1) academics; (2) fiscal; (3) diversity; (4) gender inclusion; and (5) student-athlete experience. Comments were reviewed in subcommittee breakout sessions.
3. **Review communication plan for Institutional Performance Program.** The committee reviewed the communication plan for the Institutional Performance Program. Over the course of spring 2012 and summer 2012, the NCAA staff will provide presentations to member institutions, conference offices and applicable professional organizations via webinar and in-person meetings. The committee also reviewed an FAQ document that has been assembled based on webinars and in-person meetings. The committee received information regarding a plan to provide information regarding the Institutional Performance Program on the Division I Post Presidential Retreat Working Groups' webpage. The committee felt this would help with gathering feedback and give the membership a consistent median to share and collect information.

4. **Discuss report for NCAA Division I Board of Directors meeting.** The committee reviewed and approved items being forwarded for review by the NCAA Division I Board of Directors. The committee approved an extension of a one year delay in the implementation of the Institutional Performance Program.

The proposed timeline from the committee to the NCAA Division I Board of Directors is as follows:

**2012-13:** Solicit membership input on concepts to date, possible measures and accountability measures.

**2013-14:** All Division I members required to submit data in the areas of academics and inclusion.

**August 2014:** Data available for the membership to review. Each subsequent August, additional data will be available to the membership.

**2014-15:** Begin data collection for student-athlete experience and fiscal components from all Division I members. Begin discussions about possible benchmarks.

**2015-16:** Finalize decisions regarding benchmarks.

**2016-17:** Possible benchmark requirements implemented.

5. **Update of discussion regarding Institutional Performance Program at Leadership Council meetings.** Staff provided an update regarding the Institution Performance Program at the April Leadership Council meeting. Staff informed the committee that the Leadership Council was in agreement with the direction of the new program as well the recommended one year delay moving forward to the NCAA Division I Board of Directors.
6. **Subcommittee discussion summaries.** The subcommittee chairs reported out to the full committee on their discussions and work during the breakout sessions. The committee approved consent packages from the following subcommittees: (1) academics; (2) fiscal; (3) diversity; (4) gender inclusion; and (5) student-athlete experience. Subcommittees can now move forward working on dashboards and gathering feedback from the Division I membership specific to data the program will collect for each area.
7. **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.

8. **Other business.** The committee was asked to consider a new philosophy statement for the next committee meeting in July 2012 that focuses on the new program.

*Acting Committee Chair: William Perry, Eastern Illinois University, Missouri Valley Conference (Thursday)*

*Acting Committee Chair: Amy Folan, University of Texas (Friday)*

*Staff Liaisons:*  
*Troy Arthur, Academic and Membership Affairs*  
*Matt Brewer, Academic and Membership Affairs*  
*Dan Calandro, Academic and Membership Affairs*  
*Mira Colman, Academic and Membership Affairs*  
*Danielle Ghiloni, Academic and Membership Affairs*  
*Andy Louthain, Academic and Membership Affairs*  
*Matt Maher, Academic and Membership Affairs*  
*Abbie Renaker, Academic and Membership Affairs*  
*Danielle Teetzel, Academic and Membership Affairs*

April 12-13, 2012	
Attendees	Absentees
Anthony Archbald, Princeton University	Joanne Glasser, Bradley University
John Balog, Jacksonville University	Beth DeBauche, Ohio Valley Conference

Attendees	Absentees
Henry Brooks, University of Maryland, Eastern Shore	William Perry, Eastern Illinois University (Friday)
Roger Caves, San Diego State University	
Casey Comoroski, Missouri State University	
Beth DeBauche, Ohio Valley Conference	
Tom Douple, The Summit League	
John Dunn, Western Michigan University	
Amy Folan, University of Texas at Austin	
Tracey Flynn, Quinnipiac University	
Angela (A.J.) Grube, Western Carolina University	
Nina King, Duke University	
Gary Overton, East Carolina 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, Michael Cioroianu, Diane Dickman, Kevin Lennon, Binh Nguyen, Todd Petr, Dave Schnase, Dave Tunik.	

**April 2012 NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification  
Recommendations to the NCAA Division I Board of Directors  
for Institutional Performance Program**

During its April 2011 meeting the NCAA Division I Board of Directors charged the NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification with developing a new, streamlined, technology driven institutional review program that emphasized the student-athlete experience. This report represents action items and information items for the board review.

**ACTION ITEM**

- **Request for Delay.**

**Recommendation:** The committee recommends the Board support a one year delay in implementing the new NCAA Division I Institutional Performance Program (IPP) (previously named athletics certification) with a staggered roll-out as outlined. Additionally, this recommendation includes the requirement that all Division I members be required to implement the school's athletics certification cycle two or three plans for improvement.

**2012-13:** Solicit membership input on concepts to date, possible accountability measures and use of a pilot group of institutions to start collecting data. The pilot institutions would participate voluntarily to help inform the process and ensure ease of use when the full membership is required to submit data.

**January 2013:** Recommend that the Board approve legislation the committee will recommend that provides a basic framework for the new IPP including establishing an oversight committee, purpose of the program, and the required data collection for all Division I members. The committee intends to circulate this legislation in advance to the membership for comment prior to the January requested action.

**Spring/Fall 2013:** Continued membership feedback.

**2013-14:** All Division I members would be required to submit data in the areas of academics and inclusion, which includes gender and diversity.

**August 2014:** Data available for the membership to review. Each subsequent August, additional data will be available to the membership.

**2014-15:** Begin required data collection for student-athlete experience and fiscal components from all Division I members. Begin discussions about possible benchmarks.

**2015-16:** Finalize decisions regarding benchmarks. If benchmarks and accountability measures or penalties are determined to be appropriate, enabling legislation could be put forward in this legislative cycle for membership consideration.

**2016-17:** Possible benchmark requirements implemented.

Rationale: Originally the timeline provided for initial data collection from all Division I members was fall 2012. Delaying the implementation for one year would result in the collection of data beginning in fall 2013. Such a delay would allow time for additional membership input on possible benchmarks, measures and the accountability measures. The committee recommends this delay include the requirement that all Division I members be required to implement the school's athletics certification cycle two or three plans for improvement. Below is a tentative schedule for implementation of the IPP:

### **Informational and Discussion Items.**

- **IPP – Issues for Board and Membership Discussion.**

The following issues and decisions will help determine the immediate and long-term direction for the new IPP. The committee seeks the Board and membership input on these matters as it continues to develop the program.

1. **With what frequency should dashboard data be analyzed by the NCAA staff and provided to each Division I member?**

Options may include:

- a. Annually;
- b. Once every two years;
- c. Less frequently; or
- d. Could vary by area (e.g., inclusion could be annual; academic could be every three years).

2. **What Level of Accountability is Appropriate in the New IPP?** Options include:

- a. **Information and campus-driven review model:** Initially, no "penalties" or committee "decisions" would be made or assessed. The program would provide dashboard data to member institutions for their use and provide NCAA staff and the Division I committee on athletic certification assistance in areas only when requested by the institution's president. In several years after data has been collected, consideration could be given to establishing benchmarks and other accountability measures. Additionally, under this model, schools could be held accountable for their gender/diversity plans approved by the president and the committee in cycle three or previous cycles of athletics certification. This caveat would ensure that, in these critical areas, Division I institutions will continue to make progress as previously outlined in their plans for improvement;
- b. **Phase-in benchmarks over several years:** Initially establish benchmarks in the area of inclusion, which includes gender and diversity. Other areas could have established benchmarks implemented over a five year phase-in approach. Item three below outlines an example timeline under this approach;
- c. **Immediate benchmark requirements in all areas:** With the launch of new IPP, include from the very beginning benchmark requirements, penalties associated with failing to meet minimum requirements and required campus visits in underperforming areas as determined by the committee. This could include immediate benchmarks in all areas; or
- d. **Benchmarks in some area(s) only:** Some of the four key areas may warrant benchmarks and accountability measures (e.g., inclusion), while other areas may not lend themselves to such requirements (e.g., fiscal). Other areas already have significant accountability measures (e.g., academics). The membership may conclude after extensive review that benchmarks and accountability measures at the national level are only needed in some of the areas, but not all.

**NCAA Division I Institutional Performance Program  
Timeline**

**Spring and Summer 2012.**

- Gather membership feedback from conference and other group meetings.

**July 2012.**

- NCAA Division I Committee on Institutional Performance meets to refine NCAA Division I Institutional Performance Program (IPP) based on membership input and then forwards to NCAA Division I Board of Directors for proposed legislation that reconstitutes the committee overseeing this program and allows for data collection to begin in 2013-14.

**August/October 2012.**

- Committee on Institutional Performance requests Board sponsor legislation in cycle for name change, committee responsibilities and data collection. BOARD ACTION.

**August/December 2012.**

- Membership comment period on proposed legislation.

**January 2013.**

- Board adopts legislation for name change, committee responsibilities and data collection. BOARD ACTION.

**Spring 2013.**

- Membership receives notification of data collection for academics and inclusion (gender and diversity) modules.

**July 2013.**

- Committee on Institutional Performance reviews data for academics and inclusion from pilot schools.

**August 2013.**

- Start data collection of IPP in the areas of academics and inclusion.

**February 2014.**

- Committee on Institutional Performance begins to review data for academics and inclusion.

**Spring 2014.**

- Membership receives notification of data collection for fiscal management and student-athlete experience.

**August 2014.**

- Start data collection of IPP in the areas of fiscal management and student-athlete experience.

**2014-15.**

- Committee on Institutional Performance begins to examine and frame for membership options around benchmarks. Conceptual with specifics to come later in academic year.

**February 2015.**

- Committee on Institutional Performance reviews data in fiscal management and student-athlete experience.

**2015-16.**

- Committee on Institutional Performance engages membership in review of benchmarks in all areas.

**April 2015.**

Committee on Institutional Performance develops concept document for benchmarks.

**Spring and Summer 2015.**

- Membership receives notification of concept document for benchmarks.

**October 2015.**

- Committee on Institutional Performance requests Board sponsor legislation regarding benchmarks. BOARD ACTION.

**January 2016.**

- Board and NCAA Division I Leadership Council receive feedback about benchmarks.

**February 2016.**

- Committee on Institutional Performance receives feedback on benchmarks.

**April 2016.**

- Board will review and/or approve additional legislative requirements for the Institutional Performance Program.

**August 2016.**

- Board will take action on legislative items related to the Institutional Performance Program.

**Timeline for Implementation of New Program**

**Proposed Legislative Action Items:**

1. Request that the NCAA Division I Board of Directors sponsor legislation to change the name of the committee and program. The effective date will be August 1, 2013.
2. Request that the Board sponsor legislation to describe the role and responsibilities of the NCAA Division I Committee on Institutional Performance. The effective date will be August 1, 2013.
3. Request that the Board sponsor legislation to use data currently collected (e.g., NCAA sports sponsorship and demographic data, NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program data) and require the collection of new data for the NCAA Division I Institutional Performance Program beginning August 1, 2013. The effective date will be August 1, 2013.
4. Affirm the continued application of NCAA Bylaws 22 and 33 for reclassifying institutions until further notice. The effective date will be immediate.

**Informational Items:**

- Recommend to the NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet the extension of President Glasser's term as chair until August 31, 2014.

MEMORANDUM

June 27, 2012



P.O. Box 6222  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206  
Telephone: 317/917-6222

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

[www.ncaa.org](http://www.ncaa.org)

TO: NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet.

FROM: Troy Arthur  
Director of Academic and Membership Affairs.

SUBJECT: NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics  
Certification Appointment.

The purpose of this memorandum is to request the NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet extend the term of the current chair of the NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification.

In this regard, it is recommended that President Joanne Glasser, Bradley University, be reappointed as chair for two additional years, ending September 1, 2014. President Glasser's current term expires September 1, 2012. Extending President Glasser's term as chair will provide continuity for the committee as it continues working to develop and implement a program to replace the NCAA Division I Athletics Certification Program.

A roster of the current committee is enclosed for your reference.

Thank you for considering this matter.

TLA:mc

Enclosure

**DRAFT PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT FOR THE  
NCAA DIVISION I INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE PROGRAM**

“The NCAA Division I Committee on Institutional Performance is charged by the NCAA Division I membership to use ongoing, objective, cost-effective, technology-based and consultative means to assist member institutions in assessing their performance in meeting NCAA commitments to the principles of operation in academic, fiscal, gender and diversity dimensions and that focus on the student-athlete experience. The committee will provide an objective evaluation of an institution's performance based on agreed-upon data submitted, corresponding measurements adopted by the membership and the institution's mission. The Institutional Performance Program is designed to identify areas of strength and areas in which an institution needs to improve. The committee's first response to an institution's declining or deficient performance shall be to encourage the institution to return to the required performance level. Thus, the committee is committed to suggesting, and in some cases providing, consultative assistance to an institution that needs to improve. A reasonable time frame will be provided for an institution to show objective improvement based on good-faith efforts. Finally, the committee will recommend accountability measures to the appropriate NCAA body in those cases where institutional improvement of performance does not occur.”

**SUPPLEMENT NO. 15**

Proposal 2010-100 Division Membership – Elimination of Provisional and Multidivisional  
Membership – Reclassification Process and Multisport Conference Requirements

Effective August 1, 2011

Requirements Related to Athletics Certification

<b>Year</b>	<b>Requirement</b>
One (2011-12)	Completion of a preliminary NCAA athletics orientation, which shall require attendance by representatives from the sponsoring conference.
Two (2012-13)	No athletics certification requirements. Completion of a compliance review conducted by the NCAA national office and submission of a report with an institutional response to the findings and recommendations. No change from current requirement.
Three (2013-14)	Completion of an NCAA athletics certification orientation. No change from current requirement.
Four (2014-15) *New program scheduled to begin August 2014	Successfully complete an NCAA athletics certification self-study and evaluation visit. No change from current requirement.
Not later than the conclusion of second year of active NCAA Division I membership (2016-17)	Submission of an athletics certification progress report to the NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification regarding the progress of any plans for improvement (as recommended by the committee).

## **NCAA Division I Reclassifying Institutions Orientation Agenda**

1. Integrity of the process.
2. Purpose and philosophy.
3. Timeline for completion.
4. Review comparison chart between NCAA Division II and Division I requirements.
5. Required participants and broad-based participation.
6. Presidential authority and responsibility.
7. Conference office involvement.
8. Topic areas.
  - a. Governance and Commitment to Rules Compliance.
  - b. Academic Integrity.
  - c. Gender/Diversity Issue and Student-Athlete Well-Being.
9. Role of the committee.
10. Technology.
11. Best practices to prepare for self-study.
12. Resources.
  - Top 10 issues document.
13. Questions.