

# A G E N D A

## National Collegiate Athletic Association

### NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification

NCAA National Office  
Indianapolis, Indiana

February 23-24, 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 July 2011 meeting. [Supplement No. 2]
5. Review the minutes from the July 28, 2011, NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification Executive Subcommittee teleconference and the September 30, 2011, committee teleconference. [Supplement Nos. 3a and 3b]

6. Deliberations. [Supplement No. 4]
  - a. Cycle 3, Class 1 institutions.
    - (1) Active Class 1 institution with prior enforcement activity.
    - (2) Active Class 1 institution with spring 2012 evaluation visit.
  - b. Cycle 3, Class 2 institutions.
    - (1) Active Class 2 institution with fall 2011 evaluation visit.
    - (2) Active Class 2 institution with prior enforcement activity.
  - c. Cycle 3, Class 3 institutions.
    - (1) Active Class 3 institutions with fall 2011 evaluation visits.
    - (2) Active Class 3 institutions with further written required action.
    - (3) Reclassifying Class 3 institutions with fall 2011 evaluation visits.
    - (4) Active Class 3 institutions with delayed submission of self-study report.

7. Update from NCAA Division I Board of Directors meeting. [Supplement No. 5]

**Background:** During its September 30, 2011, teleconference, the committee approved the framework for the new program. During the teleconference, the committee agreed the NCAA staff should gather feedback from the membership regarding the new program. Since that time, the staff has been in contact with all Division I conference offices to request teleconferences, webinars and in-person presentations to discuss the elements of the new program. The staff has not only met with Division I conferences, but has also met with representatives from the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association (FARA), National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics (NACDA), National Association of Collegiate Women Athletics Administrators (NACWAA), National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBU), College Athletic Business Management Association (CABMA) and the Minorities Opportunities Athletics Association (MOAA). Further, staff has met with numerous groups in the governance structure including the NCAA Division I Board of Directors, Legislative Council, Academic Cabinet, and Committee on Academic Progress, Committee on Women's Athletics and Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee. The staff will provide an overview of how we are communicating with the aforementioned groups.

8. 2012 NCAA Convention session feedback. [Supplement No. 6]

**Background:** The NCAA staff conducted a 90-minute session January 12 for 189 individuals at the 2012 NCAA Convention in Indianapolis. The session was designed to give the membership an update on the development of the new athletics certification program and to solicit feedback in the four areas of the new program by using roundtable breakouts.

9. Subcommittee discussion summaries.

- a. Inclusion diversity. [Supplement No. 7a to be distributed during the meeting]
- b. Fiscal management. [Supplement No. 7b to be distributed during the meeting]
- c. Academics. [Supplement No. 7c to be distributed during the meeting]
- d. Inclusion gender. [Supplement No. 7d to be distributed during the meeting]
- e. Student-athlete experience. [Supplement No. 7e to be distributed during the meeting]

10. Discussion of legislative issues for the new program. [Supplement No. 8 to be distributed at the meeting.]

**Background:** The new program will require legislative action in order for details of the program to be included in the NCAA Division I manual. Before finalizing the legislative concepts, there are unresolved questions that have been identified for the committee to discuss.

11. Discussion regarding committee policies and procedures for the new program. [Supplement No. 9 to be distributed during the meeting]

**Background:** The new program requires the committee to amend its policies and procedures manual. The committee will review the suggested framework of a new manual and discuss unresolved questions identified within the document.

12. Discuss program for reclassifying institutions.

**Background:** In January 2011, the NCAA Division I Board of Directors adopted NCAA Proposal No. 2010-100, which establishes a four-year process for an institution

that wishes to reclassify membership from Division II to Division I. Specifically, the legislation now requires a reclassifying institution to complete a preliminary athletics certification orientation during Year One of the reclassification process and submit an athletics certification report regarding progress on plans for improvement not later than the conclusion of its second year of active Division I membership.

During its February 2011 meeting, the committee discussed items to be included in the preliminary orientation agenda for reclassifying institutions. It was agreed the focus of the preliminary orientation should be to explain how the athletics certification program differs from the NCAA Division II Institutional Self-Study Guide, provide a general overview of the process and share best practices that may be helpful for institutions to use when preparing to complete the self-study.

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 an orientation during 2011-12 and it is appropriate for this 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 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 who will be going through the new program August 2013. Finally, the committee approved the draft 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.

Staff is requesting that the committee recommend to the Division I Administration Cabinet that the orientation be delayed to fall 2012 to allow the committee to complete the measurements and structuring of the new program.

13. Update on nomination of new committee members.

**Background:** In the 2012 calendar year, there will be two vacancies on the committee (two members are eligible for reappointment). The NCAA Division I Administrative Cabinet met in early February and appointed new individuals to the committee.

14. Review of future meeting dates and sites.

- a. April 12-13, 2012: Indianapolis, Indiana.

- (1) Wednesday, April 11: Travel to meeting.

- (2) Thursday, April 12: Subcommittee meetings in morning, full committee meets in afternoon.
- (3) Friday, April 13: Full committee meets until noon; return travel after 2 p.m.

b. 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.

c. 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.

15. Other business.

16. Adjournment.

**REPORT OF THE  
NCAA DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION  
July 27-29, 2011, MEETING**

**ACTION ITEMS.**

**1. Legislative Action Items.**

- None.

**2. Nonlegislative Items.**

- None.

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.**

- 1. Suspension of current athletics certification program.** The NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification received an update specific to the adoption of emergency legislation by the NCAA Board of Directors during its April 28, 2011, meeting to suspend athletics certification activities for up to two years for NCAA Division I active member institutions. Staff informed the committee that a new program will be developed and implemented in fall 2013. Finally, staff reviewed the process for Cycle 3, Class 3 Institution's moving forward.
- 2. Update on development of new program and timeline.** The committee received an update on the status of the development of the new program from staff and was informed of the work of Springboard International. The president of Springboard International explained their role in helping to facilitate the work of the staff and committee with the development of the new program and provided a timeline for the work. Finally, the committee engaged in roundtable discussions specific to elements of the new program.
- 3. 2012 NCAA Convention session.** The staff updated the committee on the education session being provided to the membership specific to the development of the new program. The staff plans to solicit feedback from the membership specific to the four areas of the new program. The staff extended an invitation to the full committee to attend the convention and engage in discussions with the membership.
- 4. Process for Cycle 3 deliberations.** The staff reviewed the abbreviated process for deliberations on Class 3 institutions as well as for Class 2 and reclassifying institutions.

**5. Cycle 3 Certification Decisions.** The committee engaged in deliberations regarding the Cycle 3 athletics certification status of 28 institutions.

The following 27 institutions were certified:

- a. Appalachian State University;
- b. Butler University;
- c. Chicago State University;
- d. Coastal Carolina University;
- e. Florida International University;
- f. Georgetown University;
- g. Illinois State University;
- h. Iowa State University;
- i. Kansas State University;
- j. Long Beach State University;
- k. Long Island University- Brooklyn;
- l. Marist College;
- m. Miami University (Ohio);
- n. Missouri State University;
- o. Monmouth University;
- p. Montana State University;
- q. Northeastern University;
- r. Saint Louis University;

- s. San Jose State University;
- t. Southeast Missouri State University;
- u. Tulane University;
- v. Vanderbilt University;
- w. Washington State University;
- x. University of California, Los Angeles;
- y. University of Illinois at Chicago;
- z. University of Montana; and
- aa. University of Texas Pan American.

The following institution was certified with conditions:

- a. Southern University, Baton Rouge.
- 
6. **Review of the 2011-12 Athletics Certification Handbook and Self-Study Instrument.** The committee approved revisions to the 2011-12 Athletics Certification Handbook pending further clarification on conference office involvement in the athletics certification program and media entities participating in or being present during any portion of the evaluation visit including the exit meeting. In addition, the committee approved revision to the 2011-12 Self-Study Instrument.
  7. **Review of the Committee's Policies and Procedures Manual.** The committee reviewed and approved changes to its policies and procedures manual.
  8. **Discussion on reclassifying institutions.** Staff reviewed Proposal 2010-100 (Division Membership- Elimination of Provisional and Multidivisional Membership-Reclassification Process and Multisport Conference Requirements). In addition, 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 an orientation during 2011-12 and it is appropriate for this 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 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 who will be going through the new program August 2013. Finally, the committee approved the draft 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.

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

*Staff Liaisons: A. Frank Arredondo, Academic and Membership Affairs  
Troy Arthur, Academic and Membership Affairs  
Mira J. 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*

**MINUTES OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION**

**DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION**

**EXECUTIVE SUBCOMMITTEE**

NCAA National Office  
Indianapolis, Indiana

July 28, 2011

**Participants:**

Casey Comoroski, Missouri State University  
Amy Folan, University of Texas at Austin  
Joanne Glasser, Bradley University, chair  
Barbara Luebke, University of Rhode Island  
William Perry, Eastern Illinois University  
Troy Arthur, NCAA  
Mira Colman, NCAA  
Charnele Kemper, NCAA

[Note: These minutes contain only actions taken (formal votes or stated "sense of the meeting") in accordance with NCAA policy regarding minutes of all Association entities. While certain items on the subcommittee's agenda were acted on at various times throughout the teleconference, all final actions within a given topic are combined in these minutes for convenience of reference.]

The meeting was called to order at 12:15 p.m. Eastern time by the chair, Joanne Glasser.

1. Review timeline for ratification of certification decisions and public press release.

It was VOTED

“That the executive subcommittee will ratify all decisions via email made during the July 27-29 meeting. Votes will be due via email by August 5, 2011.”

2. Review and approval of NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification subcommittees.

It was VOTED

"To approve the new subcommittees effective September 1, 2011."

3. Discussion of new NCAA Division I athletics certification program.

It was VOTED

"The executive subcommittee will be provided with an executive summary for review before disclosure to the full committee. The executive subcommittee shall receive this summary at least two weeks in advance of the full committee's review of materials in order to note any areas of concern."

4. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

# # # # #

**REPORT OF THE  
NCAA DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION  
SEPTEMBER 30, 2011, TELECONFERENCE**

**ACTION ITEMS.**

- None.

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.**

1. **Update on Development of New Program.** The NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification received an update from staff on the status of the development of the new program including possible changes in the composition of the committee, role of the staff and information regarding the collection and analysis of data used to create concepts for the new program. Further, the committee received information regarding the methodology used to evaluate the current athletics certification program and discussed some of its deficiencies. Finally, the committee heard updates from three project teams that provided recommendations on how the program can be enhanced.
2. **Review of Process and Design for New Program.** The committee received an update from staff concerning the work of the process design project team. The committee engaged in discussions specific to the timing of the process, as well as the required submission deadline dates for NCAA Division I institution data that is required to be submitted annually to the NCAA and the federal government. Additionally, the committee discussed potential resources for institutions that fall below the established measurement in a particular area. Finally, the committee reviewed and approved changes to the process and design of the new program.
3. **Review of Values for New Program.** The committee received an update from staff concerning the work of the values project team. The committee approved the values statements for the new program in the areas of fiscal management, academic integrity, gender, diversity and student-athlete well-being. Further, the committee discussed proposed accountability measures for institutions participating in the new program, including accountability at the institutional, regional and national levels.
4. **Review of Organization/Roles and Responsibilities for New Program.** The committee received an update from staff concerning the work of the organization/roles and responsibilities project team. The committee engaged in discussions specific to the composition and responsibilities of the committee and subcommittees for the new program, the responsibilities for institutions participating in the new program and the

responsibilities of the staff associated with the new program. Finally, the committee reviewed and approved changes to the reporting lines for the committee, the composition of the committee including the addition of a student-athlete representative to the committee, the areas of expertise for subcommittee members for the new athletic certification program and the schedule and timing of future committee meetings.

5. **Review of the Purpose Statement for New Program.** The committee reviewed the proposed purpose statement for the new program. The committee will discuss the purpose statement for the new program at a future committee meeting.
6. **Review of Name Options for New Program.** The committee reviewed options for naming the new program. The committee recommended the name of the new program include a reference to student-athlete well-being. The committee will discuss ideas for the name of the new program at its February 2012 meeting.
7. **Discussion on Next Steps.** The committee discussed and approved the action steps and timeline for activities to be completed by the committee and staff prior to the conclusion of summer 2012.

*Committee chair:* Joanne Glasser, Bradley University, Missouri Valley Conference  
*Staff Liaisons:* A. Frank Arredondo, Academic and Membership Affairs  
Troy Arthur, Academic and Membership Affairs  
Mira J. 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

**NCAA Division I Board of Directors  
Update of NCAA Division I Athletics Certification Program**

**Review of Charge and Update.**

During its April 2011 meeting, the NCAA Division I Board of Directors approved the suspension of the NCAA Division I Athletics Certification Program until August 2013 in order to develop a streamlined and technology-driven program that focuses on the student-athlete experience.

Over the last seven months, the NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification and the NCAA staff have surveyed member institutions from Cycle 3 of the current athletics certification program, interviewed key institutional leaders and collected information from the membership. Based on this feedback, the committee is making the following recommendations for the Board's consideration.

**Name of the New Program.**

The committee has agreed to change the name of the program from the NCAA Division I Athletics Certification Program to the NCAA Division I Institutional Performance Program. Further, the name of the committee will also change from the NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification to the NCAA Division I Committee on Institutional Performance. In selecting the new name, the committee believed the name should reflect the broad-based approach of the program and the involvement by institutional personnel outside the athletics department. Finally, the term "performance" is an active term that reflects the program's new purpose.

**New Program Purpose Statement.**

The central purpose of the Institutional Performance Program shall be to facilitate member institutions in reviewing their athletics programs based on identified measures that align with the core values and principles of the NCAA and the institution's mission. This shall include data compiled by the NCAA for the chancellor's/president's review and analysis. Appropriate accountability measures will also be a part of the program. The program will assist the Division I membership in continual enhancement of the student-athlete experience.

*Board Discussion:*

- *Does the Board support this purpose or have changes to suggest?*

**System Development.**

1. Replace the current once-every-ten-years narrative self-study report with a web-based/ IT infrastructure for input and output of data annually. The new program will provide institutions with consistency in the analysis of data and have the ability to establish measurements.

2. Annual review will occur in four areas of focus: academics, fiscal management, student-athlete experience and inclusion which includes gender and diversity. Approximately 80% of the data that will be used in the new program is currently collected by the NCAA.
3. Institutions and conferences and will receive scorecards, to assist with decision making and information.
4. Replace the peer-review team with an issue-focused review when necessary. Campus visits may occur when an institution has fallen below committee determined measurements. Therefore, not all institutions will have campus visits.
5. The new program will provide information to the institution's chancellor/president in a dashboard format. Issues or concerns will be self-evident due to measurements and indicators. If no issues or concerns are identified, the process is complete and no additional response is needed.
6. For institutions that are below an identified measurement, resources will be identified to assist with the issue. Possible resources include:
  - a. Best practices;
  - b. Consultant pool;
  - c. NCAA staff visit; and
  - d. Supplemental funds.

*Board Discussion:*

- *Does the Board support this structural framework or have any changes to suggest?*

**Organizational Change.**

1. The roles and responsibilities for the committee will include the following;
  - a. Establish an ongoing and efficient review process for all Division I institutions that includes an annual indicator system;

- b. Develop a streamlined educational/orientation program for all Division I institutions;
  - c. Establish baseline measurements and comparisons for each of the four areas when appropriate;
  - d. Oversee and monitor submission deadlines and implement penalties; and
  - e. Coordinate issue-focused external review when appropriate, including the selection, approval and evaluation of peer experts. The committee will identify and partner with outside organizations [e.g., National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO), National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education (NADOHE)] to train and serve as peer experts.
2. The number of committee members will remain at 18; however, the composition would consist of the following:
  - a. One chancellor/president from each subdivision;
  - b. Two at-large chancellors/presidents. Each chancellor/president to chair one focus area with one chancellor/president to chair full committee;
  - c. One chancellor/president to be representative from the Board;
  - d. Thirteen subject matter experts by focus area as noted above (member will be ex-officio if not from institution – e.g., NACUBO); and
  - e. One student-athlete representative from the NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.
3. The committee recommends that it reports to the Board and that a Board representative serve on the committee to provide committee reports and updates. If the committee is unable to report to the Board, it is recommended the committee report to the NCAA Division I Leadership Council rather than the NCAA Division I Legislative Council.

*Board Discussion:*

- *Does the Board support these program changes?*



### **Accountability Spectrum.**

The committee developed a list that included a range from low accountability to high accountability measures at three distinct levels: institutional, regional/conference and national. The result will be a spectrum of accountability measures that encompasses these three levels. The low accountability level represents very little oversight from the NCAA staff and committee. Medium accountability represents some involvement by the NCAA staff, committee or some other oversight body (e.g., conferences). Finally, high accountability infers that the NCAA staff and committee is not only actively involved, but may require action by the institution.

### **Institutional Accountability Measures.**

<b>Activity Required</b>	<b>Equity Involved</b>	<b>Level of Accountability</b>
Chancellor/president selects individuals to conduct the review of data he or she deems appropriate.	Chancellor/ President	Low Accountability
Peer comparison developed by institution.	Chancellor/ President or Designee	Low Accountability
Chancellor/president provides annual report to faculty senate, all student-athletes and athletics department staff.	Chancellor/ President or Designee	Medium Accountability
Chancellor/president must make an annual report to the governing board.	Chancellor/ President or Designee	Medium Accountability

**Regional Accountability Measures.**

<b>Activity Required</b>	<b>Equity Involved</b>	<b>Level of Accountability</b>
Conference office is identified as an available resource to its institutions when an institution falls below a benchmark.	Conference and Institution	Low Accountability
Conference office randomly audits an institution to ensure annual reporting to constituent groups has occurred (e.g., faculty senate).	Conference and Institution	Medium Accountability
Conference office creates the benchmarks and has the responsibility/ability to impose sanctions on institutions accordingly.	Conference and Institution	High Accountability
Chancellor/president must make an annual report to the conference.	Chancellor/ President or Designee	High Accountability

**National Accountability Measures.**

<b>Activity Required</b>	<b>Equity Involved</b>	<b>Level of Accountability</b>
Institution's chancellor/president and athletics director signoff on the annual report/process.	Chancellor/ President and NCAA	Low Accountability
Institution must report back to the committee/staff actions regarding remediation plans.	Chancellor/ President and NCAA	Medium Accountability

<b>Activity Required</b>	<b>Equity Involved</b>	<b>Level of Accountability</b>
Institution has issue focused visit from staff and/or peer expert.	Chancellor/ President and NCAA	High Accountability
Public release of information on an annual basis [similar to the NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) release].	Chancellor/ President and NCAA	High Accountability
Audit of information submitted by institutions. This could be done through the department that oversees the collection of the areas being audited (e.g., academic and membership affairs for the APR data).	Chancellor/ President and NCAA	High Accountability
Institution receives postseason championship ineligibility for noncompliance.	Chancellor/ President and NCAA	High Accountability
Institution must appear in front of the committee for hearing for noncompliance.	Chancellor/ President and NCAA	High Accountability
Institution receives practice and/or regular season competition penalties for noncompliance.	Chancellor/ President and NCAA	High Accountability

*Board Discussion:*

- *Does the Board support this accountability measure spectrum?*

### **Next Steps.**

If the Board accepts the report, the committee will then engage in a series of activities to develop the new program. These steps are as follows:

#### **January 11-13, 2012.**

- 2012 NCAA Convention roundtable discussion.

#### **February 2012.**

- Committee approval of process and measurements.

#### **April 2012.**

- Board of Directors approves legislative package regarding the new program.

#### **Spring – Summer 2012.**

1. Determine best practices for institutions.
2. Determine a consultant pool.
3. Determine whether NCAA staff visits the institution.
4. Determine whether the supplemental fund should be used in areas where institution is below the benchmark.

2012 NCAA Convention Feedback

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS – Academics

**1. What type of information is important as you evaluate the academic performance of your student-athletes?**

Academic Progress Rate (APR)/Graduation Success Rate (GSR) Data  
Missed class time/study tables  
Degrees/majors  
Performance by sport  
Overall grade-point average/core-course grade-point average  
Retention rate  
Progress toward degree information  
Progress checks  
Summer school frequency  
Student-athlete withdrawal rates  
Transfers/red shirts/2 year college transfers  
SA's credentials coming into institution/backgrounds  
ACT/SAT scores  
Student-athlete credit loads  
Academic support  
Metrics other than GSR such as post college employment  
In season vs. out of season

**2. What are the biggest contributing factors to student-athletes' academic success?**

Academic preparedness  
Academic resources  
Type of student-athlete you're recruiting  
Availability of tutoring services  
Quantity and quality of academic support staff  
Access to technology (both during travel and on campus)  
Coach's commitment  
Professor to student ratio  
Student-athlete credentials coming into institution/backgrounds  
Type of sport  
Institutional fit  
Missed class time  
Coach's relationship with the student-athlete  
Accountability of student-athlete's and coaches  
Early registration of classes  
Engaged FAR  
Programming for at-risk student-athlete's

Mission/culture of the university

Individual vs. team sports athlete (individual sports tend to have more accountability)

N4A standards

Predictor of success is how representative student-athlete's are of the general population  
(See IVY League Model)

***Miscellaneous:***

Tag Facilitating Learning and Achieving Graduation (FLAG) data

How much can be mandated via a nationally run program?

How can this be enforced/legislated?

<b>DISCUSSION QUESTIONS – Fiscal Management</b>
---

**1. What is mission-critical for institutions related to fiscal management?**

Scholarship funding levels and comparisons

Consistency

Administrators/coach's salaries (NACDA has a survey and most institutions fill it out)

Team & staff travel expenses

Long term debt and liabilities

Accountability

Net generated revenue

Institution subsidies

Debt to current operations ratio

Comparing like institutions

Operating budget vs. total number of sports

University budget vs. athletics budget

Average number of subsidies for each sport

Spending per student-athlete

Ability to fund scholarships/department budgets when state funded

Consistency among EADA, revenue/expenses and dashboards

Maintaining balanced budgets

Title IX areas to ensure proper expenditures to meet federal requirements

***Miscellaneous:***

Why are we involved in Fiscal Management? Leave this to the institution. They should be able to spend as they see fit.

The NCAA has no business here in the day-to-day management of the institutional spending decisions.

Have benchmarks set for how much money should be spent on certain services.

Will benchmarks be based on monetary output?

You may think about State vs. Private institutions.

You need to hold people accountable if you go down this road.

You may want to think about geography. (i.e., comparing California to North Dakota)

**2. Is there other data we want to collect/gather and include in the new system outside of the dashboard indicators?**

Is athletics operating on its own or receiving subsidies

Gender equity data

Data related to coaches compensation

State vs. public assisted institutions

Spending broken down per athlete by sport

How they are spending per diems

Discrepancies in scholarship and revenue streams between athletics and institutions

Fiscal cuts over determined period of time

Discrepancies in data centered across institutions

Top 4 expenditures and percentage of total spending

Student-athlete aid offered in percentage to NCAA maximums

Percentage of fundraising dollars contributing to overall budget

Legal fees for major violations

*Miscellaneous:*

<b>DISCUSSION QUESTIONS – Inclusion Diversity and Gender</b>
--

**1. In what specific area(s) of inclusion diversity and gender equity would you like to be able to compare your institution against versus other Division I institutions (e.g., hiring practices, programming, etc)?**

Compare athletic department hiring vs. on campus hiring

Data related comparison of institutional and community demographics

All Title IX components including the “Laundry List” treatment section

Participation rates by gender vs. student body  
Rooney Rule for NCAA  
Athletic department make-ups vs. rest of institutions faculty/administration/students  
Level of experience of staff  
Percentage of coaches vs. percentage of student-athlete's  
Percentage of student-athlete's vs. student body  
Ethnicity of athletics department vs. overall institution administration  
Institutional vs. athletics department hiring practices  
Length of contracts

***Miscellaneous:***

Sometimes you won't look at whether a person is of a certain race or gender but rather hire the best person for the job in the end.

We can't say that this job must be filled by a female or African American.

It is hard to recruit diverse student-athlete's to some areas. (e.g., Idaho)

**2. Similar to the current athletics certification process, should the NCAA require institutions to conduct a gender equity and diversity review over a series of years?**

No, it's too hard to measure with objective measurements

Yes, this will keep the gender equity/diversity analysis as a priority

Yes, because not all Institutions are committed to gender equity and diversity

Yes, these should be a corrective action

No, we are bound by the state and the institution in how we conduct these matters

***Miscellaneous:***

If required, what is the benchmark and punishment for not meeting the benchmark?

**3. How important are plans for improvement in helping your institution maintain or progress toward fair and equitable treatment of your under-represented gender or groups?**

As a peer-reviewer these are seen as a waste of time

Very important especially if an institution has deficiencies

Very important because potential funding and potential solutions bring resource allocation



***Miscellaneous:***

Need to be deliberate and intentional

<b>DISCUSSION QUESTIONS – Student-Athlete Experience</b>
--

- 1. Should the current student-athlete exit interview requirement (NCAA Bylaw 6.3.2) be removed and allow the new certification program to create and administer a broader survey?**

Exit interviews should be handled by institutions that have context of specific issues

Exit interview is still valuable on campus

Yes, but institution needs to be able to add institution specific questions

Having a survey from a 3<sup>rd</sup> party like the NCAA gives it more teeth

Time consuming but worthwhile

***Miscellaneous:***

Maybe smart to gather more feedback from the membership on this topic.

Will the role of compliance change on campus?

How do you get every student-athlete to take the survey?

The NCAA can't tell a coach how to coach his kids.

SAAC representative noted that you should go to a 1 – 10 scale.

- 2. If a broader survey is appropriate, is there a certain group of student-athletes who should be targeted for the survey and how often should this group be surveyed?**

Scholarship vs. walk on

Grade levels

Yearly basis

All student-athlete's need to be surveyed annually

SAAC representatives

Representative from each team

Use online surveys

***Miscellaneous:***

Suggest a participation and injury surveillance system.

FAR at Oklahoma is conducting a 2 year survey to determine trends with student-athlete's.

**Overall Questions/Concerns**

Keep the program SIMPLE and TRANSPARENT.

You say the NCAA collects 80% of the data already... what does a 20% workload mean to an SWA or Compliance person who will actually be doing the work?

What are the expectations for conferences?

How do we develop trust in the new system when old system was so burdensome?

There was no discussion on what institutions get out of this new program.

What are the penalties?

Peer-review aspect is still very important.

New program needs teeth.

Stopping certification puts a stop to university momentum and takes away credibility with the rest of campus. (e.g., one institution was one week short of submitting)