REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE
OCTOBER 27-28, 2008, MEETING

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. Legislative Items.

- **Initial-Eligibility Certification of Two-Year College Transfers.**

(1) Recommendation. The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance recommends the NCAA Division I Board of Directors sponsor legislation for the 2008-09 legislative cycle to require a two-year college transfer to have his/her initial academic eligibility certified by the NCAA Eligibility Center prior to the end of the student-athlete's first regular academic term of full-time enrollment at a Division I institution.

(2) Effective Date. Applicable to two-year college student-athletes who enroll in a member institution on or after August 1, 2010.

(3) Rationale. Since June 2007 multiple governance groups within the NCAA (e.g., the NCAA Division I Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet Transfer Issues Ad Hoc Group, NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group, NCAA Football Academic Working Group and the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet) have initiated review of issues impacting the academic performance of 2-4 transfer student-athletes. Each group noted the need for additional academic research regarding two-year college transfers' academic performance. Most recently, the Academic Cabinet formally requested the Committee on Academic Performance begin to collect additional data on the academic performance of two-year college transfers. This recommendation is the first of two initiatives to obtain additional academic data on 2-4 transfers. Understanding the high school academic profiles of 2-4 transfers is important in developing sound policy and legislative requirements.

A two-year college transfer must meet transfer requirements based on his/her academic record at the two-year institution and must have his/her amateurism status certified by the Eligibility Center to be eligible to compete at a Division I institution. However, current transfer legislation does not require two-year college transfer student-athletes to obtain a final initial-eligibility academic certification through the Eligibility Center. As a result, specific information regarding academic profiles of these students has not been available for study. The collection of high school academic data would be helpful in understanding the academic profiles of two-year

transfers and will be beneficial for the membership, including various governance groups, as it considers policy and legislative changes for two-year college transfers.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. Minimal.

(5) Impact on Student-Athlete Well-Being. None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- **None.**

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

1. Data Collection on Two-Year College Transfers. The committee amended its policies and procedures to require institutions to provide data on two-year college transfer student-athletes during the annual submission of its Academic Performance Census (APC) data. Since June 2007, four separate groups within the NCAA governance structure have initiated reviews of issues impacting the academic performance of two-year transfer student-athletes. Each group noted the need for additional research regarding the academic performance of two-year college transfer student-athletes, specifically their performance at their respective two-year institutions. However, there is limited data available on the two-year college academic performance of student-athletes. Without comprehensive data on two-year transfer student-athletes, the membership's ability to provide thorough analysis regarding the academic preparation and success of two-year transfers is limited. The collection of this data would be helpful in understanding the academic profiles of two-year college transfers. In addition, it would be beneficial for the membership and would provide reliable information to various governance groups as they consider policies and legislative changes regarding two-year college transfers. A list of proposed data to be collected will be sent to various constituents groups (e.g., NCAA Division I Basketball Academic Enhancement Working Group, NCAA Division I Football Academic Working Group, and the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet) for comment, with the intent to finalize the list at the committee's February 2009 meeting. This policy change is effective with the collection of the 2008-09 APC data (i.e., for student-athletes enrolled in the 2008-09 academic year). During the 2008-09 data collection, institutions will be required to provide data on all two-year college transfer student-athletes in the cohort. In subsequent years, data for only the most recent entering two-year college class would need to be provided.

2. **Consideration of Student-Athletes Who Graduate with Eligibility Remaining within the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP) – "3/2 Early Graduation Bonus" Concept.** The committee discussed several options addressing student-athletes who graduate with eligibility remaining within the APP. Currently the APP cohort does not include student-athletes who have exhausted eligibility and graduated. However, student-athletes who have graduated, but return to their institutions to compete, are part of their teams' APP cohorts. It is important to note that in the calculation of the NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR), a student-athlete who has graduated is automatically awarded the retention ("R") point for each term in which they are part of the cohort after graduation. However, in order to earn the eligibility ("E") point, the student-athlete must meet academic requirements (e.g., pass six hours and be in good academic standing) during each regular academic term after graduation in which he or she is enrolled full time. Therefore, a postgraduate student-athlete cannot be awarded less than one out of two (i.e., "1/2") APR points in an academic term and cannot subject the team to contemporaneous penalties (i.e., they will not be "0/2"). The committee particularly considered a possible incentive that would involve the awarding of bonus APR points for student-athletes who graduate prior to exhausting eligibility. For example, for the fall term in which a student-athlete with eligibility remaining graduated, the student-athlete would receive an additional point for graduation and would be considered a "3/2." After completion of the spring term, if the student-athlete finished the term and earned the "E" point, the student-athlete would be considered a "2/2," resulting in a "5/4" for the academic year. If the student-athlete withdrew at the end of the playing season and, as a result, did not earn the "E" point for the spring term, the student-athlete would be considered a "1/2," but would be a "4/4" for the academic year.

The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting reviewed data related to each option presented and agreed to maintain the current definition of the APR cohort, but to continue to review this issue. Data indicates the number of student-athletes who compete as postgraduates has increased, while the number of lost "E" points has decreased significantly for this group over the same time period. The data also indicates an increase in the number of postgraduate student-athletes who remain in the cohort for two terms following graduation. Within all sports except men's soccer, postgraduate student-athletes are earning almost all possible points and, as a result, are helping their teams' APR. In particular, men's basketball and football have shown strong improvement in the academic performance of postgraduates during the past three years. The data also indicates that if postgraduate student-athletes were removed from each team's cohort, 63 percent of squads would experience an APR decrease, and 29 percent would experience no change. Regarding the "3/2 graduation bonus" concept, the committee noted the awarding of bonus points (i.e., APR points added to the numerator) would have a much larger effect

in shifting the APR distribution and national mean than adjusting lost "E" points or removing these student-athletes from the APR.

An option that garnered significant discussion and will be explored further is providing an automatic adjustment for lost postgraduate eligibility points (i.e., "1/1" outcome). This option would lead to much smaller decreases in the APR validity coefficients and a much smaller increase in APRs than the "3/2" bonus option. Due to continued membership interest in this topic, the subcommittee agreed to continue to review this option and others during an upcoming meeting.

3. **Access to Archived APR Reports.** Institutions now may access archived APR reports for Division I institutions on NCAA.org. In addition, institutions may access archived Federal Graduation Rates data for all three divisions and Graduation Success Rates (GSR) data since 2005 on the NCAA's Web site. This resource will make it easier for institutions that are in the hiring process to research a coach's APR history, based on previous coaching jobs. It is anticipated that the archives will be updated each year following the public release of APR data.

4. **Coaches' APR Rate.** The committee received a report from a subgroup of the Board of Directors, which was formed in August to develop potential models for a coaches' APR rate. The subgroup supported the concept of publishing the head coach's name for each team by each APR year as part of each institution's APR report. To this end, the names of head coaches could be collected through the APP data collection system starting with the fall 2009 data collection. In instances in which team had multiple coaches in a given year, all names would be listed for that year. Further, the subgroup noted that prior to implementation, the committee should solicit feedback from various coaches associations, conferences and other groups on the report's format. When discussing this concept, the committee noted that while coaches play a critical role in academic success, many other campus personnel (e.g., director of athletics, faculty athletics representative, academic support personnel, president) also impact a team's APR. As a result, it may be appropriate for others to be identified on the report. The committee agreed to pursue this concept further in response to the Board of Directors' request.

5. **Annual Release of GSR and Federal Graduation Rate Information.** The committee reviewed a summary of the most recent GSR and Federal Graduation Rate data and noted Division I student-athletes continue to perform well in the classroom and more are increased in many sports from 1995 to 2001, including men's basketball, football and women's basketball. The GSR in men's basketball increased nine percentage points during that period, including a 12-percentage point increase for African-American men's basketball student-athletes. The GSR for all African-American males increased by six percentage points and the GSR for African-American females increased by eight percentage points from the 1995 to 2001 cohorts. The increased GSR has led to

approximately 1,100 more student-athletes earning their degrees in the 2001 cohort than in the 1995 cohort. The Federal Graduation Rate for student-athletes in the 2001 cohort was 64 percent, the highest rate in history for Division I student-athletes, and was two percentage points higher than the rate for the general student-body. The rate increased four percentage points since the 1995 cohort. The Federal Graduate Rate for African-American student-athletes is eight percentage points higher than the African-American student body (i.e., 53 percent vs. 45 percent) and the rates are higher for both African-American male and female student-athletes when compared to their counterparts in the general student-body.

6. Review of NCAA Proposals in the 2008-09 Legislative Cycle. The committee reviewed several proposals in the current legislative cycle and expressed its position on the following proposals:

a. NCAA Proposal No. 2008-60 Division Membership – Provisional Membership Process and Requesting Reclassification – Institutions Subject to Academic Performance Program Penalties. The committee supports this proposal, while acknowledging concerns expressed by a few committee members who noted the proposal's lack of specificity regarding the process that will be used by the NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet to determine which institutions might be prevented from advancing within the membership process and that this proposal will become effective for some institutions who already have started the reclassification process.

b. Proposal No. 2008-48 Playing and Practice Seasons – Baseball – Maximum Number of Contests -- 52. The committee opposed this proposal and noted the legislation that was adopted as part of the NCAA Baseball Academic Enhancement Working Group's package has only been in effect for one year, which is not sufficient to fully evaluate the package's impact in improving the academic performance of baseball student-athletes.

7. Measuring APR Improvement within the APP Penalty Structure. The committee approved two revisions to the historical-penalty determination process, which added a fifth comparison test (i.e., aggregate APR of years two, three and four versus the APR in year one) to the improvement determination process and established a minimum single-year APR benchmark of 900 in the most recent year in order for a team to be eligible for automatic improvement credit within the penalty structure. Currently, teams may meet the improvement standard on any one of four comparison tests with no minimum APR in the most recent year in order to demonstrate improvement and to receive relief from penalties. With the addition of these two changes, there will be a relatively small impact on the number of teams penalized and the changes in combination will yield a lower

number of false positives (e.g., institutions that meet the former test but have not demonstrated sustained improvement). The committee also agreed to permit the staff to use the six single-year tests to assess both positive and negative change as part of the penalty waiver process. These tests will assist in clearly identifying those teams with APRs that generally are trending up and those that generally are trending down. These changes will be effective in fall 2009 with the collection of 2008-09 APP data and penalty determination in order to allow time for appropriate notice and education to the membership.

8. Occasion-Two Historical Penalty Practice Restriction in Football. The committee considered a request from a member institution and the American Football Coaches Association to reconsider the practice-season element of the Occasion-Two Historical Penalty structure. Specific concerns were raised regarding the required day off during the playing and practice season for teams that do not demonstrate improvement, because of the punitive nature of the penalty and the perception that reduced in-season practice time might be dangerous for football student-athletes and might result in increased injuries due to lack of time to adequately prepare for an opponent. AFCA leadership indicated the replacement of practice time with mandatory academic activities is a legitimate and reasonable penalty; however, the committee was asked to consider modifying the practice restriction element of the penalty to specify minimum increments of practice time (e.g., a four-hour weekly practice-time reduction must be taken in two-hour increments) that must be replaced with academic time to ensure that student-athletes have a viable amount of time to work on their academics. In addition, the AFCA emphasized the obligation of the coaching staff to teach and prepare student-athletes to play safely and suggested that the required day off, more than the practice time reduction, will have a detrimental impact of the fulfillment of that obligation. The committee sought the input of the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports and it concluded, based on 16 years of data collection (i.e., 1988-2004), that the recorded injury rates for games and practices have remained largely unchanged, even though coaching techniques and strength and conditioning programs have improved drastically. Further, the main mechanism of injury in football is player contact and, thus, eliminating a practice session could improve student-athlete well-being by reducing the number of overall injuries that occur in a season.

As a result of this feedback from the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, the Committee on Academic Performance agreed to maintain the current definition of historical penalties regarding in-season practice limitations, including hour and day limitations, noting that the penalties are meant to be a catalyst for change for teams that are underperforming academically. Further, the committee noted the penalty waiver process permits institutions to make any number of arguments as to why they should not have to take the prescribed penalty. The staff and the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Subcommittee on Appeals will consider

each institution's circumstances and the impact the institution believes the penalty will have.

9. APP Penalty Waiver Policy and Procedure Changes. The committee amended its policies and procedures regarding penalty appeals as follows:

a. Policy change regarding appeals involving committee members' institutions. The committee amended its policies and procedures regarding conflicts of interest in instances in which a committee member's own institution is requesting relief from any APP penalty. In such cases, a committee member who has recused himself or herself may not participate at an in-person hearing or teleconference appeal proceeding. However, he or she may participate in the preparation of the appeal (e.g., draft application, craft arguments, prepare waiver documentation). The committee noted a desire to minimize the perception of unfairness within the penalty appeal process, but did not want to disadvantage an institution or committee member by not permitting the member to contribute his or her APP knowledge and expertise in the preparation of the institution's appeal.

b. The committee also reviewed and approved clarifications of its policies and procedures for Occasion-Three and -Four Historical Penalty appeals as recommended by the Board of Directors. Specifically, the committee clarified the Board of Directors subcommittee's standard of review for penalty waivers, the process for review of new information, the involvement of NCAA staff members in the Board of Directors subcommittee hearing, and the factors that should be reviewed by the committee when deliberating a waiver request. In addition, the committee will provide a summary report of all hearing decisions to the Board of Directors on an annual basis.

10. Multiyear Goals in APR Improvement Plans. The committee approved an amendment to its policies and procedures and the APP Penalties Guide to require that APR Improvement Plans include a multiyear APR goal, developed as a series of single-year APR goals, to achieve an APR above the penalty benchmark(s). The committee noted that such goals are needed only if the team cannot raise its rate above the penalty benchmark in one year. Additionally, the committee noted many institutions currently are developing multiyear APR goals, but the information is not captured as part of the APR Improvement Plan. The committee observed that meaningful improvement may take longer than one year to achieve and that the process of developing a multiyear goal may provide the institution with the opportunity to develop meaningful and long-term solutions that result in significant systematic improvement and cultural change. Single-year APR goals can help verify immediate improvement, and will continue to be used for conditionally approved penalty waivers. Multiyear goals will assist the institution in the

development of its improvement plan and will outline the team's ultimate progression toward an APR above the penalty benchmark; but, they will not be cited as conditions in conditionally approved penalty waivers. Further, multiyear goals will enhance the staff's evaluation of the institution's APR Improvement Plan and will be used to help evaluate subsequent plans submitted by the institution. Finally, since institutions presently are developing and submitting plans for the 2008-09 year, this change is effective for APR Improvement Plans submitted or revised for submission during the 2009-10 academic year.

11. Conditions Placed on Teams Receiving Conditionally Approved APP Penalty Waivers. The committee approved a revision to its policies and procedures to specify that one or more of the following conditions may be used when a team is provided conditional relief from an APP penalty: (1) Single-year APR goal; (2) Single-year eligibility and retention goals; (3) Attendance at educational outreach sessions; and (4) Implementation of the institution's APR Improvement Plan. This revision is effective immediately and is applicable to APP penalty waivers filed during the 2008-09 academic year. The committee noted that institutions granted conditional relief from an APP penalty have received relief primarily based on the team achieving a single-year APR goal established by the institution and confirmed it is appropriate to continue to use the single-year APR goal as a condition. Secondly, although single-year eligibility and retention rates have been used only occasionally as conditions in waivers, the committee noted these metrics may be useful and appropriate when a particular team's circumstances reflect the need to address a specific eligibility or retention issue. Attendance at educational outreach sessions also has been used as a condition on an occasional basis and should continue to be used as appropriate. In addition, evaluating whether the most meaningful elements of an improvement plan have been implemented and whether the team is making progress toward the goal established in its plan ensures the continued academic improvement of the team. Finally, while the committee retained the use of the single-year APR goal for conditions and noted that the single-year goal should be evaluated as part of the review of the institution's APR Improvement Plan, it declined to identify a minimum required single-year APR goal.

12. APR Improvement Plans. The committee received an update on APR Improvement Plans and noted the staff currently is reviewing plans submitted by institutions that received conditionally approved penalty waivers during the 2007-08 academic year. This review is focused on the institution's implementation of its plan. Further, the committee codified the staff's authority to establish appropriate annual deadlines for the submission of APR Improvement Plans by those institutions required to submit a plan as a result of a multiyear APR below 900, those requesting an APP penalty waiver, those who previously received a conditionally approved APP waiver or those receiving grant monies through the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Supplemental Support Fund (SSF). Finally, the committee will require an institution's president or chancellor to approve an

APR Improvement Plan submitted by the institution and will notify an institution's president or chancellor directly if the institution fails to implement its plan.

13. 2009 Public Release of APP Penalties. The committee discussed the timing of the annual release of APP data and penalties in light of the timeline for review of Occasion-Three Historical Penalties in 2008-09 and Occasion-Four Historical Penalties in 2009-10. In the past data and penalties have been announced in early May. However, the addition of hearings for Occasion-Three and -Four Historical Penalties may extend the penalty process for some institutions beyond the traditional May release date. The committee elected to maintain the current release date for all APP data and for all APP penalty information that is complete at the time, while delaying the release of only the penalty information for those institutions that will not yet have completed the appeal process. The committee noted the current data release timeline has become an expectation for the membership, the media and other audiences. Further, the committee noted the outcome of the penalty waiver process does not impact APRs; therefore, all APR data can continue to be released in May. In addition, the majority of institutions will have completed the penalty waiver process by the May release date, and that information also can be released at that time. The remaining institutions that have not completed the APP process will be identified as pending appeal during the initial release of information and final penalty determinations for those institutions will be released separately.

14. Proposed Amendment to the Calculation of the APR for Transfer Student-Athletes. The Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting considered a request from a member institution to amend the criteria for the automatic adjustment for the retention point when a student-athlete transfers. The member institution proposed that the "R" point be automatically adjusted (i.e., "1/1") for a student-athlete who transfers, provided he or she leaves the institution after meeting all applicable requirements to be eligible in the following academic term. In addition, if such a student-athlete transfers to another Division I institution and later becomes academically ineligible, that institution would be "double penalized" for accepting the transfer student-athlete and APR points would be added to the denominator. For example, a student-athlete who withdraws over the summer would be "1/1" for the spring term at the initial institution, provided he or she earned the "E" point before departing. If the student-athlete transfers to another institution and subsequently fails to meet eligibility requirements and withdraws, he or she would earn "0/4" points, rather than "0/2" points for his or her final term. The member institution noted this proposal would require institutions to carefully consider whether to accept a transfer student-athlete at their respective institutions and would not penalize the first institution that ensured the student-athlete maintained eligibility. The Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting did not support any change to the current criteria for the automatic adjustment for the lost "R" point for transfer student-athletes and did not support a change to the calculation of the APR. In regard to the first issue, the data indicates that the 2.600 grade-point average benchmark is the appropriate

level for relief of the lost "R" point for student-athletes that transfer, because it indicates a similar likelihood of student-athlete academic success at the subsequent institution as the probability of graduation success for native students who meet progress-toward degree requirements. In addition, there is an adjustment process in place to review requests for student-athletes who do not satisfy the grade-point average requirement. Additionally, it was the intent of the committee that these adjustments have a high threshold of review. In regard to the concept of "double penalizing" schools that accept transfer student-athletes who subsequently fail academically, such a change would alter significantly the current calculation of the APR and the subcommittee agreed the current penalty structure is the more appropriate avenue to punish teams for poor academic performance.

15. **Removal of Recruited Student-Athletes from the APP Cohort for Non-Scholarship Programs When Standardized Test Scores are Invalidated.** The committee considered a request from a member institution to remove from the APR cohort a recruited student-athlete who was determined to be a nonqualifier as a result of an invalidated standardized test score following the team's first date of competition in the championship segment. In this case the institution sponsors nonscholarship football and uses recruited status to determine inclusion in the APR cohort. The committee determined that a recruited student-athlete whose standardized test score was invalidated following the team's first date of competition in the championship segment and who was subsequently determined to be a nonqualifier should not be included in the APP cohort for nonscholarship teams. This is consistent with the committee's previous decision to exclude student-athletes who received impermissible athletically related financial aid from the APR cohort.

16. **Requests for Corrections to APP Data from Academic Years Not Included in the Current Multiyear APR Calculation.** The committee amended its policies and procedures to allow institutions that discover corrections from prior academic years not included in the current multiyear APR calculation to appeal to the NCAA staff the specified data correction, provided the change would influence the team's current multiyear APR calculation (e.g., delayed-graduation point). Under such circumstances, an institution must submit a formal request to the staff and provide any necessary supporting documentation. The current policy allows institutions to request corrections, adjustments and delayed-graduation points to any academic year that makes up its multiyear APR. However, the policy does not permit changes to data outside the four-year window that may impact a team's current multiyear APR calculation. The committee recognizes there are instances when an institution may discover data entry errors or inadvertent omissions that may cause a team's current APP data to be inaccurate or incomplete. Permitting such changes will ensure that a team's data is accurate.

17. APP Data Reviews. The Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting received a progress report on the 25 institutions selected to have their APP data reviewed in the 2008-09 academic year. The subcommittee also was informed that the staff is completing the data reviews of three institutions for which part or all of the 2007-08 review was suspended. It is anticipated the subcommittee will complete all reviews and provide reports to all institutions by February 2009.

18. APR and APC Data Collection. The committee received a progress report on the APP data collection process for 2007-08 APP data. It was noted that most institutions are submitting their fifth year of APP data. The committee was reminded that APR data from the 2003-04 academic year no longer will be used in a team's multiyear APR calculation. APR/APC data from 391 institutions, including multidivisional institutions, will be submitted to the NCAA between September and November 2008.

19. Supplemental Support Fund. The committee received a report regarding the SSF, which is in its second year of existence. Thirty-three limited-resource institutions are eligible to apply for funding support during the 2008-09 academic year. In addition, the staff is in the process of placing the application online with ready access from the APR Improvement Plan portal. It is anticipated that notification of the availability of the application will be sent to eligible institutions in early November.

20. Women's Basketball Summer Access Model. The Committee on Academic Performance reviewed a report from the September 2008 meeting of the NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Issues Committee, which noted several concepts in its summer academic access model. If this model is adopted, incoming freshman and transfers who have signed financial aid agreements to receive athletically related financial aid for the ensuing academic year would be required to attend the institution's summer term prior to initial full-time enrollment. During this summer term they could engage in a total of 10 hours of athletics skill instruction. In addition, these student-athletes would be required to satisfactorily complete a minimum of three hours of acceptable academic credit in order to be eligible in the fall, while participating in study skills/life skills education. An exception or waiver process would be available to those institutions that do not offer summer school and/or do not award athletics aid. Continuing women's basketball student-athletes would be permitted to engage in a total of 10 hours of skill instruction if they were enrolled in summer school. However, continuing student-athletes would not be required to attend summer school. It is important to note that these discussions are still in the preliminary stages and it is anticipated the Women's Basketball Issues Committee will continue its consideration of this model at its next meeting.

21. Wrestling Coaches APR Review. The committee received an update regarding the work of an informal group of wrestling coaches and administrators focusing on

improving APR scores in wrestling. It was noted that the group has implemented several strategies to improve APRs of individual wrestling teams, which include retaining the services of consultants to work with coaches of academically underperforming programs. The committee also learned that over the next three years the group will develop a comprehensive coaches' academy to strengthen the alignment of intercollegiate wrestling programs with educational values. In the future, the group will continue to monitor the APR status of teams below 940, to reinforce to coaches the importance of APR improvement, and to thoroughly investigate the potential benefits and unintended consequences of several legislative concepts. This planned approach will allow more time to objectively evaluate the impact of the improvement strategies over the course of the next year.

22. **NCAA Division I Football Academic Working Group Update.** The committee reviewed the executive summary of the July 18, 2008, meeting of the Football Academic Working Group and will provide feedback to the working group once the preliminary concepts are more fully developed.

23. **NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group Update.** The committee reviewed the September 15, 2008, progress report of the Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group and noted the following feedback for the group:

a. The committee expressed interest in ensuring remedial hours could be applied to meet the proposed summer school requirements, in accordance with existing progress-toward-degree legislation.

b. While the committee applauds the intent behind the proposed "noncounter" option for student-athletes who elect to remain at the institution but depart from the team after a coaching change, it noted the practical application of this concept would not have the intended effect.

c. The committee discussed whether a reduction in the time allotted for student-athletes to explore professional basketball prospects prior to declaring for the National Basketball Association (NBA) draft would reduce time away from campus and missed class time and it encouraged the working group to consider this option.

d. Committee members had mixed reactions regarding flexibility in the "1/1" professional departure adjustment options outlined in the report, but they are willing to consider the final recommendation(s) of the working group.

e. The committee agreed to collect data regarding the academic profiles of 2-4 transfer student-athletes beginning with the collection of 2008-09 APR data.

24. NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet Update. The committee reviewed the report of the Academic Cabinet's September 2009 meeting and noted the cabinet's five identified priority topics for the coming years: (1) Two-year college transfer student-athletes; (2) Nontraditional courses; (3) Impact of academic reform on academic support personnel; (4) Time demands on student-athletes; and (5) Impact of progress-toward-degree requirements on degree program selection. The committee expressed support for all priorities, with a particular interest in working with the cabinet on the items related to academic support personnel and degree program selection.

Committee Chair: Walter Harrison, University of Hartford, America East Conference
Committee Liaisons: Julie Cromer, Membership Services
Diane Dickman, Membership Services
Kevin Lennon, Membership Services
Todd Petr, Research
Bill Regan, Membership Services