

Post-Presidential Retreat Updates
September 29, 2011

Collegiate Model – Committee on Academic Performance (CAP).

Presentation to Board: October 2011

Chair: Walter Harrison, President, University of Hartford

Staff contacts: Kevin Lennon, klennon@ncaa.org and Bernard Franklin, bfranklin@ncaa.org

At the direction of the NCAA Division I Board of Directors at its August meeting, the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance is creating a package of academic proposals aimed at improving academic success. The package of proposals includes increased initial-eligibility standards, increased two-year college transfer standards, an increase of the penalty benchmark to 930, and amending the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program penalty structure to include a postseason ban in the first year a team falls below the 930 benchmark.

- Initial-Eligibility Standards: The committee supports a more rigorous academic standard for competition than for practice and receipt of athletically related financial aid. Setting a higher standard for competition during the first year of enrollment allows for identification of student-athletes who are likely to be academically successful to compete during their first year of enrollment. Student-athletes who need more time to acclimate to college life in order to ensure academic success may be provided athletically related financial aid and practice (assuming they meet standard for practice and financial aid).
 - Athletically Related Financial Aid and Practice: Discussions to date have centered on eligibility standards for practice and receipt of athletically related financial aid at the current nonqualifier level (e.g., 2.0 and sliding scale), or raising the GPA floor to 2.3 with the current sliding scale. Practice would be permitted if this standard is met during a student's first regular term of full-time enrollment. However, in order to be eligible for the second term of enrollment, student-athletes would be required to successfully complete nine semester or eight quarter hours.
 - Competition During First Year of Enrollment: CAP is examining two potential models for increasing the minimum combination of high school core GPA and ACT/SAT score needed for competition in a student's first year of collegiate enrollment. One model establishes a higher threshold for eligibility than the other, but both represent substantial increases in the number of student-athletes who would be ineligible for competition during their first year of enrollment.
 - Core Course Requirements: The committee supports the concept of requiring students to complete 10 core courses prior to the start of the seventh semester of high school. Discussions will continue regarding whether such a requirement should include a specified number of courses in English, math and science (e.g., six or seven of the 10 required).
 - Effective Date: For students first entering college full time August 1, 2015, or after.

- Two-Year College Transfer Student-Athletes: The committee supports the two-year college transfer proposals put forward by the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet. Specifically, based on data related to the lack of academic success of two-year college transfers, the committee supports increased transfer standards for two-year college transfers.
 - Increased Standards: Increase the transferrable grade-point average from 2.0 to 2.5, limit the number of physical education activity courses to two and for nonqualifiers require the completion of a core curriculum (six credits of English, three credits of math and three credits of science).
 - Year of Academic Readiness: Provides an opportunity for academically underprepared student-athletes to gain the academic preparation needed to be successful. Allows student-athletes enrolled at a two-year institution to not compete during initial year of enrollment and not start the five-year period of eligibility for purposes of the five-year clock and progress toward degree.
 - Effective Date: For student-athletes initially enrolling at a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2012 (no student-athlete currently enrolled in a two-year collegiate institution will be impacted).
- Access to Championships and Division I Academic Performance Program (APP) Penalty Structure: The committee continued its review of the APP penalty structure in light of the Board's directive to include a postseason competition ban in the first level of penalties for teams with a multi-year APR below 930. The 930 APR correlates to an approximate 50 percent Graduation Success Rate (GSR). The committee's discussions to date have centered on the following concepts:
 - Penalty Structure: CAP is exploring a three-level penalty structure. First-level penalties would include a ban on postseason competition and financial aid penalties; the second level adds penalties that would include playing season restrictions (e.g. practice, regular season competitions). The third level would be a menu of penalties that could include restricted membership, coaching suspensions for a designated number of contests and fines, among others. CAP is also considering whether a TV ban should be part of this list of possible penalties.
 - Filters / Waivers: Consideration is being given to including a low-resource filter (e.g. schools in the bottom 15 percent of resources and with a 50 percent GSR receive relief from the penalty). All other teams below 930 would be subject to the postseason ban. The waiver threshold in level one would likely be very rigorous, with approval for only those teams with truly extraordinary circumstances. For levels two and three, the committee is discussing providing a filter based on improvement.
 - Effective Date: For penalties imposed during 2012-13. The committee suggests a two-year timeline for implementation of the new 930 penalty benchmark. For the next two years, an APR benchmark of 900 would be used for the new penalty structure. For the postseason ban penalty, championships conducted in 2012-13 and 2013-14 would require a minimum 900 APR and championships conducted in or after 2014-15 would require a minimum 930 APR.

Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group.

Presentation to Board: October 2011

Chair: Graham Spanier, President, Pennsylvania State University

Vice Chair: Sidney McPhee, President, Middle Tennessee State University

Staff contact: David Berst, dberst@ncaa.org

The working group had a six-hour meeting September 14 and discussed a number of concepts related to the value of athletics grants-in-aid, terms of grants-in-aid and other ways to enhance the well-being of student-athletes. The group agreed in principle to a number of recommendations that were considered during a September 27 teleconference. The staff was requested to draft the following recommendations for final review by the group on or before October 4:

- Permit a student-athlete who has received a full athletics grant in aid to receive additional athletic aid (or other institutional aid, including use of Student Athlete Opportunity Fund) up to the full cost of attendance or \$2,000, whichever is less. The additional amount to be indexed annually to consumer price index and Pell grants will be exempt from the count as they are now. Further, an equivalency grant will be computed for team limits by counting athletics aid only to allow student-athletes to receive additional sources of institutional aid without affecting team financial aid limits. As a best practice, all student-athletes should submit a Free Application for Federal Student Aid.
- Permit multi-year grants up to the full term of eligibility (one year minimum) and agreed that a 10 percent minimum award value should apply. Institutions would have discretion to increase athletics aid during the period of the award.
- Eliminate financial aid eligibility restrictions (five years of aid within a six-year period) to permit former student-athletes to return to the institution and receive unearned athletics aid to complete their baccalaureate degree requirements.
-
- Early graduation from high school and enrollment in college should receive increased scrutiny to ensure that only qualified student-athletes are permitted to engage in practice. The timing and sequencing of core courses and disproportionate levels of credits earned should disqualify such students from practice and competition until after their normal high school class graduation date.
- Support the Committee on Academic Performance's preliminary views regarding an increase in the GPA and test score requirements to attain full eligibility as a freshman. The group also supports consideration of a category of student-athletes who may qualify for financial aid and practice, but no competition in their initial year in residence.

Resource Allocation Working Group.

Presentation to Board: January 2012

Chair: Michael Adams, President, University of Georgia

Vice Chair: Ann Millner, President, Weber State University

Staff contact: Kathleen McNeely, kmcneely@ncaa.org

The Resource Allocation Workgroup had a six-hour meeting September 19, reviewing the charge of the workgroup, data relevant to discussions and possible outcomes. Additional research will be performed on a handful of possible outcomes to be revisited by the working group via conference calls. The working group:

- Voted in favor of elimination of non-traditional competition and committed to an examination of reducing mandatory out-of-season practice.
- Expressed interest in exploring what a reduction in competition looks like for all sports, including ramifications. Staff will develop data and more detailed recommendations to support such a change.
- Voted unanimously to recommend eliminating all foreign travel.
- Agreed to consider a reduction of:
 - FBS football scholarships from 85 to 80.
 - FCS football scholarships from 63 to 60.
 - Men's basketball scholarships from 13 to 12.
 - Women's basketball scholarships from 15 to 13. These scholarships will be reapportioned to other women's sports.
- Agreed in concept to a reduction in non-coaching staff within programs. Staff is working with appropriate Athletics Director groups to gather recommendations on a model for maximum non-coaching staffing size.

Collegiate Model – Rules Working Group.

Presentation to Board: April 2012

Chair: James Barker, President, Clemson University

Vice Chair: Steadman Upham, President, University of Tulsa

Staff contact: Kevin Lennon, klennon@ncaa.org

The working group met by conference calls the week of September 19-23 in preparation for its upcoming October 11 in-person meeting. The working group has begun:

- Defining success and identifying “phases” of the timeline for action on its review of NCAA bylaws.
- Reviewing themes emerging from the membership's responses to identify essential and nonessential rules and areas of regulation.
- Developing outcome-based principles that better define what is important in supporting the collegiate model of athletics and our enduring values.
- Reviewing current bylaws and proposals in the governance structure to determine if they are meaningful, support student-athlete success, and are enforceable.

The working group will continue to discuss models that will change the regulatory culture in meaningful ways that, in conjunction with an enhanced enforcement structure, can better support the collegiate model of sport by placing appropriate emphasis on the most significant regulations.

In the immediate term, the staff is developing models for consideration in the restructuring of Bylaws 11 through 17 (Conduct and Employment of Athletics Personnel; Amateurism; Recruiting; Eligibility; Financial Aid; Awards, Benefits and Expenses for Enrolled Student-Athletes; and Playing and Practice Seasons) including an overview of previous deregulation and re-regulation efforts.

Collegiate Model – Enforcement Working Group.

Presentation to Board: April 2012

Chair: Edward Ray, President, Oregon State University

Vice Chair: Nancy Zimpher, Chancellor, State University of New York

Staff contact: Julie Roe Lach, jroe@ncaa.org

The working group conducted its first conference call September 13 and its second on September 28. During these initial calls, the group discussed its charge, the guiding principles for action, milestones and timeline, prior reviews of the enforcement program and penalty structure, and violation and penalty structure background.

The timeline contemplates the following:

October

- Consider a proposed multi-level violation structure on the group's October 10 and 24 calls.

November

- Consider a proposed penalty structure during the group's November calls.

December

- In-person meeting to finalize violation/penalty structures.
- Work on shared responsibility - defining roles of all parties.
- Work on enforcement process - staff approach to investigations (inclusive of procedural review); Committee on Infractions process for handling cases (written review, hearing, other options); Committee on Infractions/Infractions Appeals Committee composition.

January 2012

- Present concepts to the Division I Board of Directors.

April 2012

- Present final concepts to the Division I Directors of Athletics.

August 2012

- Propose necessary legislative changes to the Board.

The September 28 call emphasized understanding recommendations from six prior reviews of the enforcement program and discussing concepts related to a multi-level violation structure. The group also discussed the following proposed principles to guide their work in the coming months:

- Fairness. Any new violation and penalty structure must be fair to all parties involved in the process and consider the interests of all member institutions that uphold integrity through rules compliance. Appropriate weight should be given to fair process considerations for those culpable for violations or otherwise involved, and potential legal implications. The severity of penalties must have a direct correlation with the significance of the violations, and both need to coincide with the significance of violations as identified by the membership and staff, as well as the NCAA enduring values.
- Accountability. The new violation and penalty structures should be designed to hold those institutions, coaches, administrators and student-athletes who violate the rules accountable for their conduct, both at the individual and institutional levels. In addition, both the NCAA staff and membership (coaches, administrators, institutions and conferences) must be held accountable for the fairness of the process and must understand the shared responsibility of accountability to the intercollegiate model, regardless of the direct impact on those involved in violations.
- Process Integrity. Any new structures must be designed to ensure effectiveness and efficiency in the process and its results. The new structures must be easily understood, legitimate, timely, respectful of confidentiality while transparent with process, consistently applied and sufficiently workable to establish clear and strict guidelines and boundaries.

###