



Post-Presidential Retreat Updates October 18, 2011

Committee on Academic Performance (CAP)



Presentation to Board: October 2011

Chair: Walter Harrison, President
University of Hartford



Vice Chair: Roderick McDavis, President
Ohio University

*Direct questions and feedback to staff contacts:
Kevin Lennon, klennon@ncaa.org
Bernard Franklin, bfranklin@ncaa.org*



Group Met
SEPT 13-14



Next
Meeting
OCT 24-25

DEVELOPMENTS

The committee is proposing that all conference offices adopt a policy regarding teams that do not meet championship academic access standards with respect to automatic qualification for postseason and revenue distribution. The committee will not require specific items within the policies, but simply that conferences maintain a policy on file.

EXISTING INFORMATION

At the direction of the NCAA Division I Board of Directors at its August meeting, the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance, with the assistance of the Division I Academic Cabinet in a number of areas, 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 to establish an academic standard of 930 for participation in the postseason.

1. **Initial-Eligibility Standards:** Based in large part on the recommendations of the Division I Academic Cabinet, 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).

- a. **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 non-qualifier 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.
 - b. **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.
 - c. **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).
 - d. **Effective Date:** For students first entering college full time August 1, 2015, or after.
2. **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.
 - a. **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 non-qualifiers require the completion of a core curriculum (six credits of English, three credits of math and three credits of science).
 - b. **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.
 - c. **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).
 3. **Access to Championships and Division I Academic Performance Program (APP) Penalty Structure:** The committee continued its review of the APP in light of the Board's directive to include a postseason academic access standard of a 930 APR. 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:

- a. **Penalty Structure:** CAP is exploring a three-level penalty structure. First-level penalties would include a ban on postseason competition and financial aid penalties or practice 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.
- b. **Filters / Waivers:** Consideration is being given to including an academic mission 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.
- c. **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

*Direct questions and feedback to staff contact:
David Berst, dberst@ncaa.org*



FINAL PROPOSAL

1. **Cost of Attendance (COA).**

- a. Permit a Division I student-athlete who has received a full grant in aid, i.e. tuition and fees, room and board and required course related books, to receive additional institutional financial aid (athletics or other) up to the value of the institution's "cost of attendance", or up to \$2,000, whichever is less.

- (1) The additional “miscellaneous expense” amount to be indexed annually to the consumer price index. Further, Student Athlete Opportunity Funds may be used as a potential source, as they often are currently, for these miscellaneous expenses not covered by the full grant.
 - (2) A Pell Grant will not be included in this calculation and will be considered an exempted government grant for purposes of applying NCAA regulations.
 - (3) In equivalency sports, only athletically-related aid will be counted toward team limits. All nonathletically-related financial aid will be excluded from team equivalency computations, which will permit student-athletes to receive additional sources of financial aid without affecting team financial aid limits.
 - (4) Because this legislation is permissive in nature, conferences should be encouraged to consider common application of this legislation among its members and sports.
- b. As a best practice, all student-athletes should submit a Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA).

2. **Multiyear Grants in Aid.**

a. Period of award.

- (1) Maintain, subject to existing exceptions, the requirement that the period of award for athletics aid may be not less than one academic year.
- (2) Permit athletics aid, up to the permissible limits, to be awarded for a period beyond the minimum of one academic year, up to the date the student-athlete exhausts eligibility to compete in all sports.
- (3) Maintain only nonathletically-related conditions in athletics aid agreements regarding cancellation or reduction of aid during the period of its award.

b. Changing awarded amounts.

- (1) Maintain current restrictions and processes on reducing or canceling athletics aid during the period of the award.
- (2) Permit institutions discretion to increase athletics aid during the period of its award.
- (3) Maintain current requirements for hearing opportunities related to reducing or canceling aid during the period of the award.

c. Minimum equivalency values.

- (1) Require institutions to award not less than 10 percent of an equivalency to each student-athlete who receives institutional financial aid based in any degree on

athletics ability, regardless of other sources of financial aid. [Note: Institutions currently are required in baseball to award a minimum 0.25 equivalency award to a student-athlete receiving athletics aid, but such an award may include all countable financial aid.]

d. Eligibility for financial aid – former student-athletes.

- (1) Eliminate financial aid eligibility restrictions (five years of aid within a six-year period) to permit institutions to provide unearned athletics aid to former student-athletes who remain at, or return to, the institution to complete their baccalaureate degree requirements.

3. Early Enrollment.

- The working group agreed that the practice of early graduation and enrollment in college should receive increased scrutiny to ensure that only qualified students are permitted to engage in the practice. The timing and sequencing of core courses and disproportionate levels of credits earned in a compressed period should disqualify student-athletes from practice and competition until following the normal high school graduation dates of such individuals. Therefore, the working group supports the Academic Cabinet, the NCAA Eligibility Center and the Committee on Academic Performance in the quest to address these issues. The group is concerned that premature high school graduation for the principal purpose of participating in spring practice for fall sports has both led to academic abuses and otherwise is not in the best interests of NCAA student-athletes.

4. Initial Eligibility.

- The working group supports 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 not competition in their initial year in residence.

5. Bylaw 16 “Extra Benefits”.

- The Well-Being Working Group supported six staff deregulation recommendations and referred them to the Rules Working Group for further consideration. The topics to be addressed include: incidental expense waivers; nutrition; expenses to receive recognized awards; medical and insurance expenses; missed class time waivers, and “entertainment” of family and friends of student-athletes.

Resource Allocation Working Group



Presentation to Board: January 2012

Chair: Michael Adams, President,
University of Georgia



Vice Chair: Ann Millner, President
Weber State University

*Direct questions and feedback to staff contact:
Kathleen McNeely, kmcneely@ncaa.org*


Group
Teleconference
OCT 11


Next
Teleconference
NOV 4

DEVELOPMENTS

The Resource Allocation Workgroup held a teleconference on October 11 to review draft recommendations regarding foreign travel, non-championship segment competition, reductions in competition in all sports and reductions in scholarships. The working group:

1. Reaffirmed the vote in favor of elimination of non-championship segment competition.
2. Voted in favor of a 10 percent reduction in regular-season competition for all sports. However, if the elimination of non-championship segment competition is passed by the Division I Board, credit would be given for non-championship reductions.
3. Reaffirmed the unanimous vote to recommend eliminating all foreign travel.
4. Voted in favor of a reduction of:
 - a. FBS football scholarships from 85 to 80.
 - b. FCS football scholarships from 63 to 60.
 - c. Men's basketball scholarships from 13 to 12.
 - d. Women's basketball scholarships from 15 to 13. These scholarships will be reapportioned to other women's sports.
 - e. In addition, the work group requests that the Committee on Academic Performance (CAP) consider incentives that would allow institutions above a certain APR score to maintain FBS football scholarships at 85, FCS scholarships at 63 (with 85 overall counters), men's basketball scholarships at 13 and women's scholarships at 15.
5. Agreed in concept to a reduction in non-coaching staff within programs. The next work group meeting will consider options recommended by Division 1A Athletic Directors' Association,

NCAA legislation that is on the agenda for the Division 1 Board and additional staff ideas. The work group also indicated interest in incorporating language related to non-coaching staff that serve the athletics department “in any capacity”.

6. The work group also expressed interest in reviewing the current legislation regarding the minimum number of sports mandated for Division I membership. The discussion will include both increases and decreases to the minimum number.
7. Finally, the group agreed to revisit the recommendations before finalizing to ensure each proposal aligns with the values and outcomes agreed upon by work group members at its initial meeting.

Collegiate Model – Rules Working Group



Presentation to Board: April 2012

Chair: James Barker, President
Clemson University

Vice Chair: Steadman Upham, President
University of Tulsa

*Direct questions and feedback to staff contact:
Kevin Lennon, klennon@ncaa.org*



Group
Teleconferenced
Week of
SEP 19



Group Met
OCT 11



Next Meeting
DEC 13

DEVELOPMENTS

The NCAA Working Group on Collegiate Model - Rules convened in Indianapolis Tuesday, October 11. The following provides a summary of the pertinent discussion related to the meeting and action taken by the group.

The group:

1. Reviewed feedback provided by membership in response to a 2011 NCAA Presidential Retreat Response Questionnaire.
2. Acknowledged the need to change the regulatory culture in meaningful ways that, in conjunction with an enhanced enforcement structure, will better support the collegiate model by placing appropriate emphasis on the most significant regulations.

3. Recognized the challenges inherent to our current regulatory culture, including the creation of a number of rules that are nationally insignificant, difficult to enforce and do not clearly enhance the academic and athletics success of student-athletes.
4. Discussed the importance of amending the NCAA Division I Manual to reduce the volume of unenforceable and inconsequential rules that fail to support our enduring values.
5. Supported a new approach to the regulatory aspect of intercollegiate athletics that will ensure legislation aligns with and addresses our enduring values.
 - a. Decided, in support of this new approach, to:
 - (1) Establish principle-based outcomes that will apply to each operating bylaw, promote the fundamental constitutional principle of each operating bylaw and serve as the basis for legislation of national significance that merits inclusion in the Manual;
 - (2) Redefine “competitive equity” in terms of fairness to member institutions and student-athletes;
 - (3) Identify an appropriate penalty structure that reinforces the need to adhere to established principles; and
 - (4) Increase shared responsibility for rules compliance among those who participate in, lead and administer intercollegiate athletics at the campus, conference and national levels, and coaches.
6. Develop a filtering process to evaluate future proposals to ensure that such legislation is consequential, readily enforceable, promotes our enduring values and further identified principle-based outcomes.
7. Agreed concurrent NCAA Division I Board of Directors support for the concepts and direction outlined by the working group is critical to advancing a new approach to the regulatory approach.
8. Encouraged staff to reach out to membership constituents to gather feedback on concepts identified by the working group.
9. Agreed to review specific principle-based outcomes and operational bylaws at its December 2011 meeting.
10. Presentation to Board – April 2012.

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

*Direct questions and feedback to staff contact:
Julie Roe Lach, jroe@ncaa.org*



Group
Teleconferenced
OCT 10



Next Meeting
NOV 2

DEVELOPMENTS

The working group conducted its third conference call October 10. During this call, the group revisited the guiding principles for action, reviewed the history of the current violation and penalty structure and associated processes used to resolve cases and identified advantages and disadvantages of the current system that should be considered when developing the new structure.

The October 10 call focused on the concept of a multi-level violation structure and the group began discussion of a proposed new violation structure consisting of four levels of violations, including defining each level, identifying the types of violations that would fall into each level, citing examples, and examining the process for disposition of each level of violation.

Finally, the group reviewed the bylaws and history related to show-cause requirements and the impact of show-cause orders that have been imposed on coaches and other at-risk individuals.

The work of this group in proposing a multi-level violation structure, a new penalty structure, and re-establishing a sense of shared responsibility shall be undertaken pursuant to the Association's core purpose of governing competition in a fair, safe, equitable and sportsmanlike manner, and integrating intercollegiate athletics into higher education so that the educational experience of the student-athlete is paramount. The Association's enduring values of student-athlete success, the collegiate model, amateurism as a student model and competitive equity should drive the implementation of the new structures.

EXISTING INFORMATION

The timeline contemplates the following:

October

- Continue discussion about a multi-level violation structure on the group's October 24 call.

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.

In addition, the group shall rely on the following guiding principles:

- **The Principle of 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.
- **The Principle of 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.
- **Principle of 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, respecting of confidentiality while transparent with process, and sufficiently workable to establish clear and strict guidelines and boundaries.

###