



Post-Presidential Retreat Updates October 28, 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
OCT 24-25



Group
Presented to
Board
OCT 26-27

DEVELOPMENTS

The Division I Board of Directors voted October 27 to adopt legislation implementing recommendations to improve the academic success of student-athletes. The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance, and the Division I Academic Cabinet, created a package of 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. The approved measures are outlined below.

APPROVED PROPOSAL

1. **Initial-Eligibility Standards:** The Board supported increased initial-eligibility measures that create more rigorous academic standards 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 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 will be provided an academic redshirt year without the pressure of competition. The specifics of the recommendations are below.
 - a. **Athletically Related Financial Aid and Practice:** The Board approved a model that creates a higher academic standard for incoming freshman to compete than to receive athletically related financial aid and practice, creating an academic redshirt year. Student-athletes who achieve the current minimum initial-eligibility standard on the test score-grade point average sliding scale

with at least a minimum 2.0 core-course GPA will continue to be eligible for athletically related financial aid during the first year of enrollment and practice during the first regular academic term of enrollment. Student-athletes can earn the opportunity to practice in the second term by passing nine semester or eight quarter hours.

- b. **Competition During First Year of Enrollment:** The Board approved an increase to the standard for immediate access to competition to a 2.3 GPA and an increased sliding scale. Incoming student-athletes will need to earn a grade-point/test score average that is set at approximately one-half standard deviation below the national student body mean. This represents an increase from the current one standard deviation below the national student mean. The new sliding scale requires a high school core grade-point average to be approximately 0.5 grade-point average units higher for a given test score compared to the current qualifier standard. For example, an SAT score of 1,000 requires a 2.5 high school core-course GPA for competition compared to the 2.0 currently needed.
- c. **Core Course Requirements:** The Board approved the committee's recommendation to require prospects to successfully complete 10 of the 16 total required core courses before the start of their senior year in high school. Seven of the 10 successfully completed courses must be in English, math and science.
- d. **Effective Date:** For students first entering college full time August 1, 2015, or after.

2. **Two-Year College Transfer Student-Athletes:** The Board supports the increased standards for two-year college transfers 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 proposals recommended increased transfer standards for two-year college transfers.

- a. **Increased Standards:** The Board approved increasing the transferable grade-point average from 2.0 to 2.5; limiting the number of physical education activity courses to a total of two; and for non-qualifiers, requiring the completion of a core curriculum (six credits of English, three credits of math and three credits of science).
- b. **Year of Academic Readiness:** This proposal remains in the 2011-12 legislative cycle and will be voted on for the first time at the NCAA Convention in January 2012. The year of readiness provides an opportunity for academically underprepared student-athletes to gain the academic preparation needed to be successful. It allows student-athletes enrolled at a two-year institution to sit out of competition during the initial year of enrollment without starting the five-year clock for purposes of eligibility 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 Penalty Structure:** The committee presented recommendations on the implementation schedule for the Board's directive to include a postseason academic access standard of a 930 Academic Progress Rate (APR), which correlates to an approximate 50 percent Graduation Success Rate (GSR). The Board

approved the implementation schedule for the postseason eligibility standard, as well as a new APR penalty structure.

- a. **Access to Postseason:** The Board established a 930 APR as a minimum academic standard to participate in Division I postseason competition. This includes a mission filter only in the first year a team fails to meet the benchmark and an improvement filter in the second year and beyond. There will be a transition time period of three years for access to the postseason.
- b. **Penalty Structure:** The Board approved the committee’s recommended three-level penalty structure. First-level penalties include practice penalties (e.g. four hours/one day of practice per week in-season, resulting in 16 hours per week rather than 20 and five days per week rather than six, to be replaced with academic activities). The second level adds out-of-season practice restrictions (four hours per week), cancellation of nontraditional season or spring football and for sports without a nontraditional season, a 10 percent reduction in contests and length of season. The third level comprises a menu of options including financial penalties, restricted NCAA membership, coaching suspensions for a designated number of contests and/or recruiting, restricted access to practice for incoming student-athletes that fall below pre-determined academic standards and multi-year postseason competition bans. Teams will be subject to level three penalties until APR improves.
- c. **Filters / Waivers:** A mission filter (e.g. schools in the bottom 15 percent of resources and with a 50 percent GSR receive relief from the penalty) for postseason competition exists only in the first year a team fails to meet the benchmark. All other teams below 930 would be ineligible for postseason competition. An improvement filter (e.g. teams must have an average APR of 950 over the two most recent years to demonstrate meaningful improvement) only applies the second time and beyond that a team is subject to postseason ineligibility, and applies to level two and three penalties only. The waiver threshold in level one will be very rigorous, with approval for only those teams with truly extraordinary circumstances. Lastly, filters are applied automatically, while waivers require staff review.
- d. **Conference Policies:** All conference offices must adopt a policy regarding teams that do not meet championship academic access standards with respect to automatic qualification for postseason and revenue distribution. This requirement allows conferences to develop their own policies, and only requires that a written policy exist.
- e. **Effective Date:** The new postseason eligibility structure will take effect in the 2012-13 academic year, with a two-year implementation window before the benchmark moves from 900 to 930. For access to postseason competition in 2012-13 and 2013-14, teams must achieve a 900 multi-year APR or a 930 average over the two most recent years to be eligible. For 2014-15, access to postseason competition requires a 930 average over four years or a 940 over the two most recent years.

Postseason Competition Year	Multiyear APR for Postseason Eligibility	Two Most Recent Years Average APR for Postseason Eligibility
2011-12	Current penalty structure and benchmarks apply.	N/A
2012-13	Four-Year APR of 900 OR	Two most recent years average at or above 930

2013-14	Four-Year APR of 900 OR	Two most recent years average at or above 930
2014-15	Four-Year APR of 930 OR	Two most recent years average at or above 940
2015-16 and beyond	Four-Year APR of 930	N/A

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*



DEVELOPMENTS

The Division I Board of Directors voted on October 27 to adopt legislation implementing the recommendations of the Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group. The approved measures are outlined below. The legislation implementing these recommendations is effective August 1, 2012.

APPROVED PROPOSAL

1. Cost of Attendance (COA).

- a. Permit a Division I student-athlete who has received institutional financial aid equal to the value of a full grant in aid (i.e. tuition and fees, room and board and required course-related books), to receive additional athletically related financial aid up to the value of the institution's "cost of attendance", or up to \$2,000, whichever is less. The Board decided not to revisit this amount for three years.
 - (1) The additional "miscellaneous expense" amount is to be indexed annually to the consumer price index. Further, Student Athlete Opportunity Funds may be used at the institution's discretion toward these miscellaneous expenses, as is currently permitted.
 - (2) A Pell Grant will not be included in the NCAA financial aid calculation and will be considered an exempted government grant for purposes of applying NCAA regulations.

- (3) Only athletically related aid will be counted toward team limits in equivalency sports. All non-athletically related financial aid now will be excluded, which will permit student-athletes to receive additional sources of financial aid without affecting team financial aid limits. The “miscellaneous expense allowance” would be applicable once the total of athletics and other permissible aid exceeds the value of a full grant.
 - (4) Because this legislation is permissive in nature, conferences are 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 non-athletically 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 but the Awards, Benefits, Expenses and Financial Aid Cabinet is developing a “block grant” system. The Student-Athlete Well-Being Working Group agreed that a .10 minimum may be appropriate for all sports, but the group will consider the alternative minimum cabinet model and report a final recommendation to the Board for action in January or April 2012.]

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 athletics aid to former student-athletes who remain at, or return to, the institution to complete their baccalaureate degree requirements.

EXISTING INFORMATION

Bylaw 16 “Extra Benefits”.

The Well-Being Working Group supports 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.

FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the issues below, and expressed the desire to revisit these issues as early as their January 2012 meeting.

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.

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.

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 Working Group briefed the Division I Board of Directors at its October 27 meeting on its progress to date, outlined below. The working group will convene next on November 4.

EXISTING INFORMATION

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 nonchampionship segment competition. The sports with nonchampionship segment competition are cross country, field hockey, soccer, softball, lacrosse and men's volleyball.
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 Met
OCT 11



Next Meeting
DEC 13

DEVELOPMENTS

The Collegiate Model – Rules Working Group briefed the Division I Board of Directors at its October 27 meeting on its progress to date. The working group also requested and received endorsement from the Board for a resolution that summarizes the concepts and direction for the working group as they do their part to transform intercollegiate athletics, driven by principle-based outcomes. The working group will meet next on December 13.

EXISTING INFORMATION

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: Beginning January 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 and 24



Next
Teleconference
NOV 2

DEVELOPMENTS

The Collegiate Model – Enforcement Working Group briefed the Division I Board of Directors at its October 27 meeting on its progress to date and timeline for action items, outlined below. The Working Group will meet next on November 2.

EXISTING INFORMATION

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.

During the working group's October 24 call, there was continued discussion and refinement of the multi-level violation structure. The working group also engaged in discussion related to different process models. The group intends to begin examining the penalty structure on its November 2 call.

The working group's timeline contemplates the following:

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 initial concepts to the Division I Board of Directors.

April 2012

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

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.

###