1. **NCAA Division I Board of Directors strategic areas of emphasis for 2018-2023.** The NCAA Division I Committee on Academics discussed the items identified for potential inclusion in the Board of Directors strategic areas of emphasis for Division I for 2018-2023. The committee agreed the foundational goals identified by the board position the division to reaffirm the role of intercollegiate athletics in the educational experience and support the primacy of the student-athlete.

The committee specifically noted the Association’s approach to issues of academic integrity relies on the good faith efforts of institutional leadership. Specifically, presidents and chancellors are ultimately responsible for being proper stewards of the deference afforded to institutions to identify and adjudicate academic integrity issues that arise on a campus. The committee noted a good faith commitment to institutional process and oversight is essential for the recently adopted legislative and policy package to properly function and achieve the NCAA’s collective role in reinforcing and upholding the Association’s core academic principles.

As leaders of the recent academic integrity reform efforts, the committee is positioned to partner with other presidential-led committees in the governance structure, including the NCAA Division I Presidential Forum, in affirming the division’s expectations related to academic integrity and misconduct. The committee noted the comprehensive and collaborative approach that informed the legislation adopted by the Division I membership in April 2016. The committee recommended this item be prioritized amongst the other areas identified by the board as strategic areas of emphasis.

2. **NCAA Division I Council Transfer Working Group referrals.** The committee provided the requested feedback to the Transfer Working Group regarding an academic-based four-year college transfer concept and NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate implications. The feedback reinforces the committee’s previously identified recommendations and observations related to Division I four-year transfer student-athletes.

The committee affirmed that a student-athlete’s academic record, not his or her sport, should help determine whether a student-athlete qualifies for an exception to the year-in-residence requirement following transfer. The committee noted the academic data does not support requiring all academically prepared and capable students to sit out a year of competition simply because they transferred. Not only may the additional year-in-residence unnecessarily delay certain student-athletes’ academic and career progress, but it may also pose a financial burden on transfer student-athletes and institutions.

The committee confirmed the data best supported an academic component that includes both a minimum grade-point average of at least 3.000 to 3.300 and holding student-athletes to current percentage-of-degree standards at the new institution. The committee highlighted the recommended academic standards are predicated on aggregate academic
data from all Division I transfer student-athletes. As a result, much like other Division I eligibility rules (e.g., initial eligibility, two-year college transfer rules, progress toward degree), the recommended academic standards take into account differences across degree programs, curriculums and institutions.

The committee further noted the lack of academic data to support a broad transfer exception for enrolled student-athletes who experience a head coach departure. Specifically, no data exists to suggest that enrolled student-athletes who transfer following a head coach departure are more likely to maintain academic progress at the receiving institution.

Lastly, the committee continued its discussion how the APR might be used to increase accountability in transfer decisions, including several models generated from membership ideas and feedback. The committee noted that many of the potential models would impact the integrity of the APR as a rate. Specifically, using the APR to address transfer decisions would likely require a re-examination of the how the APR is calculated, the 930 standard for penalties, and access to postseason competition and the benchmarks for the new academic-based revenue distribution.

3. **Academic summit.** The committee received an update on the development of an academic summit focused on current and future issues facing higher education. The committee discussed how to approach some of the broad issues facing higher education through the lens of intercollegiate athletics. The committee agreed an early spring 2019 date would best accommodate schedules of institutional leadership. The committee also noted that hosting the summit in the greater Washington, D.C., metro area may best facilitate engagement and partnership with external organizations. The committee will continue to refine its approach and development of a 2019 academic summit at its June in-person meeting.

3. **Review of implementation of phase one of academic-based revenue distribution and related operational issues.** The committee received an update from the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Data regarding implementation of the academic-based revenue distribution (i.e., “NCAA Division I Academic Unit”). Specifically, the committee approved several requested policy recommendations to address operational issues related to the Academic Unit, including determining that:

   a. Institutions in unusable data status be ineligible to receive the Academic Unit, which includes the time period spent in probationary status; and

   b. The NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program data used to determine an institution’s eligibility for the academic unit be locked simultaneous with when the data is locked for public releases.
The committee agreed that rendering institutions in unusable data status ineligible to receive the Academic Unit, aligns with existing APP policy implications for institutions in unusable data status. The committee noted the forthcoming recommendation regarding when an institution in unusable data status begins its ineligibility and when it regains eligibility for the Academic Unit.

Similarly, the committee agreed that locking an institution’s APP data used to determine eligibility for the Academic Unit at the same time data is locked for public releases creates finality to the data that will be used each year to assess an academic an institution’s eligibility for the Academic Unit. The committee noted that any corrections of the data made after this time will not be considered in an institution’s eligibility calculation for the Academic Unit for that academic year.

The committee also reviewed and provided further feedback on the mock Academic-Unit eligibility reports to be distributed to the Division I membership and conferences in spring 2018. The successful implementation of the distribution is a priority for the committee.

4. **Progress-toward-degree review.** The committee received an update from the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics on the progress-toward-degree legislative review as a component of the broader NCAA Division I bylaw refresh and modernization efforts. The committee approved a recommendation to request the NCAA Division I Council introduce a legislative proposal to modify the current application of the 18/27-hour rule into the 2018-19 legislative cycle. The committee notes the recommended proposal will reduce institutional advising burdens and provide student-athletes with greater academic flexibility, without jeopardizing a student-athlete’s degree progress or baseline academic performance during the regular academic year.

5. **Definition of limited-resource institution within the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program.** The committee approved an amendment to the calculation used to annually determine what Division I institutions are limited resource for purposes of the APP. The committee noted that recent changes in institutional enrollment patterns had impacted how certain institutions were identified as limited resource under the existing calculation metric. The modified calculation will better identify those institutions with the lowest resources in Division I and be used for the first time during the 2018-19 academic year.

For additional detail, the committee’s full report may be accessed on ncaa.org by clicking here.