KEY ITEMS.

1. Academic Misconduct – Post-Enrollment. The NCAA Division I Committee on Academics continued its review of post-enrollment academic misconduct and received feedback on legislative concepts from a member of the NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions. The committee continued to discuss the role of the NCAA and member institutions in institutional academic misconduct matters, scrutinized draft legislation, addressed several outstanding legislative scenarios and explored the concept of institutions developing their own academic support and assistance policies. It is anticipated that the current concepts will be in final legislative format and ready for NCAA Division I Council sponsorship at the Council's June meeting. [Informational Item No. 1]

2. Expiration of Filters for Limited-Resource Institutions (LRIs). The committee discussed the expiration of the longer transition period and filters designed for LRIs in recognition of the number of LRIs that fail to reach the 930 multiyear NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) benchmark and the unique challenges LRIs face compared with non-LRI institutions. The committee will receive feedback from the HBCU and Limited-Resource Academic Advisory Group and continue discussion at the committee's June meeting. The committee's review could result in recommendations later this academic year, including a potential short-term extension of the filters while the committee refines long-range solutions that are not time-based. [Informational Item No. 2]

3. Student-Athlete Academic Success and Readiness. The committee began preliminary discussion of transformative academic measures that could both best prepare student-athletes for life and better prepare at-risk students for college academics. The committee agreed that the student-athlete academic experience could be more student-athlete specific by providing more flexibility than the current academic system, including expanded educational opportunities and personalized assistance for academically at-risk student-athletes. The committee recognized that the NCAA Division I Board of Directors will discuss the broad concept and related strategic statements in concert with review of alternative models (e.g., freshman ineligibility). [Informational Item No. 3]

4. Committee on Academics Authority to Sponsor Legislation Pertaining to Academic Matters. In the new Division I governance structure, the committee does not have authority to sponsor legislation but must request that the Council or Board sponsor legislation recommended by the committee. The group agreed that the committee, as the
academic practitioners vested with oversight of academics, should be permitted to sponsor academic-related legislation for membership consideration. The committee recommended that the Council sponsor such legislation for the 2015-16 cycle. [Action Item/Legislative Item No. 1; Informational Item No. 4]

**ACTION ITEMS.**

1. Legislative Items.

   **a. Organization – Committee on Academics – Duties and Responsibilities.**

   (1) **Recommendation.** Provide the Committee on Academics the authority to sponsor legislation pertaining to academic matters.

   (2) **Effective Date.** Immediate.

   (3) **Rationale.** In the new Division I governance structure, the committee cannot sponsor legislation but must request that the Council or Board sponsor legislation recommended by the committee. The new governance structure was created so that practitioners could resolve legislative issues. The members of the Committee on Academics—comprised of no fewer than seven presidents or chancellors, provosts and faculty athletics representatives—are subject matter experts and practitioners in the area of academics. Accordingly, the lack of authority for the committee to sponsor legislation pertaining to academic matters could be perceived as contrary to the rationale for creating the new governance structure. Likewise, a structure in which the committee, chaired by a president or chancellor and comprised of presidents or chancellors, must request that legislation pertaining to academic matters be sponsored by the Council, which includes no presidents or chancellors, could be perceived as contrary to the principle of institutional governance set forth in the legislation. Academics is the only area from the former cabinet structure in which its current governing body is not comprised of Council members that have the ability to sponsor legislation through the new Council standing committee substructure. Providing the committee authority to sponsor legislation pertaining to academic matters makes the sponsorship process more efficient and collaborative. For example, in light of the timing of the committee meeting schedule and the legislative cycle and in order to fully vet and discuss legislative concepts, it may not be feasible for the committee to recommend legislation until the committee's June
meeting. This could result in a narrow window for the committee to communicate its recommendation to the Council, which will meet at the same time or nearly the same time as the committee. Finally, this recommended amendment only permits the committee to introduce academic-related legislation and does not disrupt the final review of legislation by the Council or Board.

(4) **Estimated Budget Impact.** None.

(5) **Student-Athlete Impact.** None.

**b. Noncontroversial – Academic Credentials – Admission, Enrollment and Academic Credentials – Validity of Academic Credentials and Committees – NCAA International-Student Records Committee – Duties.**

(1) **Recommendation.** Require the International-Student Records Committee policies and procedures be approved on an annual basis by the Committee on Academics.

(2) **Effective Date.** Immediate.

(3) **Rationale.** The NCAA High School Review Committee, the NCAA Student Records Review Committee and the International-Student Records Committee report to the Committee on Academics. As required by the legislation, the committee currently approves the High School Review and Student Records Committees’ policies and procedures. However, there is no similar legislative requirement for the approval of the policies and procedures for the International-Student Records Committee although the International-Student Records Committee has the same governance and reporting structure as the High School Review and Student Records Review Committees. In order to provide similar oversight and governance accountability, the committee should be permitted to approve the policies and procedures of the International-Student Records Committee similar to the High School Review and Student Records Review Committees.

(4) **Estimated Budget Impact.** None.

(5) **Student-Athlete Impact.** None.

(1) **Recommendation.** Permit the use of advanced-level ESL courses that meet specific criteria, as outlined in the legislation, to satisfy initial eligibility core-curriculum requirements.

(2) **Effective Date.** Immediate.

(3) **Rationale.** Changing demographics in the United States have led to increased enrollment in advanced-level ESL courses. This, in part, has resulted in movement away from advanced-level ESL courses customized for individual proficiency to courses that are standardized for all students in the classroom. The proposed amendment will ensure that advanced-level ESL courses are on par with other core courses that appear on high schools' list of approved courses. For instance, in order to satisfy initial eligibility core-curriculum requirements, the advanced-level ESL courses must appear on the high school's list of approved core courses, be qualitatively and quantitatively the same as regular course offerings, be offered exclusively for ESL students and all students in the course must be at the same level. Permitting advanced-level ESL courses to be used to satisfy core-curriculum requirements will provide non-native English speakers the same opportunity to satisfactorily complete core-course requirements as native English speakers.

(4) **Estimated Budget Impact.** None.

(5) **Student-Athlete Impact.** More advanced-level courses will be available to prospective student-athletes, including non-native English speakers.

2. **Nonlegislative Items.**

- None.

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.**

1. **Academic Misconduct – Post-Enrollment.** The committee continued its review of post-enrollment academic misconduct. A member of the Committee on Infractions presented the committee with feedback on legislative concepts, including the definition of
institutional staff members, impermissible academic assistance and academic support policies and procedures for student-athletes. The committee received an update on changes to the draft potential future academic misconduct legislation resulting from its recommendations at the February meeting. The committee also reviewed a draft proposal and question-and-answer document intended to provide clarification to the membership on the legislative concepts and potential proposed legislation.

The committee continued to scrutinize the draft future academic misconduct legislation as part of its ongoing effort to address differing philosophical viewpoints and enhance current draft language. Committee discussion included consideration of numerous academic misconduct scenarios and resulted in continued discussion regarding the role of the NCAA and member institutions in institutional academic misconduct matters.

The committee refined legislative concepts and will continue to refine outstanding concepts leading to its June meeting:

a. The committee had previously recommended that institutions have and adhere to policies and procedures on academic misconduct applicable to the general student-body, including student-athletes. This recommendation also required that institutions investigate and adjudicate alleged academic misconduct in accordance with established policies applicable to all students. In its discussion, the committee endorsed the concept that athletics departments should be provided the opportunity to develop a supplemental policy and procedure separate from institutional policies and procedures only to increase process efficiency. The supplemental policies, however, must align with institutional policies and procedures and be approved by the institution's president. The committee noted that allowing athletics departments to supplement and develop their own policies and procedures to increase expediency and efficiency would provide flexibility to institutions and is consistent with other non-academic legislation (e.g., financial aid hearings, permission to contact).

b. The committee engaged in dialogue regarding the definition of an institutional staff member. The committee agreed that the definition of an institutional staff member should include specific circumstances or acts in which students (graduate or undergraduate) may become institutional staff members. The committee noted that a student acting at the direction of an "adult" institutional staff member should be held to the institutional staff member definition. The committee also expressed interest in exploring a definition that includes student workers that primarily work with student-athletes, as they are trained and monitored by the athletics department. The committee recognized the implementation of that definition could present challenges as tutors work with both student-athletes and
general undergraduate students. Members of the Committee on Infractions and the committee will meet biweekly until the June committee meeting to refine the definition of an institutional staff member.

c. The committee engaged in dialogue regarding the definition of impermissible academic assistance. The committee noted that removing "attempts" of providing impermissible assistance may allay concern expressed in membership feedback. Specifically, the membership highlighted the potential monitoring burden of this bylaw. The committee also noted that limiting violations of this bylaw to acts that effect student-athlete eligibility for practice, financial aid, competition and APR points could also limit the scope of such violations without compromising the committee's core principles. Members of the Committee on Infractions and the committee will also meet biweekly until the June committee meeting to refine the definition of impermissible academic assistance.

d. The committee explored the concept of institutions developing their own academic support and assistance policies. In this concept, if an issue of impermissible assistance is discovered by an institution, the institution's own policies and procedures would determine if an NCAA misconduct violation occurred.

The committee will circulate a refined draft legislative proposal to the membership. The feedback from the membership will be combined with feedback from the committee and the Committee on Infractions to produce an enhanced legislative draft that the committee will review at its June meeting. It is anticipated that the current concepts will be in final legislative format and ready for Council sponsorship at the Council's June meeting. The membership would then have an opportunity to formally review the proposal before the Council vote in April 2016. If the legislation is adopted by the membership in April 2016, the legislation could be effective as soon as August 2016.

An operational overview of the review of academic misconduct is in the Attachment.

2. **Expiration of Filters for LRIs.** The longer transition period and filters designed for LRIs expire with submission of 2014-15 APR data in the fall of 2015. The committee discussed expiration of the filters and the potential impact on LRIs. The committee agreed that it should examine circumstances and review data that may better illuminate the causes for why institutions fail to meet the APR benchmark. The committee also discussed exploring different long-range solutions for LRIs to meet the benchmark that are not time-based. The HBCU and Limited-Resource Academic Advisory Group will address the issue and provide feedback and recommendations prior to the committee's
June meeting. The committee's review could result in recommendations later this academic year, including a potential short-term extension of the filters while the committee refines long-range solutions that are not time-based.

3. **Student-Athlete Academic Success and Readiness.** Although many academic reforms have occurred over the last decade and student-athlete graduation rates are at an all-time high, additional transformative academic measures could be addressed, including better preparing student-athletes for careers via enhanced access to educational opportunities and better preparing at-risk student-athletes for college academics. The committee's preliminary discussion also included extensive dialogue concerning time demands placed on student-athletes and the negative impact those demands may have on the overall educational experience and satisfaction of student-athletes.

The committee supported several strategic statements that could help guide the division in any continued review of student-athlete success and academic readiness:

a. The student-athlete experience should be tailored for individual student-athletes and should include more flexibility than the current system.

b. Academically at-risk student-athletes should be provided personalized assistance during their first year of enrollment to create a solid academic base that will ensure academic success. This may include an academic year in readiness prior to competing for the institution.

c. Student-athletes should be provided expanded educational opportunities in order to better prepare them for life after intercollegiate athletics. The academic system should provide flexibility to afford academically high performing student-athletes an opportunity to supplement their educational experience and earn more than a degree. This opportunity is often more readily available to students generally and in an effort to best integrate student-athletes, attention should be paid to providing student-athletes more access to supplemental educational opportunities.

d. Academically prepared student-athletes that have a high likelihood of graduating in four years should be provided the opportunity to access a full competitive experience.

e. Student-athletes should be satisfied with their overall academic experience at the end of their competitive athletics experience, including satisfaction that their degree selection adequately prepared them for careers after college.
f. Partnerships with other educational entities (e.g., Department of Education) may provide opportunities and insights that could result in an enhanced student-athlete academic system.

The committee acknowledged that a membership-authored white paper on Centrality of Education in the Collegiate Model would be issued, but the white paper was not yet released at the time of the committee meeting. The committee anticipates reviewing the document and concept at a future meeting.

The committee recognized that the Board will discuss this broad concept and the strategic statements in concert with a review of alternative models (e.g., freshman ineligibility). With this feedback and reaction, the Board may provide direction to the committee so that the committee could effectively operationalize and provide recommendations to the Board by August 2016.

4. Committee on Academics Authority to Sponsor Legislation Pertaining to Academic Matters. The process of sponsoring legislation significantly changed in the new Division I governance structure. As a result of this change, the committee does not have the authority to sponsor legislation in the new structure but must request that the Council or Board sponsor legislation recommended by the committee. The group agreed that the committee, as the academic practitioners vested with oversight of academics, should be permitted to sponsor academic-related legislation for membership consideration. The committee recommended that the Council sponsor such legislation for the 2015-16 cycle.

5. International-Student Records Committee Policies and Procedures. The High School Review Committee, Student Records Review Committee and International-Student Records committee report to the committee. The legislation currently requires the policies and procedures of the High School Review Committee and Student Records Review Committee be approved by the committee. In order to provide similar oversight and governance accountability, the committee recommended that the Council sponsor legislation for the 2015-16 cycle requiring the committee to approve the policies and procedures of the International-Student Records Committee on an annual basis.

6. Advanced-Level ESL Courses. Advanced-level ESL courses have evolved from customized courses for individuals to standardized courses for all students in the classroom. In order to provide non-native English speakers the same opportunity to satisfactorily complete core-course requirements as native English speakers, the committee recommended that legislation be sponsored permitting advanced-level ESL
7. **Pre-Enrollment Issues.** The committee received an update on the formation of a staff working group to address global pre-enrollment issues, which include changes to the SAT and the future role of standardized tests, competency-based education and pre-enrollment academic misconduct. The working group is in the process of evaluating potential issues, timelines and solutions and identifying academic bodies, which will include the Committee on Academics subcommittees, to address the issues.

8. **Redesigned SAT.** The committee received an update regarding the pending redesign of the SAT and the operational measures and communication strategies to be refined by the NCAA Eligibility Center to ensure the transition to the new test does not adversely impact prospective student-athletes or member institutions. The committee recognized the condensed timetable between release of the concordance tables by the College Board in May 2016 and academic certification of some prospective student-athletes for the 2016-17 academic year. The committee anticipates that it will review the refined operational approach of the NCAA Eligibility Center at the committee's June meeting.

9. **Nontraditional College Course Review.** The Board charged the committee with the review of nontraditional college courses. After reviewing the legislative history and trends in the use of nontraditional college courses, the committee determined that the current legislation achieves the appropriate institutional deference over the regulation of nontraditional college coursework. The committee will survey the membership to determine whether the student-athlete experience has been adversely impacted by the ability to be considered a full-time student while enrolled entirely in online coursework.

10. **Graduate Student-Athlete Transfer Issues.** The committee provided feedback to the newly appointed NCAA Division I Ad Hoc Transfer Issues Working Group regarding graduate student-athlete transfer issues. The committee was informed that the working group was charged to continue the division's comprehensive evaluation of four-year college transfer issues, including those impacting graduate student-athlete transfers. The committee reviewed data on graduate student-athlete transfers and discussed the policy recommendation and academic concepts proposed within the previous governance structure.
The committee recognized the disparity between the academic outcomes of graduate student-athlete transfers in specific sports (e.g., football and men's basketball compared to all other sports). The committee noted that student-athletes who seek to exhaust remaining athletics eligibility in a graduate capacity should be incentivized to complete their chosen graduate degree program. The committee provided the following feedback to the working group regarding issues impacting graduate student-athlete transfers:

a. The academic outcomes of graduate student-athletes should be a component of the working group's review of existing legislation and waiver policy impacting graduate student-athlete transfers.

b. Should the working group consider proposing a transfer waiver policy or legislation that requires graduate student-athlete transfers to serve an academic year in residence:

(1) The working group should reflect on how any legislative or policy modifications would impact the use of one-year graduate degree programs. The committee noted the current transfer waiver criteria for graduate students, which are based on graduate degree offerings at the two institutions, could be used to accommodate athletics eligibility over academics. The committee also noted that the implementation of an academic year in residence requirement and an exception for one-year degree programs may result in the burgeoning of one-year graduate degree programs.

(2) The working group should consider how any legislative or policy modifications would impact student-athletes in sports other than football and men's basketball.

c. The working group should consider an institutional requirement of commitment of athletics aid for the duration of a student-athlete's graduate degree or program as a component of graduate student-athlete transfer eligibility.

11. NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP) Policies and Procedures. The committee reviewed and approved changes to the APP manual for the 2015-16 academic year as part of the committee's annual review of the manual. In particular, the committee approved the following additions to the manual:
a. Section in Chapter One on the selection and designation of committee members to the NCAA Division I Legislative Committee and a similar, related section on designating committee liaisons to outside groups from the committee;

b. Section in Chapter Four on public recognition to reflect the expansion of the number of teams in each sport recognized in the public recognition program that has a multiyear cohort size of less than 10; and

c. Supplement in Chapter Four on postseason that provides additional clarity on what qualifies as postseason competition.

12. **Update on APP Penalties and Loss of Access to Postseason.** The committee received an update on the number of penalized teams and teams that lost access to the postseason to date based on the APR that includes the 2013-14 data as the fourth year.

13. **Update on 2014-15 APR.** The committee received an update on the APR adjustment cases and types of requests that were submitted by member institutions during the 2014-15 academic year. The committee also reviewed APR trends and indicators from the 2013-14 APR data collected in fall 2014.

14. **APR Adjustment Requests – Student-Athletes Pursuing Professional Athletics as a Vocation.** The NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Data reported to the committee that the subcommittee issued an interpretation to clarify that the professional athletics adjustment may only be applied after a student-athlete is drafted/signed a contract with a professional athletics team/organization or engages in other activities that constitute pursuit of professional athletics as a vocation, as outlined in the directive. Further, the professional athletics opportunity must have prevented the student-athlete from returning to the institution in the next regular academic term as a full-time student by the institution's fifth week of class or census date, whichever is earlier. For example, a football student-athlete who completes the fall term but is not drafted until the end of the spring term must enroll full time in the spring term, complete the term and earn the eligibility point in order to be eligible for the professional athletics adjustment. The subcommittee acknowledged the varying application of the professional athletics adjustment and recommended an increased educational effort to ensure the membership correctly applies the adjustment moving forward.
15. **Criteria to Qualify for the APR Adjustment for Professional Athletics.** The Subcommittee on Data reported to the committee that the subcommittee reviewed the professional athletics opportunities component of the APR Adjustment Directive and made no changes to the existing list of criteria that qualifies a student-athlete for an adjustment of a lost retention point due to participation in professional sports as a vocation.

16. **APP Data Submission Policy and Sports Sponsorship.** The Subcommittee on Data reported to the committee that the subcommittee reviewed several scenarios involving sports sponsorship and confirmed that the current APP data submission policy is appropriate. The subcommittee examined the following scenarios:

   a. When a student-athlete in an individual sport (e.g., track and field, swimming and diving) may qualify for a Division I championship even though the institution does not meet sports sponsorship requirements for the sport in accordance with NCAA Division I Bylaw 20.9.6.3 (minimum contests and participants requirements for sports sponsorship);

   b. When an institution adds a new sport; and

   c. When an institution may meet sports-sponsorship requirements intermittently.

The subcommittee confirmed that a sport that meets sports-sponsorship requirements per Bylaw 20.9.6.3 shall be required to report APP data. The subcommittee noted these situations have occurred on infrequent occasions since 2003 when the APP began and do not warrant action at this time.

17. **Newly Adopted Division I Autonomy Legislation and APP Impact.** The Subcommittee on Data reported to the committee that the subcommittee reviewed adopted autonomy legislation for its potential impact on APP policy. Specifically, the subcommittee reviewed NCAA Proposal No. 2014-13 (autonomy proposal -- financial aid -- maximum limit on financial aid -- full grant-in-aid-- other expenses related to attendance up to cost of attendance) and Proposal No. 2014-13-1 (autonomy proposal - - financial aid -- cost of attendance -- student assistance fund). Proposal No. 2014-13 permits a student-athlete to receive a full grant-in-aid up to cost of attendance at the institution, while the amendment (Proposal No. 2014-13-A) clarifies that a student-athlete may receive monies from the Student Assistance Fund to cover other expenses related to attendance at the institution.
The subcommittee confirmed that a student-athlete who is receiving noncountable financial aid (e.g., academic honors awards) up to the cost of a full grant-in-aid and Student Assistance Fund to cover other expenses up to the cost of attendance would be excluded from the APR cohort. The subcommittee also confirmed that the receipt of Student Assistance Fund monies in this manner would not equate to athletically related aid for purposes of the APP and would not trigger the student-athlete's inclusion in the APR cohort.

18. **APR Cohort Definition for Track and Field and Cross Country and Application of Data and Penalty Policies.** The Subcommittee on Data and the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals reported to the committee that the subcommittees conducted a joint teleconference to resolve APR data and penalty application issues with the new APR cohort definition for cross country and track and field (e.g., use of the mission filter, penalty progression, previously earned penalties, improvement filter calculation). The subcommittees agreed on the foundational principle that the track cohort amendments should not place a team that was not previously penalized into a situation in which it would now be penalized or be disadvantaged because of the preexisting status of the other track team. The subcommittees directed staff to apply the more lenient application when track APP issues arise due to implementation of the new cohort definition.

19. **Academic Related Interpretations and Educational Columns.** The NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics reported to the committee that the subcommittee reviewed three proposed staff interpretations, one proposed staff rewrite of an existing official interpretation and one proposed new educational column pertaining to the initial-eligibility legislation that will be effective August 2016. The subcommittee supported the reviewed interpretations and educational columns and recommended the NCAA Division I Legislative Review and Interpretations Committee approve the interpretations and educational columns.

20. **Two-Year College Transfer Waiver Directive Language for 4-2-4 Transfers.** The Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics reported to the committee that the subcommittee reviewed changes to the two-year college transfer waiver directive, including draft language that reflects the high standard of review for waivers when a 4-2-4 transfer student-athlete fails to complete the one-calendar year requirement. The proposed language articulates that waiver requests seeking relief from the one-calendar year requirement should generally be denied absent significant mitigation outside the control of the student-athlete and unrelated to athletics. Further, the mitigation would
also need to demonstrate a clear and compelling rationale for the student-athlete being provided immediate eligibility for competition prior to completion of the one-calendar year requirement. The subcommittee noted that the directive should create a higher standard than as set forth in the draft language and instructed staff to further refine the proposed language to reflect that waivers of the one-calendar year requirement will be denied absent, unique and extraordinary mitigation. The subcommittee will review the final language during its annual review of the directive. It is anticipated this review will occur later this spring or early summer.

21. **Two-Year College Transfer Waivers Citing Misadvisement.** The Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics reported to the committee that the subcommittee continued its review of waivers citing misadvisement for 2-4 transfer student-athletes in circumstances in which student-athletes had been advised to enroll at a four-year institution prior to meeting 2-4 transfer requirements. The subcommittee recognized that while these cases represent a small number of 2-4 transfer waiver requests, institutions making these requests may receive a competitive advantage. The subcommittee requested that NCAA staff prepare possible options to address this situation. The subcommittee noted that options should provide the appropriate avenue to ensure that institutions do not advise student-athletes to enroll prior to determining the satisfactory completion of the 2-4 transfer requirements and should also not disadvantage student-athlete that relied on the advice of the institution. The subcommittee will further review the issue at an upcoming teleconference, with any potential changes to the directive anticipated to be addressed at the committee's June 2015 meeting.

22. **Potential Legislative Requirement Regarding Submission of High School Transcripts After Six Semesters.** The Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics reported to the committee that the subcommittee received an overview of a recent membership survey that indicated support for legislation requiring submission of prospective student-athletes' high school transcripts to the NCAA Eligibility Center following the completion of a prospective student-athlete's sixth semester. The legislative concept could require prospective student-athletes to submit transcripts before being permitted to sign a National Letter of Intent or other written offer of athletically related financial aid. The subcommittee indicated it may support and recommend legislation to the committee after the subcommittee conducts a final review at an upcoming teleconference.
23. **Less Than Full-Time Waivers for Student-Athletes in Their Final Season of Competition.** The Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics reported to the committee that the subcommittee received an overview of the number of less than full-time enrollment waivers submitted during the 2014-15 academic year that cited a student-athlete being unable to enroll full time during his or her penultimate term due to a lack of required degree courses remaining. In these situations the term cannot be considered the student-athlete's final term because a required internship or student-teaching remains. The subcommittee indicated it will further examine the issue at an upcoming teleconference.

24. **Academic Governance – Future Committee Issues and Topics.** The committee reviewed its slate of future priorities as it moves forward in a new Division I governance structure. The committee anticipates approving the committee's two-year strategic priorities at the committee's June meeting.

25. **Penalty Hearing.** The committee conducted one hearing for one team subject to APP Level-Three penalties.

26. **Update from President Emmert.** The committee received an update from President Emmert on current issues impacting intercollegiate athletics and the role of the committee in addressing many of these issues.

27. **Council update.** The committee received an update on the status, composition and structure of the Council and some of the key items from the Council's April 14-15, 2015, meeting.

28. **Report of the Committee on Academics.** The committee reviewed the full report of the February 16-17, 2015, meeting.

29. **Reports of the Subcommittee on Data.** The committee reviewed the reports of the February 12, February 26, March 12, March 26 and April 9, 2015, teleconferences and the March 26, 2015, joint teleconference with the Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals and received an update on informational items from these reports.
30. **Report of the Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals.** The committee reviewed the report of the February 12, 2015, teleconference and received an update on informational items from this report.

31. **Report of the Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics.** The committee reviewed the report of the March 31, 2015, teleconference and received an update on informational items from this report.

32. **Priority Future Agenda Items.** The following items have been identified as priority items for the committee:
   
   a. Continue review of legislative concepts pertaining to post-enrollment academic misconduct and recommend sponsorship of a proposal for the 2015-16 legislative cycle.
   
   b. Review feedback from the HBCU and Limited-Resource Academic Advisory Group regarding expiration of filters designed for LRIs and continue discussion on the related issues. The committee's review could include a potential short-term extension of filters while the committee refines long-range solutions that are not time-based.
   
   c. Address any endorsements of strategic statements or other feedback from the Board regarding student-athlete academic success and readiness issues and continue discussion of transformative academic measures.
   
   d. Review and approve the committee's two-year strategic priorities list.

33. **Future Meeting Dates.**
   
   a. June 23-24, 2015, Indianapolis; and
   
   b. October 20-21, 2015, Indianapolis.
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**Guests in Attendance:** Eleanor Myers (Committee on Infractions, vice chair; and Committee on Infractions Academic Misconduct Subcommittee, chair).

**NCAA Liaisons in Attendance:** Shauna Cobb and Azure Davey.

**Other NCAA Staff Members in Attendance for Portions of the Meeting:** Lydia Bell, Emily Capehart, Andy Cardamone, Amanda Conklin, Greg Dana, Mark Emmert, Michelle Hosick, Kurt Hunsaker, Carrie Klecka, Ken Kleppel, Kevin Lennon, Andy Louthain, Oliver Luck, Joel McGormley, Binh Nguyen, Tom Paskus, Todd Petr, Brad Rochman, Dave Schnase, Nick Sproull, Naima Stevenson, Kathy Sulentic and Katy Yurk.
Academic Misconduct – An Operational Overview

Academic misconduct legislation has been developed in close consultation with many membership entities. The NCAA Division I Committee on Academics has overseen outreach via 20 meetings since summer 2014, and it is anticipated that upward of 20 additional meetings will occur prior to the committee sponsoring a final legislative proposal.

- **April 2016**
  - Council vote.

- **January 2016**
  - Ongoing membership and committee feedback.

- **June 2015**
  - Council sponsors proposal.
  - Committee on Academics recommends legislation.

- **April - June 2015**
  - Membership input on Committee on Academics draft legislation.
  - Ongoing membership and committee feedback.

- **April 2015**
  - Ongoing membership and committee feedback.

- **2014**
  - Committee on Academics establishes core principles for academic misconduct legislation.
  - Ongoing membership and committee concepts.

- **2012-13**
  - Review and discussion by academic governance groups.

- **2011**
  - Targeted evaluation of academic misconduct commences.