KEY ITEMS.

1. **NCAA Proposal No. 2015-66 – Academic Misconduct.** The NCAA Division I Committee on Academics reviewed feedback on the proposal received from the governance structure and membership since the committee’s October 20-21, 2015, meeting. This included feedback from the Division IA Athletic Directors’ Association, which recognized the proposal as a substantial improvement to the current state but recommended the committee consider some enhancements to the proposal. The committee recommended that the NCAA Division I Council modify the proposal in light of the feedback received from the Division IA athletic directors. [Legislative Action Item No. 1a; Informational Item No. 1.]

2. **Pre-Enrollment Academic Misconduct Legislation.** The committee reviewed pre-enrollment academic misconduct legislation. The committee recommended that the Council sponsor a proposal for the 2016-17 cycle that ensures consistency with the post-enrollment academic misconduct legislation as proposed in Proposal No. 2015-66 and clarifies that pre-enrollment academic misconduct legislation applies to a prospective student-athlete’s academic record and what constitutes an academic record for purposes of the legislation. The recommendation is contingent on adoption of Proposal No. 2015-66. [Legislative Action Item No. 1b; Informational Item No. 2.]

3. **NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate Retention Point Policy for Postgraduate Student-Athletes.** In response to the Council referral to address academic outcomes of graduate student-athlete transfers, the committee reviewed the automatic awarding of the APR retention point for postgraduate student-athletes to support academic accountability for institutions with postgraduate student-athletes. The committee will modify the APR retention point policy to remove the retention point from the calculation of the APR for postgraduate student-athletes pursuing undergraduate or graduate work while not enrolled in degree-granting graduate programs, and require student-athletes who are accepted to degree-granting graduate programs earn the retention point. The policy change will coincide with the effective date of the legislative proposals on academic eligibility requirements for postgraduate student-athletes that will be considered by the Council at its April 2016 meeting for inclusion in the 2016-17 cycle, provided there are no modifications to the proposals. [Informational Item No. 3.]

4. **Use of Certificate Programs to Satisfy Progress-Toward-Degree Credit-Hour Requirements.** The committee continued its review of progress-toward-degree legislation to ensure the legislation provides sufficient flexibility for student-athletes to pursue an academic path that provides educational opportunities while earning degrees within five years. The committee recommended that the proposal the committee requested in October 2015 be sponsored by the Council for the 2016-17 cycle to allow credit hours earned toward institutionally approved voluntary or optional minors be used to satisfy progress-toward-degree requirements be modified to also allow credit hours earned toward institutionally approved undergraduate certificate programs be used to satisfy progress-toward-degree requirements provided certain conditions are met. [Legislative Action Item No. 1c; Informational Item No. 4.]
5. **Initial-Eligibility Standards.** The committee received an update on the application of the new initial-eligibility standards, effective August 1, 2016, including feedback from an external association on these new standards. The committee also reviewed the initial-eligibility waiver process and discussed flexibility within the process. [Informational Item No. 5.]

6. **APR Transfer Adjustment Criteria.** The committee began an evaluation of the transfer adjustment criteria, reviewing data pertaining to the criteria and membership feedback. The committee requested the review of additional data to determine if changes to the criteria would be appropriate. This will entail work with the National Student Clearinghouse, an external entity. [Informational Item No. 6.]

7. **NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program Penalty Waiver and Appeals Process.** The committee reviewed recommendations by the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals to modify the APP penalty waiver and appeals process to provide the same process for all levels of penalties and to require institutional engagement throughout the process. The committee discussed the current process and recommended changes. Committee review will continue at an upcoming meeting. [Informational Item No. 7.]

8. **APP Improvement Filters for Limited-Resource Institutions.** In October 2015, on the recommendation of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities/LRI Academic Advisory Group, the committee approved a continuation of the current improvement filter system for teams at LRIs with a multiyear APR below the 930 benchmark required to access postseason competition and avoid APP penalties with enhancements. Beginning with submission of 2015-16 APR data in the fall 2016, these teams may use the current improvement filters twice over the next five years and will be required to complete an APR Improvement Plan that meets enhanced criteria. Educational programming will also be required when a team has a multiyear APR below 930. The committee refined the enhanced criteria for APR Improvement Plans. [Informational Item No. 8.]

9. **APP Level-Three Penalty Hearing.** As part of its ongoing duties related to the administration of the APP, the committee conducted an APP Level-Three Penalty hearing. [Informational Item No. 16.]

**ACTION ITEMS.**

1. **Legislative Items for the Council.**
   a. **Academic Eligibility – Post-Enrollment Academic Misconduct.**
      (1) **Recommendation.** Amend Proposal No. 2015-66 – Academic Misconduct for the 2015-16 cycle and reduce the scope of the legislation to:
(a) Require that for an NCAA academic misconduct violation to occur when an institution finds academic misconduct pursuant to its policies and procedures, a current or former institutional staff member or representative of athletics interest is not involved in the misconduct and the misconduct results in an erroneous declaration of eligibility (pursuant to proposed NCAA Bylaw 14.9.2.1-(b)), the student-athlete must also compete.

(b) Limit student employees under the definition of institutional staff members to student employees with institutional responsibilities to provide academic services to student-athletes.

(2) **Effective Date.** August 1, 2016.

(3) **Rationale.** Since sponsorship of Proposal No. 2015-66 in June 2015, the committee has continued to engage the membership through extensive outreach designed to educate the membership on application of the proposal and provide the committee membership feedback. This feedback has allowed the committee to more closely examine areas of concern for the membership. Two of these areas of concern, which the committee initially considered adding to the proposal prior to sponsorship of the proposal, justify refinement of the proposal based on the feedback received.

First, academic misconduct without the involvement of a current or former institutional staff member or representative of athletics interests pursuant to proposed Bylaw 14.9.2.1-(b) should result in competition in order to rise to the level of a violation. Under the current proposal, the misconduct is only required to result in an erroneous declaration of eligibility—not competition—pursuant to proposed Bylaw 14.9.2.1-(b).

In addition, including student employees that have institutional responsibilities to provide academic services to the general student-body—not just student-athletes—in the definition of institutional staff member pursuant to proposed Bylaw 14.02.11-(a) could pose an undue monitoring and educational burden on institutions. Specifically, athletics departments are generally not aware of which student employees provide academic services to the general body and may not be able to sufficiently monitor or educate these student employees.

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

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

b. **Academic Eligibility – Pre-Enrollment Academic Misconduct.**
(1) **Recommendation.** Define and clarify NCAA pre-enrollment academic misconduct activities, the individuals to whom the activities apply and violations of such activities. The recommendation is contingent on adoption of Proposal No. 2015-66.

(2) **Effective Date.** August 1, 2017.

(3) **Rationale.** Proposal No. 2015-66 moves the pre-enrollment academic misconduct legislation from Bylaw 10 to Bylaw 14, but does not substantively modify the pre-enrollment academic misconduct legislation. Pre-enrollment academic legislation should be amended to ensure consistency with post-enrollment academic misconduct legislation. Specifically, pre-enrollment academic misconduct legislation should apply to representatives of athletics interests. Likewise, the legislation should clarify that pre-enrollment academic misconduct applies to a prospective student-athlete’s academic record, which could include core courses, grades, credits, transcripts and standardized test scores. In addition, arranging for a false or inaccurate academic record should not be required to be done “knowingly” in order for a violation to occur. The process for reporting and adjudicating violations will not change with these legislative enhancements.

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

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

c. **Academic Eligibility – Progress-Toward-Degree Requirements – Fulfillment of Credit-Hour Requirements – Hours Earned or Accepted Toward a Certificate Program.**

(1) **Recommendation.** Permit credit hours earned toward established and ongoing institutionally approved undergraduate certificate programs be used to satisfy progress-toward-degree credit hour requirements (per Bylaw 14.4.3.1). In order for the certificate program credit hours to be used to satisfy credit-hour requirements, the program must:

   (a) Require at least nine credit hours to complete;

   (b) Be available only to student-athletes who have been admitted as regular degree-seeking undergraduate students; and

   (c) Be declared by the student-athlete prior to the first day of the applicable academic term.
Specifically, the committee recommends that this proposal be a part of the proposal previously recommended by the committee for inclusion in the 2016-17 cycle that would permit credit hours earned toward all established and ongoing institutionally approved minors, including voluntary or optional minors, be used to satisfy credit-hour requirements (per Bylaw 14.4.3.1) provided the minor is declared prior to the first day of the applicable term.

(2) **Effective Date.** August 1, 2017.

(3) **Rationale.** Current legislation does not permit credit hours earned toward institutionally approved certificate programs be used to satisfy credit-hour requirements. As a result, student-athletes could be unintentionally burdened by completing certificate programs in addition to coursework used to satisfy credit-hour requirements while otherwise balancing time demands of athletics and co-curricular activities. In some cases this leads to student-athletes having to choose between maintaining athletics eligibility and pursuing a desired certificate program in lieu of doing both.

Certificate programs provide similar educational benefits to student-athletes as minors; and in many cases, certificate programs are at least as academically rigorous as minors. The committee recognized that typically the only significant difference between minors and certificate programs is that minors are intradisciplinary while certificate programs are generally multidisciplinary. Many student-athletes choose to pursue a certificate in a field that will help with their career, much like minors. With the changing job market, student-athletes should have the opportunity to best position themselves to be successful after college without jeopardizing their athletics opportunities.

The proposed criteria that certificate programs must meet provides necessary restrictions to ensure the adequacy of the certificate programs used to satisfy credit-hour requirements. Student-athletes will still be required to meet all percentage-of-degree benchmarks without using certificate program credits, ensuring that they continue to progress toward graduation within five years of initial full-time enrollment.

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

(5) **Student-Athlete Impact.** Student-athletes will be provided increased flexibility to pursue certificate programs in light of demands on time from participation in intercollegiate athletics and to best prepare them for success after college without jeopardizing their athletics opportunities.
2. Nonlegislative Items.


  (1) **Recommendation.** The NCAA Division I Interpretations Committee review and archive the July 13, 2005, official interpretation and issue an official interpretation determining that the criteria for using traditional courses taken at another institution while enrolled full time at the certifying institution to satisfy progress-toward-degree credit-hour requirements be the same as the criteria set forth in Bylaw 14.4.3.5.3 for using nontraditional courses taken at another institution while enrolled full time at the certifying institution.

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

  (3) **Rationale.** Progress-toward-degree regulations related to concurrent enrollment, which allow credit hours taken at a second institution to be used to satisfy progress-toward-degree requirements at the certifying institution in certain circumstances, are more restrictive as they relate to traditional courses than they are for nontraditional courses. Specifically, the July 13, 2005, official interpretation requires credit hours taken in a traditional setting at another institution count toward full-time enrollment at the certifying institution in order to be used to meet credit-hour requirements. No such requirement exists for nontraditional courses taken at another institution. The membership has adopted less restrictive guidelines related to concurrent enrollment in nontraditional courses and those same guidelines should be applied to concurrent enrollment in traditional courses for consistency in application of the legislation, to eliminate membership confusion and to provide student-athletes more flexibility to pursue educational opportunities.

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

  (5) **Student-Athlete Impact.** Making the criteria to use traditional courses taken at another institution while enrolled full time at the certifying institution to satisfy progress-toward-degree requirements less restrictive will provide more flexibility for student-athletes to pursue educational opportunities and enhance student-athlete well-being.

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.**

1. **Proposal No. 2015-66 – Academic Misconduct.** The committee reviewed feedback on the proposal from the governance structure and membership since the committee’s October 20-21, 2015, meeting. In particular, the committee discussed recent feedback from the Division I A athletic directors, which recognized the proposal as a substantial improvement over the
current state but recommended that the committee consider some enhancements to the proposal. In light of the feedback received from the Division IA athletic directors, the committee recommended that the Council modify the proposal as specified in Legislative Action Item No. 1a.

The committee also discussed feedback received at the 2016 NCAA Convention, including from the Council and the NCAA Convention Division I Legislative Discussion and Issues Forum. The committee noted the vote taken by forum participants on dividing the academic misconduct and impermissible academic assistance portions of the proposal for the Council vote and continued application of the academic extra-benefit analysis. The committee recognized the importance of an academic extra-benefit analysis to the Association and suggested that any consideration of dividing the proposal must maintain the Association’s authority in determining academic extra-benefit violations beyond solely an institutional determination on academic misconduct.

The committee also reviewed internal operating procedures drafted by the enforcement staff that provide guidance on how the enforcement staff could conduct investigations and process alleged rule violations should Proposal No. 2015-66 be adopted.

Lastly, the committee emphasized the continued importance of educating the membership on application of the proposed legislation and best practices. This education will include additional webinars with a focus on case scenarios available to the entire membership and continued staff participation at conference meetings and meetings of constituent groups. [Legislative Action Item No. 1a.]

2. Pre-Enrollment Academic Misconduct Legislation. The committee reviewed pre-enrollment academic misconduct legislation. The committee recommended that the Council sponsor a proposal for the 2016-17 cycle that ensures consistency with the post-enrollment academic misconduct legislation as proposed in Proposal No. 2015-66 and clarifies that pre-enrollment academic misconduct legislation applies to a prospective student-athlete’s academic record and what constitutes an academic record for purposes of the legislation. The recommendation is contingent on adoption of Proposal No. 2015-66. The committee also reviewed an operational plan by the NCAA Eligibility Center to educate the membership on application of the existing legislation, including the responsibility to report a violation. [Legislative Action Item No. 1b.]

3. APR Retention Point Policy for Postgraduate Student-Athletes. In response to the Council referral to address academic outcomes of graduate student-athlete transfers, the committee continued its review of the automatic awarding of the APR retention point for postgraduate student-athletes to support academic accountability for institutions with postgraduate student-athletes. The committee reviewed data regarding the impact of the three models of change to the APR retention point policy, which the committee identified at its October 2015 meeting for further review, on the APR for postgraduate student-athletes and national APR distribution. The committee also reviewed membership feedback obtained through multiple teleconferences in December 2015 regarding the models.
Under the current policy, once a student-athlete graduates, the student-athlete is automatically awarded the retention point for any subsequent terms of enrollment, even if the student-athlete is not retained at the institution. In addition, the eligibility point is earned if the student-athlete is academically eligible to compete in the next regular academic term. The committee agreed to modify this policy to remove the retention point from the calculation of the APR for postgraduate student-athletes pursuing undergraduate or graduate work while not enrolled in degree-granting graduate programs and require student-athletes who are accepted to degree-granting graduate programs earn the retention point. Under this new policy, once a student-athlete has graduated, a student-athlete who continues studies in undergraduate or graduate work while not enrolled in a degree-granting graduate program must earn the eligibility point, but retention will not be calculated. These student-athletes would be either “1/1” or “0/1.” Student-athletes accepted into and pursuing graduate degrees must earn both the eligibility and the retention point. These student-athletes’ APRs would be calculated out of two points (e.g., “2/2”).

The committee recognized that the change to the retention point policy holds institutions accountable for the academic progress of postgraduate student-athletes, as postgraduate student-athletes should be engaged academically and satisfy a minimum standard of academic performance. Further, the change best manages institutional accountability for the academic success of postgraduate student-athletes with the concern that changes to the policy may deter student-athletes from pursuing postgraduate work. The committee also noted that the change is expected to have a minimal impact on the national APR distribution.

Lastly, the committee encouraged the Council to consider that providing institutional aid to postgraduate student-athletes following exhaustion of eligibility results in increased retention of these student-athletes during the Council’s ongoing review of financial aid issues.

The policy change will coincide with the effective date of the legislative proposals on academic eligibility requirements for postgraduate students that will be considered by the Council at its April 2016 meeting for inclusion in the 2016-17 cycle, provided there are no modifications to the proposals. [See Informational Item No. 13a on reports of the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Data.]

4. **Use of Certificate Programs to Satisfy Progress-Toward-Degree Credit-Hour Requirements.** The committee continued its review of progress-toward-degree legislation to ensure the legislation provides sufficient flexibility for student-athletes to pursue an academic path that provides educational opportunities while earning degrees within five years. The committee recommended that the proposal the committee requested in October 2015 be sponsored by the Council for the 2016-17 cycle to permit credit hours earned toward institutionally approved voluntary or optional minors be used to satisfy credit-hour requirements be modified to also permit credit hours earned toward institutionally approved certificate programs to meet credit-hour requirements, provided the certificate program meets specific criteria. [Legislative Action Item No. 1c.]
5. **Initial-Eligibility Standards.** The committee received an update regarding the application of the new initial-eligibility standards, effective August 1, 2016, including feedback from an external association on these new standards. The committee recognized the efforts of the membership over multiple years to develop the new standards via the governance structure. The committee also reviewed the initial-eligibility process and discussed flexibility within the process. The committee noted the importance of data on the impact of the new standards. The committee will continue its review through the remainder of 2015-16 and 2016-17. [See Informational Item No. 15b on reports of the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics.]

6. **APR Transfer Adjustment Criteria.** The committee began an evaluation of the transfer adjustment criteria, reviewing data pertaining to the criteria and membership feedback. The committee requested the review of additional data to determine if changes to the criteria would be appropriate. This will entail work with the National Student Clearinghouse, an external entity. Although the review could conclude with no action taken, the committee could potentially take action at an upcoming meeting to modify the criteria based on the committee’s evaluation of the data. [See Informational Item No. 13b on reports of the Subcommittee on Data.]

7. **APP Penalty Waiver and Appeals Process.** As part of a comprehensive evaluation of the operational functions of the APP, at its June 23-24, 2015, meeting, the committee supported a targeted review of the APP penalty waiver and appeals process to ensure the process satisfies its intended purpose and identify potential enhancements to the process. Prior to the committee meeting, the Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals reviewed the process and recommended that the process be modified to provide the same process for all levels of penalties and to require institutional engagement throughout the process. The committee discussed the current process and recommended changes, establishing core tenants to guide further review. The committee agreed that the process could include appropriate appellate opportunities and presidential oversight without providing for an appeal to a subcommittee of the NCAA Division I Board of Directors. Committee review will continue at an upcoming meeting. [See Informational Item No. 14a on reports of the Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals.]

8. **APP Improvement Filters for LRIs.** In October 2015, on the recommendation of the HBCU/LRI Academic Advisory Group, the committee approved a continuation of the current improvement filter system for teams at LRIs with a multiyear APR below the 930 benchmark required to access postseason competition and avoid APP penalties with enhancements. Beginning with submission of 2015-16 APR data in the fall 2016, these teams may use the current improvement filters twice over the next five years and will be required to complete an APR Improvement Plan that meets enhanced criteria established by the committee. Educational programming will also be required when a team has a multiyear APR below 930. The committee refined the enhanced criteria for APR Improvement Plans. The enhanced criteria, which are based on recommendations by the HBCU/LRI Academic Advisory Group on consultation with the Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals, require increased presidential engagement in the development of APR Improvement Plans and better
demonstration from the institution as to how it will address critical issues and review progress on the plan. The committee also received an update on the operational plan for the required educational programming for teams with a multiyear APR below 930. The first phase of the educational programming will begin in fall 2016. The committee will receive regular updates on the progress and outcomes from the programming. [See Informational Item No. 14b on reports of the Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals.]

9. **Progress-Toward-Degree Credit-Hour Requirements Related to Concurrent Enrollment at Two Institutions.** The committee reviewed the July 13, 2015, official interpretation on use of concurrent enrollment courses to satisfy credit-hour requirements and progress-toward-degree legislation related to concurrent enrollment. On the recommendation of the Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics, the committee recommended that the Interpretations Committee review and archive the July 13, 2005, official interpretation and issue an official interpretation determining that the criteria for using traditional courses taken at another institution while enrolled full time at the certifying institution to satisfy progress-toward-degree credit-hour requirements be the same as the criteria set forth in Bylaw 14.4.3.5.3 for using nontraditional courses taken at another institution while enrolled full time at the certifying institution. [Nonlegislative Action Item.]

10. **Academically At-Risk Student-Athletes.** The committee reviewed a projected operational plan to respond to the board referral to address academically at-risk student-athletes. The committee also identified opportunities to move forward in its review with affiliated groups that work closely with academically at-risk students to assess best practices, successes, failures and data in addressing academically at-risk student-athletes. Committee review will be ongoing.

11. **Academic Metrics.** The committee reviewed a projected operational plan to respond to the board referral to determine whether the existing metrics effectively measure academic achievement and opportunities for campus-based metrics to account for differences across the membership. Committee review will be ongoing.

12. **Update on Changes to SAT in March 2016 and Response by NCAA.** In March 2016, the College Board will begin administering the redesigned SAT. The NCAA has regularly communicated with the College Board regarding the timeline for administration and potential impact of the redesigned SAT on the initial-eligibility certification process for prospective student-athletes. The committee reviewed editorial revisions to the freshman academic requirements legislation to clarify use of SAT scores earned on or after March 2016. Specifically, the editorial revisions provide that SAT scores earned on or after March 2016 will be evaluated based on the concordance established by the College Board. As the committee continues to receive additional information regarding the redesigned SAT, the committee will evaluate how the redesigned SAT may affect the predictive value of the test and how to account for those changes within initial-eligibility standards.

13. **Reports of the Subcommittee on Data.** The committee reviewed the reports of the October 22, 2015, meeting and the November 5, 2015, November 19, 2015, December 3, 2015,

a. **APR Retention Point Policy for Graduate Student-Athletes.** At its January 22, teleconference, the Subcommittee on Data examined three APR models developed to support academic accountability for postgraduate student-athletes that the committee identified for further review at its October 2015 meeting. As part of its examination, the subcommittee reviewed more detailed data regarding the impact each model would have on APRs and the national APR distribution. Additionally, the subcommittee reviewed membership feedback obtained through multiple teleconferences in December 2015 regarding the potential models. The subcommittee recommended that two models be further explored by the committee. [See Informational Item No. 3.]

b. **APR Transfer Adjustment Criteria.** At its January 22, teleconference, the subcommittee reviewed the APR transfer adjustment criteria as part of a routine evaluation of the criteria. The subcommittee examined data used to establish the current criteria. The subcommittee agreed that the adjustment should not be expanded in a way that would corrode the relationship between the APR and the Graduation Success Rate or necessitate the 930 penalty/postseason access cut score to be revisited. However, the subcommittee also noted potential opportunities to refine the adjustment criteria (e.g., use of quality-point analysis rather than simple grade-point average). The subcommittee requested additional data and membership feedback to determine if changes to the criteria would be appropriate. [See Informational Item No. 6.]

14. **Reports of the Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals.** The committee reviewed the report of the November 19, 2015, December 14, 2015, January 7, 2016 and January 21, 2016, teleconferences.

a. **APP Penalty Waiver and Appeals Process.** At its November 19, 2015, December 14, 2015, and January 7, 2016, teleconferences, the Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals reviewed the APP penalty waiver and appeals process. The subcommittee recommended the committee modify the APP penalty waiver and appeals process to provide the same process for all levels of penalties and to require institutional engagement throughout the process.

The subcommittee determined that having one penalty waiver and appeals process, regardless of the level of penalty, affirms the principle that the APP be straightforward and understandable and provides significant benefits to the membership. Specifically, the burden on institutions involved in the process will be reduced as the process will be more timely, simple and efficient. The modified process also enhances institutional engagement by providing an opportunity for an institution’s chancellor or president to be involved early in the process, which could assist in facilitating change and improvement at an institution-wide level. In
addition, one process allows for more nimble, thoughtful governance by providing additional opportunity for the committee to focus on the strategic academic governance issues while the subcommittee oversees and administers the appeals process. The subcommittee recognized that its recommended process would provide appropriate appellate opportunities for institutions. [See Informational Item No. 7.]

b. Educational Programming for LRIs Under New APP Improvement Filter System for LRIs. At its November 19, 2015, teleconference, the subcommittee discussed objectives and priorities for educational programming that will be required of teams with a multiyear APR below 930 under the new improvement filter system for LRIs. [See Informational Item No. 8.]

15. Reports of the Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics. The committee reviewed the reports of November 11, 2015, December 2, 2015, December 16, 2015, and January 20, 2016, teleconferences. Actions taken by the committee on the recommendation of the Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics are addressed in the action and informational items of this report. Such recommendations are not repeated in the following subcommittee updates.

a. Alternatives for Processing Progress-Toward-Degree Waiver Requests Related to Participation in Restrictive Degree Programs. At its December 2, 2015, teleconference, the subcommittee approved an alternative method to processing progress-toward-degree waiver requests involving student-athletes enrolled in restrictive degree programs (e.g., programs that require student-athletes to schedule degree applicable courses in a specific sequence or require the completion of prerequisite courses in order to progress in a degree program) in lieu of filing these requests with the NCAA national office. Under the alternative approved, a member institution will be required to submit a one-time waiver request involving an institutional degree program to the national office outlining why the degree program is restrictive. If the waiver is approved, the institution may waive credit-hour and percentage-of-degree deficiencies for individual student-athletes enrolled in the restrictive degree program, provided specific criteria are met.

At its December 16, 2015, teleconference, the subcommittee approved the waiver directive related to the alternative method for processing waivers involving participation in restrictive degree programs. The waiver directive will be effective July 1, 2016. The subcommittee noted the directive ensures the appropriate checks and balances are provided and that institutions would not be required to contact the national office once the one-time waiver involving the restrictive degree program is approved. The subcommittee will review procedures for filing waivers under the new method prior to July 1, 2016.

b. Initial-Eligibility Waiver Policy and Process. At its January 20, 2016, teleconference, the subcommittee reviewed the current initial-eligibility waiver policy and process in light of upcoming changes to initial-eligibility standards that will take effect August
1, 2016. The subcommittee reviewed the standards for providing waiver relief and discussed data related to the type and frequency of relief provided. The subcommittee also recognized that initial-eligibility waiver requests are frequently at least partially approved for athletics aid and the committee should explore potential deregulation in this area, noting that practice and competition waiver review have different thresholds for relief and flexibility. [Informational Item No. 5.]

c. National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics Feedback Related to Legislative Proposals on Postgraduate Academic Eligibility Requirements Recommended by Committee on Academics. At its January 20, 2016, teleconference, the subcommittee reviewed feedback provided by the N4A on the legislative proposals recommended by the committee for inclusion in the 2016-17 cycle that would enhance existing academic eligibility standards for graduate and post-baccalaureate student-athletes to engender a more meaningful academic experience for these student-athletes. The subcommittee noted the importance of continued communication and collaboration with the N4A. The subcommittee will continue to review concepts proposed by the N4A and could recommend enhancements to the proposals in light of these concepts.

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

17. **Research Update.** The committee reviewed the findings from the 2015 Growth, Opportunities, Aspirations and Learning of Students in College Study (GOALS) of the student-athlete experience, including on student-athlete time commitments and academic experience.

18. **Academic Technology Update.** The committee received an update on the development of an academic portal, which will bring all APP processes under one umbrella. The membership will have opportunities to learn how to use the portal during the 2016 NCAA Regional Rules Seminars in May and June. The portal is scheduled to be released to the membership during summer 2016.

19. **Review of Two-Year Strategic Priority List.** The committee reviewed its strategic priorities for the 2015-16 and 2016-17 academic years. The committee developed the priorities in an effort to provide more transparency and accountability to the membership.

20. **Board of Directors Update.** The committee received an update on key items from the board’s October 29, 2015, and January 14, 2016, meetings.

21. **Presidential Forum Update.** The committee received an update on key items from the forum’s October 28, 2015, and January 13, 2016, meetings.

22. **Council Update.** The committee received an update on key items from the Council’s January 13, 2016, meeting.
23. **Review of Reports of the Committee on Academics.** The committee reviewed and approved the full report of the October 20-21, 2015, meeting and the strategic report of the October 20-21, 2015, meeting to the board.

24. **Priority Future Agenda Items.** The following items have been identified as priority items for the committee:
   
   a. Review developments on Proposal No. 2015-66 – Academic Misconduct, including feedback from governance structure and membership, and education provided to membership on application of the proposal;
   
   b. Continue review of initial-eligibility standards and waiver process;
   
   c. Continue review of APP penalty waiver and appeals process;
   
   d. Review “unusable data” designation used during an APP data review as part of evaluation of operational functions of APP;
   
   e. Continue review of APR transfer adjustment criteria;
   
   f. Continue response to board referrals on academically at-risk student-athletes and effective measurement of academic achievement.

25. **Future Meeting Dates.**
   
   a. April 18-20 – Indianapolis;
   
   b. June 20-21 – Indianapolis;
   
   c. October 10-11 – Indianapolis;
   
   d. February 2-3, 2017 – Indianapolis;
   
   e. April 18-20 – Indianapolis;
   
   f. June 20-21 – Indianapolis; and
   
   g. October 16-17 – Indianapolis.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roderick McDavis, Ohio University; Mid-American Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Messina, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Conference USA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renae Myles, Alabama A&amp;M University; Southwestern Athletic Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail Stefanides, Lafayette College; Patriot League.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Yeager, Colonial Athletic Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Zorn, Indiana University, Bloomington; Big Ten Conference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Absentees:** |
| None. |

| **Guests in Attendance:** |
| Maria Collier (court reporter). |

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

| **Other NCAA Staff Members in Attendance:** |
| Lydia Bell, Emily Capehart, Andy Cardamone (via teleconference), Amanda Conklin, Greg Dana, Gary deCastro, Diane Dickman, Bernard Franklin, Jenn Fraser, Judy Gauer, Stephanie Grace, Doug Healey, Michelle Hosick, Ken Kleppel, Kevin Lennon, Todd Leyden, Andy Louthain, Oliver Luck, Binh Nguyen, Tom Paskus, Susan Peal, Todd Petr, Bill Regan, Brad Rochman, Anne Rohlman, Dave Schnase, Naima Stevenson, Kathy Sulentic, Katy Yurk, Quintin Wright. |