KEY ITEMS.

1. NCAA Division I Council Transfer Working Group Referral. The NCAA Division I Committee on Academics continued its discussion of the referrals from the NCAA Division I Council Transfer Working Group. Specifically, the committee reviewed and provided feedback to the Transfer Working Group on the academic component of the uniform concept under development and the effective date for any modified transfer eligibility rule for four-year college transfer student-athletes. The committee also brainstormed ways in which the NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate could be used to foster greater accountability in transfer decisions. [Action Item No. 2 and Informational Item No. 1]

2. Review Phase One Implementation 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., "academic unit"). Specifically, the committee approved requested policy recommendations to address operational issues related to the academic unit and provided feedback on the mock academic-unit eligibility reports to be distributed to the membership in spring 2018. [Informational Item No. 2]

3. 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 modernization efforts. The committee supported the subcommittee's preferred model for modifying the existing progress-toward-degree requirements. [Informational Item No. 3]

4. Definition of Limited-Resource Institution within the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program. The committee received an update on the calculation used to annually determine what Division I institutions are limited resource for purposes of the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program. The committee began to discuss whether the current calculation continues to best identify those institutions with the lowest resources in Division I. The committee will return to this discussion at its April meeting. [Informational Item No. 4]

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items for the NCAA Division I Council.
   a. Noncontroversial Legislation – Academic Eligibility – Eligibility for Competition – Fulfillment of Credit-Hour Requirements – Hours Earned or Accepted Toward a Minor.
(1) **Recommendation.** To allow credit hours earned or accepted toward a minor, including a voluntary or optional minor, to be used to satisfy progress-toward-degree credit-hour requirements provided the minor is designated prior to the conclusion of the first five days of classes of the applicable term.

(2) **Effective Date.** August 1, 2018.

(3) **Rationale.** Under the recently adopted legislation, student-athletes must designate an optional or voluntary minor by the start of the term for the credits from those courses to be used to meet progress-toward-degree credit-hour requirements. However, in many cases student-athletes are still finalizing their schedules during the first week of class. Additionally, institutional processing may impact the ability for the minor to be officially designated by the start of the term. Allowing limited flexibility in designating minors during the first week of class accounts for these realities without jeopardizing the intent of requiring designation to occur at the outset of the term.

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

(5) **Student-Athlete Impact.** Student-athletes will be given additional flexibility early in the term to create a schedule that allows them to pursue their academic interests while still meeting the progress-toward-degree requirements.

b. **Noncontroversial Legislation – Academic Eligibility – Eligibility for Competition – Fulfillment of Credit-Hour Requirements – Hours Earned or Accepted Toward an Undergraduate Certificate Program.**

(1) **Recommendation.** To allow credit hours earned or accepted toward an undergraduate certificate program to be used to satisfy progress-toward-degree credit-hour requirements provided the program is designated prior to the conclusion of the first five days of classes of the applicable term.

(2) **Effective Date.** August 1, 2018.

(3) **Rationale.** Under the recently adopted legislation, student-athletes must designate an undergraduate certificate program by the start of the term for the credits from those courses to be used to meet progress-toward-degree credit-hour requirements. However, in many cases student-athletes are still finalizing their schedules during the first week of class. Additionally, institutional processing may impact the ability for the minor to be officially designated by the start of the term. Allowing limited flexibility in
designating minors during the first week of class accounts for these realities without jeopardizing the intent of requiring designation to occur at the outset of the term.

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

(5) **Student-Athlete Impact.** Student-athletes will be given additional flexibility early in the term to create a schedule that allows them to pursue their academic interests while still meeting the progress-toward-degree requirements.

c. **Academic Eligibility – Full-Time Enrollment – Requirement for Competition – Exceptions – Final Semester/Quarter.**

(1) **Recommendation.** To allow student-athletes to practice and compete while enrolled less than full time in their final term if the student-athlete has completed all degree requirements and is enrolled in all credits needed to complete an optional or voluntary minor or undergraduate certificate program at the end of the term and they did not use the final term exception previously. The optional minor or certificate program must be designated in accordance with institutional policy prior to the beginning of the final term.

(2) **Effective Date.** August 1, 2018.

(3) **Rationale.** Currently, student-athletes who have completed all degree requirements but have not graduated must remain enrolled full time during the next term to practice and compete. Allowing student-athletes to be enrolled in only the credits remaining toward a designated minor or undergraduate certificate during their final term will provide some flexibility for student-athletes who have achieved the goal of completing their baccalaureate degree and are continuing to better prepare themselves for their future. Student-athletes not on a full scholarship could also see a financial benefit.

(4) **Estimated Budget Impact.** A reduction in tuition fees for a student-athlete or athletics department.

(5) **Student-Athlete Impact.** Student-athletes will not have to be enrolled full time in courses that do not help them achieve a degree, minor or certificate during their final term of enrollment.
2. **Nonlegislative Items.**

   a. **Referral Feedback for the Transfer Working Group.** The committee provided the requested feedback to the Transfer Working Group regarding an academic-based four-year college transfer concept and effective date considerations. The feedback aligns with and reinforces the committee's previously identified recommendations and observations related to Division I four-year transfer student-athletes [Attachment].

   (1) **Academic Component of Transfer Working Group Concept.** The committee reviewed the data analyses conducted to inform the transfer concepts currently under consideration. Utilizing the updated analyses, the committee discussed what specific academic benchmarks could be used to establish a predictive and academically sound basis for setting aside the year in residence following transfer.

   While the committee considered whether all student-athletes should serve a year in residence following transfer, the committee ultimately noted the lack of academic data to support treating transfer students differently based on sport rather than academic record if graduation remains a paramount goal of reforming Division I transfer rules. While the default year-in-residence rule considers the impact that transfer has on average, there is no evidence that it is academically necessary for all student-athletes to sit out a year of competition following transfer. As a result, the committee did not support a uniform approach that requires all student-athletes to serve a year in residence following transfer.

   The committee recommended that like other NCAA eligibility rules, a student-athlete's academic record be considered to help determine whether a student-athlete may compete following transfer without serving a year in residence. Specifically, the committee agreed 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 noted the correlation between a student-athlete's cumulative grade-point average and subsequent percentage of degree at the institution to which he or she transfers. Specifically, the higher the student-athlete's cumulative grade-point average, the greater likelihood that more of the student's earned credit would transfer and be degree-applicable at the transfer institution. On average, student-athletes who transfer with grade-point averages of 3.000 or higher have graduation rates that are comparable to the typical student-athlete who does not transfer. The committee explored holding transfers to a four-year graduation path, but noted the unintended academic
consequences of this approach, including pushing student-athletes into undesirable degree programs, which poses its own graduation risk.

(2) **Effective Date of Transfer Working Group Concept.** The committee discussed how the effective date for a new uniform transfer standard should contemplate the existing transfer rules. Specifically, the effective date should consider how a new uniform transfer eligibility rule would impact all Division I student-athletes, including those student-athletes who participate in sports with access to the existing one-time transfer exception.

The committee recommended an effective date approach that would both allow the new uniform rule to become available following adoption and maintain the existing one-time transfer rule for an additional two academic years. The committee agreed that allowing the two rules to coexist for two academic years would provide both appropriate access to any new transfer rule, while also ensuring adequate time for current student-athletes operating under the existing one-time transfer rule to adjust to a new standard. The committee noted that two academic years aligns with the general period of time during which the majority of undergraduate student-athletes make transfer decisions (e.g., prior to junior year). The committee agreed that a phase-out period of time of the existing one-time transfer rule beyond two academic years would not be beneficial to the membership and may cause confusion and implementation difficulties.

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.**

1. **Transfer Working Group.** In addition to the committee's requested feedback to the Transfer Working Group on the academic component of uniform transfer concept and effective date considerations, the committee began brainstorming how the APR might be used to foster greater accountability in transfer-related decisions. Specifically, the committee examined ways in which the metric may be used to increase the accountability of an institution that receives a transfer student-athlete. The committee will continue this discussion at its April in-person meeting.

2. **Review Phase One Implementation of Academic-Based Revenue Distribution and Related Operational Issues.** In October 2016, the NCAA Division I Board of Directors and NCAA Board of Governors approved an initiative to distribute a portion of Division I revenue to conferences based on the academic achievement of student-athletes beginning with the 2019-20 academic year, using a portion of the annual growth in future years of the NCAA's media rights agreement for distribution. The committee is responsible for overseeing activation of distribution and monitoring the metrics upon which distribution is based. Institutions earn academic-distribution units for their conferences by meeting one of three criteria:
a. Institutional APR from the previous year equal to or greater than 985; or

b. Institutional Graduation Success Rate from the most recently available year equal to or greater than 90 percent; or

c. Difference between student-athlete and student-body rates for the most recently published Federal Graduation Rate equal to or greater than 13 percentage points.

The committee received an update on the status of implementation of the distribution, including work completed by staff to educate and communicate with the membership in response to the direction provided by the committee. The committee was provided with a sample report and feedback was gathered. The committee also resolved multiple operational items related to implementation of distribution, including determining that:

a. Indoor and outdoor track be treated as a combined sport for purposes of determining the eligibility calculation for the academic unit; and

b. All sports sponsored by the institution, even those not sponsored by the conference, be included in the eligibility calculation for the academic unit.

The committee agreed that treating indoor and outdoor track as a combined sport and including all sports sponsored by an institution in an institution's eligibility determination for the academic unit, aligns with current APP policies and procedures used for calculating the APR and the GSR.

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. [See subcommittee discussion at Informational Item No. 9]

3. Progress-Toward-Degree Review. The committee received an update on the Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics' review of the existing Division I progress-toward-degree requirements. The subcommittee provided the committee with an overview of the models under consideration and shared feedback provided by the National Association for Academic Advisors of Athletics Board during its January meeting. The subcommittee noted its preference for a model that removes degree applicability for a student-athlete's 18-hour requirement after the start of their third year of collegiate enrollment but maintains all other progress-toward-degree requirements. Specifically, a student-athlete would still need to earn degree-applicable credit to satisfy the six-hour rule for regular academic term progress and postseason eligibility. The subcommittee notes this model may best achieve the desired flexibility and reduction in institutional advising burden, without jeopardizing a student-athlete's degree progress or baseline academic performance during the regular academic year. The subcommittee noted the initial support of the N4A Board for this potential model. The subcommittee will continue to refine this
model and bring a potential legislative concept for committee consideration in April. [See subcommittee discussion at Informational Item No. 10]

4. **Definition of LRI within the APP.** The committee began to review the calculation used to annually determine what Division I institutions are considered limited resource for purposes of the APP. Specifically, the committee discussed whether the current calculation continues to best identify those institutions with the lowest resources in Division I. Institutions who meet the current limited resource definition for purposes of the APP have access to filters designed to support them in reaching the APR benchmark.

The current calculation incorporates an institution's per capita spending on all students, per capita spending on all student-athletes and the number of Pell Grant recipients at the institution. The committee discussed how changes in institutional enrollment patterns have impacted how certain institutions are identified as limited resource under the current calculation metric. The committee will continue its assessment of the current calculation in April.

5. **NCAA Accelerating Academic Success Program Update.** The committee received an update on the NCAA Accelerating Academic Success Program, including a summary of the outcomes for those institutions who were in the first two classes of grant recipients. The committee noted that in the aggregate, a majority of schools that received funding have increased their APRs. Additionally, feedback indicates that student-athletes exposed to summer school and leadership training for the first time because of the grant funding reported higher levels of self-confidence, and coaches have found recruiting easier because of the academic resources devoted to student-athletes.

6. **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 provided feedback on the suggested format, timing and areas of focus for the summit. The committee has continued to engage former and current leaders in higher education to formulate the strategic focus of the summit. The committee discussed how to approach some of the broad issues facing higher education through the lens of intercollegiate athletics. For example, discussions around issues around mental health and its relation to the student-athlete experience. The committee will continue to refine its approach and development of a 2019 academic summit at its April in-person meeting.

7. **Modification to the Calculation of the GSR for Student-Athletes Who Depart an Institution Academically Eligible to Pursue Professional Athletics.** The committee approved a recommendation from the Subcommittee on Data to amend the calculation of the GSR as it pertains to student-athletes who leave an institution eligible and return within the six-year window allowed for graduation by the GSR. Specifically, a student-athlete who departs an institution academically eligible to pursue professional athletics as a vocation will no longer re-enter the cohort if he or she returns to the institution (full or part time) prior to the end of the six-year window for graduation. The committee noted this
policy modification will eliminate the potential disincentive to bring back former student-athletes within their original six-year graduation window. The change to the GSR calculation will be effective immediately, with the submission of the GSR data due June 1, 2018, and beyond and retroactive to the current four-year cohort. [See subcommittee discussion at Informational Item No. 9]

8. **Commission on College Basketball Request.** The committee received an update from the Commission on College Basketball and discussed the February 6 request for feedback on issues identified in the commission's charter. The committee discussed the commission's areas of focus and will provide feedback on behalf of the committee prior to the March 14 deadline.

9. **Academic Integrity.** The committee received an update from the NCAA enforcement staff's academic integrity unit on academic integrity trends, including a recently published resource that provides Division I institutions with membership-developed best practices regarding academic integrity issues. The committee also discussed case studies developed to highlight the amendments made to Division I academic integrity legislation in 2016.

10. **Update on NCAA Response to SAT and Technical Advisory Panel.** The committee received an update on the NCAA response to the redesigned SAT. The Technical Advisory Panel, comprised of representatives from member institutions and external organizations (e.g., ACT, the College Board and Educational Testing Service) and endorsed by the committee to review the redesigned SAT (e.g., concorded values to prior version, predictive validity, impact on student-athlete subgroups and concordance to ACT) is waiting for a complete cycle of data on the results of the redesigned SAT before continuing its review. There is no change to the desired outcome of a revised national concordance. The NCAA will concurrently conduct its own test-score validity study, as recommended by the ACT, the College Board and panel, which could result in separate sliding scales for the ACT and SAT.

11. **Report from the Subcommittee on Data.** The committee reviewed the reports of the October 19, November 16 and November 30, 2017, and January 10 and February 7 teleconferences of the Subcommittee on Data.

   a. **Review of Operational Issues Related to Implementation of Academics-Based Revenue Distribution.** At its October 19, 2017, and February 7 teleconferences, the subcommittee addressed several operational issues related to activation of distribution. The subcommittee recommended committee action on multiple operational items, including determining that:

      (1) Indoor and outdoor track be treated as a combined sport for purposes of determining the eligibility calculation for the academic unit; and
All sports sponsored by the institution, even those not sponsored by the conference, be included in the eligibility calculation for the academic unit. [See committee discussion at Information Item No. 2]

b. Good Academic Standing Policy. At its November 16, 2017, teleconference, the subcommittee discussed the APP policy regarding academic eligibility requirements and specifically application of the data field "Is this student-athlete academically eligible to compete the next regular academic term?" The subcommittee would like to revisit this discussion on a future teleconference.

c. Review of GSR Policies and Procedures. At its January 10 and February 7 teleconferences, the subcommittee discussed the calculation of GSR for student-athletes who depart their institutions academically eligible and return within six years of initial full-time collegiate enrollment. The current GSR policy treats student-athletes who return (as either part-time or full-time students) but do not graduate within six years as academic failures, even if they are working toward a degree. The subcommittee noted this policy may discourage institutions from bringing back former student-athletes to complete their degrees or wait until the six-year window to graduate has elapsed. The subcommittee recommended the committee amend the calculation of the GSR to address this limited scenario. [See committee discussion at Informational Item No. 5]

d. APP Data Reviews. At its January 10 teleconference, the subcommittee received an update regarding the upcoming APP data review season. The 2018 data review season will begin January 22 and will include a review of 35 member institutions.

12. Report from the Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics. The committee reviewed the reports of the October 20, November 17 and December 15, 2017, and February 2 teleconferences of the Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics.

a. Proposed Legislation. At its October 20 and November 17, 2017, teleconferences, the subcommittee recommended the committee ask the Council to introduce two noncontroversial legislative proposals and one legislative proposal for the 2018-19 legislative cycle. All three proposals pertain to the use of credit towards optional or voluntary minors and undergraduate certificate programs to meet progress-toward-degree credit-hour requirements and full-time enrollment requirements. [See committee action at Action Item No. 1]

b. Division I Bylaw Modernization Project. At its December 15, 2017, teleconference, the subcommittee received an update on the progress of the NCAA Bylaw 14 modernization efforts. Specifically, the subcommittee reviewed the efforts to editorially refresh the legislative language for improved clarity and accessibility, in conjunction with the focus on identifying how to substantively
modernize the rules to better support the needs and realities of current Division I student-athletes.

c. **Review of Progress-Toward-Degree Requirements.** At its October 20, November 17 and December 15, 2017, and February 2 teleconferences, the subcommittee continued its comprehensive review of existing progress-toward-degree requirements. Over the course of its discussions, the subcommittee narrowed its preference to a couple of models based on feedback from the N4A Board. [See committee discussion at Informational Item No. 3]

13. **Report from the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals.** The committee received a report from the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals.

14. **Update on Educational Programming and Initiatives for LRIs.** The committee received an update on the educational programming and technology designed to assist institutions in academic certification efforts on campus. Specifically, online modules outlining Division I academic eligibility rules and highlighting best practices for the certification of student-athletes will be made available to the membership in summer 2018.

15. **Academic Technology Update.** The committee received an update on development of the Academic Portal, which will bring all APP processes under one umbrella and impact all three divisions. The first phase (APP and NCAA Division II Academic Tracking System data collection) was released to the membership in August 2016. The second phase (membership-wide graduation rates data collection) was released to the membership in March 2017. The final phase (APR Improvement Plan and data review processing) is scheduled to be released in the summer 2018.

16. **2017-18 Council-Governance Legislative Proposals.** The committee received an update on the NCAA Division I Legislative Committee's preliminary positions on the proposals in the 2017-18 Council-governance legislative cycle scheduled for consideration in April.

17. **Research Update.** The committee received an update from the NCAA research staff on current initiatives.

18. **Board of Directors Update.** The committee received a report from the Board's October 24, 2017, and January 18 meetings, including a summary of potential strategic areas of emphasis for Division I, to be developed in consultation with the NCAA Division I Presidential Forum.

19. **Presidential Forum.** The committee received a report from the Presidential Forum's October 23-24, 2017, and January 17 meetings, including a summary of potential strategic areas of emphasis for Division I, to be developed in consultation with the Board.
20. **Council.** The committee received a report from the Council's January 16-17 meeting.

21. **NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Update.** The committee received a report from the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee's January 17-19 meeting.

22. **Reports of the Committee on Academics' October 17-18, 2017, Meeting and January 9 and February 5 Teleconferences.** The Committee on Academics reviewed the reports from its October 17-18, 2017, meeting and January 9 and February 5 teleconferences.

23. **Future Meeting Dates.**

   a. April 9-10 – Indianapolis;
   
   b. June 18-19 – Indianapolis;
   
   c. October 9-10 – Indianapolis; and
   
   d. February 5-6, 2019 – Indianapolis.

---
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The NCAA Division I Committee on Academics discussed the referral from the NCAA Division I Council Transfer Working Group regarding possible academic standards for Division I four-year transfer student-athletes for immediate eligibility upon transfer.

The following are the committee’s recommendations and observations based on available academic data and research.

- **Academic Record.** 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. Data driven information related to the prediction of academic success of student-athletes upon transfer is not specific to any particular sport and therefore the approach to eligibility should be uniformly based in academics across all sports. At other junctures during a student-athlete’s collegiate participation (e.g., freshman year, transfer from a two-year college) a student-athlete’s academic record informs a student’s eligibility to immediately compete.

- **Transfer Standards and Four-Year Graduates.** Given the desire among many undergraduate student-athletes to graduate in four years or less and institutional policies that encourage a four-year graduation track, requiring academically prepared and capable students to sit out a year of competition simply because they transferred is not appropriate nor supported by available data, as it will likely extend their undergraduate enrollment beyond four years. An athletics-based approach to undergraduate transfer eligibility may financially disadvantage certain student-athletes and institutions and unnecessarily delay a student-athlete’s academic and career progress.

- **Academic Record Impacts Graduation Timeline Following Transfer.** Transferring to a Division I school presents challenges for all student-athletes, including acclimatization to a new school, new team and new curriculum. Sometimes a new degree will be pursued at the new institution. These challenges are pronounced when the student’s academic record at the previous institution is such that fewer credits transfer to the new school and/or degree program; thus, placing the student behind in his or her degree program and often behind other student-athletes with the same seasons of eligibility remaining. Conversely, a strong academic foundation at the previous institution is shown to mitigate the impact of transfer on a student’s degree progression following transfer.

- **Academic Standards for Undergraduate Transfers.** While transferring generally impacts a student’s graduation timeline, students with an “above average” academic performance at their original four-year school (e.g., a ‘B’ or better in majority of coursework) are better positioned to remain academically on track to graduate following transfer to a new four-year institution. To that end, the academic standards a student-athlete would need to meet to qualify for a transfer exception should be of “above average” rigor. Such standards will better identify those student-athletes who are academically ready for the challenge of competing while adjusting academically to the new institution.
“above average” standard should be determined by a combination of grade-point average at the previous institution and a specified percentage of degree attainment at the new institution. Additionally, since an enrollment gap is a significant graduation risk factor, the academic standards should ensure continuous enrollment occurs for a transfer student to be immediately eligible for competition.

- **Timing of Transfer.** Degree requirements and progress-toward-degree standards require more upper-level course work to be taken in the junior and senior years of college and institutional policies often require a certain number of credits to be taken in residence. As a result, establishing higher academic standards for transfer students who enroll junior year or later to better align graduation with a student-athlete’s exhaustion of eligibility may be a reasonable approach.

- **Impact of Academic-Based Standards.** Current student-athletes in the sports of football, basketball, baseball and men’s ice hockey are not permitted to compete immediately upon transfer, absent limited extenuating circumstances (e.g., the discontinuation of a sport), regardless of the student-athlete’s academic record. An academic-based transfer exception would establish a uniform opportunity for student-athletes who meet the “above average” academic standards that predict academic success following transfer to be immediately eligible to compete regardless of the sport. Academic-based requirements would inform which student-athletes, who based on academic performance are equally predicted to achieve academic success upon transfer, have the opportunity to be immediately eligible to compete. Those student-athletes who do not achieve the academic standards to immediately compete still have the ability to practice and receive athletics aid during their academic year in residence at the new institution.

- **Campus Application of New Standard.** There is recognition that any new transfer benchmarks for immediate eligibility should be relatively easy to evaluate and to apply by practitioners. A burdensome process – either on the leaving or the receiving institution – may cause unintended delays that may detrimentally impact the student-athlete’s academic progress in the end. An academic graduation plan developed by the new institution may further assist student-athletes in making informed transfer-based decisions and demonstrate the new institution’s commitment to the student-athlete’s continued academic progress towards graduation.

*Note: The principles identified by the NCAA Division I Presidential Forum and legislative concepts being considered related to early recruiting hold promise as to improved decision-making of students and schools that may assist in the transfer environment after initial collegiate enrollment.*