REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE
JULY 15-16, 2015, MEETING

KEY ITEMS.

- None.

ACTION ITEMS.

- Legislative Items.

  o Recommendations to the NCAA Division I Strategic Vision and Planning Committee.

    a. The NCAA Division I Committee on Institutional Performance referred the NCAA Division I Institutional Performance Program (IPP) health and safety survey instrument to the Strategic Vision and Planning Committee for further discussion and action. The committee believes this survey is important and asks the Strategic Vision and Planning Committee to consider adopting legislation to require the survey, determine its frequency and decide where in the NCAA Division I governance structure it should be reviewed.

    b. The committee referred the NCAA Division I IPP student-athlete experience survey instrument to the Strategic Vision and Planning Committee for further discussion and action. The committee believes this survey is important and asks the Strategic Vision and Planning Committee to consider adopting legislation to require the survey, determine its frequency and decide where in the NCAA Division I governance structure it should be reviewed. Further, the committee believes that the data from the survey would provide institutions important information to enhance the experience for the student-athlete.

    c. The committee referred the question of whether or not a rules compliance review should be required for all Division I schools to the Strategic Vision and Planning Committee. Further, the committee agreed that a rules compliance review is needed regardless if NCAA Division I Council required it or not.

    d. The committee referred the concept of an academic support services evaluation to the Strategic Vision and Planning Committee or other appropriate entity for further discussion and action.
INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. Review the Committee’s April 27, 2015, Teleconference Report. The committee reviewed and approved its April 27 teleconference report and took no further action.


3. Governance Structure Update. The committee received an update on the governance structure and discussed the Division I Strategic Summit scheduled for August 4-5 and the possible impact of the Summit on the work of the Strategic Vision and Planning Committee and the committee.

4. IPP Access Requests. The committee determined access to the NCAA Division I IPP data management system for conference office personnel be limited to the data of conference member institutions, with the provision that institutions can deny access to their data. The committee requested the staff develop a process and timeline for conference offices.

5. Rules Compliance Reviews. The committee noted it is important for chancellors and presidents to be aware that rules compliance is a campus-wide responsibility requiring strong processes and regular review. To that end, the committee determined a regular review of rules compliance designed to help schools improve is essential to the success of athletics departments, and is a gap not currently served by IPP that was part of the former athletics certification program.

The committee agreed to continue to work with professional organizations [i.e., National Association for Athletics Compliance (NAAC)] to develop a rules compliance review instrument that affords flexibility to change the depth and breadth of a review on an institution-by-institution basis. The committee referred the idea of a requirement and/or best practice to the Strategic Vision and Planning Committee and Council to determine whether the review should be required or a best practice.


NCAA Division I Committee on Institutional Performance Student-Athlete Experience.

a. The student-athlete experience subcommittee recommended the health and safety survey instrument to the Strategic Vision and Planning Committee for further discussion and action. The subcommittee believes this survey is critically important and asked the Strategic Vision and Planning Committee to consider adopting legislation to require the survey, determine its frequency and decide
where in the governance structure it should be housed. This recommendation was also supported by the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) and the NCAA Sport Science Institute.

b. The subcommittee recommended the student-athlete experience survey instrument to the Strategic Vision and Planning Committee for further discussion. The subcommittee feels strongly this data be collected to improve the student-athlete experience.

c. Surveys. SAAC supported the student-athlete experience and health and safety surveys presented by the committee and made the following recommendations:

(1) Require the health and safety survey be mandatory for athletic trainers;

(2) Share collected data from both surveys with student-athletes;

(3) Include questions in the student-athlete experience survey related to recruiting and pre-enrollment activities, as well as post-enrollment activities and career development;

(4) Require institutions to develop action plans regarding substantiated issues raised by respondents; and

(5) Provide the NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Experience Committee the opportunity to review and comment on the survey.

NCAA Division I Committee on Institutional Performance Inclusion.

- The inclusion subcommittee discussed the process and potential timeline for receiving information regarding the use of feedback received from institutions that have volunteered to conduct the inclusion review.

NCAA Division I Committee on Institutional Performance Academics.

a. Academic Data Indicators. The academics subcommittee requests the NCAA research staff and NCAA Division I Committee on Academics consider the following data points in addition to the reported grade-point averages (GPA).

(1) Average term GPA for each team.

(2) Average cumulative GPA each term for each team.
The committee believes this would bring the data in line with state and federal reporting.

b. Quarterly Reporting. The subcommittee recommended that it receive quarterly reports of how the membership is using academic related data. The subcommittee agreed that for the first year it will review quarterly and assess thereafter.

c. Collection Additional Data Points. The committee does not recommend gathering additional data points in the area of major clustering and special admissions. The committee believes that best practices should be developed with regard to the issue.

d. Academic Support Services Evaluation. The subcommittee referred the concept of an academic support services evaluation to the Strategic Vision and Planning Committee or any other entity for further discussion and action.

NCAA Division I Committee on Institutional Performance Fiscal Management.

a. The fiscal management subcommittee confirmed its best practices suggestions from its last meeting, including empowering “super users” on campus who can train others at the institution on the intricacies of the IPP data management system.

b. The subcommittee will continue to create case studies as the feedback has indicated institutions have been very receptive of the three case studies created as part of the IPP education modules.

7. Deliberations. The committee deliberated and voted on the issues for the evaluation visit for one reclassifying institution in the self-study process pursuant to NCAA Division I Bylaw 20.5.2.5.4 (requesting reclassification – fourth year).

- Northern Kentucky University.

The committee also approved an outside consultant request for the area of gender issues from the University of Massachusetts Lowell as it prepares its self-study report during the 2015-16 academic year. Additionally, the committee voted to no longer require a formal written request from any reclassifying institution that wishes to engage an outside consultant with the caveat the institution disclose at the beginning of the process, its intent to do so and clearly explain in the self-study report the role of its outside consultant(s).
8. **Future Plan for IPP.** The committee discussed next steps for ensuring the IPP data management system is shared with institutional chancellors, presidents and other administrators charged with oversight of intercollegiate athletics, consistent with the legislated duties of the committee. Specifically, the committee discussed any items that need to be completed prior to the transition from development to support of the IPP data management system. Additionally, the committee noted during the next three years, the focus will be on helping the membership use the IPP data management system. (Attachment)

9. **Review of Future Meeting Dates and Sites.**

- February 24-25, 2016: Indianapolis
Committee Chair: President Emeritus Joanne Glasser, Bradley University

Staff Liaisons: Troy L. Arthur, academic and membership affairs
Stephen J. Clar, academic and membership affairs
Mira J. Zimmerman, academic and membership affairs

| NCAA Division I Committee on Institutional Performance July 15-16, 2015, meeting |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| **Attendees**                   | **Absentees**                   |
| John R. Broderick, Old Dominion University | Janet Cone, University of North Carolina, Asheville |
| Beth DeBauche, Ohio Valley Conference | Gabriel Esteban, Seton Hall University |
| David DeCenzo, Coastal Carolina University | Nicki Moore, University of Oklahoma |
| Rich Ensor, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference | Tracey Flynn, Quinnipiac University |
| Joanne Glasser, Bradley University, chair |                                      |
| Angela (A.J.) Grube, Western Carolina University |                                      |
| Dianne Harrison, California State University, Northridge |                                      |
| Chris Hawthorne, University of Minnesota |                                      |
| George Haynes, Montana State University, Bozeman |                                      |
| Nina King, Duke University |                                      |
| Gary Overton, East Carolina University |                                      |
| Patrick Papin, San Diego State University |                                      |
| Angie Petrovic, University of Dayton |                                      |
| Tricia Turley Brandenburg, Towson University |                                      |
| C. Kurt Zorn, Indiana University |                                      |

NCAA Staff
Troy Arthur, Stephen Clar, Kevin Lennon, Keke Liu, Matt Maher, Abbie Markey, Todd Petr, Jenn Samble, Dave Schnase and Mira Zimmerman.

Additional Participants
None