KEY ITEMS.

1. **Review of NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate Retention-Point Policy for Postgraduate Student-Athletes.** The NCAA Division I Committee on Academics completed a multi-meeting review of the APR retention-point policy for postgraduate student-athletes. The committee agreed to modify the policy to remove the retention point from the calculation of the APR for postgraduate student-athletes. After the meeting, the committee received a referral from the NCAA Division I Council Transfer Working Group requesting the committee assess the academic impact of the existing rules and policies surrounding Division I transfer eligibility for both undergraduate and postgraduate student-athletes. In response to the referral, the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Administrative Committee conducted a teleconference on July 10 and tabled the policy change to allow the Committee on Academics an opportunity to review and respond to the referral from the working group before the policy change took effect. [Informational Item No. 1.]

2. **Review of Implementation of Academics-Based Revenue Distribution.** In October 2016, the NCAA Division I Board of Directors and NCAA Board of Governors delegated authority to the Committee on Academics to oversee activation of academics-based revenue distribution and monitor the metrics upon which distribution is based. The committee received an update on the status of distribution and resolved multiple operational issues related to activation of distribution. [Informational Item No. 2.]

3. **Update on Certifications Under New Initial-Eligibility Standards.** The committee received an update on initial-eligibility certifications under the new standards. Preliminary data continues to show a minimal change in the percentage of prospective student-athletes eligible to compete after student-athletes are certified and receive initial-eligibility waivers. [Informational Item No. 8.]

4. **Update on Educational Initiatives for Limited-Resource Institutions.** The committee received an update on the development of educational programming for LRIs. [Informational Item No. 10.]

ACTION ITEMS.

1. **Legislative Items.**
   - None.

2. **Nonlegislative Items.**
   - None.
INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. Review of APR Retention-Point Policy for Postgraduate Student-Athletes. In response to an NCAA Division I Council referral to review NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program policy for postgraduate student-athletes, the committee completed its multi-meeting review of the APR retention-point policy for postgraduate student-athletes. Under current policy, once a student-athlete graduates, the student-athlete is automatically awarded the retention point for any subsequent terms of enrollment, even if not retained. The eligibility point is earned if the student-athlete is academically eligible to compete in the next regular term.

The committee agreed to modify the policy to remove the retention point from the calculation of the APR for postgraduate student-athletes, effective August 1, 2017. Under the policy change, for each regular academic term subsequent to graduation, a student-athlete must earn the eligibility point but retention would no longer be calculated. For example, a postgraduate student-athlete who meets the eligibility requirements during a term would be a “1/1,” whereas a postgraduate student-athlete who fails to meet the eligibility requirements would be a “0/1.”

The committee determined that removing the retention point from the calculation of the APR best managed the tension between institutional accountability for the academic success of postgraduate student-athletes with the concern that changes to the APR model may deter student-athletes from pursuing postgraduate work. Membership feedback, including from leadership at the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics in attendance at the meeting, 2017 NCAA Regional Rules Seminars participants and member institutions at spring 2017 conference meetings, supported the policy change. In agreeing to modify the policy, the committee recognized that the Transfer Working Group was beginning its comprehensive review of transfer issues and agreed to work closely with the group as the group reviewed the myriad of issues related to transfer student-athletes, including postgraduate transfers.

After the meeting, the committee received a referral from the Transfer Working Group. Specifically, at its June 25-26 meeting, the working group requested the committee assess the academic impact of the existing rules and policies surrounding Division I transfer eligibility for both undergraduate and postgraduate student-athletes. For undergraduate student-athletes, the working group requested feedback on academic data to determine the predictors of academic success and graduation following transfer and potential for alignment between the predictors and APR transfer-adjustment criteria. For postgraduate student-athletes, the working group recommended the committee continue to review the academic expectations for student-athletes admitted into degree-seeking graduate programs, including APR policy and graduate admissions.

The Administrative Committee held a teleconference on July 10 to review the referral and policy change. The Administrative Committee tabled the retention-point policy change to allow the Committee on Academics an opportunity to review and respond to the referral before the policy change took effect. The Administrative Committee noted that the Committee on Academics focused its review on the retention-point policy for postgraduate student-athletes.
while the referral from the Transfer Working Group was much more broad and asked for a review of data and APP policy pertaining to both undergraduate and postgraduate student-athletes. The Administrative Committee also recognized that review by the Committee on Academics in response to the referral could result in the development of a new policy only one year after the retention-point policy change took effect.

The Committee on Academics will provide feedback, models and questions for consideration to the Transfer Working Group by November 1 to provide time for concepts to be developed and considered by the membership by early 2018. [See Attachment and subcommittee discussion at Informational Item No. 11-a.]

2. **Review of Implementation of Academics-Based Revenue Distribution.** In October 2016, the NCAA Division I Board of Directors and 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 distribution, including educational outreach to the membership at Regional Rules and conference meetings and the release of educational materials designed for use by Division I commissioners at conference meetings. The committee also resolved multiple operational items related to implementation of distribution, including determining that:

a. Most recently collected and released data be used to determine eligibility for the academic distribution unit in a given year. For example, for the first distribution scheduled for May/June 2020, the GSR and FGR will be based on data publicly released October 2019 for the 2012-13 cohort submitted June 2019. In addition, the APR will be based on data publicly released April 2020 for the 2018-19 cohort submitted fall 2019.

b. Metrics used to determine eligibility for the academic distribution unit be rounded based on the nearest hundredth. For example, a 959.49 APR would be rounded down to 959; a 959.50 APR would be rounded up to 960.
The committee noted that use of the most recently collected and released data to determine an institution’s eligibility for the academic distribution unit ensures the most current and complete data collection is used. In addition, rounding the metrics to the nearest hundredth aligns with current APP policies and procedures used for calculating the APR and GSR.

The committee will continue to address operational issues related to implementation of distribution. Mock reports of institutions that would qualify for distribution will be available to conferences by spring 2018. The successful implementation of distribution is a priority for the committee. [See subcommittee discussion at Informational Item No. 11-b.]

3. **Review of Full-Time Enrollment Requirements for Student-Athletes with an Education-Impacting Disability.** The committee reviewed its recommendation at the April meeting that Council introduce legislation establishing an exception to full-time enrollment requirements to allow student-athletes with a documented education-impacting disability to practice and compete while enrolled less than full time provided institutions maintain required documentation. The committee agreed that the current waiver directive provided student-athletes with an education-impacting disability the appropriate process and relief from the full-time enrollment legislation and rescinded its recommendation. [See subcommittee discussion at Informational Item No. 12-a.]

4. **Review of Request for Feedback from NCAA Division I Interpretations Committee on Applicability of General Institutional Upper-Division Credit Requirements for Meeting Progress-Toward-Degree Requirements.** At its April 19 teleconference, the NCAA Division I Interpretations Committee considered, in situations where a student-athlete must complete a minimum amount of upper-division credits to meet general degree requirements, whether an institution may disregard completed credit hours to allow upper-division requirements to be “degree applicable” for progress-toward-degree purposes in later terms. Following its discussion, the Interpretations Committee asked the Committee on Academics to provide feedback on the issue.

NCAA staff has advised the membership that upper-division elective courses are not degree-applicable for progress-toward-degree purposes unless they can be accounted for within the specific degree program’s available elective space at the time the course is completed, regardless of the institution’s minimum upper-division requirement. The committee noted that transfer student-athletes are the subset of student-athletes most commonly impacted by the current application of legislation. The committee agreed that an institution’s general degree requirements (e.g., upper-division credit requirements) should factor into a student-athlete’s specific degree program to calculate progress-toward-degree requirements, but that the total number of credits needed to graduate should not be increased to accommodate those credits.

The committee recognized this could lead to institutions “holding out” elective credit to accommodate upper-division credit, provided institutions demonstrate that the student-athlete cannot complete a degree within 120 hours to fulfill upper-division credit requirements and elective hours used for percentage of degree certification are not later removed to allow for credit-hour certifications. The committee agreed that institutions can and should determine and monitor remaining electives on a term-by-term basis.
5. **Review of Academic Integrity Issues Following Adoption of New Academic Misconduct Legislation.** In August 2016, new academic misconduct legislation that defined and clarified post-enrollment academic misconduct activities and the individuals to whom the activities apply became effective. The committee reviewed and discussed issues related to membership requests for interpretation of the new legislation, the NCAA Division I Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement guidelines in this area and the current enforcement climate and trends related to academic integrity. The Committee on Academics also received an update from N4A leadership on practices used by the N4A to educate its membership on how to address academic integrity issues on campus. Continued review of academic integrity issues is a priority for the committee.

6. **Update on Review to Modernize Academic Legislation.** The committee received an update on an upcoming multi-year review to modernize the academic legislation. Academic legislation modernization will involve a refresh of the language of the legislation and potential substantive changes to the legislation that may better reflect the modern needs and realities of student-athletes, administrators and higher education generally. Initial areas of focus discussed by the committee included opportunities to enhance legislation related to traditional college enrollment, enrollment requirements for graduate student participation, progress-toward-degree standards and hearing processes. Any recommended legislation resulting from the review could be part of the 2019-20 legislative cycle. Academic legislation modernization is a priority for the committee and part of a broader review to modernize NCAA legislation that will be managed by the NCAA Division I Legislative Committee. The Committee on Academics also received an update on the comprehensive review of all staff and official interpretations related to academic legislation.

7. **Review of Opportunities to Collaborate with American Council on Education.** As part of outreach by the committee to build stronger relationships with external groups dedicated to higher education, the committee discussed opportunities for continued collaboration with the American Council on Education. The committee met with representatives from ACE in April 2016 and initially collaborated with ACE to educate high-level institutional administrators on academic integrity legislation and related best practices. The committee acknowledged the ability of ACE to connect the committee with leaders, including presidents and chancellors, throughout higher education and supported continued collaboration with ACE. In addition, the committee recognized the value of outreach to other external groups that could help the committee identify trends in higher education and issues impacting student-athletes. The committee will explore opportunities to collaborate with ACE and other higher education groups at future meetings.

8. **Update on Certifications Under New Initial-Eligibility Standards.** The committee received an update on initial-eligibility certifications under the new standards effective August 1, 2016. Preliminary data continues to show a minimal change in the percentage of prospective student-athletes eligible to compete after student-athletes are certified or receive initial-eligibility waivers. While the data indicates that a very small number of prospective student-athletes have been impacted by the new standards, the committee has recognized that the small changes are
meaningful given the new standards targeted those previously eligible prospective student-athletes shown by research to be most at-risk for academic failure in college. The committee will prioritize further review of data regarding the new initial-eligibility standards this fall.

9. **Update on NCAA Response to Redesigned 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, 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, College Board and panel, which could result in separate sliding scales for the ACT and SAT.

10. **Update on Educational Initiatives for LRIs.** The committee received an update on the development of new educational programming for LRIs. Online programming that will address academic eligibility requirements is anticipated to be available by December 2017. The committee also received an update on educational programming for LRIs currently available, including educational outreach during the data review process, a hotline to resolve certification questions available during summer 2017 and other methods of targeted education.

11. **Report from the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Data.** The committee reviewed the reports of the May 4, May 18 and June 15 teleconferences of the Subcommittee on Data.

   a. **Review of APR Retention-Point Policy for Postgraduate Student-Athletes.** At its June 15 teleconference, the subcommittee continued its review of the APR retention-point policy for postgraduate student-athletes. The subcommittee recommended that the committee modify the APR retention-point policy to remove the retention point from the calculation of the APR for postgraduate student-athletes. [See committee discussion at Informational Item No. 1.]

   b. **Review of Operational Issues Related to Implementation of Academics-Based Revenue Distribution.** At its June 15 teleconference, the subcommittee addressed several operational issues related to activation of distribution. The subcommittee recommended committee action on multiple operational items, including determining that:

   (1) Most recently collected and released data be used to determine eligibility for the academic distribution unit in a given year; and

   (2) Metrics used to determine eligibility for the academic distribution unit be rounded based on the nearest hundredth.
c. Review of Threshold for Follow-Up APP Data Reviews During Ten-Year Period. At its June 15 teleconference, the subcommittee discussed the threshold for requiring institutions to participate in a follow-up data review during the same ten-year period. The subcommittee modified the APP data review policies and procedures to provide that an institution be required to undergo a follow-up review based on one or more, but not limited to, the following factors effective immediately:

1. Failure to respond to staff/subcommittee requests;
2. Lack of or incomplete policies and procedures;
3. Lack of or incomplete eligibility certification forms;
4. Misapplication of progress-toward-degree legislation; and
5. Eligibility recertification resulting in loss of APR eligibility points.

The subcommittee also noted the follow-up review should occur within two to five years of the initial review and confirmed the review should only address the specific issues identified in the initial review.

d. Update on Enhanced Support Provided to Institutions to Sustain Best Practices for Eligibility Certification. At its June 15 teleconference, the subcommittee received an update on initiatives to assist institutions that have demonstrated issues with eligibility certification during a data review. The initiatives include increased education and outreach and presentations at a future Faculty Athletics Representatives Association convention. The initiatives will begin summer 2017.

e. Review of the APR Adjustment Directive for Student-Athletes Dismissed from Institution Due to Disciplinary Action. At its June 15 teleconference, the subcommittee reviewed the APR adjustment directive to provide guidance to NCAA staff on how to process adjustment requests for student-athletes who lose APR points due to disciplinary actions. The subcommittee noted the APR adjustment directive considers these circumstances to be within the control of the student-athlete and do not warrant relief. The subcommittee made no modifications to the adjustment directive and will discuss whether there are potential solutions for institutions with these circumstances at a future teleconference.
f. **Annual Review of APR Adjustment Directive.** At its May 18 teleconference, as part of its annual review, the subcommittee reviewed the APR adjustment directive to determine if any changes were warranted based on cases submitted by member institutions in the past data submission cycle. The subcommittee reviewed the portion of the directive permitting institutions to request an adjustment for a student-athlete who is not academically eligible and for whom the institution is not able to submit a progress-toward-degree waiver (e.g., transfer, withdrawal, no pending competition). The subcommittee agreed to maintain the current directive as is. The subcommittee also reviewed the portion of the directive allowing for consideration of an adjustment request that does not meet the automatic transfer-adjustment criteria when a student-athlete is not retained because he or she transfers and presents a cumulative grade-point average .100 points or less below the qualifying grade-point average. The subcommittee agreed to discuss the issue at a future teleconference to allow for more discussion.

12. **Report from the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics.** The committee reviewed the reports of the May 9 and May 31 teleconferences of the Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics.

   a. **Review of Full-Time Enrollment Requirements for Student-Athletes with an Education-Impacting Disability.** At its May 31 teleconference, the subcommittee reviewed the full committee recommendation that Council introduce legislation establishing an exception to full-time enrollment requirements to allow student-athletes with an education-impacting disability to practice and compete while enrolled less than full time provided conditions are met. The subcommittee discussed application of the legislation and impact on the membership. [See committee discussion at Informational Item No. 3.]

   b. **NCAA Division I Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee Update.** At its May 9 and May 31 teleconferences, as part of an annual update, the subcommittee reviewed the number of two-year college transfer and progress-toward-degree waivers processed during the 2016-17 academic year, reviewed and approved the Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee Policies and Procedures, and reviewed and approved the progress-toward-degree waiver directive and two-year college transfer waiver directive. The policies and procedures contained no substantive changes. The progress-toward-degree waiver directive contained the following substantive changes, effective beginning the 2017-18 academic year:

   (1) No requirement that NCAA staff send correspondence notifying the president or chancellor of any institution that receives approval of a progress-toward-degree waiver directive based on misadvisement or lack of advisement and providing staff discretion to send correspondence to presidents or chancellors in these circumstances.
(2) Permit staff to approve waivers of the additional fall term credit-hour requirement for football student-athletes (i.e., nine-semester-hour/eight-quarter-hour requirement) when significant mitigation exists for the student-athlete’s failure to meet the requirement, even if no mitigation exists for not earning 27-semester/40-quarter hours before the next fall term.

(3) Reduce the documentation requirements for waivers where the student-athlete presents a cumulative grade-point average at or above a 3.000.

The two-year college transfer waiver directive contained the following substantive change, effective beginning the 2017-18 academic year:

- No requirement that NCAA staff send correspondence notifying the president or chancellor of any institution that receives approval of a two-year college transfer waiver based on misadvisement or lack of advisement and provision allowing staff discretion to send correspondence to presidents or chancellors in these circumstances.

The subcommittee also received an update on cases reviewed under the Council-approved review process. The subcommittee agreed the Council-approved review process provided appropriate flexibility in these cases without eroding the intent of the legislation.

c. NCAA Division I Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee Update. At its May 9 teleconference, as part of an annual update, the subcommittee reviewed the number of initial-eligibility waivers processed during the 2016-17 academic year, reviewed and approved the Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee Policies and Procedures, and reviewed and approved the initial-eligibility waiver directive. The approved policies and procedures and directive contained no substantive changes. The subcommittee also received an update on cases reviewed under the Council approved review process. The subcommittee noted that a large majority of these cases provided nonqualifiers with the opportunity to practice and receive athletically related financial aid, but not compete. The subcommittee agreed the Council-approved review process provided appropriate flexibility in these cases without eroding the intent of the legislation.

d. NCAA Student Records Review Committee Update. At its May 9 teleconference, as part of an annual update, the subcommittee reviewed prospective student-athlete review statistics for 2016-17, reviewed and approved the prospective student-athlete review directive, reviewed and approved the list of situations that could trigger a prospective student-athlete review, and reviewed and approved the NCAA Student Records Review Committee Policies and Procedures. The approved directive, trigger list, and policies and procedures contained no substantive changes.

e. NCAA High School Review Committee Update. At its May 9 teleconference, as part of an annual update, the subcommittee reviewed and approved the NCAA High School
Review Committee Policies and Procedures. The approved policies and procedures contained no substantive changes.

f. **NCAA International Student Records Committee Update.** At its May 9 teleconference, as part of an annual update, the subcommittee reviewed and approved the NCAA International Student Records Committee Policies and Procedures. The approved policies and procedures contained no substantive changes.

g. **Review of Institutional Request Regarding an Alternate Application of Progress Toward-Degree Credit-Hour Requirements Based on a Nontraditional Academic Calendar.** At its May 31 teleconference, the subcommittee heard and acted on a request from a member institution to consider providing an alternate application of certain progress-toward-degree requirements based on its unique academic calendar and credit-awarding system.

13. **Report from the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals.** The committee received an update from the subcommittee, including from the June 2 teleconference.

14. **Year-End Review of APP.** The committee reviewed the most recent public releases on institutional APRs and public recognition, teams that received public recognition for the 2016-17 academic year and teams that were penalized and/or lost access to postseason competition for the 2017-18 academic year. The committee also reviewed national and sport-group APR averages and trends based on 2015-16 APR data.

15. **Review of Elite 90 Award Recipients.** The committee reviewed the Elite 90 award recipients for the 2016-17 academic year.

16. **Research Update.** The committee received an update on the transfer composition of Division I student-athletes in the 2015-16 academic year, including trends in the proportion of two-year college transfers, four-year college transfers and total transfers in men’s and women’s sports. The committee also received an update on changes in the number of Division I graduate transfers in men’s and women’s sports over the last five years.

17. **Academic Technology Update.** The committee received an update on implementation of the Academic Portal, which will bring all APP processes under one umbrella and impact all three divisions. The first phase (APP and 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.

18. **NCAA Division I Board of Directors Update.** The committee received an update on key items involving the board, including from its April 26 meeting.
19. **NCAA Division I Council Update.** The committee received an update on key items involving the Council, including from its April 12-14 meeting.

20. **NCAA Division I Presidential Forum Update.** The committee received an update on key items involving the Presidential Forum, including from its April 25 meeting.

21. **NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Update.** The committee received an update on key items involving the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, including from the April 12 meeting of the strategic planning committee.

22. **NCAA Transfer Working Group Update.** The committee received an update on the progress of the Transfer Working Group formed to review eligibility standards related to transfer student-athletes, including from the May 17 teleconference and the agenda for the June 25-26 meeting. The committee provided input on several topics related to transfer as part of the working group’s engagement of stakeholders on the review.

23. **Review of Report of the Committee on Academics.** The committee reviewed and approved the report of the April 19 meeting.

24. **Strategic Priorities.** The committee reviewed its strategic priorities and discussed future priority agenda items. The committee developed the priorities to provide more transparency and accountability to the membership.

25. **Priority Future Agenda Items.** The following have been identified as priority future agenda items for the committee:

   a. Response to Transfer Working Group referral to assess the academic impact of the existing rules and policies surrounding Division I transfer eligibility for both undergraduate and postgraduate student-athletes.
   
   b. Implementation of academics-based revenue distribution;
   
   c. Analysis of data regarding new initial-eligibility standards and subsequent review of standards and any identified issues; and
   
   d. Modernization of academic legislation.

26. **Future Meeting Dates.**

   a. October 17-18 – Indianapolis;
   
   b. February 19-20, 2018 – Indianapolis;
   
   c. April 9-10 – Indianapolis;
d. June 18-19 – Indianapolis; and  
e. October 9-10 – Indianapolis.

Committee Chair: John DeGioia, Georgetown University; Big East Conference  
Staff Liaisons: Shauna Cobb, Academic and Membership Affairs  
Charnele Kemper, Academic and Membership Affairs  
Ken Kleppel, Academic and Membership Affairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCAA Division I Committee on Academics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 20-21, 2017, Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attendees:**

- Carray Banks, Jr., Norfolk State University; Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference.
- Jeri Beggs, Illinois State University; Missouri Valley Conference.
- Jacqueline Blackett, Columbia University – Barnard College; The Ivy League.
- Frank Bonner, Gardner-Webb University, Big South Conference.
- Jerry Bovee, Weber State University; Big Sky Conference.
- Greg Burke, Northwestern State University; Southland Conference.
- Carolyn Callahan, University of Virginia; Atlantic Coast Conference.
- David Clough, University of Colorado, Boulder; Pac-12 Conference.
- John DeGioia, Georgetown University; Big East Conference.
- Rhonda Hatcher, Texas Christian University; Big 12 Conference.
- Genese Lavalais, Jackson State University; Southwestern Athletic Conference.
- Frank Messina, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Conference USA.
- Joe Scogin, University of Tennessee, Knoxville; Southeastern Conference.
- Nicole Sherwin, Northern Arizona University, Big Sky Conference.
- Kurt Zorn, Indiana University, Bloomington; Big Ten Conference.

**Absentees:**

- Tom Burman, University of Wyoming; Mountain West Conference.
- Beth DeBauche, Ohio Valley Conference.
- Pamela Eibeck, University of the Pacific; West Coast Conference.
- Brandon Martin, California State University, Northridge; Big West Conference.
- Thomas Yeager, Colonial Athletic Association.

**Guests in Attendance:**

- Michael Meade, (president-elect, N4A) and Ken Miles, (past-president, N4A).

**NCAA Staff Liaisons in Attendance:**

- Shauna Cobb, Charnele Kemper and Ken Kleppel.
Other NCAA Staff Members in Attendance:
Lydia Bell, Eric Brey, Emily Capehart, Andy Cardamone, Greg Dana, Gary deCastro, Judy Delp, Meghan Durham, Jenn Fraser, Doug Healey, Jennifer Henderson, Michelle Hosick, Leilani Hubbard, Travis Johnston, Andy Louthain, Felicia Martin, Karen Metzger, Binh Nguyen, Sarah Otey, Tom Paskus, Todd Petr, Naima Stevenson, Kathy Sulentic, Danielle Walter (via telephone), DeAnna Wiley, Quintin Wright and Katy Yurk.
**ACTION ITEMS.**

1. **Legislative Items.**
   - None.

2. **Nonlegislative Items.**
   - None.

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.**

- **Review of Referral from NCAA Division I Transfer Working Group and NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate Retention-Point Policy for Postgraduate Student-Athletes.** In response to a NCAA Division I Council referral to review NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program policy for postgraduate student-athletes, at its June 20-21 meeting, the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics completed its multi-meeting review of the APR retention-point policy for postgraduate student-athletes. Under current policy, once a student-athlete graduates, the student-athlete is automatically awarded the retention point for any subsequent terms of enrollment, even if not retained. The eligibility point is earned if the student-athlete is academically eligible to compete in the next regular term.

The committee agreed to modify the policy to remove the retention point from the calculation of the APR for postgraduate student-athletes, effective August 1, 2017. The committee determined that removing the retention point from the calculation of the APR best managed the tension between institutional accountability for the academic success of postgraduate student-athletes with the concern that changes to the APR model may deter student-athletes from pursuing postgraduate work. Membership feedback, including from leadership at the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics in attendance at the meeting and 2017 NCAA Regional Rules Seminars participants, supported the policy change. In agreeing to modify the policy, the committee recognized that the Transfer Working Group began its comprehensive review of transfer issues and agreed to work closely with the group as the group reviewed the myriad of issues related to transfer student-athletes, including postgraduate transfers.

After the meeting, the committee received a referral from the Transfer Working Group. Specifically, at its June 25-26 meeting, the working group requested the committee assess the academic impact of the existing rules and policies surrounding Division I transfer eligibility for both undergraduate and postgraduate student-athletes. For undergraduate student-athletes, the working group requested feedback on academic data to determine the predictors of academic success and graduation following transfer and potential for alignment between the
predictors and APR transfer-adjustment criteria. For postgraduate student-athletes, the working group recommended the committee continue to review the academic expectations for student-athletes admitted into degree-seeking graduate programs, including APR policy and graduate admissions.

The Administrative Committee reviewed the referral and policy change. The Administrative Committee tabled the policy change to allow the Committee on Academics an opportunity to review and respond to the referral before the policy change took effect. The Administrative Committee noted that the Committee on Academics focused its review on the retention-point policy for postgraduate student-athletes while the referral from the Transfer Working Group was much more broad and asked for a review of data and APP policy pertaining to both undergraduate and postgraduate student-athletes. The Administrative Committee also recognized that review by the Committee on Academics in response to the referral could result in the development of a new policy only one year after the retention-point policy change took effect.

The Committee on Academics will provide feedback, models and questions for consideration to the Transfer Working Group by November 1 to provide time for concepts to be developed and considered by the membership by early 2018.

Administrative Committee Chair: John DeGioia, Georgetown University; Big East Conference
Staff Liaisons: Shauna Cobb, Academic and Membership Affairs
Charnele Kemper, Academic and Membership Affairs
Ken Kleppel, Academic and Membership Affairs

NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Administrative Committee
July 10, 2017, Teleconference

| Attendees: |
| Jeri Beggs, Illinois State University; Missouri Valley Conference. |
| Jerry Bovee, Weber State University; Big Sky Conference. |
| Pamela Eibeck, University of the Pacific; West Coast Conference. |
| John DeGioia, Georgetown University; Big East Conference. |
| Kurt Zorn, Indiana University, Bloomington; Big Ten Conference. |

| Absentees: |
| None. |

| Guests in Attendance: |
| None. |

| NCAA Staff Liaisons in Attendance: |
| Shauna Cobb and Ken Kleppel. |

| Other NCAA Staff Members in Attendance: |
| Jennifer Henderson and Binh Nguyen. |