1. **Academic Misconduct – Post-Enrollment.** The NCAA Division I Committee on Academics approved a final post-enrollment academic misconduct legislative draft proposal for the 2015-16 legislative cycle, signifying the close of a nearly two year legislative drafting process. The membership will have an opportunity to formally review the proposal before the NCAA Division I Council's vote in April 2016. If the legislation is adopted by the membership in April 2016, the legislation could be effective as soon as August 2016. [Informational Item No. 1]

2. **Expiration of NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP) Filters for Limited-Resource Institutions (LRIs).** The committee discussed the expiration of the longer transition period and improvement filters designed for LRIs in light of the number of LRIs that fail to reach the 930 multiyear NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) benchmark. While recognizing the unique challenges LRIs encounter compared with non-LRI institutions and balancing this with the importance of holding all institutions accountable in meeting the APR benchmark, the committee agreed to extend improvement filters for LRIs that expire with the submission of the 2014-15 data in the fall 2015 by one year. The short-term extension of the filters will provide the committee one year to develop long-term solutions regarding LRIs and the APP penalty structure that are not time-based and do not have an expiration date. [Informational Item No. 2]

3. **Time Demands – Academic Opportunities.** The committee discussed transformative academic measures that could both best prepare student-athletes for life and better prepare academically at-risk student-athletes for college academics, focusing on beginning to respond to the charge by the NCAA Board of Directors that the governance structure identify and address the challenges to better balancing student-athlete time commitments devoted to athletics participation. The committee noted that academic opportunities related to time demands will be addressed at the NCAA Division I Strategic Summit. [Informational Item No. 3]

4. **Examination of Policy Regarding Automatic APR Retention Point for Student-Athletes.** In response to a request by the Council Ad Hoc Transfer Issues Working Group to explore measures that would enhance accountability for student-athletes pursuing graduate degrees and the anticipated Council referral, the committee began examination of the APP policy regarding the automatic retention point for student-athletes and engaged in robust discussion regarding guiding principles for any potential changes to the policy and potential models for a change in policy. [Informational Item No. 4]
ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items for the Council.

   a. Academic Eligibility – Post-Enrollment Academic Misconduct.

      (1) **Recommendation.** To define and clarify NCAA post enrollment academic misconduct activities and the individuals to whom the activities apply.

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

      (3) **Rationale.** Over the course of the past several years, the membership has engaged in a comprehensive review of post-enrollment academic misconduct with the goal of refining current legislation, interpretations and policies. In its review, the membership made clear the current regulatory structure is confusing, unclear and imprecise and appropriate revisions to the academic misconduct legislation will serve to benefit individual institutions and the NCAA. Despite changes in the academic landscape, academic misconduct legislation has not been revised since 1983 when the legislation was added to the Manual.

         The regulatory structure for academic misconduct is currently located in multiple bylaws, interpretations and educational columns and should be consolidated in a single article (NCAA Division I Bylaw 14). Under the current regulatory structure, it can be unclear when academic misconduct involving student-athletes rises to the level of an NCAA violation and/or involvement. Current legislation in some instances focuses only on the outcome of academic misconduct (e.g., competing while otherwise ineligible). Membership input indicated that in some instances the act of and/or actors engaging in a particular activity also should be characterized as a violation of NCAA legislation (e.g., institutional staff member involvement). Further, some egregious academic improprieties may only be charged as a "lesser" violation under the current regulatory structure, which results in a penalty that does not appropriately reflect the gravity of the action.

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

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

(1) Recommendation. To require that the Eligibility Center receive an official transcript for each high school attended through the most recently completed term before an institution may provide a written offer of athletics aid to a prospective student-athlete.

(2) Effective Date. August 1, 2016.

(3) Rationale. The new Division I initial-eligibility standards effective August 1, 2016, impose a core-course progression requirement (e.g., 10 core-course units before the seventh semester) and revised core-course grade-point average (GPA) calculation to determine whether a prospective student-athlete meets the sliding-scale index for competition. The proposal will facilitate the Eligibility Center conducting earlier preliminary evaluations, which will result in the proactive identification of initial-eligibility issues and improve the sharing of academic information in a timely manner between prospective student-athletes, high schools, institutions and the Eligibility Center. It is anticipated this will also lead to better and more timely informed prospective student-athletes during the recruiting process. The proposal will not impact current processes related to official visits or admissions. In addition, prospective student-athletes who attended a secondary school in an educational system not based in the United States are exempt from this requirement due to potential delays and difficulties in obtaining official academic credentials early in the recruiting process.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. Prospective student-athletes will be better and more timely informed during the recruiting process through earlier preliminary evaluations by the Eligibility Center.

2. Nonlegislative Items for the Board.

• None.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. Academic Misconduct – Post-Enrollment. The committee continued its review of post-enrollment academic misconduct and approved a final legislative draft proposal that the
committee recommended the Council sponsor for the 2015-16 legislative cycle, signifying the close of a nearly two year legislative drafting process.

Following its April meeting, the committee circulated a refined draft legislative proposal to the membership. The significant feedback from the membership was then combined with feedback from a working group of members of the committee and the NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions that reviewed and addressed the outstanding legislative issues since the April meeting to produce an enhanced legislative draft. At the June meeting, the committee received an update on feedback from the membership, working group and NCAA Division I Legislative Committee, as well as feedback from the National Association of Academic Advisors (N4A) as presented by members of the N4A, and reviewed the enhanced legislative draft and question-and-answer document intended to provide clarification to the membership on the legislative concepts and proposed legislation. The committee then resolved the following outstanding legislative issues following discussion:

a. A student employee should only be considered an institutional staff member under the draft legislation if the academic misconduct or assistance provided by the student is at the direction of a nonstudent employee or representative of athletics interests of the institution or the student employee has institutional responsibilities to provide academic services to student-athletes or the general student-body. Based on feedback from the membership, the committee agreed that the definition of student employee for purposes of the draft legislation should not also separately include student workers in athletics.

b. The committee removed language in the impermissible academic assistance definition that referred to "work product not reflective of a student-athlete's own abilities" based on membership feedback. The committee noted the removal of the language from the definition simplified the application of the bylaw while maintaining the intent of the legislation and the core principles developed by the committee.

In recommending the legislation, the committee agreed that the final legislative draft incorporated all of the committee's core principles, which were developed through membership feedback obtained by the committee over the last two years. The committee noted that one of the academic misconduct legislative core principles is that penalties associated with academic misconduct be on a spectrum. The committee recognized the need to provide notice to the NCAA Division I Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement and Committee on Infractions that these bodies may need to review their respective guidelines and directives in anticipation of the proposal's consideration by the membership. The committee also agreed to provide correspondence from the chair of the committee to Division I presidents notifying the presidents that the legislative proposal will be part of the 2015-16 legislative cycle. The membership will have an opportunity to formally review the
An operational overview of the review of academic misconduct is in the Attachment. [Legislative Action Item No. 1a.]

2. **Expiration of APP Improvement Filters for LRIs.** The committee continued its discussion of expiration of the longer transition period and improvement filters designed for LRIs in light of the number of LRIs that fail to reach the 930 multiyear APR benchmark to avoid APP penalties and access postseason competition and the unique challenges LRIs face compared with non-LRI institutions. The filters expire and the transition period ends with submission of 2014-15 APR data in the fall 2015. The committee reviewed feedback from the HBCU and Limited-Resource Academic Advisory Group, which discussed the issues prior to the meeting and recommended that the committee extend the filters by one year. While recognizing the unique challenges LRIs encounter compared with non-LRI institutions and balancing this with the importance of holding all institutions accountable in meeting the APR benchmark, the committee agreed to extend the improvement filters for LRIs that expire with the submission of the 2014-15 data in the fall 2015 by one year. The short-term extension of the filters will provide the committee one year to develop long-term solutions regarding LRIs and the APP penalty structure that are not time-based and do not have an expiration date.

The committee provided feedback on a framework of concepts for long-term solutions to be provided to the HBCU and Limited-Resource Academic Advisory Group for discussion in July. These concepts focused on academic improvement and the importance of recent, "real time" graduation rates. A round table with chancellors and presidents from HBCUs and LRIs and commissioners at conferences with these institutions will be held in early October to react to concepts and potential recommendations. The committee will then discuss the recommendations from the advisory group and roundtable at the committee's October meeting as the committee continues its review of the issue. It is anticipated the committee could present its recommendations to the Board for review and feedback during the Board's January 2016 meeting.

3. **Time Demands – Academic Opportunities.** The committee continued its discussion of transformative academic measures that could best prepare student-athletes for life and at-risk student-athletes for college academics, focusing on beginning to respond to the charge by the Board that the committee identify and address the challenges to better balancing student-athlete time commitments devoted to athletics participation. While the committee recognized that the NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Experience Committee will serve as the Division I governance body charged with making any ultimate legislative recommendations/package and that autonomy conferences have begun to address time demands and may also sponsor
legislation pertaining to time demands, the committee engaged in robust discussion on potential academic reform measures that could enhance the student-athlete experience while satisfying time demand concerns.

In particular, the committee discussed concepts related to the ways in which the legislation and waiver directives pertaining to full-time enrollment and progress-toward-degree requirements provide sufficient opportunities to pursue educational and/or academic activities. The committee recognized that some of the concepts more suitably aligned with the Student-Athlete Experience Committee. The committee also considered a phased approach to provide both immediate solutions in areas that are policy or directive-based and address sports that have the most troubling time demands.

The committee noted that academic opportunities related to time demands will be addressed at the Division I Strategic Summit. The committee will incorporate any feedback provided by Strategic Summit participants in its October meeting discussion. The NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics will continue to develop academic-specific concepts and potential models. It is anticipated that the committee could provide recommendations this academic year.

4. Examination of Policy Regarding Automatic APR Retention Point for Student-Athletes. In March, the Council appointed an Ad Hoc Transfer Issues Working Group to continue the division's comprehensive review of four-year college transfer issues, specifically in the areas of graduate student-athlete transfers and permission to contact. As part of this review, in June, the working group requested the committee explore measures that would enhance accountability for student-athletes pursuing graduate degrees. In response to this request and in anticipation of a referral from the Council, the committee began examination of the APP policy regarding the automatic retention point for student-athletes and engaged in robust discussion regarding guiding principles established by the working group to guide any potential changes to the policy and potential models for a change in policy.

The committee endorsed a survey of the membership to obtain data on graduate student-athletes. The NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Data will review data received and feedback from the membership and explore potential models in more detail during the summer. The committee will continue discussion of the issues at the committee's October meeting.

5. Required Submission of Transcript to Eligibility Center Prior to Written Offer of Athletics Aid. The committee approved a legislative recommendation that would require the Eligibility Center to receive an official transcript for each high school attended through the
most recently completed term before an institution may provide a written offer of athletics aid to a prospective student-athlete. [Legislative Action Item No. 1b.]

6. **Operational Approach of Eligibility Center in Response to Redesigned SAT.** In March 2016, the College Board will begin administering the redesigned SAT. The Eligibility Center has communicated regularly with the College Board regarding the potential impact of the redesigned test on the initial-eligibility certification process for student-athletes. The committee approved the Eligibility Center's operational approach for using scores from the March 2016 redesigned SAT in the initial-eligibility certification process. In particular, under the approach, the Eligibility Center will ensure the redesigned test has no adverse impact on the initial-eligibility certification process and the application of the 2016 initial-eligibility standards. As the committee receives additional information regarding application of the redesigned SAT, the committee will evaluate how changes to the SAT may affect the predictive value of the test and how to account for those changes within initial-eligibility standards.

7. **Review of APP.** The committee received an update on the review of the operational functions of the APP. The review confirmed that the operational functions of the APP process further the objectives of the APP and effectively meet its goals. However, the review identified areas that could benefit from operational improvement and/or further evaluation. At its June 18 teleconference, the Subcommittee on Data approved policy updates to support the identified operational improvements. In particular, all APP processes should operate as one continuous process with APP data reviews serving as the entry point. APP data reviews would be complete before an institution could submit APR data each fall. For data reviews not complete by the fall APR submission due date:

   a. An institution's APR data submission deadline could be extended until January 1 or 14-calendar days after completion of the data review, whichever is earlier; and

   b. Any APR data corrections resulting from the data review that are confirmed by December 1 will be considered in determining the multiyear APR and penalties. After December 1, no corrections discovered in the data review process will impact the team's current multiyear APR or APP penalties, other than those made through the data correction/adjustment.

The committee also supported a targeted review of the APP penalty waiver process and unusable data issues, as well as further evaluation of current educational initiatives and the development of a strategic outreach and educational plan for the APP process. The committee will review the results at a later date.
8. **NCAA Division I Board of Directors Subcommittee on Appeals.** The committee discussed the composition of the Board of Directors APP Appeals Subcommittee following the change in the governance structure. Since adoption of the APP in 2004, institutions could appeal Level-Three penalties to a subcommittee of the Board. The intent of this appeal opportunity was to ensure presidential oversight and involvement in light of the significance of Level-Three penalties. In the new governance structure, however, the Board is no longer comprised entirely of chancellors and presidents. The committee recommended that the Board adopt a policy that the subcommittee be comprised only of chancellors and presidents in order to ensure that the intent of the legislation is fulfilled and true presidential oversight of Level-Three appeals is provided.

9. **Committee on Academics Policies and Procedures.** At its April meeting, the Council approved a recommendation that the committee appoint a member of the committee to serve as a liaison to the Council. The Council's policies pertaining to the committee liaison, however, are anticipated to slightly differ from the committee's policies approved in January. As such, the committee approved changes to its policies and procedures to ensure consistency with Council policies and procedures pertaining to the committee liaison.

10. **Reports of the Subcommittee on Data.** The committee reviewed the reports of the April 23, May 7, May 21, June 4 and June 8 teleconferences.

   a. **APR Adjustment Requests – Student-Athletes Pursuing Professional Athletics as a Vocation.** In February 2015, the subcommittee issued a policy clarification to specify that the professional athletics adjustment may only be applied after a student-athlete is drafted/signs a contract with a professional athletics team/organization or engages in other activities that constitute pursuit of professional athletics as a vocation, as outlined in the directive. Further, the professional athletics opportunity must have prevented the student-athlete from returning to the institution in the next regular academic term as a full-time student by the institution's fifth week of class or census date, whichever is earlier. For example, a football student-athlete who completes the fall term but is not drafted until the end of the spring term must enroll full time in the spring term, complete the term and earn the eligibility point in order to be eligible for the professional athletics adjustment.

   At its April 23 teleconference, the subcommittee amended the effective date of application of the clarification. The subcommittee elected to amend the effective date such that institutions are required to apply the professional adjustment, as clarified, starting with the submission of 2015-16 APR data in fall 2016. Accordingly, institutions may no longer misapply the professional athletics adjustment beginning fall 2015 in preparing 2015-16 APR data for submission in fall 2016.
The committee recognized continued review on this issue is necessary and charged the subcommittee with reviewing membership feedback prior to the committee's next in-person meeting.

b. **Definition of the APR Cohort for Women's Sand Volleyball.** At its May 7 teleconference, the subcommittee approved the APR cohort definition for women's sand volleyball. Based on a review of financial aid legislation, Division I indoor and sand volleyball rosters and membership feedback, the subcommittee created a separate APR cohort for women's sand volleyball rather than combining the cohort with indoor volleyball. Student-athletes who receive athletically related financial aid (or for institutions that do not offer athletics aid, student-athletes who meet the definition of recruited), enrolled full time as of the fifth week of class or the census date, whichever is earlier, and are on the women's sand volleyball squad list should be in the women's sand volleyball cohort for purposes of the APR.

c. **Updates to Committee on Academics Operating Manual for Cycle Two Data Reviews.** At its June 4 teleconference, the subcommittee approved updates to the Committee on Academics Operating Manual to reflect policy changes for cycle-two data reviews. The updates included clarification of the authority of the staff and subcommittee to expand the scope of a data review, to request additional information and to establish deadlines. Additionally, the updates include clarification of the unusable data policy to reflect current practice and give clear guidance to the membership.

d. **Comprehensive Evaluation of the Transfer Adjustment to the APR.** At its June 4 teleconference, the subcommittee approved a plan to complete a comprehensive review of the transfer adjustment to the APR, including the 2.600 cumulative GPA requirement at the time of departure, as part of a routine evaluation of the transfer adjustment criteria. Over the next several months, the subcommittee will request membership feedback and review relevant data with the intent to complete the evaluation prior to the October committee meeting.

e. **APR Adjustment Directive.** At its June 4 teleconference, the subcommittee reviewed a request from the membership to amend the APR adjustment directive to provide for an adjustment when a head coach follows NCAA and institutional policies and procedures to cancel a student-athlete's athletics aid, but aid is awarded due to administrative error and the student-athlete is included in the APR cohort. The subcommittee provided guidance to the staff for these types of requests, noting that documentation is required to verify that athletics aid was awarded erroneously (i.e., documentation of aid cancellation prior to the census date, letter from the head coach, letter from institutional staff member who made error and institutional plan to prevent future errors).
f. **Consideration of Former Student-Athletes within the APP.** At its June 18 teleconference, the subcommittee reviewed a request from the membership and approved an exception to the APR cohort for individuals who receive institutional financial aid per Bylaw 15.01.5.2 (exception – former student-athletes). Starting with the submission of 2014-15 APR data in fall 2015, former student-athletes who receive aid per Bylaw 15.01.5.2 shall not trigger inclusion in the APR cohort. The APR cohort is comprised of student-athletes who received institutional financial aid based in any degree on athletics ability and are enrolled full time as of the institution's fifth week of classes or official census date for that institution, whichever is earlier, or satisfied a legislated exception to full-time enrollment.

To be included in the APR cohort, a student-athlete must trigger both the financial aid criteria and the full-time enrollment criteria. The subcommittee noted that recent legislative changes provided an exception to financial aid legislation, Bylaw 15.01.5.2, which allows institutions to provide financial aid to "former student-athletes." This exception was intended to allow institutions to provide financial aid to former student-athletes to encourage them to return to school to finish their degrees.

In April, a staff interpretation clarified that, for purposes of NCAA financial aid legislation, a former student-athlete is a student-athlete who has exhausted his or her five years of eligibility. Additionally, the interpretation clarified that a student-athlete who is permanently ineligible to participate in intercollegiate competition due to a violation of NCAA amateurism and athletics eligibility regulations (e.g., signed an agreement with a professional organization, secured the services of an agent or exhausted eligibility due to delayed-enrollment penalties) but is still within his or her five-year period of eligibility, who returns to the institution with no intent to participate in athletics, shall also be considered a former student-athlete.

The membership request noted that former student-athletes, as defined by the interpretation, who return to their institutions full time on athletics aid within their five-year period of eligibility would trigger inclusion in the APR cohort. Issues with this situation occur when a student-athlete leaves his or her institution prior to graduation in order to pursue professional athletics, but later returns to make progress toward his or her degree. For example, a football student-athlete who leaves after his third-year of enrollment to play in the NFL may return to his institution full time during the following spring term to make progress toward his degree. As the former student-athlete can only enroll in one term prior to returning to his professional team, he does not earn 18 degree-applicable hours and loses both the eligibility and retention points.
Feedback from the membership indicated that institutions may be reluctant to provide aid to former student-athletes as they could lose both the eligibility and retention point despite their academic performance. The subcommittee noted that the change to financial aid legislation inadvertently required broadening the scope of the APR cohort definition. In establishing this exception to the cohort, the subcommittee noted the APR cohort was intended to capture current student-athletes and should not include former student-athletes, who may no longer represent the institution in competition.

To align with the timing of the change to financial aid legislation, the subcommittee determined that the former student-athlete exception shall be effective immediately with the submission of 2014-15 APR data in the fall 2015, retroactive to all years in the current multiyear rate (2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15).

g. **Graduation Success Rate (GSR) and Student-Athletes Who Depart Academically Eligible and Later Return within Six Years.** At its July 18 teleconference, the subcommittee reviewed a request from the membership regarding student-athletes who depart from their institutions academically eligible, but return within six years of initial collegiate enrollment. Specifically, GSR policy allows institutions to discount any student-athlete who withdraws from an institution within the six-year window if that student-athlete would have been academically eligible had he or she returned. Student-athletes who withdraw, but later return to their institutions must be reported based on their status at the end of the six-year window rather than their status at the time of original withdrawal. Therefore, student-athletes who return (part time or full time) but do not graduate within six years must be considered "non-graduates." The membership request noted that this policy may discourage institutions from bringing back former student-athletes to complete their degrees. The subcommittee noted the impact of the policy, but also that the GSR is intended to be a reflection of actual graduation patterns within a six-year period. The subcommittee determined that further discussion of this issue is necessary and requested additional data to inform those discussions.

h. **APR Adjustment Requests for Professional Athletics Departures.** At its June 18 teleconference, the subcommittee reviewed a proposal from the membership to add a progress-toward-degree criterion to the professional athletics departure adjustment. The proposal suggested that the professional athletics departure adjustment could better support the APP’s primary purpose of supporting graduation by adding a percentage-of-degree requirement to its criteria. The subcommittee reviewed the request and noted that additional data would be required to determine if additional criteria for the adjustment would be appropriate. Additionally, the subcommittee noted the ongoing discussion regarding the current application of the professional athletics departure adjustment within the membership.
11. **Reports of the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals.** The committee received an update on the number of appeals decisions reviewed by the subcommittee and reviewed the reports of the May 21, May 28 and June 4 teleconferences.

a. **Application of Mission Filter When Team is Ineligible for Postseason Competition or Does Not Have Access to Postseason Competition for Reasons Other Than Failing to Meet APP Threshold.** At its May 21 teleconference, the subcommittee addressed whether a team that qualifies for the limited-resource mission filter to avoid the loss of access to postseason competition but cannot use the filter because the team is ineligible or does not have access to postseason competition due to another issue (e.g., unusable data) is able to use the filter the first time the team both qualifies for and is able to benefit from the filter. Pursuant to the committee policies and procedures, this mission filter is available only once—the first time a team at a limited-resource institution falls below the APR benchmark. Specifically, the subcommittee considered the scenario when a team has both fallen below the APR benchmark for its first time while concurrently being precluded from postseason competition for another reason (e.g., unusable data). In this scenario, the team would expend its one opportunity to use the mission filter, despite being unable to actually benefit from the filter. The subcommittee noted that the mission filter was designed to provide a one-time exception for teams at LRIs that have shown historical success with graduation and to give these teams more time to meet the benchmark provided they have demonstrated past graduation success. Accordingly, the subcommittee determined that, effective immediately for teams that were unable to use the filter for the 2014-15 postseason, a team should not be precluded from using a mission filter because the team did not have access to postseason competition for reasons other than failing to reach the APR benchmark at the team’s only opportunity to use the filter. The subcommittee specifically found that this determination provides flexibility for teams to use the filter and satisfies the original intent of application of the filter.

The subcommittee changed no other requirements for use of the mission filter. The subcommittee reiterated that the filter applies only to postseason access and does not impact APP penalties.

b. **Updated Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) Document on Concurrent Penalties.** At its June 4 teleconference, the subcommittee approved updates to the language in an FAQ that is part of the committee policies and procedures. The questions provide clarity on which APP penalties or loss of access to postseason competition must be taken at the same time a team is subject to penalties or postseason ineligibility due to a non-APP issue, such as Committee on Infractions action.
12. **Report of the Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics.** The committee reviewed the reports of the May 19 and June 2 teleconferences.

a. **Progress-Toward-Degree Waiver Directive.** At its May 19 teleconference, the subcommittee reviewed and approved the progress-toward-degree waiver directive. The approved waiver directive includes a minor update, which reflects that the committee, and no longer the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet, reviews and approves the directive annually in light of the change in the governance structure.

b. **Two-Year College Transfer Waiver Directive.** At its May 19 teleconference, the subcommittee continued its review of the two-year college transfer waiver directive and approved a directive modification for waivers of the one-calendar year requirement for 4-2-4 transfers. Specifically, waivers will be denied absent unique and extraordinary mitigation demonstrating a strong need for a student-athlete to be immediately eligible for competition prior to the one calendar year elapsing. The subcommittee's rationale in modifying the directive was to affirm that a student-athlete may not use enrollment at a two-year institution to avoid being subject to four-year transfer legislation. The modified directive establishes a high threshold for waiving the one calendar year requirement for 4-2-4 transfer student-athletes.

c. **Prospective Student-Athlete Review Directive.** At its May 19 teleconference, the subcommittee reviewed and approved the prospective student-athlete review directive and prospective student-athlete trigger list. The approved directive contained no changes.

d. **Initial-Eligibility Waiver Directive.** At its May 19 teleconference, the subcommittee reviewed and approved the initial-eligibility waiver directive. The approved directive contained no changes.

e. **Annual Policies and Procedures Review – Committees Reporting to Subcommittee.** At its May 19 teleconference, the subcommittee reviewed and approved the Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee, Student Records Review Committee, High School Review Committee, International Student Records Committee and Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee policies and procedures. The approved policies and procedures contained no changes.

f. **Two-Year College Transfer Waivers Citing Misadvisement.** At its June 2 teleconference, the subcommittee discussed recent two-year college transfer waivers citing misadvisement of a student-athlete by the certifying institution as mitigation for why a student-athlete failed to meet two-year transfer requirements. The subcommittee discussed the issue of an institution gaining a potential competitive advantage through the waiver process by submitting multiple waivers citing misadvisement of a prospective student-athlete in the same year or in consecutive
years despite repeated failures on the part of the institution to correctly advise two-year college prospective student-athletes. The subcommittee will develop language to be included in the two-year college transfer directive that indicates recurring submission of two-year college transfer waivers citing misadvisement will be taken into consideration when determining whether a waiver should be granted on behalf of an institution. Additionally, the subcommittee will track the number of two-year college transfer waivers citing misadvisement by each institution and report to the subcommittee after the 2015-16 academic year.

g. **Less-Than Full-Time Waivers for Student-Athletes Entering Their Final Season of Competition.** At its June 2 teleconference, the subcommittee reviewed recently submitted less-than full-time enrollment waivers of student-athletes who were entering their final season of competition in which institutions asserted the student-athlete should not be required to enroll full time during a term due to limited availability of degree applicable coursework. Generally, a student-athlete in this case needs to complete fewer than 12 degree-applicable credits prior to graduation; however, the student-athlete is unable to use the final term exception to full-time enrollment because the student-athlete still needs to complete a required internship or student-teaching and thus would not graduate at the conclusion of the term.

The Progress-Toward-Degree Committee, which reports to the Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics, indicated taking a full-time course load generally does not negatively impact the student-athlete. The Progress-Toward-Degree Committee also noted the intent of the legislation is for student-athletes to be considered students first and compete against other students who are similarly carrying a full-time course load. As such, the Progress-Toward-Degree Committee has only approved this type of less-than full-time enrollment waiver when it can be shown that, due to institutional or department policy, the student-athlete is required to complete an internship during the summer or after all coursework has been completed. Thus, when it is within the control of the student-athlete to determine when the internship or student teaching will be completed, the Progress-Toward-Degree Committee has generally denied such waivers. The subcommittee agreed with the Progress-Toward-Degree Committee's approach, indicating that student-athletes should be encouraged to enroll as full-time students when possible.

h. **2016-17 Obvious-Waiver Standards.** At its June 2 teleconference, the subcommittee approved initial eligibility obvious-waiver standards for the 2016-17 academic year. Specifically, to align the standards to the 2016 initial-eligibility requirements, the subcommittee increased the minimum required core-course GPA on the obvious-waiver sliding-scale index to 2.300 and specified that a prospective student-athlete must meet core-core progression requirements to receive an obvious waiver.
13. **2014-15 APP Public Release, Awards and APR Averages and Trends.** The committee received a summary of the most recent public releases of institutional APRs and APP penalties, public recognition and Elite 89 awards for 2014-15 and the teams that were penalized and/or lost access to postseason competition during the 2015-16 academic year. The committee also received an update on national and sport-group APR averages and trends.

14. **Research Update.** The committee received an update on the Institutional Performance Program webpage, which became available to the membership June 1. The committee reviewed the functionality of the webpage, how to use the resources provided by the webpage and the ways in which the webpage provides information in a number of categories related to academics.

15. **Academic Technology Update.** The committee received an update on the development of an academic portal, which would bring all APP processes under one umbrella. The portal is anticipated to be available in April 2016.

16. **Review of Redesigned NCAA Division I Academics Webpage.** The committee reviewed the redesigned academics webpage, which provides a central location for a number of resources related to academics, including the APP, governance and academic eligibility. The webpage also provides an Academic Primer that addresses hot topics and links to news articles and other resources, such as the Division I Accelerating Academic Success and Degree Completion Award Programs. The redesigned webpage is part of the committee's ongoing efforts to enhance communications with the membership.

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

18. **Board Update.** The committee received an update on key items from the Board's April 30 meeting.

19. **NCAA Division I Presidential Advisory Group Update.** The committee received an update on key items from the Presidential Advisory Group's April 29 meeting.

20. **Council Update.** The committee received an update on key items from the Council's June 23-24 meeting. The committee also discussed the Council's response to and position on
the legislative proposals recommended by the committee for Council sponsorship for the 2015-16 legislative cycle, including the Council's decision to decline to sponsor a legislative proposal that would provide the committee the authority to sponsor legislation pertaining to academic matters. The committee acknowledged the Council's rationale, noting that the governance structure is new and time may be required before making changes. The committee maintained interest in pursuing a legislative recommendation.

21. **Report of the Committee on Academics.** The committee reviewed and approved the full report of the April 15-16 meeting and the corresponding strategic report to the Board.

22. **Priority Future Agenda Items.** The following items have been identified as priority items for the committee:
   
   a. Continue review of long-term solutions regarding LRIs and the APP penalty structure that are not time-based and do not have an expiration date.
   
   b. Respond to direction and feedback on issues of academic opportunities related to time demands provided at the Division I Strategic Summit and continue addressing academic reform measures that could enhance the student-athlete experience while satisfying time demand concerns.
   
   c. Review data on graduate student-athletes from survey of the membership and feedback from the membership and explore models involving a potential change in policy regarding the automatic retention point for graduate student-athletes through subcommittee work prior to continued full committee discussion at the October meeting.

23. **Future Meeting Dates.**

   a. October 20-21, 2015 - Indianapolis;
   
   b. February 1-2, 2016 - Indianapolis;
   
   c. April 18-20, 2016 - Indianapolis;
   
   d. June 20-21, 2016 - Indianapolis; and
   
   e. October 10-11, 2016 - Indianapolis.
Committee Chair: Roderick McDavis, Ohio University, Mid-American Conference  
Staff Liaisons: Shauna Cobb, Academic and Membership Affairs  
                        Azure Davey, Academic and Membership Affairs
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| Raymond Harrison, Jr., Texas A&M University, College Station; Southeastern Conference.  
| Rhonda Hatcher, Texas Christian University; Big 12 Conference.  
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| John DeGioia, Georgetown University; Big East Conference.  
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| NCAA Staff Liaisons in Attendance: |  
| Shauna Cobb and Azure Davey.  
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Academic misconduct legislation has been developed in close consultation with many membership entities. The NCAA Division I Committee on Academics has overseen outreach via more than 40 meetings between summer 2014 and the recommendation of the legislative proposal in June 2015.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- **April 2016**
  - Council vote.