KEY ITEMS.

1. **Metrics and Academic Achievement.** In response to a referral by the NCAA Division I Board of Directors, the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics continued a review to address enhanced and effective measurement of academic achievement, including campus-based comparisons. The committee examined areas it targeted at its April meeting for further examination, including data related to the relationship between the NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate and graduation, opportunities for assessment of academic achievement by institutions at the local level and how the NCAA “tells the story” of the APR, and endorsed next steps in each of these areas. [Informational Item No. 1.]

2. **APR Transfer Adjustment Criteria.** The committee continued its evaluation of the transfer adjustment criteria. The committee reviewed feedback from the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Data, received an update regarding preliminary analysis of data obtained from the National Student Clearinghouse and discussed concepts for potential refinement of the criteria. The committee endorsed further analysis of the data to support evaluation of the criteria and anticipates action at its October meeting. [Informational Item No. 2.]

3. **Modifications to Recommended Postgraduate Academic Eligibility Proposals for 2016-17 Cycle.** In October 2015, the committee recommended the NCAA Division I Council introduce legislation to (1) require postgraduate student-athletes complete only academic credit that applies toward a designated degree program to satisfy the six-hour academic eligibility requirement, and (2) require graduate student-athletes be fully admitted, degree-seeking and enrolled in a designated graduate degree program to be eligible. The committee recommended that the proposals be replaced with a modified recommendation requiring postgraduate student-athletes use degree-specific coursework to satisfy the six-hour requirement but permitting graduate student-athletes enrolled without being admitted to or designating a specific graduate program (as permitted by their institutions) to use graduate-level coursework to satisfy the six-hour requirement. As previously recommended, post-baccalaureate student-athletes permitted to remain enrolled without declaring a second degree program and/or major may use credits acceptable toward any of the degree programs to satisfy the six-hour requirement. In addition, the committee withdrew the recommendation that student-athletes be enrolled in a designated graduate degree program to be eligible due to the prevalence of unique graduate program structures, including at-large programs. [Action Item No. 1; Informational Item No. 3.]

4. **Time Demands and Overview of NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Experience Committee Concepts.** The Committee on Academics received the results of the recent time demands survey of student-athletes and reviewed legislative, best practices and referral concepts to enhance the student-athlete experience developed by the Student-Athlete...
Experience Committee for membership and constituent feedback. Recognizing the progress by the Student-Athlete Experience Committee, the Committee on Academics recommended enhancements to the legislative and best practices concepts to better address the student-athlete educational experience. The committee also recommended that the “time demands” review be remessaged to review of the “student-athlete educational experience.” [Action Item Nos. 2a and b; Informational Item No. 4.]

5. **Two-Year Governance Structure Review.** The committee received an informational update and continued to support legislation that would provide the committee the authority to sponsor academic-related legislation. [Informational Item No. 12.]

**ACTION ITEMS.**

1. **Legislative Items.**

   - **Modifications to Postgraduate Academic Eligibility Proposals Recommended by the Committee on Academics for 2016-17 Cycle.**

     (1) **Recommendation.** Replace postgraduate academic eligibility proposals recommended by committee during October 2015 meeting with a modified recommendation. Specifically:

     (a) Modify recommendation that the Council introduce legislation requiring postgraduate student-athletes with remaining athletics eligibility to complete a minimum of six hours of academic credit toward the student-athlete’s designated degree program during each regular full-time term to appropriately account for graduate student-athletes that are not admitted to or do not designate a specific graduate program as permitted by their institution. Under this modified recommendation, require postgraduate student-athletes use degree-specific coursework to satisfy the six-hour requirement but permit graduate student-athletes enrolled without being admitted to or designating a specific graduate program (as permitted by their institutions) to use graduate-level coursework to satisfy the six-hour requirement. As previously recommended, if an institution permits post-baccalaureate students to remain enrolled without declaring a second degree program and/or major, these student-athletes may use credits acceptable toward any of the institution’s degree programs to satisfy the six-hour requirement.

     (b) Withdraw recommendation that the Council introduce legislation requiring graduate student-athletes be fully admitted, degree-seeking graduate students enrolled in a designated graduate degree program to be eligible for intercollegiate athletics participation.
(2) **Effective Date.** August 1, 2017.

(3) **Rationale.** Requiring graduate student-athletes be enrolled in a designated graduate degree program to be eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics is too restrictive given the prevalence of institutions that offer “at large” graduate enrollment (i.e., enrollment without a requirement that students pursuing graduate studies enroll in a graduate program), the academic requirements typically associated with at-large graduate enrollment and the practical application of the requirement. An informal survey indicates that at least 50 percent of the Division I membership offers some type of at-large graduate enrollment. In addition, institutions typically require students meet specific academic standards in order to enroll in at-large graduate programs. Likewise, at-large graduate programs are often exploratory in nature and designed for students who have decided to pursue graduate studies, but are uncertain as to the type of graduate degree they wish to pursue. Accordingly, such programs benefit student-athletes and enhance their well-being. Under the proposals originally recommended by the committee, graduate student-athletes enrolled in at-large programs would not be permitted to compete because such programs do not result in a specific graduate degree. The recommended modifications to these proposals are consistent with the intent of the proposals to create a more meaningful educational experience and encourage graduate students to complete graduate-level coursework.

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

(5) **Student-Athlete Impact.** Graduate student-athletes enrolled in at-large graduate programs as permitted by their institutions will be eligible to compete without having to declare a specific graduate degree program provided the student-athletes meet the six-hour requirement by completing graduate-level coursework.

2. **Nonlegislative Items for Council.**

   a. **Legislative Concepts and Best Practices Related to Time Demands Endorsed by Student-Athlete Experience Committee.**

   (1) **Recommendation.** Enhance legislative and best practices concepts endorsed by Student-Athlete Experience Committee to better address the student-athlete educational experience. Specifically, in response to the Concepts for NCAA Division I Members and Constituents: Feedback on Enhancing the Student-Athlete Experience – Time Demands dated May 3, 2016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept Nos.</th>
<th>Committee Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 5, 6, 7</td>
<td>Committee is generally supportive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3a: Excepting terms in full-time study abroad program from five-year rule.
The legislative concept should encompass participation in study-abroad programs in which the institution does not recognize the student-athlete as a full-time student (e.g., participation in a five to six week-long study-abroad program rather than a semester-long program).

3b: Excepting terms in degree-required internship or cooperative educational work experience program from five-year rule.
The legislative concept should encompass participation in all internship or cooperative educational work experience programs, not only those required for degree completion.

4: Best practice that institutions should consider requiring comprehensive time management program as part of required life skills program.
The best practices concept endorsed by the Student-Athlete Experience Committee could increase student-athlete demands on time, not decrease it, if participation in such a program does not count toward countable athletically related activities. The concept should target true sources of student-athlete time demands rather than require additional student-athlete time to learn skills the student-athlete may already possess.

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

(3) **Rationale.** Although the legislative concepts and best practices endorsed by the Student-Athlete Experience Committee represent progress, the recommended enhancements to the concepts would result in even more significant benefit to student-athletes. Specifically, the recommended enhancements address concerns expressed by student-athletes related to demands on their time and the requested flexibility to pursue educational opportunities. Providing the recommended additional flexibility to pursue study-abroad programs, internships and cooperative educational programs would impact a much greater percentage of student-athletes than the current legislative concepts.

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

(5) **Student-Athlete Impact.** The recommended enhancements to the legislative and best practices concepts enhance student-athlete well-being by providing additional flexibility to student-athletes to pursue educational opportunities.

b. **Titling and Messaging of Time Demands Review.**

(1) **Recommendation.** Retitle and remessage the “time demands” review as the review of “enhancement of the student-athlete educational experience.”
(2) **Effective Date.** Immediate.

(3) **Rationale.** At the crux of issues related to time demands is the student-athlete educational experience. Accordingly, a more exact and complete description of the “time demands” review should be review of “enhancement of the student-athlete educational experience.” Such retitling and remessaging will help ensure that the appropriate issues related to the student-athlete educational experience are considered and addressed during the review.

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

(5) **Student-Athlete Impact.** The retitling and remessaging will help ensure student-athlete educational experience issues are identified and addressed during the review.

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.**

1. **Metrics and Academic Achievement.** In response to a referral by the Board of Directors, the committee continued a review to address enhanced and effective measurement of academic achievement, including campus-based comparisons. The committee examined areas targeted by the committee at its April meeting for further examination, including data related to the relationship between the APR and graduation, opportunities for assessment of academic achievement by institutions at a local level and how the NCAA “tells the story” of the APR.

a. **Relationship Between APR and Graduation.** The committee reviewed and reacted to initial data on the relationship between the APR and graduation. Specifically, the data indicated that although the APR is still a good measure of a team’s eventual graduate rate, scale compression makes it difficult to reliably differentiate between levels of academic performance among the teams that far surpass the 930 benchmark. Likewise, the APR is more predictive of GSR in sports with larger squad sizes. The committee endorsed a more extensive review of data related to the relationship between APR and graduation, including whether a 930 APR still roughly predicts a 50 percent graduation rate. The committee reaffirmed that the metrics should be as predictive as originally intended.

b. **Opportunities for Assessment of Academic Achievement at Local Level.** The committee recognized that what is considered academic achievement varies across the membership in light of differences in the membership and could be assessed by institutions at a local level. The committee discussed opportunities for institutions to assess academic achievement locally. The committee supported developing best practices, including related to the student-athlete academic experience, academically at-risk student-athletes and institutional review of data to allow institutions to track academic outcomes, that could be endorsed by the committee and provided to institutions to help institutions assess academic achievement.
c. How the NCAA “Tells the Story” of the APR. The committee reviewed how the NCAA “tells the story” of the APR, including through public releases, the NCAA Division I academics webpage, social media and targeted outreach to the membership and media. The committee supported developing enhancements to how the “story is told,” including values related to achievement that should be “part of the story.” The committee reminds the membership that the APR was developed to address low performing teams and the metric continues to be successful in that regard.

Committee review of the metrics and academic achievement is ongoing and will continue throughout 2016-17.

2. APR Transfer Adjustment Criteria. The committee continued its evaluation of the transfer adjustment criteria. The committee reviewed feedback from the Subcommittee on Data, received an update regarding preliminary analysis of data obtained from the National Student Clearinghouse and discussed concepts for potential refinement of the criteria. The preliminary review of the data indicated that immediate, four-year college transfers are significantly more likely to earn a four-year degree than two-year college transfers. However, there may be a specific academic profile that indicates a two-year college transfer is similarly positioned to earn a four-year degree as a four-year college transfer. The committee endorsed further analysis of the data to support evaluation of the criteria. Although the review could conclude with no action taken, the committee could take action to modify the criteria at an upcoming meeting. [See subcommittee discussion at Informational Item No. 16c.]

3. Modifications to Recommended Postgraduate Academic Eligibility Proposals for 2016-17 Cycle. In October 2015, the committee recommended the Council introduce legislation to (1) require postgraduate student-athletes complete only academic credit that applies toward a designated degree program to satisfy the six-hour academic eligibility requirement (post-baccalaureate student-athletes permitted to remain enrolled without declaring a second degree program and/or major may use credits acceptable toward any of the degree programs), and (2) require graduate student-athletes be fully admitted, degree-seeking and enrolled in a designated graduate degree program to be eligible. The committee reviewed recommendations from the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics, feedback from the membership, data on the prevalence of “at-large” graduate programs across the membership and the practical application of the recommended proposals in light of the new information. The committee recommended that the proposals be replaced with a modified recommendation requiring postgraduate student-athletes use degree-specific coursework to satisfy the six-hour requirement but permitting graduate student-athletes enrolled without being admitted to or designating a specific graduate program (as permitted by their institutions) to use graduate-level coursework to satisfy the six-hour requirement. As previously recommended, post-baccalaureate student-athletes permitted to remain enrolled without declaring a second degree program and/or major may use credits acceptable toward any of the degree programs. In addition, the committee withdrew the recommendation that student-athletes be enrolled in a designated graduate degree program to
be eligible due to the prevalence of unique graduate program structures, including at-large programs. [Action Item No. 1; see subcommittee discussion at Informational Item No. 18c.]

4. **Time Demands and Overview of NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Experience Committee Concepts.** The committee received the results of the recent time demands survey of student-athletes and reviewed legislative, best practices and referral concepts to enhance the student-athlete experience developed by the Student-Athlete Experience Committee for membership and constituent feedback. While the committee recognized the progress by the Student-Athlete Experience Committee, the committee recommended modifications to the legislative and best practices concepts to better address concerns by the student-athletes on the use of time and the student-athlete educational experience. The committee also recommended that the “time demands” review be retitled and remessaged to review of the “student-athlete educational experience” to better align with the issue. [Action Item Nos. 2a and 2b.]

5. **“Slowing Down” Student-Athlete Progress Toward Graduation.** The committee began a review of the phenomena of “slowing down” student-athlete progress toward graduation to allow student-athletes to complete athletics eligibility at roughly the same time as graduating. The committee discussed issues associated with the phenomena and reacted to feedback from the representatives of the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics. The committee endorsed a survey of the N4A membership to further examine these issues, including a determination of the prevalence of the phenomena.

6. **Initial-Eligibility Financial Aid Deregulation.** The committee reviewed legislation and policy on access to athletics aid during the initial year of collegiate enrollment. The committee determined that an examination of the nexus between a student-athlete’s initial-eligibility status and the ability to receive athletics aid is premature given the pending implementation of the 2016 initial-eligibility standards. The committee supported revisiting the broader discussion in the near future.

7. **High-Achieving Student-Athletes.** The committee received an overview of how the committee has provided legislative and operational flexibility for high-achieving student-athletes, concepts considered by the committee to provide flexibility, but not advanced, and next steps to be taken by the committee. The committee endorsed continued review of the current legislation and directives to identify areas where additional flexibility may be appropriate and in the best interest of student-athletes’ overall academic experience, including evaluating the merits of a progress-toward-degree exception for academically high-achieving student-athletes after their third year of enrollment.

8. **Redesigned SAT and Response by NCAA.** In March 2016, the College Board began administering the redesigned SAT. The NCAA has regularly communicated with the College Board regarding the timeline for administration and potential impact of the redesigned SAT on the initial-eligibility certification process for prospective student-athletes. The committee received an update on initial test scores from the redesigned SAT, initial-eligibility waivers involving use of scores from the redesigned SAT and concordance tables (between current SAT and redesigned SAT). As the committee continues to receive additional information
regarding the redesigned SAT, the committee will evaluate how the redesigned SAT may affect the predictive value of the test and how to account for those changes within initial-eligibility standards.

The committee also endorsed use of a technical research panel comprised in part of external members, including the NCAA Division II Academic Requirements Committee, admissions officers (or similar) and experts on testing/psychometrics. The charge of the panel is to discuss, evaluate, collect data and/or conduct analyses in several areas, including concordance values between the former and redesigned SAT and between the redesigned SAT and ACT, validity of the ACT/SAT in predicting academic success of student-athletes, whether current versions of the ACT/SAT have differential impacts on subgroups of student-athletes and the NCAA’s approach to using ACT/SAT scores. [See subcommittee discussion at Informational Item No. 18c.]

9. NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program Penalty Waiver and Appeals Process Operational Enhancements. At the April meeting, the committee modified the APP penalty waiver and appeals process to provide a single process for all penalty waivers and appeals. Under the modified process, the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals has the authority to consider all initial appeal decisions. The committee reviewed the operational enhancements to the appeal procedures approved by the subcommittee on its review of the modified policies and procedures and appeal procedures. [See subcommittee discussion at Informational Item No. 17.]

10. Unusable Data Policy for APP Data Reviews. As part of the committee’s continued evaluation of the unusable data policy for APP data reviews, the committee received an update on the review by the Subcommittee on Data of areas within the policy targeted by the committee in April. The subcommittee determined that no substantive changes to the policy were necessary but that additional ways to motivate institutions, other than loss of access to postseason competition, and tools for institutions to sustain best practices could be further explored or enhanced through subcommittee action. The committee discussed the subcommittee review and agreed with the subcommittee determinations. [See subcommittee discussion at Informational Item No. 16b.]

11. NCAA Division I Values-Based Revenue Distribution Working Group Update. The committee received an update on the progress of the Values-Based Revenue Distribution Working Group, reviewed the committee’s role in implementation of revenue distribution and discussed distribution of revenue. The working group is responding to the charge by the Board of Directors that the Division I Revenue Distribution Plan reflect and enhance the division’s overarching commitments, including the commitment to sound academic standards and student-athlete academic performance at member institutions. The committee continued to support that academic performance be a foundation for the distribution and recognized the importance of allocation of this revenue to academic support of student-athletes. The committee endorsed a model that proposes distribution based on single-year to top quarter quartile without a stipulation that institutions not have teams subject to APP penalty or have access to postseason competition in order to receive funds (i.e., Model No. 2 in the Concepts
The committee also agreed that a trial period should be held before actual revenue distribution.

12. **Council Two-Year Governance Structure Review Ad Hoc Working Group Update.** The committee received an update on the progress of the working group, recommendations related to legislative and governance processes and concepts for consideration with the membership. In discussing the progress and challenges of the governance structure, the committee continued to support legislation that would provide the committee authority to sponsor academic-related legislation for membership consideration.

13. **National Association For Coaching Equity and Development Proposals Regarding Core Curriculum Progression and Time Limitations and 2016 Initial-Eligibility Standards.** The committee reviewed the response by the Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics to modifications to the initial-eligibility legislation effective August 1, 2016, proposed by NAFCED that would provide greater access to competition during the first year of collegiate enrollment by allowing prospective student-athletes to repeat two core courses during high school for purposes of increasing core-course GPA, the opportunity for student-athletes to take an additional English, math or science course during or after the seventh semester of high school enrollment and the opportunity to complete five additional core-course units in a postgraduate year. The subcommittee determined that the concepts rooted in the proposed modifications to the legislation are contrary to the intent of the 2016 initial-eligibility standards. Likewise, the subcommittee determined that it would be premature to consider alternatives to the 2016 initial-eligibility standards until data is available on the impact of the core-course progress requirement on all 2016 enrollees. [See subcommittee discussion at Informational Item No. 18b.]

14. **Medical Absence Waivers.** The committee received an update on initiatives to educate the membership on use of medical absence waivers during the APP data collection. These initiatives include education at the NCAA Regional Rules Seminars and updates to the adjustment directive and the Q&A in the APP manual to provide clarification on policy.

15. **Year-End Review of APP.** The committee received a summary of the most recent public releases of institutional APRs and APP penalties, Elite 90 awards for 2015-16 and teams that were penalized and/or lost access to postseason competition during the 2016-17 academic year. The committee also received an update on action taken by the committee in areas identified for operational improvement or additional review through a comprehensive review of operational functions of the APP during spring 2015.

16. **Reports of the Subcommittee on Data.** The committee reviewed the reports of the April 19, May 5, May 19 and June 9 teleconferences.

a. **Identifying Efficiencies in Use of Subcommittee Time.** At its May 5 and May 19 teleconferences, the Subcommittee on Data discussed opportunities to more efficiently complete subcommittee work. The subcommittee agreed to complete any data review...
that did not require subcommittee action electronically in lieu of discussion on a
teleconference and/or in-person meeting.

b. **Unusable Data Policy for APP Data Reviews.** At its May 19 teleconference, the
subcommittee continued its review of the unusable data policy for APP data reviews to
determine whether the policy is accomplishing its intended goal of motivating
institutions to fully participate in the APP data review process. The subcommittee
reviewed three areas previously identified by the subcommittee for closer examination.

First, the subcommittee determined that the following additional motivators may be
considered in the future, if warranted:

1. Financial aid penalties.
2. Practice reductions.
3. Season and competition reductions.
4. Restricted membership status.
5. Public notification of unusable data designation.

Second, the subcommittee agreed that the current involvement of the institution’s
chancellor/president in the process is appropriate. However, the subcommittee
determined that staff should consider if additional education and notification of the
chancellor/president is needed prior to a campus visit.

Third, the subcommittee determined that staff should explore ways to support
institutions in sustaining best practices for eligibility certification (e.g., peer support
groups, webinars) as part of this review of membership education. [See committee
discussion at Informational Item No. 10.]

c. **APR Transfer Adjustment Criteria.** At its June 9 teleconference, the subcommittee
continued its discussion of the APR transfer adjustment criteria. The subcommittee
reaffirmed guiding principles for the review, received a preliminary update on data
obtained from the National Student Clearinghouse and discussed questions for further
exploration. The subcommittee noted preliminary analysis of the data indicated four-
year college transfers are significantly more likely to earn four-year degrees than two-
year college transfers. Additionally, students who transfer immediately to their next
institution are more likely to earn four-year degrees than those students who have a gap
in enrollment. However, more analysis is required to determine how a gap in
enrollment impacts eventual graduation. Based on the data, the subcommittee
recommended upholding the requirement that a student-athlete must earn the eligibility
point during the student-athlete’s last term of enrollment prior to transfer. Additionally,
the subcommittee recommended further analysis of the data to explore the following questions:

(1) Does a higher cumulative GPA mitigate the impact of attending the first institution for less than one academic year?

(2) How does time to transfer (i.e., immediate transfer, one-term gap, one-year gap, more than one-year gap) impact eventual graduation at a four-year institution?

(3) Is a combination of cumulative GPA and earned credits (i.e., quality-point analysis) a better predictor of eventual four-year graduation than a lone GPA requirement?

(4) For two-year college transfers, is there a cumulative GPA that predicts eventual four-year graduation at similar rates to four-year college transfers and/or students who do not transfer?

(5) For students who do not meet the established criteria upon transfer, is it appropriate to award a “delayed adjustment” of the lost retention point if they earn a four-year degree at another institution within five years of initial full-time enrollment? [See committee discussion at Informational Item No. 2.]

17. **Report of the Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals.** The committee reviewed the report of the May 19 teleconference.

- **APP Penalty Waiver and Appeals Process Operational Enhancements and Reporting of Decisions.** At its March 14 teleconference, the subcommittee reviewed the modified penalty waiver and appeals process and current appeal procedures and approved operational enhancements to the appeal procedures. The subcommittee determines how an appeal is conducted and which representatives from the institution are required to participate. The subcommittee finalized the appeals procedures by adding videoconference as a method of conducting the appeal to provide an opportunity for face-to-face interaction between the subcommittee and the appealing institution. In addition, the subcommittee modified the appeal procedures to require the appealing institution’s athletic director be a participant and designate the senior woman administrator as an additional participant if required by the subcommittee. The subcommittee also addressed reporting penalty waiver and appeal decisions. The subcommittee agreed to provide the committee with an annual report that includes the decision and information on rationale that will allow the committee to track trends. [See committee discussion at Informational Item No. 9.]

18. **Reports of the Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics.** The committee reviewed the reports of the May 11 and June 16 teleconferences.
a. **Modifications to Recommended Postgraduate Academic Eligibility Proposals for 2016-17 Cycle.** At its May 11 teleconference, the subcommittee reviewed feedback from the membership, data on the prevalence of “at-large” graduate programs and the practical application of the recommended proposals enhancing postgraduate academic eligibility requirements in light of this new information. The subcommittee recommended that the proposals be replaced with a modified recommendation requiring postgraduate student-athletes use degree-specific coursework to satisfy the six-hour requirement but permitting graduate student-athletes enrolled without being admitted to or designating a specific graduate program (as permitted by their institutions) to use graduate-level coursework to satisfy the six-hour requirement. As previously recommended, post-baccalaureate student-athletes permitted to remain enrolled without declaring a second degree program and/or major may use credits acceptable toward any of the degree programs. In addition, the subcommittee recommended that the committee withdraw the recommendation that student-athletes be enrolled in a designated graduate degree program to be eligible. [See Action Item No. 1 and committee discussion at Informational Item No. 3.]

b. **NAFCED Proposals Regarding Core Curriculum Progression and Time Limitations and 2016 Initial-Eligibility Standards.** At its June 1 teleconference, the subcommittee reviewed correspondence from NAFCED proposing modifications to the initial-eligibility legislation effective August 1, 2016. The subcommittee determined that the concepts rooted in the proposed modifications to the legislation are contrary to the intent of the 2016 initial-eligibility standards, which are based on data that indicates a high likelihood of academic success in the first year of enrollment and highlights steady academic progress throughout high school, as opposed to attaining eligibility in high school grade 12. The subcommittee also determined it would be premature to consider alternatives to the 2016 initial-eligibility standards until data is available on the impact of the core-course progress requirement on all 2016 enrollees. [See committee discussion at Informational Item No. 13.]

c. **ACT/SAT Research Technical Panel.** The subcommittee received an update on the formation of a research technical panel comprised of external members, including representatives from the Academic Requirements Committee, admissions officers (or similar) and experts on testing/psychometrics, as well as Committee on Academics members. The subcommittee endorsed the panel and agreed a broad-based group like the panel could be instrumental in assisting with the evaluation of the use of ACT/SAT in the initial-eligibility standards. [See committee discussion at Informational Item No. 8.]

d. **NCAA Division I Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee Update.** At its June 16 teleconference, as part of an annual update, the subcommittee received a report on the number and outcome of initial-eligibility waivers. Additionally, the subcommittee reviewed and approved the initial-eligibility waiver directive, which was modified to reflect the continued endorsement of the temporary review analysis and commitment to its application on a permanent basis. The subcommittee also reviewed and approved
the Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee policies and procedures. The policies and procedures contained no substantive changes.

e. NCAA Division I Progress-Toward-Degree Waivers Committee Update. At its May 11 and June 1 teleconferences, as part of an annual update, the subcommittee received a report on the number and outcome of two-year college transfer and progress-toward-degree waivers. Additionally, the subcommittee reviewed and approved the two-year college transfer waiver directive and progress-toward-degree waiver directive, which were modified to reflect the continued endorsement of the temporary review analysis and commitment to its application on a permanent basis. The progress-toward-degree directive also contained three other substantive changes:

(1) Granted staff authority to approve waivers applicable to an institution’s specific degree program that regularly results in credit-hour or percentage-of-degree deficiencies due to the restrictive nature of the program.

(2) Granted staff authority to approve 4-4 transfer waiver requests for financial aid in limited circumstances.

(3) For less than full-time enrollment waivers involving education-impacting disabilities, required institutions submit documentation from an appropriate institutional authority indicating that the institution defines full-time enrollment for that student-athlete to be less than 12 hours to accommodate the education-impacting disability.

f. NCAA High School Review Committee Update. At its June 1 teleconference, as part of an annual update, the subcommittee reviewed and approved the High School Review Committee policies and procedures. In response to requests from the membership and the secondary school community for increased transparency and consistency, the High School Review Committee significantly modified its policies and procedures to establish criteria for review across all areas of the high school review process, clarify procedures associated with all areas of the high school review process and institute high school account statuses and subsequent implications. The High School Review Committee highlighted the following modifications to the subcommittee:

(1) Criteria for review. There are four primary types of reviews conducted by the high school review staff: (a) account reviews (i.e., reviewing the validity of a high school), (b) nontraditional program reviews, (c) core-course reviews and (d) courses pending individual review on a student-by-student basis. Criteria for review were established for each of these areas pursuant to research, feedback from national secondary school associations and a hired consultant.

(2) Change in status policies. Member institutions, prospective student-athletes and secondary school representatives rely on the NCAA Eligibility Center to
determine whether courses, programs and schools may be used in the initial-eligibility certification process. Generally, if the status of an approved course, program or school changes, the course, program or school will be grandfathered through the remainder of the academic year in which the status was approved.

(3) High school account statuses. All high schools and secondary programs in the NCAA Eligibility Center database will be given a publicly visible account status on the Eligibility Center website. Moving forward, the account status chart will clearly display each high school’s account status, as well as the implications of the associated status.

g. NCAA Student Records Review Committee Update. At its June 1 teleconference, as part of an annual update, the subcommittee received a report on prospective student-athlete review statistics for 2015-16. Additionally, the subcommittee reviewed and approved the prospective student-athlete review directive and prospective student-athlete trigger list. The subcommittee also reviewed and approved the Student Records Review Committee policies and procedures. The approved directive, trigger list and policies and procedures contained no substantive changes.

h. NCAA International Student Records Committee Update. At its June 1 teleconference, as part of an annual update, the subcommittee reviewed and approved the International Student Records Committee policies and procedures. The approved policies and procedures contained no changes.

19. Educational Programming Update. The committee received an update on academic-focused educational programming for the membership. Educational programming designed for administrators at limited-resource institutions subject to APP and postseason penalties is scheduled for release by the beginning of the 2016-17 academic year.

20. Academic Technology Update. The committee received an update on the development of the Academic Portal, which will bring all APP processes under one umbrella and impact all three divisions. The first phase of the portal (APP and Division II Academic Tracking System data collection) is scheduled to be released to the membership in late July 2016. A robust education plan has been launched for both internal and external stakeholders to learn how to use the portal. The second phase (membership-wide graduation rates data collection) is scheduled to be released in winter 2016.

21. Advocacy Effort by NCAA Strategic Initiatives. The committee received an update on the advocacy effort by the strategic initiatives group, including priorities, the strategic plan and the focus of the effort on academics.

22. Board of Directors Update. The committee received an update on key items from the April 28 meeting of the board.
23. **NCAA Division I Presidential Forum Update.** The committee received an update on key items from the April 27 meeting of the Presidential Forum.

24. **Council Update.** The committee received an update on key items involving the Council, including from the April 6-8 meeting.

25. **NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Update.** The committee received an update on key items involving the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

26. **Reports of the Committee on Academics.** The committee reviewed and approved the full report of the April 18-19 meeting and the strategic report of the April 18-19 meeting to the Board of Directors.

27. **Strategic Priorities.** The committee reviewed its strategic priorities. The committee developed the priorities in an effort to provide more transparency and accountability to the membership.

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

   a. Response to Board of Directors referral to address enhanced and effective measurement of academic achievement, including campus-based comparisons.

   b. Evaluation of APR transfer adjustment criteria.

   c. Review of initial-eligibility standards and waiver process.

   d. Response to board referral to address the identification of and support provided to academically at-risk student-athletes.

29. **Future Meeting Dates.**

   a. October 10-11 – Indianapolis;

   b. February 2-3, 2017 – Indianapolis;

   c. April 19-20 – Indianapolis;

   d. June 20-21 – Indianapolis; and

   e. October 16-17 – Indianapolis.
### NCAA Division I Committee on Academics
#### June 20-21, 2016, Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carray Banks, Jr., Norfolk State University; Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeri Beggs, Illinois State University; Missouri Valley Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Bovee, Weber State University; Big Sky Conference (via telephone).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Burke, Northwestern State University; Southland Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Burman, University of Wyoming; Mountain West Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Callahan, University of Virginia; Atlantic Coast Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Clough, University of Colorado, Boulder; Pac-12 Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John DeGioia, Georgetown University; Big East Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Eibeck, University of the Pacific; West Coast Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Hatcher, Texas Christian University; Big 12 Conference (Tuesday only).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roderick McDavis, Ohio University; Mid-American Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Messina, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Conference USA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renae Myles, Alabama A&amp;M University; Southwestern Athletic Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail Stefanides, Lafayette College; Patriot League.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Zorn, Indiana University, Bloomington; Big Ten Conference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absentees:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Blackett, Columbia University – Barnard College; The Ivy League.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth DeBauche, Ohio Valley Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Martin, California State University, Northridge; Big West Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Yeager, Colonial Athletic Association.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guests in Attendance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jean Boyd (past-president, N4A) and Ken Miles (president, N4A).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCAA Staff Liaisons in Attendance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shauna Cobb and Azure Davey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other NCAA Staff Members in Attendance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lydia Bell, Emily Capehart, Greg Dana, Gary deCastro, Andrea Farmer, Judy Gauer, Jennifer Henderson, Michelle Hosick, Leilani Hubbard (via teleconference), Kurt Hunsaker, Ken Kleppel, Keke Liu, Andy Louthain, Binh Nguyen, Tom Paskus, Todd Petr, Anne Rohlman, Quintin Wright, Katy Yurk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>