

**The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill**  
**Faculty Athletics Committee**  
Anne Queen Room – Campus Y  
Minutes of Meeting: May 31, 2016

**Present:**       **Committee Members:** Bev Foster, Daryhl Johnson, Josefa Lindquist, Layna Mosley, Joy Renner, John Stephens, Kim Strom-Gottfried, Deborah Stroman.

**Incoming Committee Members** (terms begin July 1, 2016): Melissa Geil, David Guilkey, Steven Knotek, Darin Padua (attended first part of meeting).

**Advisors:**     Michelle Brown (Director, ASPSA), Bubba Cunningham (Athletics), Vince Ille (Athletics).

**Guests:**       Debbi Clarke (Consultant to Provost, Process Review Group), Jamie Gwaltney (DTH), Katie Stephens (DTH).

Chair Joy Renner called the meeting to order at 4:34 p.m. She asked all present to offer short introductions, with longer discussion of committee members' backgrounds over dinner.

I. April minutes

Deb Stroman moved, Bev Foster seconded a motion to approve the April minutes as submitted. Passed unanimously.

II. Major and Course Clustering Data

The data is presented in “UNC-Chapel Hill Enrollment Clustering Review: Summary of Methodology, Procedures, and Results” (attached).

Layna Mosley and Deb Stroman led discussion. They worked with Lissa Broome (Faculty Athletics Representative - FAR), Abigail Panter (Senior Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education) and Chris Derickson (University Registrar) on the review of student-athlete clustering, as mandated by the UNC General Administration.

Mosley and Stroman also reported data on the majors of student-athletes at UNC-Chapel Hill, which the academics topic members of FAC do annually. They reviewed data from Fall 2011 through Fall 2015. Mosley noted that the data count both first and second majors, for students with junior and senior year status, and that some departments have more than one major (e.g. a BA or a BS in Psychology and Neuroscience). Mosley also presented a list of the three most popular majors by team.

The data indicate a general increase during the last five years in EXSS, Business Administration and Economics majors, and a general decrease in Communication as well as History majors. Stroman commented that there is an understandable alignment of interest for some students, e.g., black students (and black student-athletes) choosing a major in African, African American, and

Diaspora Studies. Similarly, many student-athletes major in EXSS. Renner agreed, and offered how business-related matters can link to athletics after UNC. Darin Padua reported that EXSS has a new sports administration major which appears to be attractive.

Bev Foster asked if there is a greater diversity of majors, given the changes in ASPSA counseling and AAP advising. Layna replied that she did not examine the “small majors” numbers for student-athletes.

Michelle Brown noted there is greater collaboration over the last 18 months between Career Services, Academic Advising Program, Academic Support Program for Student Athletes, and Dana Gelin (Athletics Department career resources person). There is more varied, but coordinated discussion about majors and careers across many offices. Also, starting this summer, even more effort will focus on “whole student” development for student-athletes.

Stroman suggested brief information about orientation/summer programming, preferably some short written piece that can be posted on the FAC Sakai site. Brown said it is a work in progress, but should be able to share something later this summer.

#### Consideration of Course Clustering

Mosley and Stroman provided background about the University’s review of clustering of student athletes in particular courses and/or classes. They noted that there might be various reasons why one would worry about clustering; given UNC-CH’s recent history, the Board of Governors mandates that every school in the system undertake an annual review of course clustering. The FAR, Senior Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education, Registrar and two members of FAC (those charged with the Academic topic area) participate in this review.

The UNC General Assembly imposes a threshold of 25% student athlete enrollment in spring or fall, and 30% of enrollment in summer session. UNC Chapel Hill uses a more restrictive threshold, of 20% in the fall and spring and 25% in summer (since student-athletes are overrepresented in summer courses). UNC General Administration also mandates a review of the transcripts of any student-athlete who is enrolled in three or more flagged (as “cluster”) courses in a given academic year.

During the time that the clustering review has been mandated, those involved have worked to develop procedures to address the problems that might result from clustering. Current practice involves asking, for each of the flagged courses:

- a) Is there a syllabus?
- b) Does the syllabus align with the purpose of the course?

Mosley noted this is much easier to do now that the College of Arts and Sciences requires instructors to upload a syllabus for every course. Abigail Panter’s staff can now easily access and review the syllabi, to ensure that the course being offered meets legitimate instructional parameters. For example, for the spring 2015 semester, 104 course sections were flagged.

In terms of transcript review for individual student-athletes, for 2014-15, and using the 20% threshold, 341 student-athletes fit the “three clustered sections” standard. There were a few instances of student-athletes who had a lot of clustered classes on their transcript. The largest number for clustered courses for a student was 11. The group gave closest scrutiny to student-athlete transcripts of 6+ clustered courses although, even in those instances, the group was not entirely sure for what they ought to look.

Discussion ensued about possible reasons for several student-athletes being in the same course. Some factors include: how the course aligns with requirements for a major, general education requirements, related skills of languages (for example, after taking Spanish, a student is now taking Portuguese), and scheduling demands for most student-athletes (where most block out 2-6 PM for sports activities).

Mosley also noted that the group also has delved deeper in the last year, looking as well at grades earned by students (non-athletes vs. athletes) in the same courses. She observed that it is difficult to know, when there are significant differences (existing in either direction), what the cause is. There are different hypotheses, driven by different processes. For example, the course topics could match strengths and interests of student-athletes, leading to better performance. And because students are not randomly assigned to courses, the same factors that lead them to choose a course (see above) also could affect their performance.

Therefore, as another means of assessing potential issues, the group looked at the deviation of student-athletes’ grades in “clustered courses” from their overall performance in all other courses. Are they systematically over or underperforming in the cluster classes? So far, these comparisons have not raised flags to probe for favored or inappropriate treatment of student-athletes.

Mosley reported the group’s consideration of Friday Center/Carolina Courses Online, possible concerns about oversight for online courses, and that summer courses have a different student population compared to fall/spring enrollments. Revenue-based course models may create different incentives (regarding treatment of all students) than their fall and spring semester counterparts, and they may be subject to less departmental oversight. Grades generally seem to be higher in summer school, but this could be due to smaller class sizes or more concentrated subject exposure.

Mosley said the group will meet again June 6<sup>th</sup> for further analysis. Members generally agreed that course selection, enrollment patterns and clustering should be a key agenda topic for 2016-17.

### III. Process Review Group

Debbi Clarke reported on recent actions and the Process Review Group’s (PRG) workplan for 2016-17. Clarke said the Educational Policy Committee approved adding entering first-year student-athletes to priority registration effective Summer 2016. The EXSS Department is working on offering a couple of their courses for study abroad during Summer Session 1,

beginning Summer 2017. This is in response to seeking additional options for student-athletes to gain study abroad experience.

Clarke noted that the Registrar now has course scheduler software which helps students enter constraints for how they build their course schedules. She noted this is useful for students who work, as well as students who are athletes, and for other purposes.

There was discussion about the extent of priority registration for student-athletes (currently, 30 minutes in advance of their cohort for timed registration), the drop/add period for possible patterns of course changes among student-athletes, and to what degree data on past course grade distribution is available to students and affects their choices of courses or sections of courses.

One outcome of the PRG's discussion of *Process 4.0 Orientation & Summer Programs for Student-Athletes* is to have a more intensive and deliberate on-boarding for entering student athletes. Clarke has been working on this effort with Michelle Brown, Jan Yopp and Jeannie Loeb (who teaches The Science of Learning) on the processes and areas for improvement on orientation & summer programs.

Clarke noted changes in PRG membership and that the group has its fall 2016 schedule of meetings set (monthly, September-November). Details available at <http://apsa.unc.edu/ongoing-review-improvement-of-processes/#item-21-3-process-review-group-members>

The following topics are set for PRG attention:

Fall 2016

- 6.0 Registration
- 7.0 Academic Support for Student-Athletes
- 8.0 Faculty Relations and Governance
- 9.0 Class Attendance and Travel
- 10.0 Resources for Student-Athletes with Disabilities

Spring 2017 (tentative)

- 11.0 Eligibility and Compliance
- 12.0 Academic Performance Monitoring
- 13.0 Communications and Recognition
- 14.0 Budgeting
- 15.0 Facility Use and Programming

Fall 2017 (tentative)

- 16.0 Housing and Residential Education
- 17.0 Honor Court
- 18.0 Student Athlete Development
- 19.0 Supporting Non-Participant Student-Athletes
- 20.0 Focus Groups and Surveys

Renner asked that FAC members note how the PRG topics and schedule relate to their work in the four FAC sub-groups (Admission, Academics, Advising, and Student-Athlete Experience) and that all members raise questions or concerns for PRG's deliberation.

#### IV. Continuing Business and Updates

The meeting moved to an informal dinner period. Members and incoming members provided longer introductions, including their roles on FAC and/or their interests and involvement in college varsity athletics.

Renner noted the roles played by Athletics Director Bubba Cunningham, ASPSA Director Michelle Brown, and the reasons FAC has for closed session discussion of some topics. Joy noted that often the Chancellor or a designee attends meetings.

The dinner period concluded with an appreciation for Joy Renner's leadership as FAC chair, with a signed card and a piece of art from members to Joy.

##### A. Committee for Campus Discussion Regarding the Academic Implications of the Changes Coming to College Sports

Vice Chair Kim Strom-Gottfried provided an overview of the purpose of this committee, and membership: five appointed by the Faculty Chair, one student representative, and two members from FAC (Daryhl Johnson and Kim Strom-Gottfried). The committee's charge is to sponsor and participate in campus dialogues: what is happening nationally in college sports and what it means for UNC. Strom-Gottfried views this committee as delving into key topics and then coordinating with FAC for policy distillation and recommendations. Strom-Gottfried cited an example from a recent FAC discussion: a University of Pennsylvania report on Black Athletes and graduation rates disparities.

The committee is anticipating three discussions for the coming academic year: (1) time demands on student-athletes, (2) student-athletes' well-being, and (3) not yet decided. At the May 24<sup>th</sup> meeting, the committee decided to hold the forum on time demands on student-athletes during the September 12th week.

Strom-Gottfried noted the current plan for the first forum is panelists, discussion and question and answer. The committee wishes to draw on UNC resources (rather than outside speakers), including having presentations by a former student-athlete and one or more current student-athletes. One committee member is preparing a white paper for background, and the panelists would be selected based on different expertise and perspectives on time demands on student-athletes.

The time demands discussion will be informed by work undertaken by a study group led by Nicki Moore from the Athletics Department and from continuing discussions at the ACC and NCAA (Autonomy Conferences and other Division I schools). Cunningham noted that a resolution before the NCAA on time demands is set for a January 2017 vote.

Lissa Broome has populated a folder on the Sakai site with some of the NCAA and Conference survey information related to time demands.

A second fall forum is anticipated, and one in the spring semester.

Strom-Gottfried noted that this committee will act as a conduit for other relevant events on the UNC campus: providing connections and publicity beyond organizing its own conversations. Renner, Strom-Gottfried and others summarized the impetus for this work coming from related resolutions presented by the Athletic Reform Group (ARG), but not adopted by the Faculty Council (this resolution was adopted by Faculty Council to form this group). The committee concludes June 30, 2017.

There was brief discussion about how to best name this committee, especially on the different views about how much “discussion” versus “action” is central to the group’s work. One alternative, Collegiate Sports and UNC Dialogue Group, was proposed, then withdrawn. Renner and Strom-Gottfried said they will work on alternative for FAC/Faculty Council consideration.

B. Consideration of and response to 2015 – 2016 data requests from ARG following year review of data, outcomes, and processes

Renner directed committee attention to an email from Dr. Jay Smith, on behalf of ARG, which said that FAC had not been responsive to his request for specific data. She noted that Smith’s September 2015 email resulted in a reply from FAC, but did not provide all the detailed data requested by Smith. Renner noted that some of the key data were items FAC wanted to gather and review first, and then consider what is appropriate to release, per FERPA and small numbers concerns (i.e., data by team when the rosters are small).

Discussion centered on the level of detail of information requested by Smith, the kinds of questions or purposes for seeking the information, and concerns about context for understanding particular pieces or comparisons of data. Some members were concerned about FAC being seen as a conduit of information when the data/information is held by other entities, (e.g. Registrar, Special Talents Subcommittee of the Admissions Committee).

Renner provided background for the incoming members. On October 13, 2015, the Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and FAC held a joint meeting, with a closed session to review individual student information as part of oversight of first year performance of students who were in the special talent admissions process. This was an example of doing finer grained analysis, but in an appropriate non-public setting.

Discussion included concerns about student-athletes feeling unfairly targeted, beyond the 2011 cessation of improper classes and questions about grades, and the kinds of data made public about their admissions and academics.

Renner summarized the main points for guidance on her response to Smith. She will reply by email and offer a face-to-face conversation to identify the sources of the information Smith has

requested, why FAC is concerned about small number data being public, and review how FAC has examined what appears to be most of Smith's/ARG's implicit questions or concerns prompting the information request.

#### V. Report from the FAR

In Broome's absence, Renner noted the following reports and documents (all posted to Sakai):

- 2016 ACC Spring Meetings Summary.pdf
- NCAA and ACC Updates May 2016.docx
- SAEC+Time+Demands+Concepts+Feedback.pd.pdf
- Time Demands mandatory wks off DRAFT 2 (003).docx
- Time Demands sked transparency DRAFT 2 (002).docx

Cunningham commented on the level of details about the time demands data, it is a "very thorough document." Some considerations: the length of the playing season, whether the season overlaps fall and spring semesters (or continues into summer). He noted the related legislation coming forward in January 2017 for NCAA action.

Cunningham noted a change to rules on Summer School aid. Previously, there was a cap based on a percentage of aid received for Fall and/or Spring semesters. That cap has been removed. The good news is student-athletes can receive more aid. The bad news is the expense. If every student-athlete takes a 3-hour summer course, the aid needed would be \$2.5 million.

Cunningham drew attention to measures for student-athlete academic performance and degree completion: GSR, FGR and APR. He noted that GSR data is being submitted now, and that FGR and GSR will show declines. He explained that it is due to incoming students for 2006-09 are ones who did not do well (or transferred) in 2010, 2011 and 2012. Thus, he views FGR and GSR as lagging indicators. APR is more "current state." It best gauges eligibility and if you return to school. Our APR numbers are strong. Cunningham acknowledged the likely criticism of the lower FGR and GSR numbers.

Renner drew committee attention to two proposals on time demands and management:

- Supplement No. 2 – Mandatory Time Off Concept
- Supplement No. 3 – Schedule transparency and consistency concept

She reports that Broome believes that these proposals need a lot more vetting by student-athletes and coaches. A big question is what kinds of activities count. For example, the UNC student-athlete Leadership Academy sessions on Mondays: does that count against being a true day off from obligatory athletic time.

Cunningham offered a perspective on different sports and individual versus team practice, and the advantages and detriments of having a no-sports-activity day weekly. Overall, the idea of down time makes sense, but does one size fit all?

There is significant student-athlete interest in having fewer changes to their schedule, per coach's discretion of changing practice or conditioning times. Proposals to have schedules better set one

or two weeks ahead of time, and very rare changes, would probably be welcomed by many student-athletes.

#### VI. Recommendations from the Student-Athlete Experience topic members based on SAAC Focus Groups

Vince Ille reported that this work goes back to 1980s. What is new is looking at sport by sport. He referred the committee to the document *SAEC+Time+Demands+Concepts+Feedback.pd.pdf* (Sakai, Time Commitments Info folder).

There is variance of practice and conditioning by athletes on the same team. Other differences are on equivalency sports, and one-semester versus two-semester sports. It also matters if there is practice prior to the fall semester. Vince believes there are so many differences that it is hard to get a good solution. In general, the unwillingness to offer different time obligation rules by sport may need to be examined.

#### VII. Early 2016 – 2017 FAC Planning

Incoming Chair Kim Strom-Gottfried and Incoming Vice-Chair John B. Stephens noted their early efforts at transitioning and preparing for the FAC's work for 2016 – 2017.

Strom-Gottfried noted she will be in touch with all 2016 – 2017 about their serving on topic groups, and as liaisons to teams. Similarly, she will learn how they wish to contribute to FAC in order to plan topics and the committee's work.

Strom-Gottfried polled people about keeping the current monthly Tuesday 3:30-5:30 period for committee meetings. There were no objections.

The meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by John B. Stephens

#### Attachments

- UNC-Chapel Hill Enrollment Clustering Review: Summary of Methodology, Procedures, and Results”
- *SAEC+Time+Demands+Concepts+Feedback.pd.pdf*
- 2016 ACC Spring Meetings Summary.pdf
- NCAA and ACC Updates May 2016.docx
- SAEC+Time+Demands+Concepts+Feedback.pd.pdf
- Time Demands mandatory wks off DRAFT 2 (003).docx
- Time Demands sked transparency DRAFT 2 (002).docx

# UNC-Chapel Hill Enrollment Clustering Review

## Summary of Methodology, Procedures, and Results

For all semesters (Fall, Spring, Summer I, and Summer II), a standing committee reviews data for courses in which student-athletes enrollments reach a specified threshold. This committee consists of the following:

University Registrar (Chair): Chris Derickson  
Faculty Athletic Representative: Professor Lissa Broome, School of Law  
Senior Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education: Professor Abigail Panter, Department of Psychology and Neurosciences, College of Arts and Sciences  
Faculty Athletics Committee (Faculty Council) members:  
Professor Deborah Stroman, Kenan-Flagler Business School  
Professor Layna Mosley, Political Science

In order to identify any issues of concern about the enrollments of student-athletes, many factors are taken into consideration in these reviews, and new criteria are added as the Committee continues to refine the analysis. It is important to note that the general framework that UNC–Chapel Hill put into place in 2012 to look for potentially problematic clustering of student-athletes was subsequently adopted and implemented by the University of North Carolina System for all of its constituent institutions (see UNC Policy 700.6.1R, attached). However, a key distinction is that the threshold UNC-Chapel Hill established for triggering these reviews in fall and spring semesters is lower, and therefore more stringent, than the level adopted by the UNC System. The UNC System’s General Administration set a 25% threshold, while UNC–Chapel Hill reviews all courses in which student-athletes make up 20% or more of the total enrollment in the fall or spring or 25% in the summer sessions.

The review process established by UNC–Chapel Hill is conducted at multiple points and levels:

- All sections that exceed the threshold are reviewed twice for each term. The first review occurs after the add/drop period ends (i.e., after the first 10 days of class). The second review occurs after grades have been awarded.
  - o At the enrollment level review at the end of the first 10 days of class, the composition of the cluster is analyzed based on the following:
    - The majors of the students, to determine if the course is required for the students’ curriculum;
    - The number of students from any one team;
    - The number of sections offered for that particular course;
    - The number of clustered sections that the primary instructor teaches as compared to non-clustered sections; and,
    - A transcript review is conducted for students who were enrolled in three or more clustered sections over the course of an academic year to ensure that the

enrolled courses make sense within the context of the student's curriculum.

- For the grade level review at the end of the term, the grading patterns of the clustered sections are examined in depth based on the following:
  - Average GPA of the individual students in the class versus the grade awarded;
  - Average grades awarded to student athletes versus non-student athletes with sections having a difference of greater than .50 grade points (in either direction) reviewed at the individual student level for possible concerns;
  - Grading patterns of the primary instructors in clustered sections compared to non-clustered sections; and,
  - An additional transcript review for any students who have 3 or more clustered sections over the course of an academic year or any student who has been identified for review based on the aforementioned grade analysis.
  
- All sections identified with student-athlete enrollment exceeding 20% are flagged for a review of the syllabus to ensure that the course requirements, meeting patterns, and grading standards are comparable to other courses at that level.
  
- Any concerns identified either in the enrollment or the grade level reviews are referred to the Senior Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education who contacts the chair of the department offering the class for further information.

The reports that follow summarize the results of UNC-Chapel Hill's clustering analyses provided to the UNC System General Administration for the 2013-14 and 2014-15 academic years. **For both years, no irregularities were identified among courses that met the University's criteria for review.**

This process continues to evolve and additional data points are being considered to ensure that any and all possible risks are identified in an effort to verify the integrity and fairness of all classes offered to UNC-Chapel Hill students. Our review process is as in-depth and detailed as any clustering review process in the country, and the goal is to share our methodology more broadly for other institutions interested in monitoring and reviewing clustering patterns on their own campus.

**The 2013-14 UNC System Intercollegiate Athletics Report**  
**Academic Integrity Regulations Section**  
 Submitted by UNC-Chapel Hill to UNC General Administration  
 October 2014

**Academic Integrity Regulations**

**1. Summary of the campus review process and how “irregularities” are determined**

A team made up of the Senior Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education in the College of Arts and Sciences, the University Registrar, and the Faculty Athletics Representative reviews class enrollments each semester to identify those that exceeded the numeric threshold for “clustering” of student-athletes. For each course exceeding the threshold, the Senior Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education follows up with department chairs to determine the reason and to consider whether there are any potential irregularities requiring further inquiry and review.

**2. Summary of findings for the analysis of course sections**

For classes reviewed in 2013-14:

Fall 2013 (20% threshold) – 85 identified (0 irregularities)

Spring 2014 (20% threshold) – 89 identified (0 irregularities)

Summer 2014 (30% threshold\*) – 27 identified (0 irregularities)

**3. Summary data on findings of student-athlete transcript reviews**

UNC-Chapel Hill reviews all student-athlete transcripts at least once a year as part of the NCAA certification process and audit processes overseen by the University Registrar. No irregularities were identified last year.

**4. Results of analysis of overall student-athlete GPA and non-student-athlete GPA**

<b>Average Cumulative GPAs, Spring 2014</b>	
Student-Athletes	2.950
Non-Student-Athletes	3.206
All Undergraduates	3.196

*\*Initially, the threshold was set at 30% for summer sessions due to the typically small class enrollments in those terms. This was changed to 25% for the 2014-15 academic year.*

**The 2014-15 UNC System Intercollegiate Athletics Report**  
**Academic Integrity Regulations Section**  
**Submitted by UNC-Chapel Hill to UNC General Administration**  
**October 2015**

**Summary of the Campus Review Process and How “Irregularities” Are Determined**

UNC-Chapel Hill’s review process for “clustering” is based on 20% enrollment of student-athletes in a given course at the end of the fall and spring term (in order to account for all add/drop activity). This sets a more rigorous higher standard for review than the UNC System threshold of 25%. For summer session courses, UNC-Chapel Hill uses the UNC System standard of 25% to trigger the review of a course.

A team made up of the Senior Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education in the College of Arts and Sciences, the University Registrar, the Faculty Athletics Representative, and two representatives from the Faculty Athletics Committee reviews the grades for class sections that exceed the established thresholds for student-athlete enrollments. In addition, the Senior Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education examines the syllabus of each flagged section to evaluate the rigor of the assignments and consistency with the stated learning outcomes; as well as total time spent in class, on out-of-class assignments, and on examinations to ensure compliance with the University’s credit hour policy. Follow-up inquiries are made to the department chairs when necessary to clarify or gather additional information.

**Summary of Findings from the Review of 2014-15 Course Sections**

In 2014-15, a total of 241 class sections exceeding the threshold for student-athlete enrollments were flagged using UNC-Chapel Hill’s standards and reviewed as described above. It should be noted that only 154 class sections met the criteria for review using UNC General Administration’s 25% threshold. No irregularities were found, regardless of the threshold used.

<b>Table 7</b>			
<b>Results from the 2014-15 Clustering Review of Course Sections</b>			
<b>Term</b>	<b>Threshold Used</b>	<b># Flagged for Review</b>	<b>Irregularities Found</b>
Summer 2014	25%	50	0
Fall 2014	20%	87	0
Spring 2015	20%	104	0
<b>Total 2014-15</b>		<b>241</b>	<b>0</b>

The overall average section grades by student-athlete status are compared for the flagged and not flagged sections using UNC-Chapel Hill’s standard of 20% in the table below.

<b>Table 8</b>		
<b>Overall Average Grades for Flagged and Not Flagged Sections</b>		
<b>Sections</b>	<b>Enrollees</b>	<b>Overall Average Grade</b>
Sections Flagged	All Students	3.22
	Student-Athletes	2.94
	Non-Student-Athletes	3.34
Sections of the Same Courses That Were Not Flagged	All Students	3.42

This analysis of GPAs yielded very similar results using UNC-General Administration’s 25% standard for the review.

**Summary of Findings from Student-Athlete Transcript Reviews**

UNC-Chapel Hill reviews all student-athlete transcripts as part of the NCAA certification process and audit processes overseen by the University Registrar. Transcripts of student-athletes who were enrolled in three or more flagged course sections over the 2014-15 academic year (including summer sessions) were identified for further review. Using UNC-Chapel Hill’s standard of 20%, a total of 341 of the 528 students enrolled in three or more flagged courses were student-athletes. Using UNC General Administration’s 25% threshold, a total of 258 students were enrolled in three or more flagged courses, and 213 of them were student-athletes. No irregularities were found following the reviews, regardless of the threshold used.

**Overall Cumulative GPA for Student-Athletes and Non-Student-Athletes**

The average cumulative GPA of student-athletes is 0.246 lower than the average for all undergraduates.

Student-Athletes	2.950
Non-Student-Athletes	3.206
All Undergraduates	3.196

### Academic Integrity Regulations

The following set of required procedures will enhance the ability of each UNC campus to monitor and protect the integrity of its curriculum, student evaluation, and academic records. In addition, the appropriate review, evaluation, and supervision of University staff, including academic department chairs and other faculty administrators, will promote an enhanced culture of academic integrity. These procedures are to be implemented in addition to and in concert with the recommendations included in the 2011 Report of the Task Force on Athletics and Academics, the implementation of which President Ross has already required. These supplemental procedures stem from extensive discussions among campus stakeholders and incorporate concepts discussed in the UNC-Chapel Hill Report of the Independent Study Task Force, the Report of the Special Subcommittee of the Faculty Council, and specific campus policies addressing monitoring of academics and student-athletes, as well as the report of the Board of Governors Academic Review Panel.

The procedures below are grouped by functional area, and each has a corresponding implementation date.

#### I. Registrar and Student Records Best Practices

A. All campuses will have clear rules designating individuals (by position occupied) authorized to submit a course grade or grade change, and the circumstances under which such changes may be made. (September 2013)

B. All campuses will have audit procedures for verifying that only an authorized person submitted grades or grade changes to the student information system. (September 2013)

C. All campuses will maintain an electronic record of grade-related approvals and changes to the student information system. (December 2014)

D. All campuses will have course numbering and reporting conventions that utilize separate section numbers to identify independent study courses taught by individual faculty members. (May 2014)

#### II. Evaluating the Academic Performance of Student-Athletes and Other Student Subgroups

A. Using results from the 2013 Board of Governors' Intercollegiate Athletics Report, General Administration will work with campuses to develop a common threshold or definition of clustering by student-athletes or other student subgroups that will trigger an automatic review of flagged courses to determine whether there were any irregularities in the reasons clustering occurred. (December 2013)

B. On an annual basis, all campuses will review the course grade-point averages calculated for student-athletes and other student subgroups versus nonstudent-athletes and other identified subgroups. A summary of student-athlete comparisons will be included in the required Board of Governors' Intercollegiate Athletics Report, beginning in 2014.

C. All campuses will have procedures for notifying academic advisors and Academic Support Program staff of any changes made to the course grades of student-athletes and/or to their course schedules after the designated two-week drop/add period. (December 2013)

III. Review and Approval of Nonstandard Courses and Course Sections

All campuses will have processes and policies to ensure that all forms of individualized instruction conform to the basic guidelines pertaining to other undergraduate courses, including but not limited to a syllabus or learning contract specifying expected student learning outcomes, number of hours of expected work, grading information, and scheduled meeting times with the faculty member. (September 2013)

IV. Supervision and Evaluation of Faculty and Faculty Administrators

A. All campuses will have guidelines on the number of undergraduate independent studies a faculty member may teach per term. If campuses choose to enumerate a limited number of circumstances under which exceptions to these limits may be approved, guidelines must enumerate the required individuals (by position) who must grant approval. (September 2013)

B. All campuses will have criteria and processes to ensure the regular review and evaluation of all aspects of performance of department chairs. (September 2013)



NCAA DIVISION I COUNCIL  
STUDENT-ATHLETE EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE

CONCEPTS FOR NCAA DIVISION I MEMBERS AND  
CONSTITUENTS: FEEDBACK ON ENHANCING THE  
STUDENT-ATHLETE EXPERIENCE - TIME  
DEMANDS

May 3, 2016

*Prepared by:*

Michael Sagas, Faculty Athletics Representative, University of Florida  
Chair of the Student-Athlete Experience Committee Subgroup on Student-Athlete Time Demands

Lindsey Babcock, Senior Associate Athletic Director, Kansas State University

Jennifer Condaras, Associate Commissioner, SWA Big East Conference

James Gehrels, NCAA Division I National SAAC, Pepperdine University

Justin Sell, Athletic Director, South Dakota State University

Brandy Hataway, NCAA Academic and Membership Affairs

Quintin Wright, NCAA Academic and Membership Affairs

National Collegiate Athletic Association

*Supporting student-athlete success on the field, in the classroom and for life*

Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
Guiding Principles .....	2
Background.....	3
Council Governance Concepts for Further Consideration .....	5
Concept No. 1 - Playing and Practice Seasons – Define Required Athletically Related Activities .....	7
Concept No. 2 - Recruiting – Official and Unofficial Visits – Educating Prospective Student-Athletes on Time Demand Expectations .....	8
Concept No. 3a and 3b - Seasons of Competition - Five-Year Rule - Educational Exceptions to the Five-Year Rule .....	9
Concept No. 4 - Awards, Benefits and Expenses – Academic and Other Support Services – Mandatory – Life Skills Program – Time Management .....	11
Concept No. 5 - Sport and Athletic Department Activities Scheduling and Predictability .....	12
Concept No. 6 - Sport-Specific review of Playing and Practice Seasons and Countable Athletically Related Activity .....	13
Concept No. 7 - Review Summer Schedule Impact on Student Experience.....	14
Council Governance Timeline .....	15

# **CONCEPTS FOR NCAA DIVISION I MEMBERS AND CONSTITUENTS: FEEDBACK ON ENHANCING THE STUDENT-ATHLETE EXPERIENCE - TIME DEMANDS**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This document was developed by the NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Experience Committee at the request of the NCAA Division I Council. The NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Experience Committee Subgroup on Student-Athlete Time Demands was appointed to accomplish the following:

1. Identify Division I Council Governance legislative concepts for introduction into the 2016-17 legislative cycle;
2. Identify Division I Council Governance best practices for further development; and
3. Identify Division I Council Governance areas for referral and further review within the governance structure.

This document details three potential legislative concepts, two best practice and two referrals to other bodies in the Division I Governance structure and NCAA membership.

### **Legislative Concepts:**

Concept No. 1 - Playing and Practice Seasons – Define Required Athletically Related Activities.

Concept No. 2 - Recruiting – Official and Unofficial Visits – Educating Prospective Student-Athletes on Time Demand Expectations.

Concept Nos. 3a and 3b - Seasons of Competition – Five-Year Rule – Educational Exceptions to the Five-Year Rule.

### **Best Practice Concepts:**

Concept No. 4 - Awards, Benefits and Expenses – Academic and Other Support Services – Mandatory – Life Skills Program – Time Management.

Concept No. 5 - Sport and Athletic Department Activities Scheduling and Predictability.

### **Referral Concepts:**

Concept No. 6 - Sport-Specific review of Playing and Practice Seasons and Countable Athletically Related Activity.

Concept No. 7 - Review Summer Schedule Impact on Student Experience.

The legislative, best practice and referral concepts outlined in this document have been vetted thoroughly over the last several months by the Division I Council Student-Athlete Experience Committee. This process included an analysis of data from three surveys:

1. 2015 Growth, Opportunities, Aspirations and Learning of Students in college survey;
2. 2015 NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Student-Athlete Time Demands survey; and

3. 2016 Student-Athlete Time Demands survey.

Additionally, a set of guiding principles were developed to assist with the creation of the concepts.

#### **Guiding Principles:**

The Student-Athlete Experience Committee identified the following guiding principles to help frame their review of time demand concepts and discussion related to enhancing the student-athlete experience:

1. Advance legislation that continues to enhance the health and well-being of student-athletes, furthers their academic and experiential learning pursuits, promotes fairness and ensures the opportunity to take full advantage of the student experience rather than limit athletics participation.
2. Prioritize the student-athlete voice in evaluating stakeholder perspectives.
3. Design value-based legislation that is meaningful, impactful and enforceable.

#### **Action Requested:**

The Student-Athlete Experience Committee is seeking feedback from the Division I membership and constituents to determine if any of the legislative concepts and best practices need further examination or modification before advancement.

It is important that feedback is gathered collectively from each conference, organization and coaches associations. We encourage each group to use this document to facilitate discussions with your membership including directors of athletics, senior woman administrators, faculty athletic representatives, other athletics administrators, student-athletes and coaches to gather feedback.

Please review the concepts and provide feedback by completing this [form](#) . We are seeking one response from your conference, organization or coaches association as opposed to individual responses from your member institutions, affiliates and coaches. Your conference, organization or coaches association may offer feedback directly or you may consult with your membership prior to providing feedback, the process is left to your discretion. **Please submit the form not later than June 20, 2016.**

**Please note that this request is for feedback purposes only and is not considered a formal vote or position.**

### **Background**

In August 2015, members of the NCAA Division I Board of Directors acknowledged that the demands on college athletes' time were significant. There was concern that athletics commitments can sometimes prevent college athletes from pursuing academic goals such as particular majors, internships and research opportunities. The board asked both the Council and the NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee to provide guidance on how to more accurately measure and limit the time commitments of college athletes.

The Council and the Student-Athlete Experience Committee began discussions in October 2015 on how to address the time demands on college athletes and ways to enhance the student-athlete experience. The discussion was aimed at finding ways to support college athletes in their pursuit of educational, athletic, personal and professional goals. It was determined that the students themselves should have the initial opportunity to offer potential solutions.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee embarked on its charge later that month, noting as its top priority, ensuring that college athletes' time can be balanced appropriately between athletics, academics and other pursuits. Specifically, SAAC began formulating concepts that would ensure college athletes have more time to devote to internships and professional development without compromising the competitive nature of Division I sports amongst other things. To achieve that goal, SAAC worked with NCAA research staff to design an athletic time commitments study aimed at exploring possible changes to countable athletically related activity limits, practice legislation and competition schedules. The survey was sent to Division I student-athletes shortly after the October 2015 meeting, which asked them to offer their perspective on the following concepts:

1. Receiving one day off per week from athletic activity and prohibiting travel on their off day;
2. Shifting the countable athletic-related activities log from a 20-hour weekly limit to a daily hourly limit; asking for recommendations regarding what the daily hourly limit should be and if it should be sport-specific;
3. Requiring a mandatory dead period one week after a college athlete's championship season is complete and seeking recommendations for how long that period should last;
4. Reducing midweek nonconference games during the conference season;
5. Prohibiting college athletes from missing class for reasons related to their sport during the nontraditional season;
6. Educating prospective student-athletes on the expectations and time demands of being a Division I student-athlete; and
7. Providing a more comprehensive time management seminar for student-athletes.

During the SAAC meeting at the 2016 NCAA Convention, SAAC reviewed the results of the student-athlete survey as well as the 2015 Growth, Opportunities, Aspirations, and Learning of Students in College survey. SAAC identified five key concepts that student-athletes universally supported.

The key concepts are as follows:

1. Require one day off per week from athletic activity and prohibit travel on the off day.
2. Shift the countable athletically related activities log from a 20-hour weekly limit to a daily hourly limit, to be examined on a sport-by-sport basis.
3. Require a mandatory “no activity period” following each sport’s championship season. A two-week period was most supported in the survey results.
4. Educate prospective student-athletes on the expectations and time demands of being a Division I student-athlete, using a “best practices” approach.
5. Provide a more comprehensive time management seminar for student-athletes.

Additionally, the Council engaged in a strategic discussion at the convention on the overall issue of student-athlete time demands, including a review of the 2015 GOALS survey data, the SAAC survey of student-athletes and a review of the concepts developed by the SAAC. Coming out of the convention, SAEC was charged with continuing to review concepts and feedback from the membership and other affiliate groups with the goal that the concepts will be refined in preparation for the introduction of proposals into the 2016-17 legislative cycle.

During the autonomy business session at the NCAA Convention, voters referred three proposals intended to reduce time spent on athletics to the governance structure for more robust consideration, and passed a resolution vowing to create new proposals addressing the issue to vote on in January 2017. The Atlantic Coast, Big Ten, Big 12, Pac-12 and Southeastern conferences developed an initial plan to work with student-athletes and the Council to cultivate research-based proposals aimed at ensuring student-athletes have the time needed to balance athletic, academic and personal interests.

In February 2016 the Council continued its discussion of time demands with renewed intensity, voting to embark on a collaborative survey of student-athletes, coaches, athletic directors and athletics administrators with the five conferences that built on the initial information-gathering started by SAAC. The results from this comprehensive survey were provided to the Council and SAEC at the April 2016 meeting where SAEC accomplished three key items:

1. Identified legislative and best practice concepts for further development;
2. Established a subgroup that would refine Council governance concepts for membership feedback at spring conference meetings; and
3. Developed considerations and questions for potential autonomy legislative concepts.

This document is a product of the work of the subgroup of SAEC that was created to refine and improve the initial concepts.

The autonomy conferences, Council and SAAC are working to bring forward legislative proposals to be voted on in January 2017.

### **Council Governance Concepts for Consideration and Feedback**

Specific to areas of Council Governance, the subgroup of the SAEC identified seven concepts for further consideration. These concepts were identified considering the established guiding principles and data provided from the October 2015 SAAC survey and March 2016 Student-Athlete Time Demands survey. The concepts were reviewed and placed into the following groups:

1. Legislative: Concepts in this group were identified as having potential to be proposed into the 2016-17 legislative cycle.
  - a. Concept No. 1 - Playing and Practice Seasons – Define Required Athletically Related Activities.
  - b. Concept No. 2 - Recruiting – Official and Unofficial Visits – Educating Prospective Student-Athletes on Time Demand Expectations.
  - c. Concept Nos. 3a and 3b - Seasons of Competition – Five-Year Rule – Educational Exceptions to the Five-Year Rule.
2. Best Practice: Concepts in this group were determined to be possible best practices for administrators and coaches on campus.
  - a. Concept No. 4 - Awards, Benefits and Expenses – Academic and Other Support Services – Mandatory – Life Skills Program – Time Management.
  - b. Concept No. 5 - Sport and Athletic Department Activities Scheduling and Predictability.
3. Referrals: Concepts in this group will be referred to the appropriate committees within the Division I governance structure or national coaches association.
  - a. Concept No. 6 - Sport-Specific review of Playing and Practice Seasons and Countable Athletically Related Activity.
  - b. Concept No. 7 - Review Summer Schedule Impact on Student Experience.

Additionally, while reviewing each concept, the subgroup:

1. Identified any areas of refinement or improvement within the concept;
2. Determined what areas within the concept would benefit from additional feedback from the membership before the concept is advanced; and

3. Identified questions for consideration in addition to those developed at the April 2016 in-person SAEC meeting and during the four teleconferences of the subgroup.

**Concept No. 1 - Playing and Practice Seasons – Define Required Athletically Related Activities.**

Intent: To legislatively define required athletically related activities.

**Required Athletically Related Activities. Required athletically related activities include any activity, in addition to those that are countable in the weekly and daily limitations that are required as a part of being a student-athlete. These activities may include, but are not limited to the following:**

- a. Compliance meetings;**
- b. Organized team promotional activities;**
- c. Prospective student-athlete host duties; and**
- d. Media activities.**

Rationale: Following an extensive review of survey data related to countable athletically related activities, SAEC recognized that the current countable athletically related activity model is imperfect and imprecise. Based on the survey data, there is clear misalignment between student-athletes, coaches and administrators regarding what should be countable athletically related activities. The inclusion of a definition of activities that are required and necessary for participation as a student-athlete will allow for a more clear understanding of the delineation of these activities when this concept is combined with SAEC's Concept No. 5 (Sport and Athletic Department Activities Scheduling and Predictability) regarding countable and required activities being prohibited on the legislated day off. This concept would not change the current legislated definition of countable athletically related activities, but would rather define those activities that may be required but are not considered countable.

After review of Concept No. 1 (Playing and Practice Seasons – Define Required Athletically Related Activities), please consider the following when providing feedback.

1. Identify any areas of refinement or improvement within the concept;
2. Determine what areas within the concept would benefit from additional feedback from the membership before the concept is advanced; and
3. Identify questions for consideration.

**Concept No. 2 - Recruiting – Official and Unofficial Visits – Educating Prospective Student-Athletes on Time Demand Expectations.**

Intent: To legislatively require an institution to establish written expectations related to the time demands of being a student-athlete to prospective student-athletes during an official or unofficial visit.

**Student-Athlete Time Demand Expectations. A prospective student-athlete must be provided with written expectations of the time demands of being a student-athlete generally and specific to the prospective student-athlete's sport and institution during the official or unofficial visit.**

Rationale: SAEC recognizes the importance of prospective student-athletes making informed decisions when considering collegiate athletics participation and selecting an institution; therefore, prospective student-athletes should be made aware of Division I time demands generally, as well as in their sport, at the institution during the recruiting process. This concept will ensure the establishment of a set of expectations for the institution to ensure that the prospective student-athlete is well-informed. The concept further recognizes that simply detailing the expectations of time demands nationally may be too broad, hence the requirement to specify the different time demands expectations for the particular sport and institution.

SAEC recommends that the following educational resources be developed: (1) General rules education to be developed by the NCAA staff and provided as a part of the prospective student-athlete's registration with the NCAA Eligibility Center; (2) Division I SAAC develop a resource with questions a prospective student-athlete should ask when on an official or scheduled unofficial visit; and (3) Institutions provide a prospective student-athlete, in writing, with any conference or institutional specific rules or policies related to participation expectations as a student-athlete.

After review of Concept No. 2 (Recruiting – Official and Unofficial Visits – Educating Prospective Student-Athletes on Time Demand Expectations), please consider the following when providing feedback.

1. Identify any areas of refinement or improvement within the concept;
2. Determine what areas within the concept would benefit from additional feedback from the membership before the concept is advanced; and
3. Identify questions for consideration.
  - a. When should the information be provided (e.g., unofficial/official visits/ on-campus evaluations)?

**Concept No. 3a - (Academic Study Abroad) – Seasons of Competition – Five-Year Rule – Educational Exceptions to the Five-Year Rule.**

Intent: To specify that academic terms spent participating in a study abroad program may be excepted from the application of the five-year rule.

**Academic term(s) spent participating in a full-time study-abroad program may be excepted from the application of the five-year rule. To qualify for an exception the following criteria must be satisfied:**

- (1) **The institution recognizes the student-athlete as a full-time student while participating in the study-abroad program;**
- (2) **The student-athlete satisfactorily completes the study-abroad program;**
- (3) **At the time of participation in the study-abroad program, the student-athlete was academically and athletically eligible;**
- (4) **The student-athlete graduates within five-years or less; and**
- (5) **The student-athlete does not participate as a member of the institution’s team in practice or competition and may not engage in outside competition during the academic term(s).**

If this concept is advanced, SAEC would also recommend changes to the financial aid legislation. Possible financial aid legislative changes include allowing a student-athlete participating in an equivalency sport to be exempted from team limits during the academic term in which the study-abroad program occurs and a student-athlete participating in a head count sport to be replaced for the academic term.

---

**Concept No. 3b - (Degree Required Internship/Cooperative Educational Work Experience) – Seasons of Competition – Five-Year Rule – Educational Exceptions to the Five-Year Rule.**

Intent: To specify that academic terms spent participating in a degree required internship or cooperative educational work experience may be excepted from the application of the five-year rule.

**Academic term(s) spent participating in a degree required full-time internship or cooperative educational work experience may be excepted from the application of the five-year rule. To qualify for an exception the following criteria must be satisfied:**

- (1) **The institution recognizes the student-athlete as a full-time student while participating in the internship or cooperative educational work experience;**
- (2) **The student-athlete satisfactorily completes the internship or cooperative educational work experience;**
- (3) **At the time of participation in the internship or cooperative educational work experience, the student-athlete was academically and athletically eligible;**
- (4) **The student-athlete graduates within five-years or less; and**
- (5) **The student-athlete does not participate as a member of the institution’s team in practice or competition and may not engage in outside competition during the academic term(s).**

If this concept is advanced, SAEC would also recommend changes to the financial aid legislation. Possible financial aid legislative changes include allowing a student-athlete participating in an equivalency sport to be exempted from team limits during the academic term in which the internship or cooperative educational work experience occurs and a student-athlete participating in a head count sport to be replaced for the academic term.

Rationale: Acknowledging that one of the 13 principles from the 2015 Presidential Summit included an emphasis on better preparing student-athletes for life after intercollegiate athletics, SAEC affirmed that the opportunity to participate in study-abroad experiences and internships enhances the student's educational experience and preparation for life after graduation. Study-abroad and internship opportunities should be made available to student-athletes without limiting their access to a full athletics participation experience. Institutions should be encouraged to consider establishing study-abroad and internship opportunities that better accommodate the athletic and academic schedules of student-athletes as well as consideration for exceptions to the five-year clock.

These concepts developed by SAEC are intended to extend the legislative proposal NCAA Division I Committee on Academics recommended and was introduced by the Division I Council into the 2016-17 legislative cycle. The COA legislative proposal is intended to address progress-toward-degree requirements in situations where the student-athlete is receiving minimal or no academic credit by allowing the institution to prorate nine hours for the 18-semester/27-quarter hour regular academic year progress-toward-degree credit-hour requirement per NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3.1-(b). The COA legislative proposal combined with SAEC's five-year rule exception concept will provide increased flexibility to allow student-athletes' to pursue institutionally approved study-abroad, internship or cooperative educational work programs and have a full athletics participation experience while maintaining an emphasis on graduation in five years or less.

After review of Concept No. 3a (Academic Study Abroad) and Concept No. 3b (Degree Required Internship/Cooperative Educational Work Experience), please consider the following when providing feedback.

1. Identify any areas of refinement or improvement within the concept;
2. Determine what areas within the concept would benefit from additional feedback from the membership before the concept is advanced; and
3. Identify questions for consideration.

**Concept No. 4 - Awards, Benefits and Expenses – Academic and Other Support Services – Mandatory – Life Skills Program – Time Management.**

Best Practice Recommendation: Member institutions should consider requiring a comprehensive time management program as part of the current legislatively required life skills program for student-athletes.

Rationale: SAEC recognizes the importance of time management for success in college and in life after graduation; therefore, student-athletes should be provided with mandatory time management programming as part of the institution's life skills program. The programming may vary by institution; however, time management must be included in that programming. While development of the time management programming should be left to the discretion of each institution, SAEC recommends that the NCAA staff be directed to provide access to programming and content and that may be used by an institution to satisfy this requirement.

After review of Concept No. 4 (Awards, Benefits and Expenses – Academic and Other Support Services – Mandatory – Life Skills Program – Time Management), please consider the following when providing feedback .

1. Identify any areas of refinement or improvement within the concept;
2. Determine what areas within the concept would benefit from additional feedback from the membership before the concept is advanced; and
3. Identify questions for consideration.

**Concept No. 5 - Sport and Athletic Department Activities Scheduling and Predictability.**

Best Practice Recommendation: Member institutions should distinguish that a day off for student-athletes from countable athletically related activities should also be a day off from other required or mandatory activities that are not considered countable or athletically related. This recommendation would not include health and medical activities (e.g., nutrition sessions, medical treatment and prevention of injuries) or any activities that are academically related (e.g., study hall, tutoring sessions).

Rationale: SAEC recognizes that an important element of time management is predictability in scheduling and acknowledging that the student-athlete experience encompasses activities outside of practice and competition, for example promotional activities, team fundraising and community service. The entire athletics department should consider when these activities are occurring with a focus on protecting the student-athlete's time away from athletics (e.g., one day of per week). Further, SAEC recognizes that there may be challenges with weather and emergencies that arise, however; there should be a certain level of predictability for the student-athlete.

After review of Concept No. 5 (Sport and Athletic Department Activities Scheduling and Predictability), please consider the following when providing feedback.

1. Identify any areas of refinement or improvement within the concept;
2. Determine what areas within the concept would benefit from additional feedback from the membership before the concept is advanced; and
3. Identify questions for consideration.

**Concept No. 6 - Sport-Specific review of Playing and Practice Seasons and Countable Athletically Related Activity.**

Referral: Recommend further study and recommendations from sport-specific stakeholders regarding possible modifications to the sport's playing and practices season, including two-season models, start dates, number of contests and length of the season. Additionally, recommend a sport-specific review of current countable athletically related activity legislation to include identification of possible adjustments to more accurately account for the time demands of student-athletes and identify changes that could.

Rationale: As SAEC reviewed the data related to reductions in the number of contests, changes to start dates or the playing season model it was evident that a sport-specific review would be necessary. Further, SAEC identified areas within its study where sport specific analysis of countable athletically related activity would be critical (e.g., golf, baseball). SAEC believes that this sport-specific review and analysis is critical in conducting a comprehensive review of identifying the expectations and time demands placed on student-athletes and will allow for the identification of opportunities to allow student-athletes to pursue educational and personal development experiences.

After review of Concept No. 6 (Sport-Specific review of Playing and Practice Seasons and Countable Athletically Related Activity), please consider the following when providing feedback.

1. Identify any areas of refinement or improvement within the concept;
2. Determine what areas within the concept would benefit from additional feedback from the membership before the concept is advanced; and
3. Identify questions for consideration.

**Concept No. 7 - Review Summer Schedule Impact on Student Experience.**

Referral: Request Division I SAAC conduct a review regarding participation of student-athletes in summer school and summer athletics activities with a focus on what expectations student-athletes have for what summer should look like.

Rationale: Increased summer school attendance and participation in summer athletics activities has limited a student-athlete's ability to fully participate in the student experience (e.g., internships, employment) during a time when student-athletes should be able to pursue personal and career development opportunities. SAEC recognizes the importance of the student-athlete development of concepts which will align with the expectations of summer participation.

After review of Concept No. 7 (Review Summer Schedule Impact on Student Experience), please consider the following when providing feedback.

1. Identify any areas of refinement or improvement within the concept;
2. Determine what areas within the concept would benefit from additional feedback from the membership before the concept is advanced; and
3. Identify questions for consideration.

**Council Governance Timeline - Enhancing the Student-Athlete Experience**

Week of May 2	Council governance concepts submitted to conferences and coaches associations for review and feedback.
June 20	Deadline for conference, organization and coaches association feedback on Council governance concepts.
June 27 – June 29	Review of conference, organization and coaches association feedback during Student-Athlete Experience Committee and Council meetings.
June 30 – July	Student-Athlete Experience Committee will continue to refine the Council governance concepts.
August 3	Student-Athlete Experience Committee will recommend legislative concepts for Council review and consideration for introduction in the 2016-17 legislative cycle.

## Joint Business Session

### Reminders

1. Statement on North Carolina House Bill 2 and ACC Championship Events. The Joint group unanimously approved a statement regarding the conference's commitment to provide a safe and inclusive environment for all championship events:

*"The Atlantic Coast Conference and its member institutions remain committed to equality, diversity and inclusion. Discrimination in any form has no place in higher education and college athletics, and the safe and respectful treatment of all student-athletes, coaches and fans, regardless of gender, will remain a priority. During the 2016 ACC Spring Meetings, the league's Faculty Athletics Representatives, Athletics Directors, Senior Woman Administrators and student-athlete representatives discussed North Carolina's HB2 and its effects. The membership strongly supports the league continuing to engage at the highest levels regarding the effects of this law on its constituents as it evaluates current and future events and championships within the state of North Carolina. The league will also require commitments to provide safe and inclusive environments from sites for which there are current commitments for ACC Championships."*

2. A Decade of Milestones. Commissioner Swofford provided an overview of the conference's recent collective successes, including advancements in membership, governance, multimedia rights, bowl partnerships, and academic performance.
3. Time Demands (Autonomy). The Autonomy Governance Forum resulted in the development of a concept to better manage student-athlete time demands in order to promote recovery and allow time to access other elements of the college experience. The concept would increase transparency, communication, and engagement of student-athletes by requiring each team to develop a time management plan that would specify time commitments and time away from athletics during the academic year. **The concept encourages local decision-making and discretion to appropriately address institutional differences and unique circumstances. As a follow up to discussion in the meeting about travel that occurs on an expected required day off (e.g., team returns to campus after midnight), such local flexibility would be permitted even in the absence of extenuating circumstances (e.g., travel delay, weather delay). This level of flexibility was confirmed among the five conferences following the ACC meeting.**

In addition, each conference will use its internal process to develop potential legislative proposals. The ACC Autonomy Committee is developing a concept that would increase the transparency of time commitments and schedules for current and prospective student-athletes.

### Follow-Up Items

1. Two-Year Governance Review Working Group – Submit feedback to Brad Hostetter by June 9 regarding the recommendations in the Two-Year Governance Review Working Group report (General Supplement No. 9). The working group is requesting one response from each conference by June 10.

2. Time Demands (Council) – Submit feedback to Brad Hostetter by June 10 regarding the time demands concepts developed by the Division I Council Student-Athlete Experience Committee. A hard copy of the committee’s report was provided at the meeting and will also be distributed by email from Brad.
3. NCAA Presidential Forum Revenue Distribution Review – Review the Values Based Revenue Distribution Working Group concept document and respond to the survey by the July 1 deadline. A hard copy of the working group’s report was provided at the meeting and will also be distributed by email from Brad Hostetter. The electronic version of the report includes a link to the survey.
4. Council Legislative Proposals – Review and provide feedback on the draft Council Governance legislative proposals when they are distributed for a vote on whether the conference should formally sponsor them in the 2016-17 cycle. [To be distributed via email from Matt Burgemeister.]

## Faculty Athletics Representatives

### Reminders

1. Conversation with Student-Athletes. Discussed career development programming, North Carolina House Bill 2, and student-athlete time demands.
2. Governance and Legislation. Received an update on the Autonomy Governance Forum in Dallas, including the resulting concept related to time demands. Also updated on the ACC subcommittees working on time demands, personnel limits, and early recruiting.
3. Committee on Academics. Carolyn Callahan provided an update on the Committee’s discussions regarding graduate transfers and post-graduate student-athlete eligibility. She also described several proposals that would adjust progress-toward-degree requirements for student-athletes who participate in cooperative educational programs, study abroad, internships, and minor or certificate programs.

### Follow-Up Items

1. Division 1A FAR Board of Directors Representative. Submit nominations for the ACC rep on the 1A FAR Board to Matt Burgemeister by May 20; respond with vote for preferred candidate by May 27.

## Athletics Directors

### Reminders

1. Football Landscape / Satellite Camps. Discussed the college football landscape white paper and were briefed on the upcoming comprehensive review of football recruiting to be undertaken by the Football Oversight Committee. The attached document includes talking points related to football satellite camps and reinforcing the ACC position on such camps.
2. Football Collaborative Instant Replay. Approved the use of collaborative instant replay in football, effective with the 2016 season.
3. Bowl Game Expense Allowance. Approved an increase in the bowl travel allowance for the Sun Bowl (to \$1.25 million) and Pinstripe Bowl (to \$1.15 million).

4. Football Officiating Fees. Approved an increase in fees for football officials, including replay officials and communicators, that will be rolled out over a three-year period.
5. Women's Basketball Strategic Plan. Approved a recommendation to develop a Request for Proposals for a consultant who would be asked to develop a strategic plan aimed at enhancing the conference's position as a national leader in the sport.
6. Women's Basketball Officiating Fees. Approved the recommendation of the Officiating Committee to increase game fees for women's basketball officials.

## Follow-Up Items

1. ACC Service Groups / Structure. ADs should have on-campus discussions regarding ACC Service Groups to better understand the value of such groups, necessity for meeting regularity, etc. Consider input regarding a request for the formalization of three new service groups: Strength & Conditioning Coaches, Sports Dietitians, and Digital Contacts. The ADs will take a broader look at the structure and oversight of ACC Service Groups at the July AD meeting (see attached document).
2. ACC Men's Basketball Tournament Tickets. ADs are asked to solicit general input from their ticket managers and development directors regarding the 2017 ACC Men's Basketball Tournament in Brooklyn, New York.

## Senior Woman Administrators

### Reminders

1. Championship Dates and Sites. Approved Olympic sport championship dates and sites for several future championships.
2. Championship Formats. Approved an increase in championship fields for women's soccer (to 8 teams), men's soccer (to 12 teams), and softball (to 10 teams; effective in 2018).
3. Baseball Umpires. Approved conference-office coordination of hotel rooms (2017), a game fee increase (2018), and a per diem increase (2019).

### Follow-Up Items

1. Early Recruiting Subcommittee. Respond to Early Recruiting Subcommittee request by collecting feedback from coaches and submitting to the subcommittee. Additional detail (specific concepts and instructions) forthcoming via email from Matt Burgemeister.

## Satellite Camps Talking Points

- Recruitment of prospects is purposely directed through the use of a recruiting calendar – a calendar that the football coaches association was instrumental in developing and has been in place for years.
- We are supportive of engaging in a conversation about increased/different evaluation opportunities throughout the year.
- The emphasis on the scholastic environment permeates this recruiting calendar and is a core principle that should be maintained.
- Several years ago, after some institutions were holding their own camps in locations outside their region, the membership instituted a rule that your camp had to be in your state or within a 50-mile radius of campus if it was outside your state. The use of satellite camps is clearly an “end-around” to this change from several years ago that is motivated by recruiting, not providing a camp experience for all participants.
- The trend has been that college coaches were initiating employment at other college’s camps in order to evaluate and have recruiting interaction with specific prospects in whom they had interest.
- This led to increased use of camp employment for off-campus recruiting during the summer, which is not an active recruiting period and we don’t believe healthy for the sport. The majority of FBS membership agrees with this based on the recent Council vote
- A recent survey of FBS coaches (which had an 80% response rate) led to 65% of FBS (Autonomy and non-Autonomy) coaches agreeing that a change to the camp rules is needed to better manage the recruiting landscape.
- In the same survey, 73% of FBS Autonomy coaches responded that coaches should not be able to work noninstitutional camps (e.g., high school, third party, other colleges). There is a stark contrast in this response when compared to FBS non-autonomy and FCS responses.
- Why isn’t it healthy?
  - High school and nonscholastic entities are seeking the employment of football coaches at their camps in return for access to prospects in their programs. This is changing the recruiting dynamic in a negative way and straining relationships between college coaches and high schools coaches.
  - Current NCAA rules preclude an NCAA institution or their coaches from providing donations to high schools or programs that involve prospects. Increased enrollment in camps conducted by high schools and nonscholastic entities are undoubtedly bringing financial gain to the high school and nonscholastic entity.
  - Pressure on prospects to attend various satellite camps through the summer will increase which is likely to lead to attendance by prospects for minimal time (1 or 2

days) as they bounce from camp to camp. This pressure exists now with on campus camps as prospects from all over the country find ways to attend the on-campus camps of the schools in which they are truly interested.

- Targeted camp employment motivated solely by recruiting interests for a particular subset of camp attendees is not consistent with the purpose of camps.
- Why doesn't prohibiting "satellite camps" take opportunities away from prospects?
  - The opportunities to earn a scholarship and be seen by coaches still exists in several ways – ways that the rules intend them to be seen and offered opportunities.
  - Prospects who have the talent to play at the FBS level are being seen and recruited by the FBS schools given the sophistication that FBS programs have to find and evaluate talent. This includes full use of 5-6 weeks – 168 evaluation days - of spring evaluation opportunities on the high school campuses. Evaluation during this period is the primary focus of FBS programs. This period is in addition to the fall evaluation period in September, October and November.
  - In most of the media articles, anyone that has used a specific prospect example has noted that the prospect already had FBS scholarship offers when they were seen by another school's coach – they gained additional offers that are perceived by the author as "better" because they were "Power Five" offers. That hardly sounds like the satellite camp was the ONLY opportunity they had to earn a scholarship.
  - Many of the prospects schools have interest in have found a way to take unofficial visits – many tied to attendance at a camp on campus. Put another way, nobody was suggesting that the ACC and SEC ban on satellite camps for years was taking opportunities away from young people.



## **2015-16 ACC Service Groups**

Academic Support Directors

Associate/Assistant Athletic Directors

Communications Directors

Compliance Coordinators

Development Directors

Equipment Managers (annual meeting via conference call)

Facilities & Operations Directors

Head Athletic Trainers

Marketing Directors

Student-Athlete Development Coordinators

Team Physicians

Ticket Managers

Video Services Directors

All service groups, except compliance coordinators and equipment managers, will meet once per year and will be reimbursed for that meeting. Compliance coordinators will meet twice per year. Equipment managers will meet via conference call. One individual from each school will be reimbursed for all service group meetings. (Revised: May 2011, April 2015)

### Proposed Service Groups:

- Strength & Conditioning Coaches
- Sports Dietitians
- Digital Contacts



**Update to FAC from the Faculty Athletics Representative  
May 31, 2016**

**NCAA**

1. NCAA Legislation
  - a. Time Demands
    - i. Division I Time Demands document on Sakai
    - ii. Autonomy 5 Conferences representatives met in Dallas April 25-26. The concepts they developed on time demands are on Sakai and were discussed by the ACC at the ACC May meeting (see ACC summary document on Sakai)
      1. Trying to get NCAA to move date for submitting legislation from September 1 to November 1
  - b. Summer School Aid legislation adopted in April is in a rescission period
    - i. Instead of requiring summer school aid to be proportional to academic year athletically related financial aid, summer school aid may be in any amount.
    - ii. Rescission requires a super-majority vote of each Division I school. This proposal could have a significant financial impact on schools that choose to fully fund summer school
  - a. GSR to be released soon

**ACC**

1. May meetings – Summary in Sakai
2. Survey of ACC FACs
  - a. The responses I have received are summarized below. All those responding believe there would be interest in coordinating on issues of mutual interest.
    - i. FSU
      1. FSU Athletics Board – 25 members appointed by President (not including ex officio members). Includes faculty, academic administrators, current students, student-athletes, alumni, Seminole Boosters, citizens-at-large, and members of the Varsity Club. The majority of appointed members must be faculty and academic administrators of the University. Meets at least 4 times per year. The FAR chairs the Board.
      2. There are standing committees: Academics, Finance, Equity and Student-Athlete Welfare
    - ii. Georgia Tech
      1. The Georgia Tech Athletic Association Board of Trustees has a Committee on Academics. This committee is composed of at least 3 members of the GTAA Board, at least 2 of whom shall be Academic faculty, and such other members as the Chair may determine. The Committee on Academics works with the AD and Director of Academic Services of the GTAA to provide the best

academic environment for academic success for SAs. Overall composition of the Committee on Academics includes 4 faculty, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, the Graduate student body president (who is a GTAA Board member), a student-athlete, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management, the Registra, the Associate AD for Academics, and Associate AD for Compliance. The Committee makes recommendations to the full Board for approval.

a. The FAR is a member of the GTAA Board and chairs the Committee on Compliance and Equity; former FAR chaired the Committee on Academics

2. There is also a Athletics Academics Steering Committee. The FAR is a member of this committee.

iii. Louisville

1. Committee on Academic Performance (CAP) of the University of Louisville Athletics Association (ULAA) Board of Directors. Composed of 9 faculty (6 elected by the faculty, 2 appointed by the President, and the FAR). The FAR chairs CAP. Meets monthly.

iv. NC State

1. Faculty Academic Committee is a standing committee of the Council on Athletics and the FAC is composed of ten members of the voting faculty, six of whom are elected by the Faculty Senate with the other four members appointed by the Chancellor. The FAR is a non-voting, ex officio member.

v. Notre Dame

1. Faculty Board on Athletics consists of 15 members: 7 elected, 4 appointed, and 4 ex officio members. The 7 elected members are elected as follows: 1 by and from the teaching and research faculty of each College, one from the teaching and research faculty of the Law School, and two elected at large from the teaching and research faculty. Three of the 4 appointed voting members are appointed by the President from the teaching and research faculty and one voting member is appointed from the student body. The FAR chairs the Faculty Board on Athletics.

vi. University of Virginia

1. Athletics Advisory Council reports to the A.D. and is composed of 17 members, including faculty, staff, administrators, and two student members (SAAC President and an at-large member). The FAR is a regular member of the committee. The Faculty Senate appoints one representative to the committee.

vii. Virginia Tech

1. University Athletics committee. President appoints the Chair from Committee members. The current Chair is the FAR. There are

representatives from the alumni association (1), the athletic booster club (1), one college dean, one faculty representative from each of the 8 colleges nominated by the faculty in the college, one faculty senator, one rep from the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies, one administrator and professional faculty nominated by the Commission on Administrative and Professional Faculty Affairs, one staff rep, one scholarship SA, one grad student, one undergrad student.

viii. Wake Forest

1. Faculty Committee on Athletics composed of 9 elected undergraduate faculty, FAR (voting), students, Dean of College, VP of University for Investments

**UNC**

1. Response to Jay Smith email data request. See email exchange posted on Sakai. Jay has written back (as you know) asking for our response.

## Time Demands

### Mandatory time off concept

**Intent:**

- In sports other than football, to require three (3) weeks of student-athlete discretionary time (defined in 17.02.14; no required or recommended workouts) from the beginning of classes in the fall to the conclusion of the academic year in the spring, with at least one (1) week off following the championship segment of the playing season for those sports that conclude during the academic year and before the week prior to final exams.
- Each week must be seven consecutive calendar days.
- Already required time off the week before final exams through the end of final exams shall NOT be included in satisfying this requirement.
- Vacation periods between terms shall not be included in satisfying this requirement.
- Vacation periods during a regular academic term may be used to meet this requirement.

**Rationale:** During the course of the academic year, student-athletes should be provided an appropriate number of weeks off from required athletics activities to be able to focus on non-athletics activities and recover from their seasons. Assigning a number of weeks to each sport but not specifying exactly when each of those weeks must be used provides appropriate flexibility for each sport to use the weeks according to what is best for its student-athletes and the sport's training and recovery norms. This is a similar model that currently exists for football. These three weeks, in addition to already required weeks off prior to and during final exam periods outside the season will provide meaningful time for student-athletes to engage in non-athletic activities on campus.

**Potential bylaw(s):**

1. A new bylaw would be added to the beginning of Bylaw 17 or to each sport section that identifies that each student-athlete must be provided three (3) weeks of student-athlete discretionary time during the academic year. One such week shall be provided following the championship segment for any sport that concludes during the academic year and before the week prior to final exams.
2. An exception to the postseason week would be included to accommodate sport-specific training with a coach when the student-athlete is training for elite national and international competition or qualifying competition for such events.

## **Time Demands**

### **Schedule transparency and consistency concept**

Intent: To require the distribution of anticipated sport-specific athletics activities to each student-athlete on a regular basis, as specified. Further, to require the distribution of such information to prospective student-athletes on an official visit.

Rationale: Increasing the communication and transparency on the athletic activities for a student-athlete will allow them to better budget their time and determine when they may be able to participate in non-athletics activities. Student-athletes have reported a frustration with frequent changes to workouts, practice schedules and recruiting activities in particular and greater transparency may lead to a better relationship between coaches and student-athletes.

Potential bylaw(s):

1. A potential new bylaw (Bylaw 17) would specify the following:  
Institutional coaching staff members shall provide a prospective schedule of athletic activities in which each student-athlete would be expected to participate. The schedule may be provided for a minimum of one week but may be provided for a longer period of time (e.g., monthly, semester). At a minimum the schedule shall outline the days, time and anticipated length of athletic commitments, regardless of whether they are mandatory or notifications of voluntary opportunities.
2. A bylaw (Bylaw 17) would outline that changes to the schedule are permissible when circumstances outside the control of the student-athlete's coach (e.g. changes necessitated due to weather, facility scheduling issue) occur and are documented with the athletics director (or designee). The institution shall document its distribution and change policy in its student-athlete handbook or similar publication provided annually to student-athletes.
3. A bylaw (Bylaw 13) would require the provision of a sample student-athlete schedule to a prospective student-athlete on an official visit. The schedule must be in the sport in which the prospect is being recruited.