

Intercollegiate Athletics Committee
Minutes of the January 20, 2012 Meeting

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 2:00 p.m.

In attendance were:

Andy McCollough, Chair

Albert Matheny

Mike Katovich

Keith Carodine

Joe Delfino

Jamie McCloskey

Jessica Harland-Jacobs

Mike Sagas - FAR

Brian Howell, SAACS Representative

Craig Thompson, Student Body Representative

Rebecca Pauly - via telephone conference

Dave Bloomquist, Secretary

Agenda

1. Review and approval of the minutes of the November 18, 2011, meeting.
2. Discussion of the IAC responsibilities as specified by the 2006 self-study- Mike Katovich
3. Tutor survey - final review –Dave Bloomquist
4. Clustering study: Review and IAC “Dashboard”
5. Eligibility /Graduation –Timelines
6. Graduation success rate
7. Remedial classes
8. COIA Membership
9. NCAA Update – Jamie McCloskey
10. Liaison Updates
11. Student and Student Athlete Reports
12. Other Business

ITEM 1. Approval of Minutes

A motion was made and seconded to approve the November 18, 2011 minutes as distributed. They were unanimously approved.

ITEM 2. Discussion of the IAC responsibilities

Background. Our last Self-Study report (included in the NCAA Certification Report), listed several IAC responsibilities that seemed outside of our purview. Hence, Mike K. and his subcommittee drafted a revised list of charges that Jamie suggested was more appropriate. The specific handout in question, addresses Equity and Student-Athlete Welfare and Academic Integrity areas. Mike walked the committee through the suggested changes, with Jamie noting that the NCAA’s new president is now questioning the entire Certification process (as to its value).

The items discussed include:

3. Appoint a member of the student-athletic committee to the IAC. Brian explained that either the SAAC president or vice-president is automatically an IAC member. While no formal vote was taken, the suggestion of changing "Appoint" to "Approve" was left on the table.

2. Evaluate results of programsminority student-athletes. This is a Title IX responsibility and hence it was recommended that the IAC be removed from this item as a co-implementer. However, after discussion, it was decided to keep the IAC on board.

1. Review competitive schedules....."likewise for this item, i.e., it was suggested that the IAC be removed, but after much discussion, it was added back on as a charge. This was decided after Albert summarized UF's policy on excused absences (i.e., the 12-day rule)

The other two items, Tutors (A4) and Academic Integrity both remained as IAC co-responsibilities.

ITEM 3. Tutor Survey Final Review (handout)

Andy had asked the members to submit suggestions/comments to Dave B. or Keith on the current survey questions. The only question that elicited discussion was number 20, "Has a coach or other staff member done work for another athlete?" The issue was why is "coach or other staff member" mentioned since this is a tutoring program survey and shouldn't ask for information outside of this subject. Albert explained why it was originally inserted; due to other schools having issues with coaches helping. The other suggestion was to include an open ended question, such as "Do you have suggestions, comments or criticisms about the program."

The committee agreed on the rewording as "Other than the tutors, has anyone else done work for another athlete?"

Regarding the open ended suggested question; Number 22 does allow for comments. However, Dave will rework 22 to read. "If you have suggestions, comments or criticisms about the program, please explain below".

A new question will be added that reads (subject to committee approval), "Have you ever asked your tutor for help on something, and he or she said 'No, I am not allowed to do that'". He will also remove the "Thank you, etc. and place it at the end of the survey.

The question was asked what happens if a problematic answer comes back. Jamie said that in the past, a single answer that raised a red flag resulted in hiring an outside consultant to look over the tutoring program, including interviews with athletes, tutors, academic advisors. They then submitted a report to the UAA with their findings and if appropriate, any suggestions for improvement. This was done by the UAA and IAC and the question was reworded.

Andy reminded the committee about the process that is currently followed. The tutor survey answers are compiled and the results presented at an IAC meeting for discussion. If there are issues (to date, other than the aforementioned consultant review, there have been none), the IAC will make suggestions to the UAA as to what action(s) should be taken.

Dave mentioned the very low response rate, typically 10 - 12% and if there were any ideas to increase it? One of the responses from an S.A. was that, he had already taken it last year. Several ideas were floated. One suggestion is to rework the "Greetings....." section to indicate that this survey should be filled out **each** Semester. There was a substantial amount of discussion on this topic. While no consensus was reached, one idea that appeared to gain traction was for the OSL Academic Advisors to tell the S.A.s at the beginning of each term (during pre-registration) that at some point they will have to take the survey (a "heads-up").

Andy asked Keith and Dave to come up with some suggestions on how to improve the submission rate.

ITEM 4. Clustering study

This topic was discussed at the last meeting. Basically why are the majors for S.A.s so different when compared to the general student population? Andy asked for a volunteer to further vet this by looking at S.A. majors by sport. Joe Delfino suggested that the first step would be to query the OSL advisors on why their particular S.A. decided on a particular major. Andy added that the S.A.s should also be interviewed. Examples of questions one could pose to the Advisors, could include, "Has your S.A. started working towards a declared major?", "If so, why did he or she choose this one?" After obtaining the data, query the S.A.s with similar questions for comparison.

Our S.A. committee member was asked how he chose his major. He explained the process, i.e., a give and take between the student and his or her advisor with no set procedure in play. He thinks some students simply stay in the major they are originally placed, while others are more invested in their ultimate career major and migrate towards it.

Mike asked why the IAC stopped the exit interviews with graduating students. He thought this would be an opportunity to ask these types of questions.

Andy wants this committee to meet with S.A.s without the Liaison or Administration members present to ask them about their experiences. This topic was initiated by a newspaper article on S.A.s "clustering" around certain majors - across FBS schools.

Andy asked Joe and Keith to work on this - understanding that this will be an iterative process.

The next topic was something the Chair feels should be on the IAC's radar continuously. The "Dashboard" relates to the intersection of academics and athletics and includes such items as the APR, GSR, Major, etc.,- basically the academic lives of S.A.s. He will generate a list of items on what information the committee needs (including how often and from whom) in order to fulfill our responsibilities. This list will be sent to the members for comments, additions, etc. and then to Keith et.al, for implementation.

ITEM 5. Eligibility/Graduation Timelines

At the last meeting, Mike K. asked about the Post-Bachelorette conundrum S.A.s can fall prey to with respect to playing time eligibility versus graduation dates. Currently, students cannot register as Post-Bacs, which negatively impacts S.A.s that have graduated but still eligible to compete.

Albert said he, Mike K. and Mike S. would investigate possible solutions. Albert has already talked to several in the Registrar's Office for their input.

ITEM 6. Graduation Success Rate (GSR)

This item was discussed at the last meeting and David is tasked with plotting the data similar to the APR plots previously created. He reminded the members about the low basketball GSR figure (38%) compared to the national BB average of 64% and the reasons for it.

Andy asked Dave B. to further investigate this with regards to UF and to report back at the next meeting with his findings.

ITEM 7. Remedial Classes

Andy brought this item up based on the practice of S.A.s taking remedial classes at Santa Fe College, instead of at UF. He wanted to know how many do this, what is their success rate, etc. Keith responded that it is under the auspices of the Office for Academic Support's AIM Program (**Assisting students Improving skills Maximizing potential**). The courses are taught on UF campus, but by Santa Fe faculty. He also stated that these course grades are not included in a student's GPA. Since the Registrar has lists of all AIM students, it would be possible to determine how many of them are (and were) S.A.s.

Albert explained the downside of students taking these classes, in that unless they are registered as an Exploratory major, they rapidly get "off track" since the credits don't count towards their major. In addition, they are only allowed to take three semesters of classes. Other information includes they must make a "C" in a particular course or repeat it and enrollment is based on their High School ACT or SAT scores.

ITEM 8. COIA Membership (Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics)

The Chair of the Faculty Senate approached the IAC Chair to see if UF was interested in joining the organization. This is a coalition of faculty senates from the NCAA FBS schools, their mission, to provide a faculty voice on intercollegiate issues. Andy queried the UAA, which had no objections, and in fact, felt that the IAC was doing more than the COIA mission statement. Dave will present this as an informational item at the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting. Andy mentioned several publications that the COIA produced and which can be found at the website below.

<http://blogs.comm.psu.edu/thecoa/>

ITEM 9. NCAA Update

Jamie reported that at the NCAA recent meeting (October, 2011) a Board (subcommittee) approved, in addition to a full scholarship, the payment of \$2,000 to athletes, beginning in Fall 2012. In addition, they allowed schools to offer multi-year scholarships (i.e., 1 -5 years). Subsequently, the membership (schools) voted to suspend the full scholarship/monetary award item. They will discuss this again in April possibly for implementation in 2013. However, because some schools had already offered the scholarship/funds to their S.A.s., they are allowed to honor their commitment to their students. (UF did not make any commitment)

The multi-year proposal is still up for adoption and the schools will vote it up or down in February.

The other item of business was that the NCAA was streamlining their enforcement process - due in part to issues occurring at other schools. The penalties will be stricter as a result. The NCAA manual is also scheduled for an overhaul- including simplification and de-regulation.

ITEM 10. Liaison Updates

Keith told the committee that next Tuesday at 7 pm, they are sponsoring the Recruiter Roundtable. This venue provides companies to meet with S.A.s before Career Day the next day begins.

Mike Sagas, the FAR, had nothing to report.

ITEM 11. Student and Student Athlete Reports

Brian (SAACS) reported on the creation of a S.A.s blog (Gator Grind) that provides other students an insight on the various facets of being a student athlete.

Craig (Student Body Rep) mentioned that Blue Key is working on a project that introduces international students to football. This clinic would be held in the fall to help them understand the nuances of athletics as well as integrate them into the culture.

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

*David Bloomquist,
IAC Secretary*