

Intercollegiate Athletics Committee
Minutes of the March 29, 2011 Meeting

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 11 a.m. In attendance were:

Andy McCollough, Chair

Albert Matheny

Mike Katovich

Jeremy Foley

Keith Carodine

Joe Delfino

Jamie McCloskey

Lynda Tealer

Joe Glover, Provost

Jessica Harland-Jacobs

Rebecca Pauly

Jill Varnes, Faculty Athletic Representative (F.A.R.)

Dave Kratzer

Ryan Moseley

Dave Bloomquist, Secretary

Guest: Mark Rush

Agenda

1. Review and approval of the minutes of the February 10, 2011 meeting (attachment #1).
 2. Report and recommendation of the subcommittee to review the charge of the IAC (Varnes, Harland-Jacobs, McCloskey –distributed via email 3/15/11).
 3. Report of the newly constructed P.I. (Rush).
 4. Report of the subcommittee reviewing student learning disabilities (L.D.) data-policies and practices (Matheny, Pauly, Mosely, Carodine).
 5. Report and discussion of APP and GSR in response to NCAA review. (Bloomquist). Also a discussion of UF men’s Basketball GSR as reported in the following study:
http://www.tidesport.org/Grad%20Rates/2011_Mens_Bball_FINAL.pdf
 6. Review and discussion of the oversight responsibilities assigned to the IAC in the 2006 Self Study Report (attachment #2).
 7. Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative (Varnes).
 8. Liaison Updates (Foley, Tealer, McCloskey, Carodine).
 9. Student and Student Athlete Updates
- Other Business

ITEM 1. Minutes.

The February 10, 2011 minutes had been distributed prior to the meeting. The Chair asked for any corrections and hearing none, the minutes were passed by acclamation.

ITEM 2. Subcommittee to review the charge of the IAC.

A member of the subcommittee suggested that a By-laws and procedures manual be created. This will be on future agendas, but the Chair made an executive decision on the voting procedure. The

voting members will be the six faculty members, the F.A.R. and the two student members. The Chair and liaison members will not vote, but simply observe.

Jill then proposed revisions to the IAC's charge (previously distributed)

Responsibilities:

- A. Recommend policy changes related to academic issues affecting or affected by intercollegiate athletics
- B. Monitoring of admissions and academic progress of all student-athletes
- C. Monitoring changes in NCAA **and SEC** rules and procedures **relative to academic programs and progress**
- D. Reviewing with the UAA compliance officer the institution's compliance program
- E. **Receive, review and advise on various reports related to student athlete academic wellbeing (such as admissions, academic progress or others as identified by the committee or UAA)**
- F. Report to the faculty on issues related to intercollegiate athletics via the University Senate at least **once per year**
- G. Make additional recommendations to the President on any other matters related to **academic issues affecting or affected by** intercollegiate athletics

After a short discussion, a motion was made and seconded to approve the changes. The changes were approved unanimously. The Chair will send them on to the President for his review and probable endorsement.

ITEM 3. Predictive Index Update. *A former IAC member, Mark Rush updated the Committee on his progress in revisiting the P.I. formula (He was the originator of the Predictive Index, and the Committee felt it was due for a review and possible updating). Mark said he and his graduate student are making good progress and once the Registrar provides some additional data, he will be able to report back at the next IAC meeting.*

ITEM 4. Learning Disabilities. *The Chair prefaced this topic by noting the disparity between S.A. and the general student population vis-à-vis the numbers of learning disabled (L.D.) athletes. He was keen to understand why this occurs, what is the certification process and what accommodations are provided to them (e.g., extra test taking time, testing environment, note taking and substitution of courses).*

Albert distributed a summary of his subcommittee findings as well as the process UF uses in identifying L.D.s. once on campus. A major reason for the increase is that they are not diagnosed until they enroll. As a result, UF, like most other large universities, screen all incoming student-athletes for L.D.s. which in turn produces a dramatic increase in their number.

UF's Office of Student Life (OSL) developed an elaborate process for screening L.D.s and for defining and regulating OSL's Learning Specialist Assistants.

Quite a bit of discussion ensued, with several members impressed with the entire screening and accommodating process. Jill said this is an ongoing topic with the other SEC F.A.R.s and that UF's procedure is light years ahead of the other schools. Unfortunately a lack of resources limits screening the general student population.

ITEM 5. GSR Report to the NCAA. Dave Bloomquist handed out a series of documents describing the NCAA GSR (Graduation Success Rate) and APR (Academic Progress Report) submittals. He said all Division 1 schools must submit APR data annually (formative assessment) and that it was UF's turn to submit a GSR (summative assessment) report this year. After a copious amount of diligent work provided by the Registrar, OSL, et. al., UF submitted the required documentation, and is awaiting the NCAA's response.

The suggestion was to have the IAC look at future related documentation, but to maintain order, the internal rotation of them will be coordinated by a UAA point person.

There was quite a bit of discussion concerning the low graduation rate of UF's basketball team competing in the NCAA tourney. Several reasons were mentioned, such as timing of the season, if and when athletes leave during the term, etc. The point was made that due to the very small number of players on a team, having just a few leave (not in good standing), greatly affects the statistics. Regardless, this situation needs to be addressed.

ITEM 6. IAC's Oversight Responsibilities. This was a concomitant topic of the IAC's charge. Two documents were distributed ("Equity and Student Welfare" and "Academic Integrity") summarizing the current role of the IAC. Since we previously (ITEM 2) voted to revised our charge, it was suggested that we then should revisit the above documents. Jill and Jamie volunteering to review and recommend changes, since some of the duties and responsibilities appeared to be incongruent with the stated IAC oversight mission.

ITEM 7. F.A.R. Report. The F.A.R. mentioned that other SEC schools had implemented UF's class attendance policy, but that some now want to revisit it since they say it is too expensive or difficult to enforce. Jill doubts the other F.A.R.s will consider changes as there is little support to do so.

The other update is that the legislative cycle has started. One item involves the NCAA's Academic Cabinet recommendation that no more than 50% of a student's credit hours each term can be based on non-traditional courses. There is an ongoing conversation about how this should be spelled out.

There was further discussion about class attendance, particularly with more and more classes going on line. Watching a podcast or video of a lecture results in the current rule becoming somewhat dated. Andy said we might look at this next year.

There were no further updates from Liaisons Lynda, Jamie or Jeremy or the S.A member. Keith mentioned the "ESPY clone" awards banquet is April 11. It is organized by and run by the students and is worth attending.

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 12:06 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

David Bloomquist,
IAC Secretary