

Intercollegiate Athletics Committee Minutes of the May 6, 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
Jessica Harland-Jacobs
Rebecca Pauly
Jill Varnes, Faculty Athletic Representative (F.A.R.)
Dave Kratzer
Dave Bloomquist, Secretary*

Guest: Mark Rush, Adam Narkiewicz, Steve Pritz

Meeting May 6, 2011

AAC Room 202; 9:00

Agenda

1. Review and approval of the March 29, 2011 meeting minutes.
2. Report on the APP/GSR information submitted to the NCAA. (Steve Pritz)
3. Discussion of the new APR scores. (Dave Bloomquist)
4. Report on the newly revised predictive index. (Mark Rush, Adam Narkiewicz)
5. Liaison Update
6. Student and Student Athlete update
7. Other Business

ITEM 1. Minutes.

The March 29, 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. Report on the APP/GSR information submitted to the NCAA.

Steve updated the committee on the GSR Report that the NCAA is requiring of all Bowl Subdivision (formerly Division 1) schools. This is a summative collection of graduation data for the 2003-2004 cohorts (all teams). He acknowledged the tremendous effort his staff, the UAA and IAC representatives provided in delivering a comprehensive document. Out of twenty questions the NCAA submitted, sixteen were explainable (e.g., required additional information/clarification). The remaining four involved an interpretation of minor differences in definitions and after a brief discussion, were addressed satisfactorily.

Jamie said that an APR report, similar to the above GSR report, will likely be required in the future, and having a team approach rather than a single point person involved in this process is very helpful.

Since these issues involve academic standing of S.A.s, Andy wanted to know if the IAC should play a greater role in academic monitoring. Jamie responded by saying that they feel very good about the process, since it involves a multitude of checks and balances (with most of them outside of the UAA). However, the IAC should be cognizant of the process and what the data mean (APR, GSR).

Steve reminded the group that all UF students are tracked academically. That is to say, colleges are not involved in determining eligibility requirements, progress towards graduation, etc. of student athletes. He did admit that more automation would be desirable, since there is currently a lot of manual data inputting – always a possible source of error.

Andy suggested that in the future, any certifications, reports, etc. that are submitted (SEC, NCAA) should have an academician involved. It was pointed out that the FAR is this person and that the Provost's Office has also become a very active participant. Steve was more than willing to have a faculty member be more involved in the tracking and monitoring procedure. However, it is apparent that the current procedures in place are satisfactory.

ITEM 3. Discussion of the new APR scores. Dave B. provided an overview of the just released 2009-2010 Academic Progress Rate (APR) data, via handouts. They show how UF compared to the other schools. In each sport, all exceeded the minimum 925 figure (a number that is supposed to correlate to a 50% graduation rate). He volunteered to plot the data so that trends could be easily recognized. He noted that there is an upward trend and Keith and Jamie feels this figure will likely rise in the future (possibly 930-935).

Andy remarked that this is the kind of data that the NCAA and public can relate to vis-à-vis academic progress and the IAC should be intimately acquainted with.

Jeremy made the point that a "blip" in any data should not be interpreted as a forgone trend. The most important aspect is that all the teams are well above the 925 threshold. However, the IAC should understand if and why such a "blip" occurred.

Joe Delfino asked if these analyses are done on the student body at large. The GSR is tracked, but since the APR involves competition eligibility, the data are not relevant.

ITEM 4. Report on the newly revised predictive index. Mark Rush, the originator of the Predictive Index, updated the Committee. This is based on a regression analysis of incoming S.A. high school data and to predict their first year GPA (He said that this is a good predictor of ultimate success at UF). He was asked to revisit the formula and if necessary re-calibrate it, based on additional historical data.

Mark and his graduate student, Adam handed out the results of the analysis. Their results are based on numerous variables (SAT, GPA, ACT scores, etc.) and they found that the ACT score is the least significant variable. In addition, The PI will vary according to a freshman's high school GPA. That is to say, a student with a low GPA will be helped more (their GPA raised via OSL's tutelage) than a 3.9 incoming athlete.

He was very reassured that the analysis closely mirrored the 1995 and 2005 equations. Their recommendation is to use an updated P.I., but to not include the above remedial variable in the regression.

Andy asked the committee to study Mark's report and relay any questions to him for clarification.

ITEM 5. Liaison Update

Jeremy wanted the committee to know that drug testing program of S.A.s is a very serious enterprise. There are numerous layers of oversight and testing (all outside of the UAA) and that the coaches are not involved in any way.

Andy added that both the President and Provost feel drug use on the campus is a serious problem, but that singling out the S.A.s to scrutinize is not fair.

Lynda mentioned that several schools are using males that practice with women's teams and classifying them as team members. This is ostensibly to satisfy TITLE IX. She said that no UF team does this.

Jamie and Mike's subcommittee looked at the charges of the IAC and recommended that two of them be transferred to others. That is to say, internal UAA staffing should be removed from the charge and instead have the FAR be the point person. The second was that since there is already a TITLE IX University committee in place, its duties could be expanded to include minority coaches hiring issues.

He handed out the suggested revisions to the charges and Andy asked the committee to be prepared to discuss at the next meeting.

Keith mentioned the graduating senior's banquet.

Jill provided an update to the committee. The SEC has their upcoming meeting in Destin. The new F.A.R. is Mike Sagas, Department Chair and faculty member in the department of Tourism and Sports Management. A former baseball player at Utah, he is very excited about the job. She said that the IAC should be the first place Mike should go to if he feels he is overloaded with his new responsibilities.

ITEM 7. Other Business

Dave K. said that Ryan Mosley's term is expiring and nominations are being solicited. Andy wanted to know if the Exit Interviews that the IAC had performed years ago could be reinstated.

Jeremy suggested that he should be more involved and volunteered to attend Deans meetings and the Senate to explain how serious the UAA is about academics.

Finally, Lynda recommended that committee members attend team events in order to get to know the S.A.s better.

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

Respectfully submitted,

David Bloomquist, IAC Secretary