

Intercollegiate Athletics Committee
Minutes of the December 3, 2010 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
Jaime McCloskey
Lynda Tealer
Alicia Goodwin
Jessica Harland-Jacobs
Ryan Moseley
Dave Bloomquist, Secretary

Guests: Zina Evans, Steve Pritz

Intercollegiate Athletic Committee

Agenda – December 3, 2010

1. Review and approval of the minutes of the October 19, 2010 meeting.
2. Report of the subcommittee to review the charge of the IAC (Varnes, Harland-Jacobs, McCloskey).
3. Report of the subcommittee to review data needs of the IAC.
 - a.) Suggested study of the success of the PI in terms of APR and Graduation Rates (Delfino, Katovich, Carodine).
 - b.) Report on the responsibilities of the IAC as assigned in the 2006 Self Study Report (Mike Katovich).
4. Report on the progress of:
 - a.) IAC notebooks
 - b.) Revision and update on Predictive Index.
5. Report on SEC Compliance Review (McCloskey)
6. Information and data on learning disabilities.
7. Discussion and explanation of the procedures used in admissions and tracking of the Academic Program of Athletes (Zina Evans, Steve Pritz).
8. Liaison Update.
9. Student and Student Athlete Report
10. New Business

ITEM 1. *The first order of business was to approve the October 19 meeting minutes. A motion was made and seconded. The vote was taken and the minutes were approved unanimously.*

ITEM 7. *This item was first on the agenda with Zina Evans (Associate Provost for Enrollment Management) and Steve Pritz (Registrar), explaining the eligibility/ admissions procedure for S.A.s and how their academic progress is monitored. Basically, there is no difference in how S.A. and regular students are evaluated and admitted. They flow into the system the same way. Zina mentioned that NCAA requires that scores must come from the testing agency as opposed to simply using High School transcripts. Prior to an official visit, UF checks the S.A.'s Predictive Index (P.I.) to decide if he or she can succeed at UF if admitted. A small subset of borderline admits (any student, foreign or domestic) are evaluated by the Admissions Committee, to see if an exception is warranted. The Committee also considers the P.I. In very*

rare cases, the Provost is consulted and after weighing all factors, may provide for a "special admit". It was pointed out that the in place screening process has had a huge effect on reducing the number of special admits (e.g., none this year), since a S.A. that has no chance of succeeding will not be recruited.

Steve then proceeded to explain the monitoring of S.A.s. He said that it is a team effort, from the Provost down to the individual colleges, due in part to the enormous amount of procedures that must be adhered to. Each year there is a training program for all involved and the process is continually refined as needed. The UAA submits its squad lists to the various groups and then each potential S.A. is reviewed to see if they are eligible for the upcoming year. Keith was singled out as doing an outstanding job supporting the students.

He was asked if data are generated regarding the certification/recertification process and how many students are making progress. Steve said yes there is cumulative data, but due to privacy issues, UF does not want it distributed.

Jeremy interjected that the IAC should be privy to and review the APR (Academic Progress Rates) and GSR (Graduation Success Rates) reports.

Steve finished up by listing some of the data that they look at on a daily basis. For example, student credit hour load, grade/degree program changes and GPAs term by term. One thing that he emphasized is their ability to sort the data by sport. He provided some examples on how well the S.A.s are doing (out of 518 reviewed, seven were not certified).

He was asked about the amount of time and effort needed to track the athletes. He and Zina said it is substantial due to the complexities involved. For example, two full time FTE support staff work on this.

ITEM 2. Andy reiterated that the IAC's charges are extremely open-ended and hence subject to interpretation. In fact, the wording implies that the Committee's responsibilities are the same as the FAR's. He asked if the subcommittee that was looking into this was ready to update the committee. Since the FAR was absent, this item was postponed.

ITEM 4b. Andy said that Mark Rush has agreed to review and update the Predictive Index if warranted. The UAA will fund a graduate student to help. An updated version should be ready in January. In addition, post P.I. data will be included through an enlarged study.

ITEM 3b. In the NCAA academic certification report, there were several items that cited the IAC as assuming the responsibilities for the items. The subcommittee is hence looking into this and if needed, may reallocate some of them. A draft of the report was distributed to the committee. One of the issues was whether the IAC should interact more with the Title IX committee. Andy asked that the members look over this carefully. Lynda stated that the Title IX committee reports directly to the President and it does not involve academics. In fact, it deals more with staffing issues (makeup).

In addition, some of the responsibilities cited in the report appeared to not logically fall to the IAC. The NCAA requires that some entity other than UAA staff review these. Jeremy said he and his staff will review it and decide which responsibilities should the IAC be involved with and if not, then to reallocate to another body. As an example, travel and per diem data should be reviewed by the UAA Board rather than the IAC.

ITEM 4a. The IAC notebooks were distributed. One advantage to them is when members cycle off, they can be given to new members to bring them up to speed.

ITEM 8. *Jamie handed out a summary related to the SEC's compliance review audit that occurred for the 3rd time on campus last week. It included who was interviewed and some of the topics discussed. The report will be completed in the Spring and the IAC will review it. In future reviews, it was suggested that both the UAA Board and SAAC committees be interviewed.*

ITEM 6. *Andy mentioned that the Provost was interested in the number of S.A.s designated as having learning disabilities compared the general student body.*

Hence, Steve Pritz will provide the data to the IAC for review. There may be reasons why there is or is not a difference. For example, OSL's support for the S.A.s may be more robust than for other students in identifying symptoms and supporting them. Jeremy said the IAC needs to understand how OSL operates in this assessment process. He also stated that the assessment procedure has been slightly modified to better reflect how the University handles these students.

Keith interjected that one in five people in the U.S. have a learning disability. He has looked at this issue with College of Education faculty. He said OSL has a systematic, screening and referral system in place.

The last items came from the SAAC representative. Alicia stated that their organization is currently involved in GatorTracks, distributing shoes to needed kids. They worked downtown helping set up the Miracle on Main Street event. They are starting a Tee shirt drive for Haiti and organizing a Dodge Ball game for S.A.s.

Ryan Moseley, apologized for missing the previous meetings due to an incorrect email address. He said that the IAC notebooks are a good idea for maintaining institutional knowledge. He also will work with Alicia and contribute to the notebook where appropriate from the students perspective.

Jeremy, Lynda and Keith had nothing to report. Dave said the Tutor Survey will go out in the next few weeks.

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 12:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

David Bloomquist,
Faculty Council Secretary