

NCAA Recertification Academic Integrity Committee

Meeting Summaries and Attendance

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
Drew Appleby	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Rose May	X	X			X		X	X
Cynthia Stone	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Denise O'Grady		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Steve Payne	X		X	X				X
Maggie Calcaterra	X	X		X		X	X	
Michelle Peterson				X			X	
Jennifer Scorniaenchi	X	X	X	X	X			
Tiffany Kyser								
Jeff Holloway						X	X	X

Drew Appleby, faculty representative from the Psychology Department (Chair)

Rose May, faculty representative from the Nursing Department

Cynthia Stone, faculty representative from the Public Health Department

Denise O'Grady, Associate Athletic Director for Academics

Steve Payne, athletic representative, Volleyball coach

Maggie Calcaterra, athletic representative, Softball coach

Michelle Peterson, staff representative, University College advisor

Jennifer Scorniaenchi, undergraduate student, Soccer player

Tiffany Kyser, graduate student, former Basketball player

Jeff Holloway, athletic representative, Athletic Department Event Manager

Meeting #1

- September 6, 2007
- Members were introduced. The recertification process was explained and its importance was emphasized. Recent changes in academic advising for student-athletes (SAs) were explained. The process for answering the recertification questions was discussed and tasks were identified and assigned. A sample recent recertification report (Utah State) was distributed so that members could form an impression of a "final product."

Meeting #2

- September 27, 2007
- The Utah State report was discussed. The process of reviewing and assessing the efficacy of support services for SAs was discussed, and it was decided that it was not appropriate for our committee to undertake this task because it must be conducted by a group that is separate from the Athletic Department and our committee contains three members who are directly affiliated with the Athletic Department. Types of data needed for the report (e.g., graduation rates and standardized test scores) were identified, sources for these data were

ascertained, and members volunteered to gather and collate these data into tables and descriptions.

Meeting #3

- October 18, 2007
- Denise shared information from her recent NCAA recertification site visit to Georgia State that provided the committee with a “reviewer’s view” of the process. The committee was informed that the process of reviewing and assessing the efficacy of support services for SAs would be conducted by a team led by the chairperson of the university’s Athletic Committee and composed of members with no direct affiliation with the Athletic Department. The concept of “special admissions” was discussed, and the Director of Admissions was identified as a source of information (i.e., the definition of a specially admitted student) on this topic. The chair volunteered to create an outline of the entire report so that individual reports could be placed into an organized structure.

Meeting #4

- November 8, 2007
- The Athletic Director was invited to the meeting to evaluate the progress of the committee, and he reported that we were making satisfactory progress in comparison to the other two recertification committees. Drew reported on a research project he is undertaking with two SAs that would identify the needs of transfer SAs and then create a set of workshops on these needs (e.g., time management, study skills, etc.) that would allow students to choose those topics they need and avoid those they do not need. Members continue to volunteer to work on individual sections of areas 2.1 and 2.2 of the report.

Meeting #5

- November 29, 2007
- Jeff Holloway is added to the committee and assumes the responsibility of accepting individual sections written by the members and collating them into a coherent report. He was invited to attend the rest of the meetings. The topic of “special admit” students was introduced and discussed without resolution. Drew volunteered to contact the director of admissions to clarify what constitutes a specially admitted student.

Meeting #6

- December 13, 2007
- The data collected in regard to graduation rates, standardized test scores, and admission status (fully admitted, conditionally admitted, and admitted based on appeal) were discussed and members volunteered to interpret these data and write sections of the report to describe how these data could be used to answer the questions posed in the report. Drew reported that students can be “special admits” in two ways. All special admits are those who are originally denied admission to the university. One group of specially admitted students are those who obtain a faculty member to sponsor them, but this arrangement cannot be

used by a student athlete because one stipulation of this arrangement is that the student cannot enroll in more than 11 hours, which would automatically make that student ineligible to compete. The other group are those who appeal directly to the Admissions Office.

Meeting #7

- January 17, 2008
- Drew requested the names of specially admitted SAs from the Admissions Office so that the committee could determine if there was any similarity among them (e.g., most from the same sport) that would raise any suspicions that favoritism or bias. Members continued to read and revise the report to ready it for its final draft.

Meeting #8

- January 31, 2008
- Members received and read the report prior to the meeting and spent the meeting making final corrections. The series of Yes No questions at the end of sections 2.1 and 2.2 were answered. All received a Yes answer except 2.2 d (The support services are approved and reviewed periodically by academic authorities outside the department of inter-collegiate athletics?). Denise created a plan to explain how this periodic review would take place.