



MINUTES OF THE
1A FACULTY ATHLETICS REPRESENTATIVES
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

NCAA National Office
Indianapolis, Indiana

May 9-10, 2008

Participants:

Percy Bates, University of Michigan
Peter Nicholson, University of Hawaii, Manoa
Joe Potuto, University of Nebraska
William Smith, University of Utah
Bob Chichester, NCAA
Ted Breidenthal, Sports Association Management, Inc.

Susan Lipnicky, University of Miami (Ohio) attended the meeting and was the conference representative on behalf of Jan Rintala.

Committee members Susan Albrecht, University of Pittsburgh; Roger Caves, San Diego State University; Jack Evans, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Joe Hornsby, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Ken Kasavant, Washington State University; Bill McKee, University of North Texas; Jan Rintala, Northern Illinois University; and C. Paul Rogers III, Southern Methodist University, were not able to attend.

Friday, May 9, 2008

1. Opening Remarks. The meeting was called to order at 1 p.m. by Dr. Bates, University of Michigan, president of the Association. All members were present as noted above.
2. Discussion of COIA's National Meeting. The Executive Committee focused its discussion on COIA's announcement that it intends to develop a national ranking system of academic performance by NCAA member institutions. It expressed concern regarding the criteria that will be used to determine the ranking and the overall evaluation process.

3. Discussion of the Good Academic Standing Rules. There was a lengthy discussion on how the NCAA defines “good academic standing” in various NCAA Bylaws (14.4.3.3, 14.01.2.1, 14.02.5, 14.01.2.1.1). It was noted that a large number of institutions that do use the term “good academic standing” (perhaps as many as one-half) apply the relevant bylaws strictly and in good faith. Thus, students who are on probation or who have less than a 2.0 are not eligible to compete. However, it was stated that a large number of the schools that use the term do not refer to the “good academic standing” rules in determining eligibility. Instead, these schools refer to an interpretation of Bylaws 14.01.1 and 14.02.5 to specify that the definition of good academic standing applied to student-athletes shall be a standard “*at least as demanding* as the minimum standard applied to all students in order to participate in extracurricular activities at that institution.” Mr. Chichester contacted Julie Cromer, NCAA director of legislative services, who confirmed that this item has been added to the agenda for the newly formed Academic Cabinet.

4. Update on 1A FAR Bylaws. Dr. Bates asked that Mr. Breidenthal provide a written update of the 1A FAR bylaw issues that are left to be resolved from the January 2008 meeting. It was noted that an election to seat a vice president and a treasurer is of paramount importance. Also, the conference rotation on the Executive Committee needs to be addressed.

5. Agenda Items for the September 28-30 1A FAR Meeting.
 - a. The tentative agenda for Sunday, September 28, is as follows:

9 – 10:30 a.m.	APR Discussion
10:30 a.m. – Noon	Discussion of the Basketball Enhancement Committee recommendations
1 – 2:30 p.m.	How to nominate your student-athletes for NCAA scholarships and awards (e.g., Walter Byers Scholarship; post-graduate scholarships; Woman of the Year)
2:30 – 5 p.m.	1A FAR Business Meeting

 - b. The tentative agenda for Monday, September 29, is as follows:

1 – 3 p.m.	The FAR role in dealing with crisis on campus (joint session with athletics directors)
------------	--

[The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.]

Saturday, May 10

The meeting was called to order at 8 a.m. by the president, Dr. Bates.

6. Discussion of What the Ideal 1A FAR Association Would Look Like in Five Years. Dr. Bates led the Executive Committee in a discussion about what the ideal 1A FAR Association would look like in the next five years. A number of identifiable goals were discussed, including the following:
 - a. The NCAA would contact the 1A FARs first for counsel as it relates to academic issues within athletics;
 - b. Key media would contact the president of the 1A FARs to seek comment when needed;
 - c. The 1A FAR Executive Committee would be involved in all NCAA planning as it relates to academic reform and like issues;
 - d. A broader, more involved partnership would be formed with the NCAA research staff to assist in studying and researching on-going academic issues;
 - e. The Association would develop more policy papers and propose legislation, when appropriate;
 - f. Regular, annual meetings would be scheduled to discuss academic issues with presidents;
 - g. More assistance would be provided to assist in getting FARs more involved on campus;
 - h. Clearly define the key issues, articulate them and be in a position to act quickly;
 - i. Ensure that faculty are an integral part of all academic reform solutions;
 - j. Identify key issues, present the range of arguments, develop three to four components that are necessary and critical to a solution, and allow presidents the freedom to put it together;
 - k. Develop a partnership with and a special interest group (SIG) for FARs within the American Education Research Association (AERA);
 - l. 1A FARs would take a leadership role in interpreting data that is generated from APR studies;

- m. Develop a large sample of successful APR improvement plans to share with and educate other 1A FARs; and
- n. Assist the NCAA national office staff with “Shaping the Future of APR.”

7. Other Business.

- a. Mr. Breidenthal agreed to call all 1A FARs to promote attendance at the annual meeting in September and to solicit interest to serve on one of four new committees to be developed this summer. The new committees are research, academic reform, legislation and membership/media relations.
- b. The executive committee applauded the efforts and commitment of Dr. Nicholson, who traveled from Hawaii to attend the meeting.

8. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 10 a.m.

#