

**MINUTES, STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING  
2006 NCAA CERTIFICATION SELF-STUDY  
FRIDAY, JANUARY 20, 2006**

The January 20, 2006, meeting of the Steering Committee was called to order by the Chair, Provost Larry Abele, at 10:00 a.m. in room 211-A Westcott. Also attending were Ms. Cheryl Gonzalez, Ms. Pam Overton, Ms. Amy Lord, Mr. Mark Meleney, Mr. Charles Carr, Dr. Dianne Harrison, Dr. Maxine Jones, Mr. David Hart, Ms. Betty Steffens, Ms. Ruth Feiock, Mr. Mike Hankin, Dr. Karen Laughlin, Mr. Chris Schoonover, and Ms. Lee Hinkle.

The purpose of this meeting was to review and comment on the first draft (narrative and tables) submitted by the Academic Integrity Subcommittee. Many of the members' comments concerning this draft focused on minor changes in diction and/or syntax in order to either clarify or emphasize certain points. These have been communicated to the subcommittee chair in writing. Therefore, for the purposes of these minutes, only those members' comments pertaining to significant substantive issues are cited.

After Dr. Laughlin distributed copies of her Subcommittee's draft report, Dr. Harrison noted that it was important to address item no. 2, "Top 10 Issues for Division I Institutions in the Athletics Certification Process," as that issue pertains to Operating Principle 2.1. Dr. Laughlin explained that the Academic Subcommittee of the Athletics Committee is the entity responsible for reviewing and approving the Academic Support Services program for student-athletes, while Mr. Meleney added that this unit conducts reviews of student-athletes' graduation rates as part of this overall review process. Dr. Abele interjected that it was important that such reviews be presented as part of the certification process's formal 5-year plan, and that language be added to the narrative explaining that student-athletes not graduating do, however, leave the University in "good standing."

Dr. Harrison also noted that the CARE program is for *all* students (not just student-athletes), while Mr. Meleney suggested that the narrative state the results of student-athletes' participation in CARE.

Ms. Overton agreed with Dr. Abele that the report narrative should contain a few brief sentences comparing the current three-year average graduation rates of student-athletes to the data presented in the 1999-2000 NCAA Certification Self-Study document.

Ms. Overton further suggested, and Committee members unanimously agreed, that whenever possible, all references to 2009 as a completion date for any project be changed to 2010 to ensure that all future-based data associated with this Self-Study be included in the next certification cycle, not the present one. Also, Dr. Abele requested, and Committee members agreed, that the required minimum TOEFL scores be cited as they pertain to admission requirements.

A discussion ensued regarding the differences between the three thresholds for admitting students with special skills, but who do not meet some of the specific academic/test criteria for admission. Currently, these three thresholds are: 1) “special admissions,” i.e., general NCAA term for students not meeting minimum acceptance criteria; 2) “state,” i.e., Board of Governors state-wide minimum acceptance criteria; and 3) “gap admissions,” i.e., students whose scores fall between the state criteria and general FSU minimum acceptance criteria (which are higher than the “state” criteria). Dr. Abele, Dr. Harrison, and Mr. Meleney ultimately agreed that these criteria must be better defined within the narrative. The terms to be used shall be “regular,” i.e., falling within the purview of regular admissions criteria; “special,” i.e., the general term as used by the NCAA; and “gap,” i.e., meeting the state criteria but falling below FSU’s regular admissions criteria. Dr. Abele requested that the narrative further report on “special” or “gap” student-athletes’ academic successes to clarify the interpretation of the admissions data. Dr. Laughlin also suggested that the narrative contain data on all “special admit” students, e.g., performing arts, not just student-athletes, when discussing admissions practices for students not meeting threshold academic and testing criteria.

Dr. Harrison suggested that the role of Undergraduate Studies be discussed in greater detail regarding “flagged” students applying for admission, including a brief discussion on audition requirements for “flagged” students applying for admission to one of the performing arts departments or who are admitted as “low income/first generation.” Dr. Abele added that the narrative be reworded to state, for example, that of 263 special admissions occurring in 2002, only 65 were student-athletes. The narrative will mention that detailed data and information regarding special admissions shall be available upon request.

Regarding narrative sections dealing with missed class time, Dr. Harrison requested that the words “criteria” and “excessive” be better defined, while Ms. Overton interjected that the ACC regulates missed class times for championships. In the discussion in Self Study item no. 13, all Committee members agreed that the Athletic Department’s policy manual regarding missed class time be revised to state explicitly that the first criterion for scheduling of team travel should be “To minimize missed classes” and that the self study response be revised to reflect this policy statement.

Under Operating Principle 2.2, Committee members recommended that any exact verbiage from the 1999-2000 Certification Self-Study cited in this document be enclosed in quotation marks. Also, the five areas comprising the Athletic Department’s Academic Support Program are to be specifically cited. Dr. Harrison suggested that the discussion on the “mapping” process be clarified, including a statement that mapping is available to all students, not just student-athletes.

Regarding the section on specific academic support services, both Ms. Overton and Ms. Lord noted that athletic counselors work closely with all satellite advisors to provide “seamless” academic assistance for student-athletes. Moreover, a discussion regarding gifted student-athletes shall be included within the heading of “Academic Awards and Honors.”

Dr. Laughlin suggested that the discussion of the periodic review process for academic support services further clarify the roles of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and the Academic Subcommittee of the Athletics Committee. This revision should also contain more detailed information about the timelines involved with the rotational review process.

Subcommittee chairs were encouraged to limit the length of the narrative reports due to space restrictions in the NCAA online forms.

Upon conclusion of the discussion of the draft from the Academic Integrity Subcommittee, Dr. Jones provided a status report of the Equity and Student-Athlete Welfare Subcommittee. Her group has completed the first draft of the gender equity section and will shortly begin work on the minority equity section.

Ms. Steffens reported the progress on the Governance and Commitment to Rules Compliance Subcommittee. Two sections have already been completed in draft format, and she expects all first drafts to be completed by March 17.

Finally, Dr. Abele informed Committee members that all the orientation sessions for broad-based participation had been completed (except for a presentation to the members of the Faculty Senate).

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.