Present:

Ms. Danielle Teetzel, NCAA (via conference call)
Dr. Peg Gray-Vickrey, Chairperson
Mr. Kenneth Kavanagh, Director of Athletics
Ms. Kathy Peterson, Senior Woman Administrator/Athletics Certification Liaison
Ms. Susan Byars, Academic Integrity Subcommittee Chair
Mr. Jorge Lopez, Gender/Diversity and Student Athlete Well Being Subcommittee Chair
Dr. Donna Price Henry, Governance and Commitment to Rules Compliance Subcommittee Chair (via conference call)
Ms. Colleen Sorem, Athletics Administration Director
Dr. Cathy Duff, Chief Report Writer
Ms. Jessica Rouse, Director of Compliance
Ms. Veronica Forsyth, Administrative Staff for Steering Committee

Absent:

Ms. Marianne Rosenhauer, Assistant to the Chief Report Writer

Meeting Convened at 2:35PM

I. Welcome and Gathering

Dr. Gray-Vickrey welcomed the committee members and Ms. Teetzel.

II. Remarks – Ms. Teetzel

Ms. Teetzel stated that she hoped the Committee was progressing and that the April deadline would be here before we knew it.

III. Steering Committee – Dr. Gray-Vickrey

Dr. Gray-Vickrey reported that the Committee is making good progress. The first draft of the Academic Integrity section has been reviewed and the Gender/Diversity and Student Athlete Well Being section is being worked on.

IV. Academic Integrity Subcommittee – Ms. Byars, Chair

Ms. Byars had no agenda items.

V. Gender/Diversity and Student Athlete Well-Being Sub Committee – Mr. Lopez, Chair

Mr. Lopez submitted one agenda item for clarification.
a) **Clarification. Operating Principle 3.1, question 8(18).** Is this question just telling us that an annual review of the plan for improvement needs to be included in #9 or is it asking for something different?

Ms. Teetzel stated that question #8 on pages 42 and 43 had four (4) sections (“a” through “d”). Each section has 18 program areas that need to be addressed. The program areas are listed in Attachment No. 2: Program Areas to be Reviewed for Gender Issues on pages 54 and 55. Attachment No. 2 lists 17 areas but there are 18 areas. No. 18 is **Annual Review for Plan for Improvement.** This area documents the review process that will be used in looking at the plan each year.

Ms. Teetzel stated that this is the starting point for answering question #9 on page 43.

Mr. Lopez asked for clarification of Operating Principal 3.2 questions 7 and 8 on page 46. His question was whether additional narrative was needed or if tables are sufficient. Ms. Teetzel stated that the questions ask that the data be analyzed and explained so an explanation is required.

VI. Governance and Commitment to Rules Compliance Subcommittee – Dr. Henry, Chair

Dr. Henry submitted two agenda items for clarification.

a) **Operating Principle 1.2 #5.** How broad should the category of “individuals outside of the athletics department” be? For example, if we include a College of Arts and Sciences advisor, do we also include the supervisor (associate dean), and the next level of supervisor (dean)? Is there a standard list of positions that should be included in this response?

Ms. Teetzel stated that anyone who deals directly with a student athlete should be included. There is no standard list of individuals established by the NCAA. Each institution is different.

b) **Clarification Operating Principle 1.2 #4-5.** What evidence do you recommend for demonstrating meeting this operating principle for Contracts, Letters of Appointment, Job Descriptions, and Performance Evaluations? How much latitude do the reviewers have in interpreting this item?

Ms. Teetzel stated that the Peer-Review Team will ask for a sample of each document that is used by the University – contract, letter of appointment, job description and performance evaluation. The question was asked whether the Peer-Review Team would accept documents that are not current since all of the documents listed are either on an annual basis or anniversary date. Ms. Teetzel stated that an explanation of University policy for evaluations and reviews should be provided.

VII. Chief Report Writer Questions – Dr. Duff and Ms. Rosenhauer

Dr. Duff had no agenda items.

VIII. General Questions or Comments

Dr. Gray-Vickrey asked Ms. Teetzel whether the University should start planning for the Peer-Review Team. She stated that we have a file cabinet which will hold all critical documents. Ms. Teetzel suggested that all coaches, student athletes, and others that will be interviewed by the Peer-Review Team be notified of the dates of the visit so that holds can be placed on their calendars. The Peer-Review Team will provide a list of individuals that they will want to meet with at a future date.
Ms. Teetzel stated that five (5) hotel rooms would be needed for the visit. The Peer-Review Team and she will arrive on Sunday, September 26th and depart on Tuesday, September 28th. Hotel accommodations were discussed and Ms. Teetzel agreed that Embassy Suites would be appropriate. She stated that the Peer-Review Team would want a facility tour followed by a reception and dinner to include the Steering Committee members on Sunday. All interviews by the Peer-Review Team would be conducted on Monday, September 27th, followed by an exit meeting on Tuesday, September 28th. She suggested that a dinner reservation be made for the Peer-Review Team for Monday evening.

Ms. Teetzel stated that besides reserving Academic Building 5 #309 (conference room) and the Eagle Conference Room, we should also provide four (4) small conference rooms/offices for use by the Peer-Review Team.

Ms. Teetzel stated that a full list/description of the needs of the Peer-Review Team will be provided closer to the date of the visit.

IX. Meeting adjourned at 3:10PM.