Meeting Convened at 10:05AM

I. Welcome and Gathering

Dr. Gray-Vickrey welcomed the committee members and Ms. Teetzel. She confirmed that Ms. Teetzel had received the agenda.

II. Remarks – Ms. Teetzel

Ms. Teetzel thanked Dr. Gray-Vickrey for the agenda.

III. Steering Committee – Dr. Gray-Vickrey

Dr. Gray-Vickrey reported that the Committee is making good progress and is in the process of reviewing drafts.

IV. Academic Integrity Subcommittee – Ms. Byars, Chair

Ms. Byars submitted two agenda items for clarification.

- **Clarification. Operating Principle 2.2—Please clarify what FGCU should do regarding the Self Study items since we do not have a self study or a cycle 2 certification.**

Ms. Teetzel stated that FGCU was not involved in the Review Cycle #2 due to being in Division II. We are currently in Cycle #3. Questions 1, 2, and 3 relate to historical issues and questions beginning with question #4 on relate to current issues. She recommended contacting the chairs of the other subcommittees to see what wording they were using. She stated that the answers should be consistent.
• Clarification. Operating Principle 22.2#6. — Is this question designed to differentiate between general students and student athletes?

Ms. Teetzel stated that question #6 relates to general students.

(Ms. Teetzel confirmed on 12-17-2009 that when the self-study items/charts refer to “students generally” it means all undergraduate, full-time degree seeking students.)

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

Mr. Lopez submitted two agenda items for clarification.

• Clarification. Operating Principle 3.2 Item # 8 – please define “students generally”. Is that undergraduate students degree-seeking full-time students only? Entire student body?

Ms. Teetzel stated that the chart on page 53 was confusing. The chart only relates to student athletes. The chart on page 54 however compares both populations – students and student athletes.

• Clarification. Operating Principle 3.2 Item # 8 – please define “student-athletes who received aid”. Is that all athletes, even those who did not receive aid? Additionally, the definition on the self study states to include partial and non-qualifiers who were ineligible for aid. Therefore, should we include all athletes (aid recipients and non-aid recipients)?

Ms. Teetzel stated that question #8 refers to all student athletes – recruited and non-recruited as well as scholarship and those not receiving financial assistance.

She stated that she will confirm the above information in an email to Dr. Gray-Vickrey.

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

Dr. Henry submitted one agenda item for clarification.

• Clarification. Operating Principle 1.2 Item #14—Please clarify the first portion of this question “Describe the process used by the institution during the “self-study” to review the most recent rules compliance evaluation to determine any necessary corrective action?”

Ms. Teetzel stated question #14 should include the following
1. Description of process used
2. Who analyzed/reviewed the evaluation
3. Actions taken
4. Date actions taken

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

Dr. Duff asked whether each section of the report should be responded to individually or if the report should be responded to in its entirety. Ms. Teetzel stated that it depended on how the initial report was written but that she would recommend responding to each section – action taken and the date the action was taken. Dr. Duff confirmed that each section has a text box in the program area which will enable the information to be added. She stated that the Ice Miller evaluation had been reviewed internally. Ms. Teetzel stated that the content of “A” through “O” needs to fit with the NCAA and that we need to make sure that we address all. She stated that “a, e, n, and o” are usually overlooked.

The Committee discussed whether the Ice Miller Compliance Report should be reviewed by them. Ms. Teetzel stated that it does not have to be reviewed by the Committee.
Ms. Teetzel addressed 1.2 #14. She recommends that the self study be reviewed during 2009-2010 by the committee that reviewed in 2008. Mr. Kavanagh stated that as the new Director of Athletics he should be part of the 2009-2010 review.

VIII. General Questions or Comments

Ms. Sorem asked whether the Academic Support Athletic Evaluation should be completed before the Peer Review visit. Ms. Teetzel stated that it should be done before April 30, 2010 and will need to be completed before certification standing for FGCU. If the evaluation has not been completed, she recommended that we add narrative outlining what has been done so far. Ms. Sorem reported that Dr. Toll, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, has recommended Peggy Raynor to review the self study and chair the Student Academic Support Athletic Review Committee. This committee must be comprised of members other than the Athletics staff or the Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR). The Committee requested that Dr. Gray-Vickrey ask President Bradshaw to approve the committee with Ms. Raynor as chair. The Academic Integrity subcommittee will provide Dr. Gray-Vickrey will additional names to submit to the President. The report must be completed by the end of January 2010. This committee will be continuing and will need to submit a report yearly.

Dr. Duff asked what the due date for supplemental information would be. Ms. Teetzel responded that the supplemental information should be submitted by April 30, 2010, but that we would have the opportunity to provide additional information during the period that she will be reviewing our submission – April 30, 2010 through June 30, 2010. The report will be submitted to the full NCAA committee in July 2010. If any issues arise on review by the committee, we will have the opportunity to provide additional supplemental information between July 2010 and August 2010.

Ms. Teetzel confirmed that we are still holding the week of September 19 through 24, 2010, September 26 through October 1, 2010 and the week of October 25 through 29, 2010 for the Peer Review visit to campus. A chair of the Peer Review Team has not been appointed. As soon as this is accomplished, a date for the visit will be confirmed.

Ms. Teetzel stated that it is better to put more information than we believe necessary in the report rather than try to make the answers concise and that it is better to create a plan for improvement instead of stating that the plan will be done in the future.

There were no technical questions from the Committee.

IX. Meeting adjourned at 10:55AM.