NCAA DIVISION I ATHLETIC CERTIFICATION
MONTHLY CONFERENCE CALL
MARCH 25, 2010
ACADEMIC BUILDING 5 – ROOM #309

Present:

Ms. Danielle Teetzel, NCAA (via conference call)
Dr. Peg Gray-Vickrey, Chairperson
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
Ms. Colleen Sorem, Athletics Administration Director
Dr. Cathy Duff, Chief Report Writer
Ms. Marianne Rosenhauer, Assistant to the Chief Report Writer
Ms. Jessica Rouse, Director of Compliance
Ms. Veronica Forsyth, Administrative Staff for Steering Committee

Absent:

Mr. Kenneth Kavanagh, Director of Athletics
Dr. Donna Price Henry, Governance and Commitment to Rules Compliance Subcommittee

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 asked how the certification was progressing. Dr. Gray-Vickrey stated that the goal of the Committee was to have all sections completed by April 2nd.

III. Steering Committee – Dr. Gray-Vickrey

Dr. Gray-Vickrey asked whether the new dates for the Peer Review Team visit were confirmed. Ms. Teetzel confirmed that the Team would visit the University on Tuesday - September 28th, Wednesday – September 29th – and Thursday – September 30th. The Team will arrive on campus the afternoon of the 28th. A campus tour, reception and dinner for the Team will be planned. The Steering Committee and other University staff will attend the reception and dinner. Location to be determined.

IV. Academic Integrity Subcommittee – Ms. Byars, Chair

Ms. Byars submitted one agenda item for clarification.

a. Clarification. 2.2 Question #11 – There are several recommendations that were made by the committee that conducted the Academic Support Services evaluation. Some of the issues are very small while others are larger and more identifiable. Do we respond to all of the recommendations in Question 11 or do
we just respond to the larger and more identifiable issues. What is NCAA expecting as a response for this question?

Ms. Byars asked whether all of the recommendations would need to be addressed. Ms. Teetzel stated that it would be best to lay out all the changes that have come out of the recommendations. She stated that she believes the more changes that have been made the better for the institution being reviewed. She also stated that any future changes should be presented in a Plan for Improvement. She cautioned that not all recommendations had to be followed but that it was important not to list a recommendation if the University did not plan to implement any changes.

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

Mr. Lopez submitted one agenda item for clarification.

a. Clarification. 3.1 Question #7

Mr. Lopez asked what constitutes a significant difference in the analysis of financial reports. Ms. Teetzel stated that there were no particular guidelines but any difference should have an explanation. This explanation can be provided in the narrative response.

Ms. Sorem asked whether the 36 examples in the revenue and expense categories were to be analyzed men vs. women or the total. Ms. Teetzel explained that there were only 13 categories with the 14th being a summary. An email with the information changing the number of categories had been sent previously. In this email it states the categories are analyzed men vs. women.

b. Governance and Commitment to Rules Compliance Sub Committee, Donna Henry Chairperson

Dr. Gray-Vickrey reported that the Steering Committee has signed off on 3.1 and 3.2. Dr. Henry was not in attendance but had not submitted any questions or comments.

c. Chief Report Writer Questions, Cathy Duff and Marianne Rosenhauer

There were no questions or comments from either Dr. Duff or Ms. Rosenhauer.

d. General Questions or Comments

Dr. Gray-Vickrey asked whether Ms. Teetzel though we were where we should be in the process. Ms. Teetzel said that she believed we were actually ahead of where we would be expected to be and thought that the monthly telephone calls have helped to keep the process on track.

Ms. Teetzel stated that she would not be able to do the scheduled conference call on April 22nd. She also stated that she did not believe that it was necessary to reschedule the call. Dr. Gray-Vickrey agreed and said that she would call or email if she or any Committee members have questions or concerns.
Ms. Teetzel stated that this is the first time that she has had scheduled monthly conference calls with any of the institutions that she has previously worked with. She said that she would be interested to see if they were beneficial to the process.

VI. Meeting adjourned at 3:10PM.