

HANDBOOK



2015-16
NCAA © Division I
Institutional Performance Program
Handbook for Reclassifying Institutions

2015-16

RECLASSIFYING INSTITUTIONS

The NCAA Division I Institutional Performance Program Handbook is designed to assist NCAA member institutions participating in the Division I Institutional Performance Program and members of peer-review teams who will be conducting campus evaluation visits. The handbook was developed by the NCAA Division I Committee on Institutional Performance and has been organized in a format that permits easy access for individuals with only modest familiarity concerning Institutional Performance Program. It is not meant to answer every question related to the Institutional Performance Program; rather, it provides a foundation on which to increase understanding of the self-study process.

The handbook follows a sequential order that conforms to the sequence of events related to the Institutional Performance Program and describes the responsibilities and activities of the institution, the peer-review team and the Committee on Institutional Performance. Throughout the handbook, external peer reviewers are referred to as “the peer-review team.” When referring to the Committee on Institutional Performance Program, the handbook uses either the formal title or refers only to “the committee.”

To ensure that the handbook is a useful and up-to-date resource guide, the NCAA revises it annually and distributes it each year to reclassifying institutions and peer-reviewers involved in the Institutional Performance Program process for the upcoming academic year.

Contained within this handbook is a document referred to as the glossary of terms. The glossary of terms document provides a brief explanation of key terms with which the institution will need to become familiar throughout the Institutional Performance Program process.

We hope the handbook is useful and contributes to the successful completion of the Institutional Performance Program process.

Users of the handbook are encouraged to submit questions or suggestions regarding the use of the publication to:

NCAA Academic and Membership Affairs
Attention: Institutional Performance Program Staff
P.O. Box 6222
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6222
Telephone: 317/917-6222

Information regarding the Institutional Performance Program can be obtained via the Internet at www.NCAA.org [[NCAA Division I Institutional Performance Program](#)]

1. Introduction.....	4
The NCAA and its Legislative Process	4
Origin and History of the Institutional Performance Program	4
The Program’s Purpose.....	4-5
Benefits of Self-Study.....	5
Committee on Institutional Performance.....	6
Philosophy Statement of the Committee on Institutional Performance.....	6
External Peer-Review Teams.....	6-7
General Timeline for the Institutional Performance Program Process	8
2. Preparing for the Self-Study	9
Responsibilities of the Chancellor or President.....	9
Forming the Self-Study Steering Committee	10
Forming the Subcommittees	11
Key Individuals.....	11
Involvement of the Conference Office	12
Use of Outside Individuals or Agencies	12
Preparing a Tentative Written Plan for Completing the Self-Study	13
Preparing for the Orientation Visit	14
Orientation Visit	14
NCAA Enforcement Activity	14-15
3. Conducting the Self-Study	16
General Responsibilities of the Self-Study Steering Committee.....	16-17
Preparing the Self-Study Report	17
Expectations for the Self-Study Report	18
Expectations for Communication with NCAA Staff Liaison	18
Postponement of Evaluation Visits or Resubmission of Report.....	18
Institutional Plans for Improvement	19
Gender-Issues and Diversity-Issues Plans	20
Confidentiality of the Self-Study Report.....	20
4. Preparing for the Evaluation Visit	21
Responsibilities of the Committee.....	21-22
Responsibilities of the Participating Institution	22-23
Responsibilities of NCAA Staff	23-24
Costs	24
Responsibilities of the Peer-Review Team.....	24-25
5. The Evaluation Visit	26
Length of the Evaluation Visit.....	26-27
Ethical Considerations	27
Peer-Review Team’s Basic Functions	27-28
Peer-Review Team Interviews.....	28
Verifying the Completeness and Accuracy of the Self-Study Report	29
Verifying Broad-Based Campus Participation	29
Verifying Conformity with the Operating Principles	29-30

Preparing the Peer-Review Team’s Written Report30
Format of the Report.....30
The Exit Meeting 30-31
Possible Rules Violations31

6. After the Evaluation Visit32
Preparing the Peer-Review Team’s Formal Report.....32
Institutional Response to the Peer-Review Team’s Report32
Release of Information Regarding the Evaluation Visit.....32
Evaluations..... 32-33

7. The Institutional Performance Program Decision.....34
Basis of the Institutional Performance Program Decision.....34
Conflict of Interest for Committee Members35
Appearance by Institutional Representatives.....35
Enforcement Activity.....35
Institutional Performance Program Categories36
Postponement of the Institutional Performance Program Decision.....36
Notification of the Institutional Performance Program Decision37
Opportunity for a Hearing.....37
Request for Appeal37

Appendixes38
Appendix A: Glossary of Terms 38-40
Appendix B: Peer-Review Team Requirements 41-42
Appendix C: Most Common Issues 43-44

Introduction

The NCAA and its legislative process.

The NCAA is a voluntary organization devoted to the sound administration of intercollegiate athletics. The Association's active members are separated into three membership divisions. Member institutions choose their membership division based on the relative emphasis and support they wish to devote to athletics within the academic context.

NCAA members regulate their athletics programs through cabinets and committees. These groups, made up of campus and conference representatives, may suggest changes in NCAA rules, but the full membership has the final authority. In Division I, that authority is exercised initially through a representative governance structure, consisting of a NCAA Council (athletics administrators and faculty members) and a Board of Directors (campus chancellors and presidents). The members of those bodies are selected by the conferences they represent. Division I institutions can call for an override vote, in which all schools and conferences participate, on any legislative action taken by the Council and/or Board of Directors.

Origin and history of the Institutional Performance Program.

The Institutional Performance Program was approved for Division I institutions at the 1993 NCAA Convention as a key part of the NCAA reform agenda. It was originally introduced in 1989 and tested in a two-year pilot program. Participants generally agreed that the pilot program was valuable but could be improved by limiting the scope of the self-study. After a special committee reworked the idea during the next year, the NCAA Presidents Commission, the NCAA Council and the Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics supported a revised version of the program.

The program's purpose.

The Institutional Performance Program is meant to ensure the NCAA's fundamental commitment to integrity in intercollegiate athletics. The program is structured to achieve its goal in several ways:

- 1. By opening the affairs of athletics to the university community and the public.**
 - a. Key campus constituent groups must be meaningfully involved in the development of the institution's self-study and may be asked to review the institution's self-study report after it has been drafted.
 - b. Self-study reports are evaluated by teams of peer-reviewers from other institutions and conference offices.
 - c. Decisions of the committee related to an active Division I member institution's status are announced publicly.

2. **By setting standards (called operating principles) for the operation of Division I athletics programs.** These operating principles originally were adopted overwhelmingly at the 1993 Convention. They cover three basic areas — governance and commitment to rules compliance; academic integrity; and gender/diversity issues and student-athlete well-being.
3. **By putting tough sanctions in place for institutions that fail to conduct a comprehensive self-study or to correct deficiencies.** The Institutional Performance Program is intended to help an institution. For this reason, the program allows ample time for an institution to consider its programs, to identify deficiencies and to correct them. Institutions that fail to make an honest effort may face serious consequences including ineligibility for NCAA championships and, eventually, removal from active membership in the Association.

Benefits of self-study.

The core of the Institutional Performance Program is the institution's self-study, in which broad-based campus participation is critical.

An effective self-study benefits the institution by providing:

1. **Self-awareness.** The self-study offers a unique opportunity to educate individuals across campus about the athletics program's goals and purposes, the many challenges facing athletics and the ways in which athletics supports the institution's mission.
2. **Affirmation.** The Institutional Performance Program is meant to be a positive experience and the self-study process will reveal many aspects of the athletics program worthy of praise.
3. **Opportunities to improve.** Even an outstanding program can be better, and issues will be identified routinely as part of any institution's self-study. As these issues come to light, the Institutional Performance Program process will offer a forum for suggestions from individuals with a wide range of experience.

There are also benefits for the Association:

1. The process provides a framework for the Division I membership to show its continuing commitment to institutional control of intercollegiate athletics within the academic setting.
2. Increased public confidence.
3. The Institutional Performance Program serves as a means to ensure all Division I member institutions are meeting the standards adopted by the membership.

Committee on Institutional Performance.

The committee is responsible for the administration of the Institutional Performance Program. All members are employed at Division I institutions or conferences, and include chancellors or presidents, athletics administrators, faculty athletics representatives, and conference administrators. The committee initially reviews institutional self-study reports to identify issues, receives and reviews the written evaluations of the peer-review team and the institution's responses. This information becomes the basis for determining the active status for each Division I member institution.

Philosophy statement of the Committee on Institutional Performance.

The Committee on Institutional Performance is charged by the NCAA Division I membership with assisting institutions in identifying mechanisms that ensure intercollegiate athletics programs are operating in accordance with the high standards and core values of Division I. An institution is expected to conduct an accurate self-study that involves broad-based campus participation. The committee, and a visiting peer-review team, will provide an objective evaluation of the institution's program based on legislated operating principles adopted by the membership. Further, the committee expects institutions to routinely monitor and implement its plans for improvement to ensure these plans are completed on time. The Institutional Performance Program is designed to help an institution improve and make continual progress toward its stated objectives. The committee will allow ample time for an institution to consider its programs, identify deficiencies and take steps to correct them. If the self-study reveals deficiencies in the intercollegiate athletics program, the committee will work collaboratively with the institution to achieve those corrective actions or will withhold a recommendation to active Division I membership if the institution fails to remedy its deficiencies. Through its actions, the committee will monitor the effectiveness of the Institutional Performance Program to ensure that the NCAA's fundamental commitment to integrity in intercollegiate athletics is supported and that the program continues to emphasize applicable principles of the Association.

External peer-review teams.

External peer-review teams, selected and assigned by the committee, are composed of experienced institutional and athletics personnel.

Peer-review teams are responsible for:

1. Verifying that the institution's self-study is accurate and complete.
2. Confirming the self-study was developed through a process that involved broad-based campus participation.
3. Evaluating the self-study and committee-identified issues in relation to the operating principles that have been approved for all Division I members.

A typical peer-review team will consist of three to five members. Whenever possible, a chancellor or president will serve as chair.

Peer-review team chair.

The peer-review team chair shall be responsible for preparing the peer-review team's written recommendation regarding successful completion of the self-study and the recommendation shall be based upon the breadth of institutional participation, the depth of discussion at the institution level and adherence to the operating principles.

Techniques and documentation used by peer-review teams.

The peer-review team shall employ traditional evaluative techniques (e.g., review existing records, conduct in-person interviews of key personnel) to determine whether the participating institution's stated policies and procedures are engaged and functioning.

General Timeline for the Institutional Performance Program Process.**Step 1: August 24 through November 20, 2015.**

- Orientation visit occurs.

Step 2: August 24, 2015, through May 15, 2016.

- Institution develops the self-study report.

Step 3: May 15, 2016.

- Deadline to submit institution's self-study report.

Step 4: May 16 through June 3, 2016.

- NCAA staff liaison reviews the institution's report for preliminary issues.

Step 5: June 6 through August 12, 2016.

- Committee on Institutional Performance reviews the self-study report and finalizes the issues.

Step 6: August 15, 2016 until two weeks before the evaluation visit.

- Institution may respond to the Committee on Institutional Performance analysis.

Step 7: September 12 through November 18, 2016.

- Peer-review team conducts the institution's evaluation visit and writes the report.

Step 8: Within two weeks after campus visit.

- Peer-review team report is sent to the institution's chancellor or president for response.

Step 9: December 16, 2016.

- Institution's response to the peer-review team report is due.

Step 10: February 2017.

- Committee on Institutional Performance deliberates a final recommendation whether institution has successfully completed the self-study process.

Preparing for the Self-Study

The Institutional Performance Program process allows the institution approximately six to eight months to conduct its self-study. An orientation visit conducted by a member of the NCAA staff initiates the formal start of the self-study process.

Whenever possible, the NCAA staff member who conducts the orientation visit also will receive the institution's self-study report, work with the institution to make arrangements for the peer-review team's visit and accompany the peer-review team on the visit. The institution should consider the NCAA staff member the primary resource and should feel free to contact the individual directly with questions. If the institution has questions before a specific staff liaison is assigned, the institution should contact the academic and membership affairs staff at the national office.

Responsibilities of the chancellor or president.

Throughout the self-study process, the chancellor or president must make it clear, by word and action, that the self-study is a priority and that the entire institution – not just the department of athletics – is responsible for its completion.

In preparing for the self-study, the chancellor's or president's specific responsibilities include:

1. **Appointing the chair of the self-study steering committee.** Neither the chancellor or president, nor any person with direct oversight for athletics (e.g., the director of athletics, the vice president to whom athletics reports, the faculty athletics representative), may chair the steering committee. The chair should be appointed from among the institution's senior-management team.

Some priorities to consider when selecting the self-study chair include the appointment of an individual who is organized, detail-oriented and has a comfort level to be able to successfully communicate, delegate and hold others responsible for completing the work of the self-study in a timely manner. In addition, some familiarity working with other accreditation processes is preferable.

The chair should be provided clear authority from and ready access to the chancellor or president. By doing so, the chancellor or president communicates the importance of the Institutional Performance Program process and encourages other participants to take the process seriously. However, given the unique organizational structures and reporting lines at some institutions, each chancellor or president is permitted flexibility in appointing a chair. The institution must document that the chair has clear authority from and ready access to the chancellor or president in situations in which the institution cannot state definitively that the chair is a member of the institution's senior-management team.

2. **Selecting the members of the self-study steering committee.** The chancellor or president is responsible for ensuring effective representation of key campus constituent groups on the steering committee. The goal should be a balance between athletics department staff members and other key individuals and groups on campus.
3. **Making the charge to the steering committee clear.**
4. **Giving the steering committee the proper authority and resources to complete its work.**

Forming the self-study steering committee.

Required members of the steering committee:

1. Chancellor or president.
2. Faculty athletics representative (FAR).
3. Athletics director (AD).
4. Senior woman administrator (SWA).
5. Equal employment opportunity officer (EEOO)
6. Title IX officer.
7. Student-athlete representative(s).
8. Institutional Performance Program liaison.

The committee recommends the institution involve the campus contact and report coordinator in all meetings conducted by the steering committee.

The chancellor's or president's involvement as an active member of the steering committee is critical to ensuring the process is conducted with the necessary authority and seriousness of purpose. The chancellor or president may designate an individual to replace him or her at steering committee meetings that he or she cannot attend.

In addition to the required positions listed above, the membership of the remainder of the steering committee is left to the discretion of the chancellor or president, keeping in mind the importance of broad-based participation. The number of members will vary from campus to campus.

In appointing steering committee members, the chancellor or president should consider the differing perspectives, range of expertise and access to information that may be offered by representatives of the following groups:

1. Governing board.
2. Administration external to athletics, including, but not limited to, academic affairs, fiscal affairs, student affairs, multicultural or diversity affairs, admissions, registrar, financial aid, internal audit/assessment and human resources.
3. Faculty.
4. Student-body.
5. Alumni or representatives of the institution's athletics interests.
6. Athletics board or committee members.

Forming the subcommittees.

The steering committee should establish as many subcommittees as it considers necessary to complete the major topic areas of the self-study. Subcommittees should be organized in ways that best suit the institution's needs and the requirements of the self-study. Subcommittee membership should be reflective of the broad constituent interests of the institution, including faculty, administrators (internal and external to athletics), students and student-athletes.

The chair of each subcommittee must be a member of the steering committee. Also, neither athletics department staff members nor faculty athletics representatives may serve as subcommittee chairs, although they can be included as subcommittee members.

Some athletics department staff members (e.g., athletics academic advisor, compliance coordinator) may serve as ex-officio members of subcommittees as appropriate to facilitate data collection and analysis.

Subcommittees are accountable to the steering committee and should be actively involved through regular communication, periodic meetings and timely reports.

The steering committee is required to identify methods (e.g., appointment to subcommittees, interviews, student-athlete forums, student-athlete advisory committee) of involving student-athletes in the self-study process.

Key individuals.

1. **Campus Contact:** This individual is responsible for fielding questions from institutional personnel and forwarding them to the NCAA staff liaison, and is responsible for coordinating preparations for the evaluation visit, including lodging and travel for peer-review team members, scheduling interviews and organizing any work-related needs for peer-reviewers (e.g., computer resources, meeting rooms).
2. **Report Coordinator:** This individual is responsible for editing the self-study report and should pay particular attention to the following:
 - a. Clarity;
 - b. Consistency; and
 - c. Formatting of the self-study report.
3. **Institutional Performance Program Liaison:** The committee requires each Division I institution to designate an individual to serve as its Institutional Performance Program liaison (hereafter referred to as "liaison"). The liaison is the individual on the institution's campus who is responsible for monitoring the progress of the institution's plans for improvement developed during the Institutional Performance Program process.

Involvement of the conference office.

Member conferences shall facilitate the Institutional Performance Program in accordance with Division I legislation. The role of an institution's conference office is determined by the institution. The conference office's role may include:

1. Participating in the pre-orientation visit (Year One) and in the orientation visit (Year Three).
2. Serving as an ex-officio member of the institution's steering committee.
3. Reviewing drafts of the institution's self-study report.
4. Participating in the steering committee interview and exit meetings of the evaluation visit. Please note, the conference representative involved in an evaluation visit will not be permitted to attend any other interviews or meetings of the peer-review team.

If the regular, ongoing role of the conference office includes a review of the institution's rules compliance efforts or help in developing and maintaining compliance initiatives, the institution should be prepared to provide a record of those efforts to the peer-review team.

Conference offices should treat institutional self-study reports as confidential. To the extent that conference personnel become aware of violations during the Institutional Performance Program process, the conference is obligated to help ensure that conference members self-report those violations.

Use of outside individuals or agencies.

Some institutions may wish to involve individuals or agencies not otherwise employed by the institution in one or more aspects of the self-study process. These outside individuals or agencies may perform related functions that are different from the conference office responsibilities. However, institutional personnel are responsible for analyzing the data and writing the self-study report. Peer-review teams will evaluate institutions on their roles in developing the content of self-study reports.

NCAA rules recognize the institution's responsibility not only for determining what role (if any) individuals outside the institution might play in the Institutional Performance Program process, but also for ensuring that outside individuals or agencies are appropriately involved. In no way should the balance of responsibility for the self-study process shift from internal to external personnel.

In addition, before individuals or agencies outside the institution may be used, the institution must receive written approval from the committee. The institution's chancellor or president must request in writing from the committee approval for outside involvement and the request should include a full explanation of the specific services that will be rendered.

Any anticipated involvement by outside individuals or agencies also must be clearly defined in the institution's written plan for completing the self-study process.

Please note, current committee members and individuals in the peer-reviewer pool may not engage in any Institutional Performance Program consulting arrangements with institutions (other than their own or, for conference office personnel, institutions within their respective conferences) involved in the self-study process.

Preparing a written plan for completing the self-study.

Before the orientation visit, each institution must develop its written plan, or roadmap, that will assist in the development of the institution's self-study report. The steering committee must consult with the institution's governing board and/or its chancellor or president before writing the plan regarding plans and commitments that may affect the future of the institution and its athletics program (e.g., composition of the student body, organization of the athletics program, sports sponsorship, conference or NCAA divisional membership). The written plan should be submitted to the institution's NCAA staff liaison two to three weeks before the institution's orientation visit.

The written plan should be concise and must include:

- 1 Stated goals for the process.
- 2 The function (e.g., role in drafting report, developing plans for improvement) and composition of the steering committee and subcommittees, with the names and titles of steering committee and subcommittee members.
- 3 The identification of the institution's campus contact.
- 4 The identification of the report coordinator.
- 5 An outline and schedule for completing the self-study, including the process for reviewing subcommittee and steering committee draft reports.
- 6 Plans for involving the conference office or other individuals or agencies outside the institution. [Note: Outside involvement requires prior written approval of the committee.]
- 7 Institutional guidelines for writing and editing the self-study report. These should address the work-related needs of self-study participants (e.g., meeting rooms, computer resources, clerical assistance, copies).
- 8 Plans for communicating the work of the steering committee to the institutional community. Also, the institution should consider what plans, if any, it has for communicating the work of the steering committee to the media and general public.

The written plan outline is included in the institution's orientation visit materials.

Preparing for the orientation visit.

To prepare for the orientation visit, the institution (and the steering committee in particular) is expected to:

1. Review the Institutional Performance Program handbook and the self-study instrument.
2. Prepare its written plan.
3. Determine the role of the conference office in the self-study and evaluation visit.
4. Review institutional compliance policies and procedures.
5. Identify potential dates for the institution's evaluation visit.

Orientation visit.

The NCAA staff liaison will conduct the orientation visit for the institution approximately 12 to 14 months before the evaluation visit. The purpose of the orientation visit is to review:

1. The purpose and format of the Institutional Performance Program.
2. The institution's activities that have been conducted in preparation for the orientation visit.
3. The self-study instrument.
4. Preparations for the evaluation visit.
5. Projected dates for the evaluation visit.

The orientation visit is intended for the benefit of those individuals who will be involved in the Institutional Performance Program process.

Please note: conference staff representatives may participate during the orientation visit at the conference's expense.

NCAA enforcement activity.

Institutions that receive a notice of allegation(s) or inquiry from the NCAA enforcement staff are requested to notify the chair of the committee if the institution is currently engaged in the Institutional Performance Program process or is scheduled to begin the process in the near future.

After receiving a notice of allegation(s) or inquiry, an institution may continue with the self-study process on campus (e.g., conduct orientation videoconference, participating institution's evaluation visit); however, the committee will postpone a its decision until the enforcement process has concluded and the NCAA

Division I Committee on Infractions has issued its public report or, for those institutions appealing the Committee on Infractions decision or penalties, the NCAA Division I Infractions Appeals Committee has issued its public report. Once the enforcement activity has concluded and before the committee's decision, the committee will review the Committee on Infractions report and the Infractions Appeals Committee report, if necessary, and may add conditions or issues associated with the enforcement findings to those previously communicated to the institution.

Conducting the Self-Study

The Institutional Performance Program allows each institution approximately six to eight months to conduct its self-study. During this period, an institution must gather and analyze data, and report the findings in a self-study report.

General responsibilities of the self-study steering committee.

1. **Collecting and organizing pertinent data.** The institution should gather data by making use of the individuals most appropriate to the specific area. For example, staff members in the offices of admissions and registrar will be able to report on the demographics and the academic preparation and performance of the general student body. Similarly, athletics department staff members (e.g., compliance coordinators, academic advisors) may serve as resources.
2. **Coordinating activities of the subcommittees and monitoring progress of the self-study.** The steering committee is expected to help ensure that subcommittee and steering committee reports are developed with:
 - a. Opportunities for input from appropriate campus constituent groups.
 - b. Appropriate involvement of all members of the steering committee or of a given subcommittee in the preparation of particular reports.
3. **Reviewing the reports of the steering committee and the various subcommittees.**
4. **Communicating regularly through meetings and reports.**
5. **Maintaining a written record of:**
 - a. Dates on which subcommittee and steering committee meetings were conducted, and the individuals in attendance at those meetings.
 - b. Individual(s) responsible for writing subcommittee reports.
 - c. Invitations extended to members of the subcommittees and steering committee to comment on subcommittee and steering committee draft reports, including the approximate dates on which those invitations were extended.

The peer-review team will review these records and the extent to which the Institutional Performance Program process reflected broad-based campus participation.

In their review of the institution's self-study process, peer-review teams and the committee will be guided more by the opportunities provided for comment and the quality of discussion than by the number of meetings.

6. Producing and publicizing the final self-study report.

Institutions shall be required to submit self-study reports and any supporting documentation to the NCAA staff sufficiently in advance of the evaluation visit. The committee shall perform a preliminary analysis of the report based upon directives or criteria established by the committee. Any decisions to delay the processing of a report shall be made only after consulting with NCAA staff members and with the chair of the committee.

Preparing the self-study report.

The committee has established a specific format for organizing each institution's self-study report for the following reasons:

1. To make the institution's preparation of the report as straightforward as possible.
2. To make the report easier for the peer-review team and members of the committee to read and understand.
3. To ensure greater consistency in the material being reviewed.

Further, the committee expects that the institution will:

1. Ensure that institutional responses address each aspect of all self-study items in a thorough but concise manner.
2. Prepare responses to each specific self-study item so that they can be read individually, rather than as part of a general narrative.
3. Ensure that institutional responses meet the expectations of the committee by reviewing the measurable standards documents and using the self-study report checklist.

Beyond the information requested in specific self-study items, the self-study instrument also refers to documents or materials that are "to be available" to the peer-review team.

The notation "to be available" denotes that the material should be collected during the self-study process and made available to the peer-review team either before or during the evaluation visit.

Expectations for the self-study report.

The committee will review an institution's self-study report to ensure that:

1. The report's conclusions are based on data or records that are available and reliable.
2. The conclusions reached are reasonable based on available data.
3. The institution has provided thorough responses to all self-study items.
4. All existing concerns have been identified by the institution and plans for improvement have been established to address those concerns.
5. Where the institution has concluded that plans to correct issues in one area may affect existing programs in other areas, plans have been established to maintain the current level of quality of all programs.

Expectations for communication with NCAA staff liaison.

The committee expects institutions to maintain regular and on-going communication (i.e. monthly conference calls, e-mail) with their assigned NCAA staff liaison.

Postponement of evaluation visits or resubmission of report

The committee reserves the right to postpone the evaluation visit or recommend the institution resubmit its report the preceding academic year for the following reasons:

1. The report has numerous and complex issues.
2. No gender and or diversity issues plan(s) for improvement or plans require major revisions.
3. Incomplete gender and/or diversity area analyses for Operating Principles 3.1 or 3.2.
4. Incomplete report (e.g., incomplete charts, incomplete responses, lack of information).
5. Nonsubmission of required documents (e.g., once in four-year rules compliance evaluation, once in four-year academic support services evaluation, student-athlete exit interview instrument).

Institutional plans for improvement.

Institutional plans for improvement are required when an institution is not in conformity with a specific operating principle. Additionally, plans for improvement are required for the gender-issues and diversity-issues operating principles.

Written institutional plans communicate an institution's current commitment, provide benchmarks to assess progress and also serve as records that ensure an institution's continued commitment.

Institutional plans must include the following requirements:

1. **Issues/Problems.** Each plan must identify issues or problems confronting the institution.
2. **Measurable Goals.** Each plan must include the specific measurable goals the institution intends to achieve to address issues or deficiencies.
3. **Steps to Achieve the Goals.** Each plan must include the specific steps the institution will take to achieve the goals.
4. **Individuals/Offices Responsible for Carrying Out the Specific Actions.** Each plan must identify the individuals and/or offices responsible for carrying out the actions identified by the institution.
5. **Specific Timetable(s).** Each plan must include specific timetables for completing the work.

Further, institutional plans for improvement must meet the following requirements:

1. **Must be in Writing.** Each plan shall be submitted in writing and be specific to the intercollegiate athletics program.
2. **Broad-Based Campus Participation.** Each plan shall be developed with opportunities for significant input from appropriate constituent groups inside and outside athletics.
3. **Institution Approval.** Each plan must be adopted formally by the institution's final authority (e.g., chancellor or president, or governing board) in such matters to ensure that it carries the commitment and support of the entire institution.

A sample format for plans for improvement can be found on the website [NCAA.org/Compliance, Waivers, and Reinstatement/Institutional Performance Program (Division I)].

Gender-issues and diversity-issues plans.

In addition to the requirements listed above, plans for improvement to address gender issues and diversity issues in the intercollegiate athletics program must extend five years into the future, and institutions must maintain an active written plan at all times. The institution must develop a new five-year plan that will maintain conformity with the operating principle. Further, the gender-issues plan must address all 17 areas for gender issues, and the diversity-issues plan must address all nine areas for diversity issues. All of the previously mentioned areas can be found in the self-study instrument.

An institution-wide affirmative action plan is acceptable only if it:

1. Specifically references, in the plan or in a separate document, the intercollegiate athletics program.
2. Addresses diversity issues and needs (e.g., special programming, services of multicultural offices, general well-being issues) for student-athletes and athletics staff.
3. Satisfies the committee's minimum expectations for a plan.

Finally, NCAA Operating Principles 3.1-(c) and 3.2-(c) require an institution to maintain a program, or continue progress toward a program, that is equitable for both genders and expands opportunities and support for diverse student-athletes and athletics personnel. Within gender-issues and diversity-issues written plans, specific numerical targets may place an institution at legal risk and are not expected in an institution's written plan, particularly as they relate to hiring practices. In the area of hiring practices, institutions may submit plans that have broad, flexible non-numeric hiring goals. As they relate to other areas, including, but not limited to, participation rates and budget increases, specific numerical targets may be appropriate.

Confidentiality of the self-study report.

Institutional self-study reports shall be treated as confidential by conference offices, the NCAA, peer-review teams and the committee. Institutions are permitted to distribute reports and supporting documentation at their discretion.

Preparing for the Evaluation Visit

Responsibilities of the Committee.

The committee is responsible for selecting and assigning peer-review teams. The committee takes a number of factors into consideration when making peer-review team assignments:

1. Composition of peer-review teams.

As a general rule, the committee will assign peer-review teams according to the characteristics of the participating institution (e.g., public/private, size of intercollegiate athletics program), giving specific attention to whether the peer-review team includes:

- a. An appropriate number of individuals to handle the anticipated workload.
- b. A range of expertise to cover Institutional Performance Program topic areas.
- c. Appropriate subdivisional representation.
- d. Appropriate representation of campus constituent groups.
- e. Appropriate gender and ethnic minority representation.

2. Conflicts of Interest.

Approximately nine to 11 months before the scheduled evaluation visit, the NCAA staff will provide the participating institution with a list of potential peer-review team members from the larger pool of qualified peer-reviewers.

The institution will review this list and, within approximately one month, may recommend to the committee, for legitimate reasons, particular individuals not be assigned as peer-review team members. The committee will consider conflicts but reserves the right to make all final decisions regarding peer-review team assignments.

3. Notice of evaluation visit.

An institution shall receive notice at least one year in advance of its evaluation visit.

4. Notification of peer-review team assignments.

Approximately six months before the evaluation visit, the NCAA staff will notify the institution of the peer-review team chair who has been assigned to that institution.

As circumstances dictate, the committee may change the assignment of the peer-review team at its discretion.

Before the evaluation visit, the NCAA staff will notify the institution of the members of the peer-review team who will accompany the chair on the evaluation visit.

5. Ethical considerations.

The committee relies on the integrity of institutions and of individual peer-reviewers to avoid any assignment for which any potential for conflict of interest exists.

Responsibilities of the participating institution.

In preparing for the evaluation visit, the participating institution is required to:

1. Submit its completed self-study report not later than **May 15, 2015**.
2. Make lodging arrangements for members of the peer-review team and NCAA staff.
3. Make arrangements for transportation of peer-review team members (i.e., flights, transportation to and from airport).
4. Provide local transportation for peer-review team members and NCAA staff.
5. Make arrangements to cover peer-review team members' expenses. (See Costs section, Page No. 29)
6. Establish an itinerary with the NCAA staff for the visit.

The institution's commitment to specific dates carries an assurance that key institutional personnel will be available for interviews, including, but not limited to, the institution's:

- a. Chancellor or president.
- b. Member(s) of the institution's governing board(s) (e.g., board of trustees, board of regents).
- c. Member(s) of the institution's athletics committee or board (if one exists).
- d. FAR.
- e. AD.
- f. SWA.
- g. Compliance coordinator.
- h. Institutional Performance Program Liaison.
- i. Steering committee chair.
- j. Steering committee members.

- k. Subcommittee chairs.
- l. Sampling of student-athletes.
- m. Sampling of coaches.

The peer-review team also may request to interview other institutional staff members, including but not limited to, the admissions director, financial aid director, registrar, human resources director, associate or assistant director of athletics, Title IX coordinator and EEOO.

Peer-review teams will interview selected institutional staff members who participated in the self-study process and others who might offer helpful information regarding self-study issues and the conclusions reached by the institution.

The peer-review team will inform the institution in advance of those individuals they will want to interview. The peer-review team also may request interviews at the time of the evaluation visit without prior notice.

Responsibilities of NCAA staff.

The NCAA staff member assigned to accompany the peer-review team on its evaluation visit serves as the liaison between the participating institution and the peer-review team.

The NCAA staff liaison verifies the institution's self-study report is complete. In addition, the NCAA staff liaison also will provide a preliminary analysis regarding the institution's conformity with the operating principles and adherence to the measurable standards.

As the date of the evaluation visit draws near, the NCAA staff liaison will coordinate with the institution's campus contact to confirm arrangements for the peer-review team's visit, including:

1. Hotel reservations for peer-review team members and NCAA staff.
2. Travel for peer-review team members.
3. Local transportation for peer-review team members and NCAA staff.
4. The itinerary and specific schedule for interviews and other activities of the peer-review team.
5. Availability of institutional representatives for scheduled interviews.
6. Involvement of the conference office (if any).

7. Adequate, private interview and work rooms, sufficient computer resources, Internet access, printers, photocopiers, and attention to other work-related needs of the peer-review team.
8. Reimbursement of visit expenses incurred by peer-review team members, including per diem.

Costs.

The costs related to Institutional Performance Program will be shared by the NCAA and participating institutions. The institution is responsible for:

1. Expenses of all institutional representatives related to the orientation visit.
2. All costs associated with the preparation and completion of the self-study report.
3. Actual expenses of peer-reviewers for evaluation visits, including transportation to the reviewer's local airport, local airport parking, luggage fees, round-trip coach air travel or ground transportation, lodging, local transportation, and per diem of \$50 per day for each day of the visit, including official travel days.
4. Work-related needs (e.g., copiers, meeting rooms, computers, Internet access, printers, shredder) of the peer-review team and the NCAA staff member during the evaluation visit.

The NCAA is responsible for:

1. Expenses of NCAA staff members related to the orientation process.
2. Actual expenses of NCAA staff members (i.e., transportation to and from campus, to the hotel, lodging and meals) related to the evaluation visit.

Please note, member conferences are responsible for all costs incurred by a conference staff member related to that individual's participation in the Institutional Performance Program process of a conference member institution.

Responsibilities of the peer-review team.

In consultation with the NCAA staff, the peer-review team chair is responsible for:

1. Identifying topic areas to which the team will give special attention, in consultation with the other members of the peer-review team.
2. Assigning sections of the institution's self-study report to particular team members.
3. Contacting the institution's chancellor or president before the evaluation visit for the purpose of understanding special circumstances that might affect the peer-review team's evaluation visit.
4. Consulting with the other members of the peer-review team to establish a schedule of activities (e.g., reviews of records, facility tours) for the visit and to identify those individuals on campus who will be interviewed by the peer-review team.

5. Meeting with the institution's chancellor or president to discuss informally the nature of the information to be presented in the exit meeting.
6. Leading the exit meeting at the completion of the evaluation visit.
7. Ensuring the peer-review team's report is reflective of the visit's findings.
8. Communicating with the committee regarding the evaluation visit and peer-review team report, including appearing in person, if necessary, before the committee regarding an institution's Institutional Performance Program status.
9. Evaluating the performance of the peer-reviewers serving on the team.
10. Ensuring the team fulfills its responsibilities and the objectives specified for evaluation visits.

In addition, all members of the peer-review team, including the chair, share equally in other preparations for the evaluation visit.

Each peer-review team member is expected to review the institution's self-study report and committee-identified issues in order to:

1. Understand the organization and operation of the institution's athletics program.
2. Identify areas in the report that may require clarification or additional information.
3. Target specific topic areas as instructed by the committee for special emphasis during the evaluation visit.

Members of the peer-review team should treat all materials and discussions related to the visit as confidential.

The Evaluation Visit

Peer-review team members visit the participating institution's campus in order to assess the level of broad-based campus participation in the institution's self-study and to assess the accuracy of the information contained in the institution's self-study report. Experiences gained by the peer-review team during the evaluation visit help the team to evaluate more fairly the information contained in the institution's self-study report.

By the end of the visit, the peer-review team will have reached tentative conclusions about the nature of the institution's self-study process, the accuracy of the institution's self-study report and the operation of the athletics program in accordance with the Institutional Performance Program's operating principles.

Before leaving campus, the peer-review team will write a report that will be forwarded to the institution and to the committee.

The institution's chancellor or president is afforded an opportunity to hear the peer-review team's general impressions in an exit meeting at the end of the evaluation visit.

Length of the evaluation visit.

The evaluation visit typically takes place during a three- or four-day period. The chair of the peer-review team, in consultation with the staff liaison, is responsible for determining the length of time necessary for the evaluation visit based on a review of the self-study report and the committee-identified issues.

Every effort will be made to establish a schedule in advance that reflects accurately the length of the evaluation visit. However, unanticipated events on campus may require changes in the schedule at the time of the evaluation visit. The chair is authorized to modify the schedule as necessary within the established period.

The following is a typical schedule for the evaluation visit:

Day 1

1. Peer-review team travel (morning).
2. Peer-review team prep session at hotel (afternoon).
3. Facility tour (afternoon).
4. Reception/dinner with institutional representatives (optional).

*Please note: Evaluation visits, including interviews, may occur on Sunday.

Day 2

1. Interviews with chancellor/president and steering committee (morning).

2. Interviews with other institutional staff/representatives (morning/afternoon).
3. Peer-review team report writing (afternoon/evening).

Day 3

1. Exit meeting with chancellor/president and other institutional representatives (morning).
2. Peer-review team departs campus following the exit meeting.

Ethical considerations.

The following guidelines have been established for evaluation visits in an effort to protect the integrity of the process:

1. All aspects of the evaluation visit are to be treated as confidential. This confidentiality extends to evaluation materials provided by the institution (including the institution's self-study report); issues identified by the committee; peer-review team, conference or NCAA staff files and notes; conversations with institutional, conference or NCAA representatives; and conversations among peer-review team members, institutional representatives, conference administrators and NCAA staff members.
2. Institutions may choose to host a meal or reception on the first day of the visit to give the peer-review team an opportunity to meet key institutional representatives. The institution should not feel obligated to host such a function and it should not interfere with the peer-review team's ability to accomplish its work.
3. Institutions should not offer, and peer-review team members or NCAA staff may not accept, gifts or gratuities of any kind.
4. Peer-review team members are required to pay for personal and incidental items.
5. The committee will not tolerate unprofessional or unethical behavior on the part of any individual participating in the evaluation visit on behalf of the committee. Please inform the NCAA staff liaison immediately if there are any questions or concerns.
6. The peer-review team, NCAA staff and representatives from the institution and conference office participating in the Institutional Performance Program process are the only individuals who can be present for any portion of the evaluation visit, including the exit meeting (see Page Nos. 31-32).

Peer-review team's basic functions.

The peer-review team performs three basic functions:

1. Verifies the accuracy and completeness of the self-study report.
2. Verifies broad-based campus participation during the Institutional Performance Program process.

3. Verifies issues that may prevent the institution from establishing conformity with the operating principles as identified by the committee.

The peer-review team typically begins the evaluation visit by meeting with the institution's chancellor or president and with the steering committee. Members of the peer-review team also conduct interviews, review records and tour campus facilities. Throughout the visit, peer-review team members compare and contrast findings with each other, then adjust interview schedules based on these conversations.

Peer-review team interviews.

Individuals required to be interviewed during the evaluation visit include the following:

1. Chancellor or president.
2. Member(s) of the institution's governing board (e.g., board of trustees).
3. Member(s) of the institution's athletics committee or board (if one exists).
4. FAR .
5. AD.
6. SWA.
7. EEOO.
8. Title IX Officer.
9. Compliance coordinator.
10. Steering committee chair.
11. Steering committee members.
12. Subcommittee chairs.
13. Sampling of student-athletes.
14. Sampling of coaches.
15. Institutional Performance Program Liaison.

The peer-review team also may request to interview other institutional staff members, including, but not limited to, the admissions director, financial aid director, registrar, human resources director, associate or assistant director(s) of athletics.

Verifying the completeness and accuracy of the self-study report.

In evaluating the completeness and accuracy of the institution's self-study report, the peer-review team will consider whether:

1. Institutional responses address each specific aspect of all self-study items.
2. Conclusions are based on data or records that are available and reliable.
3. Conclusions are reasonable in light of the available data.
4. All substantive concerns have been identified by the institution and a plan for improvement, if necessary, has been established to address those concerns.

Verifying broad-based campus participation.

The peer-review team will evaluate the institution's level of broad-based campus participation by considering whether appropriate constituencies were:

1. Represented on the steering committee and subcommittees.
2. Involved in the collection and analysis of data used in drawing conclusions and responses to self-study items.
3. Afforded sufficient opportunities to respond to the steering committee's initial observations.
4. Made aware of and provided access to the self-study report.

In addition, the peer-review team will evaluate whether members of particular subcommittees were involved in preparing and evaluating the subcommittees' reports, and whether steering committee members were involved in evaluating subcommittee reports and in preparing and evaluating reports of the steering committee.

In verifying broad-based campus participation, peer-review team members will use the institution's written plan for conducting its self-study, written records of meeting dates and attendees, writing assignments, and opportunities afforded to campus and community groups to offer comments.

Verifying conformity with the operating principles.

The peer-review team evaluates the extent of substantial conformity achieved by the institution with respect to the operating principles identified by the committee. In making these decisions, the peer-review team should make every effort to:

1. Base its decisions on reliable data.

2. Be sensitive to the unique characteristics and circumstances of the institution.
3. Remain free of personal and professional bias.

Preparing the peer-review team's written report.

Before leaving campus, the peer-review team completes a written report which will be forwarded to the committee.

Format of the report.

The committee has established a standard format for peer-review team reports to promote consistency in the information provided to the committee.

The format approved by the committee for the peer-review team report includes:

1. An evaluation of the institution's self-study report as to openness, thoroughness, breadth of participation and accuracy.
2. Peer-reviewer observations of the institution's status related to the operating principles and committee-identified issues based on the information contained in the institution's self-study report and the team's campus findings (verified through a review of records and other data).
3. Additional issues the peer-review team believes should be addressed before the committee can recommend successful completion of the Institutional Performance Program process.
4. Modifications to consider suggested by the peer-review team.

Lists of the individuals interviewed and the institutional records reviewed by the peer-review team are included as appendixes to the peer-review team report.

The exit meeting.

The peer-review team will conduct a meeting at the end of the team's evaluation visit with the institution's chancellor or president and other institutional representatives at his or her discretion. The purpose of the meeting is to offer the team's general impressions of the visit and to share information, including any serious problems that were discovered during the visit, which will be included in the peer-review team's formal written report.

The peer-review team's comments during the exit meeting will address:

1. The institution's self-study process in terms of openness, thoroughness, breadth of participation and accuracy.

2. Any issues (identified by the committee or peer-review team) that should be addressed before the committee can recommend successful completion of the Institutional Performance Program process.

Possible rules violations.

The peer-review team will include in its written report any information discovered during the evaluation visit concerning possible violations of NCAA rules. The chair of the peer-review team or the NCAA staff liaison also will remind the institution of its obligation to self-report violations per NCAA Division I legislation and the institution's formal response to these findings can be a factor in the committee's decisions.

The Committee on Infractions also may recommend to the committee that a particular institution's Institutional Performance Program status be reviewed as a result of the institution's completed infractions case. The committee may review and alter an institution's Institutional Performance Program status on referral from the Committee on Infractions.

After the Evaluation Visit

Preparing the peer-review team's report.

After all members of the peer-review team agree the report is complete, the NCAA staff liaison finalizes and submits a copy of the report to the institution's chancellor or president before its submission to the committee. The chancellor or president will be given at least two weeks from receipt of the report to review and respond. Copies of the peer-review team's report also will be forwarded to the institution's steering committee chair and the institution's conference commissioner.

Institutional response to the peer-review team's report.

After reviewing the peer-review team's report, the institution may submit a written response to the committee through the Institutional Performance Program System. Even though the institution may not have comments to provide, it should indicate this in writing. The institution's response shall be limited to:

1. Corrections of factual errors.
2. Presentation of new, relevant information not considered by the peer-review team.
3. Proposed additional corrective actions for remedying deficiencies (e.g., institutional plans for improvement).

Release of information regarding the evaluation visit.

Until the committee renders its decision, information released during the evaluation visit shall be limited to statements of the visit's status (whether the visit has not been made, is in progress or has been completed) and the identities of the peer-review team members. Before the committee formally assesses the institution, the NCAA staff, peer-review team and the institution shall not publicize information regarding the visit and shall respond only to inquiries with the public regarding the information just described. Following the release of the committee's Institutional Performance Program decision, the institution is permitted to release any information regarding the evaluation visit.

Evaluations.

The final task for the peer-review team chair is to complete an evaluation of the performance of other members of the peer-review team and the NCAA staff liaison(s). The chair also will be asked to comment on the self-study evaluation process in general.

Peer-review team members will be asked to evaluate the peer-review team chair, and the NCAA staff after the evaluation visit.

Institutions will be asked to assess the evaluation visit, and the work of the peer-review team chair, other peer-review team members and the NCAA staff.

After the final Institutional Performance Program decision, the institution's chancellor or president will have the opportunity to evaluate the overall Institutional Performance Program process.

All of this information will be used by the committee to improve the Institutional Performance Program, including the peer-review process.

The Institutional Performance Program Decision

Once the committee receives the institution's self-study report, the written report of the peer-review team and the institution's response to the peer-review team's report, the committee is responsible for determining whether an institution has successfully completed the Institutional Performance Program process.

Committee members will not participate in determining the Institutional Performance Program status for those institutions in which a potential for conflict of interest exists. In considering whether a potential conflict exists, the committee members shall apply the same guidelines approved by the committee for use by potential peer-review team members.

Basis of the Institutional Performance Program decision.

The committee's decision is a two-step process. First, the committee must decide whether the institution's self-study report is adequate. Adequacy is based on whether the report was completed in an appropriate manner; for example, whether the information contained in the report was accurate and the self-study was conducted with broad-based campus participation. This decision is based both on the institution's self-study report and the peer-review team report.

When the self-study is considered adequate, the committee then works toward a specific Institutional Performance Program decision. In both parts of this process, NCAA Division I legislation requires the committee to base its decision on:

1. The institution's self-study report;
2. Issues initially identified by the committee after reviewing the institution's self-study report;
3. The peer-review team's report;
4. Additional written comments the institution may submit in response to the committee's initial analysis and/or the peer-review team's report; and
5. Additional material and information deemed relevant by the committee.

Further, the committee has the discretion to use any information it deems relevant in reaching a decision for an institution from the institution's website and any other materials that are available to the general public.

Additionally, the committee will include an institution's public infractions report in its deliberations when such a report is released during the Institutional Performance Program process.

Conflict of interest for committee members.

Committee members shall recuse themselves from Institutional Performance Program decisions in which they may have potential conflicts of interests. Former and current employees, consultants or alumni shall not participate in Institutional Performance Program decisions regarding institutions with which they have a conflict of interest. Further, an individual shall not take part in decisions regarding an institution that is in the same conference as the individual's conference.

Appearance by institutional representatives.

At the request of the committee, institutional representatives may be asked to appear in person to clarify factual discrepancies and other matters at the time the committee is rendering its Institutional Performance Program decision.

Enforcement activity.

Institutions that receive a notice of allegation(s) or inquiry from the NCAA enforcement staff are requested to notify the chair of the committee and/or NCAA staff liaison if the institution is currently engaged in the Institutional Performance Program process or is scheduled to begin the process in the near future.

After receiving a notice of allegation(s) or inquiry, an institution may continue with the self-study process on campus (e.g., conduct orientation visit, continue to develop self-study report, participate in the evaluation visit); however, the committee will postpone any Institutional Performance Program status decision until the enforcement process has concluded and the Committee on Infractions has issued its public report or, for those institutions appealing the Committee on Infractions decision or penalties, the Infractions Appeals Committee has issued its public report. Once the enforcement activity has concluded and before the committee's Institutional Performance Program decision, the committee will review the Committee on Infractions report and the Infractions Appeals Committee report, if necessary, and may add issues associated with the enforcement findings to those previously communicated to the institution.

Institutional Performance Program categories.**1. Successful Completion.**

A reclassifying institution that has been determined to have successfully completed the Institutional Performance Program process is considered to be operating its athletics program in substantial conformity with the operating principles. This classification denotes that (a) any problems identified by the institution in its self-study or by the peer-review team during its evaluation were considered by the committee to be not serious enough to affect the institution's Institutional Performance Program status, and (b) the institution demonstrated adequate follow-up to concerns or improvement plans directly related to the operating principles that were identified by the institution or the committee.

2. Nonsuccessful Completion.

A reclassifying institution that has been determined to have not successfully completed the Institutional Performance Program process is not considered to be operating its athletics program in substantial conformity with the operating principles. This classification denotes that (a) problems identified by the institution in its self-study or by the peer-review team during its evaluation were considered by the committee to be serious enough to withhold a determination of successful completion until those problems have been corrected, or (b) the institution did not demonstrate adequate follow-up to concerns or improvement plans directly related to the operating principles that were identified by the institution or the committee during the institution's self-study.

3. Postponement of Institutional Performance Program Decision.

The committee reserves the right to postpone the Institutional Performance Program decision of an institution under either of the following conditions:

- a. When the self-study is deemed to be inadequate (e.g., lacking accuracy, openness or campus-wide participation). If the institution does not respond to the committee's concerns in a specified time period established by the committee, it may be placed in restricted-membership status. Such an institution shall not be eligible for active Division I membership until an appropriate self-study is completed; or
- b. When the committee, during its deliberations, concludes the institution has not received adequate notice from the peer-review team of a problem significant enough to affect the institution's Institutional Performance Program status. The postponement allows the committee to seek written clarification from the institution and the peer-review team chair before rendering a decision as to the Institutional Performance Program status of the institution.

Notification of the Institutional Performance Program decision.

The committee will communicate the Institutional Performance Program decision to the institution's chancellor or president in writing.

Reclassifying and provisional institutions are not considered active Division I members; therefore, these institutions will not be included in any public press release. However, the chancellor or president of a reclassifying or provisional institution will receive a letter advising that the institution has successfully completed the self-study.

While other information related to the peer-review team's report or the committee's actions will be considered confidential between the institution and the NCAA, the institution may release information regarding the committee's decision at its own discretion. The chair of the committee, the NCAA staff or a member of the committee designated by the chair also is authorized to offer additional comments concerning the committee's deliberations when an announcement is warranted.

Opportunity for a hearing.

An institution may request a hearing related to its Institutional Performance Program status or decision from the committee according to the committee's policies and procedures. The committee shall be obligated to honor an institution's request for a hearing related to a decision by the committee regarding the institution's Institutional Performance Program status.

Request for appeal.

An institution may appeal the decision of the committee to the Legislative Council according to the appeal procedures established by the Legislative Council. Public announcements of decisions of the committee, however, will not be postponed pending appeals.



Glossary of Terms

Campus Contact. The campus contact is responsible for coordinating preparations for the evaluation visit, including lodging and travel for peer-review team members and NCAA staff, scheduling interviews and organizing any work-related needs for peer-reviewers (e.g., computer resources, meeting rooms, documents to be reviewed).

Committee Analysis. Once the staff analysis is completed, the committee will review the institution's self-study and the staff analysis of the report. The committee will determine the final issues that will be forwarded to the institution and the peer-review team.

Conformity. The peer-review team's and committee's most demanding task is to assess the extent of substantial conformity achieved by the institution with respect to the operating principles. This evaluation inevitably involves subjective judgment. In making these decisions, the peer-review team and committee make every effort to base decisions on reliable data; be sensitive to the unique characteristics and circumstances of the institution; and remain free of personal and professional bias.

Evaluation Visit (EV). The EV occurs after the institution has submitted its self-study report, after the staff and committee analyses have been completed and after the institution has had an opportunity to respond to the committee's analysis. The EV is staffed by a peer-review team that will have reached tentative conclusions about the nature of the institution's self-study process, the accuracy of the institution's written report and the operation of the athletics program in relation to the Institutional Performance Program's operating principles. Before leaving campus, the peer-review team is obligated to record its conclusions in a report that eventually will be forwarded to the institution and to the committee. In the meantime, the institution's chancellor or president (and other institutional representatives at the discretion of the chancellor or president) is afforded an opportunity to hear the peer-review team's general impressions in an exit meeting at the end of the EV. The EV can occur anytime between September 15 and November 21.

Institutional Performance Program Liaison. The committee requires each NCAA Division I institution to designate an individual to serve as its Institutional Performance Program liaison. The liaison shall be the individual on the institution's campus responsible for monitoring the progress of the institution's plans for improvement developed during the Institutional Performance Program process. After the evaluation visit and before receiving the Institutional Performance Program decision, the NCAA staff liaison will contact the chancellor or president to initiate the submission of the liaison for monitoring plans for improvement developed by the institution.

Measurable Standard (MS). The committee developed measurable standard documents as a means to bring greater consistency to the Institutional Performance Program process. These documents are intended to clarify the expectations of the committee for each operating principle.

Operating Principle (OP). The Institutional Performance Program is made up of seven standards, OPs, that every Division I institution needs to meet. The OPs were originally adopted overwhelmingly at the 1993 Convention. They address the three basic areas of governance and commitment to rules compliance, academic integrity, and gender/diversity issues and student-athlete well-being. OPs are included as a part of

the Institutional Performance Program self-study instrument.

Modifications to Consider. As part of its report, the peer-review team will identify any pertinent recommendations for the institution in a section titled, “Opportunities for Enhancement.” The institution is not obligated to implement or respond to such recommendations; rather, these should be viewed as helpful suggestions from the institution’s peers to improve its athletics program.

Orientation Visit (OV). The NCAA staff liaison will conduct an OV for an institution approximately 12 to 14 months before the evaluation visit. The purpose of the OV is to review the purpose and format of the Institutional Performance Program; the institution’s activities already conducted in preparation for the orientation; the self-study instrument (with members of the steering committee and subcommittees); preparations for the EV; and projected dates for the EV. The OV is intended to benefit campus members who will be involved in the self-study. The OV can occur anytime between August 26 and November 27.

Peer-Review Team (PRT). An external PRT, selected and assigned by the committee, is composed of experienced education and athletics personnel. The PRT is responsible for verifying the institution’s self-study was accurate and complete; confirming that the self-study was developed through a broad-based process that involved campus-wide participation; and evaluating the self-study and committee-identified issues in terms of the OPs that have been approved for all Division I members. Before leaving campus, the PRT must complete its written report to the committee. Ordinarily, each member of the PRT is responsible for writing one or more sections of the report, divided generally according to those sections of the self-study to which members of the PRT were assigned. A typical PRT will consist of a maximum of five members. Whenever possible, a chancellor or president will serve as chair. Each PRT member will receive training, with special emphasis on training for PRT chairs.

Plans for Improvement. Written institutional plans have significant value for every Division I institution. They communicate an institution’s current commitment, provide benchmarks to assess progress and also serve as enduring records that help ensure an institution’s continued commitment in the future. Institutional plans must meet certain minimum requirements. There are additional requirements for gender and diversity plans.

Report Coordinator. The report coordinator is responsible for editing the self-study report, including plans for improvement, into one large document. The report coordinator combines responses to each specific self-study item so they can be read individually, rather than as part of a general narrative. It is suggested the report coordinator be well-versed in Microsoft Word and be comfortable with editing narrative from multiple writers.

Self-Study Item (SSI). An SSI is a question contained in the self-study instrument to be researched, studied and answered by an institution during its self-study process. In evaluating the completeness and accuracy of an institution’s self-study report, the peer-review team will consider whether institutional responses address each specific aspect of all SSIs identified by the committee.

Staff Analysis. After an institution submits its self-study report via the Institutional Performance Program System, the NCAA staff liaison will review the self-study report, verify that all self-study items are completed and ensure that all measurable standards are met. This results in the staff analysis. Once the staff analysis is completed, the committee will review the institution’s self-study and the staff analysis of the report. The committee will determine the final issues that will be forwarded to the institution and the peer-review team.

Staff Liaison. There is an NCAA staff liaison assigned to each institution going through the self-study process. The staff liaison verifies that the institution’s self-study report, including any supporting documentation, is complete. In addition, the liaison provides a preliminary assessment regarding the institution’s adherence to the measurable standards. The staff liaison accompanies the peer-review team on its campus visit and serves as the liaison between the participating institution and the peer-review team.

B

Peer-Review Team Requirements

Following is a list of the basic qualifications and typical activities of peer-review team members involved in the Institutional Performance Program.

Placement in the pool of peer-reviewers.

To be considered for placement in the pool of peer-reviewers, an individual must:

1. Be currently employed at a Division I institution or conference office; (Note: An individual who has retired will be considered for selection for up to five years after retirement and can be considered for a longer period if he or she demonstrates continued active involvement in intercollegiate athletics.)
2. Have a substantial knowledge of intercollegiate athletics as evidenced by employment and service history;
3. Hold the position of chancellor or president, faculty athletics representative, director of athletics, or senior woman administrator at a member institution; or
4. Have recognized expertise, skills or experience in at least one of the three areas addressed in the Institutional Performance Program (i.e., expertise in all operating principles related to that area).

In addition to these basic criteria, the committee has established additional guidelines for its selection of peer-reviewers:

1. An individual should have five years of campus experience as a full-time employee, including three years in Division I. A conference administrator may be selected, provided the individual has at least three years of conference office experience.
2. An individual employed outside an institution's athletics department should have a direct working relationship with athletics.
3. An individual will not be considered for selection if that individual has been found by the Committee on Infractions to have committed a major violation of NCAA rules in the last five years.

The committee uses a variety of specific criteria outlined on Page No. 22 in selecting peer-reviewers that are subject to periodic revision. In addition, the pool of peer-reviewers includes women and members of underrepresented groups to ensure diverse peer-review teams.

The committee will, on an ongoing basis, thoroughly evaluate peer-reviewers, including chairs, through NCAA staff evaluation of individuals and evaluation of each peer-reviewer by his or her fellow team members.

The committee will not knowingly assign an individual to serve as a peer-reviewer who:

1. Is or has been an employee at the participating institution.
2. Is employed at an institution in the same primary athletics conference as the participating institution.
3. Is employed at an institution in the state in which the participating institution is located.
4. Is or has been an employee within the past three years, at a conference office in which the participating institution is a member.
5. Is a candidate for employment, or has been a candidate within the past two years, at the participating institution.
6. Has been an appointee, consultant or employee of the participating institution, or has close relatives who are employees at the participating institution.
7. Is an alumnus or alumna of the participating institution.
8. Has previously visited the institution as a peer-review team member or as part of a regional or professional accreditation team that either put the institution on probation or terminated its accreditation.
9. Is or has been associated in any manner with an organization that provides consulting services for the Institutional Performance Program.

To avoid the appearance of any conflict of interest, no member of the peer-review team may serve as a consultant to an institution to which that individual was assigned as a peer-review team member for a period of one year after the conclusion of the evaluation visit.

Peer-review team members should not encourage staff members at the institutions they visit to seek employment at the peer-review team members' institutions, nor should peer-review team members suggest their own availability as consultants or employees.

Every peer-review team member must review and sign a statement related to potential conflicts of interest at the time that individual agrees to serve as a member of a particular peer-review team.

Peer reviewers are also asked to verify that they are willing to have a conversation with their institution's legal counsel (and, if necessary, the NCAA general counsel) to discuss the application of their state open records laws to the provision of confidential information provided to them during the peer-review team process.



MOST COMMON ISSUES IDENTIFIED FOR DIVISION I INSTITUTIONS IN THE INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE PROGRAM PROCESS

The purpose of this document is to educate NCAA Division I member institutions and conference offices by providing information on the 10 issues most frequently identified by the NCAA Division I Committee on Institutional Performance. This information is intended to assist institutions that are preparing to go through the Institutional Performance Program process in the near future.

1. The institution's gender-issues plan must include all required plan elements. [*NCAA Operating Principle 3.1*]
2. The institution must analyze its Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) report (i.e., participation, head coaches and assistant coaches) and NCAA financial report (specified revenue and expense categories) for the three most recent academic years, explain (using supporting data) any differences, address any deficiencies and comment on any trends. [*Operating Principle 3.1*]
3. The institution must conduct a thorough and written review of each of the 17 program areas for gender issues. If the institution identifies any deficiencies during this review, the deficiencies must be incorporated into the institution's gender-issues plan for improvement. If no deficiency exists, the institution must include a maintenance plan for each program area. [*Operating Principle 3.1*]
4. The institution must have written policies and procedures in the areas of athletic training; sports medicine; emergency medical plans for practices and games; emergency medical plans for out-of-season workouts, strength training and skills sessions; and travel policies (e.g., passenger vans, buses, permissible drivers, flights, length of trips). Further, the institution must evaluate the policies and procedures for their effectiveness in protecting the health and providing a safe environment for its student-athletes; identify the administrator(s) responsible for annually evaluating the policies and procedures for their effectiveness in protecting the health and providing a safe environment for its student-athletes; and demonstrate that policies and procedures are directly communicated in writing to department of athletics staff members, coaches and student-athletes. [*Operating Principle 3.3*]
5. The institution's diversity-issues plan must include all required plan elements. [*Operating Principle 3.2*]
6. The institution's instrument used to conduct student-athlete exit interviews must contain specified questions. [*Operating Principle 3.3*]

7. The institution must conduct a thorough and written review of each of the seven program areas for student-athlete well-being. If the institution identifies any deficiencies during this review, these deficiencies must be incorporated into a student-athlete well-being plan for improvement. [*Operating Principle 3.3*]
8. The institution must conduct a thorough and written review of each of the nine program areas for diversity issues. If the institution identifies any deficiencies during this review, the deficiencies must be incorporated into the institution's diversity issues plan for improvement. If no deficiency exists, the institution must include a maintenance plan for each program area. [*Operating Principle 3.2*]
9. The institution must analyze, explain and address any differences between the most recent four-class average Federal Graduation Rate of all student-athlete subgroups (i.e., team, gender, ethnicity, ethnicity within team) and the most recent four-class average Federal Graduation Rate of students generally, including comparable student body groups. If there is a difference that cannot be adequately explained between the most recent four-class average Federal Graduation Rate of a student-athlete subgroup and the most recent four-class average Federal Graduation Rate of students generally or a comparable student body subgroup, the institution must develop a plan for improvement to address the issue. [*Operating Principle 2.1*]