REPORT OF THE JANUARY 9, 2005, MEETING OF THE NCAA DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

1. *ACTION ITEM.*

a. Academic Progress Rate Scoring.

(1) Recommendation. The committee recommends approval of the following regarding academic progress rate (APR) scores:

(a) APR scores be used to define the contemporaneous penalty "cut" score and be published as stand-alone rates of academic measure;

(b) APR scores be reported as a whole number that is the raw APR score multiplied by one thousand to arrive at the final APR score. For example, a raw APR of .94 becomes a final APR score of 940; and

(c) APR scores for quarter institutions be converted to a metric that is comparable to that of semester institutions using a standard nonlinear transformation.

(2) Rationale. APR scores are a "real-time" rate providing the most current data on student-athletes' academic performance. Further, the use of APR scores will have the positive result of moving away from using a federal graduation rate that represents a cohort of students entering six years prior and fails to adequately capture the extensive transfer patterns of students that are typical in higher education today. Therefore, these scores should be used to determine contemporaneous penalties. Translating the scores from decimals to whole numbers aids in the understanding and interpretability of scores, versus a metric that uses an extensive number of decimal places. This translation does not alter the meaning of the scores; rather it puts the scores in a metric that is more understandable. Finally, the score conversion is necessary for quarter schools because the term-by-term calculation of the APR gives a boost to the APR distribution of quarter schools that is unrelated to academic performance. A technical analysis of this score conversion is provided. [Attachment A]

b. Cut" Score for Contemporaneous Penalties.

(1) Recommendation. The committee recommends that teams with a two-year APR score below 925 (within a consistent margin of error set at a confidence level of 84 percent) should be subject to contemporaneous penalties when a student-athlete withdraws from the institution prior to earning eligibility.

(2) Rationale. An APR of 925 correlates to an expected graduation rate of 50 percent and this "cut" score will affect approximately 7.4 percent of all teams. Therefore, any team with an expected graduation rate below 50 percent will be subject to contemporaneous penalties. Along with an approximately ten percent scholarship capping limit recommended later in this report, the 925 cut score indirectly establishes the minimum goal of 50 percent graduation rate for athletics teams. This cut score helps achieve both of the outlined goals of the contemporaneous penalties: sending "notice" to the lowest performers, and helping promote acceptable academic performance for all teams.

The issue of small sample sizes for particular teams or sports and their impacts relative to contemporaneous penalties is addressed using a statistically derived margin of error value for each sport, which will help ensure that any penalties given to teams with small sample sizes are as statistically valid as those for teams with large sample sizes. It is recommended that a consistent margin of error set at a confidence level of 84 percent be applied to determine each team's subjectivity to the penalty. This means that the "upper-confidence boundary" of a team's APR score would have to be below 925 for that team to be subject to contemporaneous penalties. A technical analysis of the confidence boundary analysis is provided. [Attachment B]

The committee noted that notice letters will be sent to member institutions in February identifying APR scores for each institution's team and reporting on the effect contemporaneous penalties would have on each team if such penalties had been in effect this year. Additionally, contemporaneous penalties will be initially based on two years of APR data (2003-04 and 2004-05), then three years of data (adding 2005-06) and from then on four years of APR data.

c. "Capping" the Contemporaneous Penalty Scholarship Losses.

(1) Recommendation. The committee recommends the Board approve a policy regarding the maximum contemporaneous penalty applied to a team in any given year. More specifically, the penalty would apply up to, but not more than, approximately ten percent of the maximum financial aid team limit in that sport. This includes rounding up to the next whole number for headcount sports. A chart listing the maximum value of contemporaneous penalties for each sport is attached. [Attachment C]

Rationale. The contemporaneous-penalty legislation is intended to serve notice to the lowest academic performing teams and to encourage improved academic performance of all sport teams and student-athletes. By limiting the amount of athletics aid included in the penalty, the contemporaneous penalties would serve as a catalyst to create change over the next several years where performance lags, but would not be overly punitive. Historical penalties will provide more significant and punitive penalties, which begins in fall 2006, with the most severe penalties taking effect in fall 2008 and beyond.

Additionally, these recommendations have been made based on one year of APR data. As such, taking a conservative approach to the penalty structure while more years of data accumulate appears to be a reasonable approach.

d. Institutional Mission.

(1) Recommendation. The committee recommends that institutional mission be a factor considered by the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Subcommittee on Appeals when considering waiver requests of the contemporaneous penalty.

(2) Rationale. Institutional mission is an important distinction when weighing academic outcomes. It is also fairly complex to mitigate penalties in a formulaic manner across a very wide range of institutional missions. The committee intends to develop some broad guidelines that could be considered as mitigation by the subcommittee in the appeals process.

This approach provides some flexibility as the Subcommittee on Appeals considers a range of factors, rather than administering mission considerations systematically. For example, the subcommittee might look at several data points related to institutional mission (e.g., comparing a team's APR with the overall athletics program APR; comparing a team's federal graduation rate with the institution's overall federal rate; comparing a team's graduation success rate (GSR) with a GSR calculated for a general student-body sample; or comparing the academic profiles of student-athletes who subject the team to the penalty with the institution's overall student-body academic profile and/or record). The subcommittee also could consider whether the team's APR and/or GSR is trending upward or downward.

The capping of scholarship losses also serves to lessen the impact of the penalty for institutions with restricted resources or other institutional characteristics or factors that may contribute to a slower rate of academic improvement.

e. Modification of Wording of NCAA Proposal No. 2003-114 (Academic Performance Program – Contemporaneous Penalty) (NCAA Division I Bylaw 15.5.7.1).

(1) Recommendation. The committee recommends that the NCAA Division I Management Council adopt a modification of wording of Proposal No. 2003-114 to clarify that that in headcount sports, the contemporaneous penalty is applied to the full-counter status (i.e., 1.0) for one full academic year.

(2) Rationale. This modification of wording is consistent with the original intent of Proposal No. 2003-114 to prohibit a team that is academically subject to contemporaneous penalties based on its academic progress rate from re-awarding the athletics aid of a student-athlete who fails to satisfy eligibility requirements and does not return to the institution. Based on how financial aid regulations apply to headcount sports, any countable aid received by a student-athlete in that sport results in the sport being charged with one full counter against its financial aid maximum limitations. This modification clarifies that in headcount sports, any counter who subjects the team to the contemporaneous penalty will result in a 1.0 penalty, regardless of the amount of aid the student-athlete was awarded.

f. Term-by-Term Awards Academic Performance Program – Contemporaneous Penalty.

(1) Recommendation. The committee requests that if Proposal No. 2003-24 is defeated, the Management Council sponsor emergency legislation that specifies that for institutions awarding aid on a term-by-term basis, the contemporaneous penalty applies to the amount of countable athletics aid awarded in the student-athlete's most recent regular academic term of enrollment, multiplied by the number of regular terms in the institution's academic year. Aid awarded to a midyear enrollee shall be exempt from the application of this proposal. [Attachment D]

(2) Rationale. The committee supports Proposal No. 2003-24 (Financial Aid – Term and Conditions – Periods of Award), which would require institutions to award athletically related financial aid for a period of one academic year, except as otherwise specified. The committee supports this proposal because it is consistent with the intent of the Academic Performance Program (APP) in that it will prevent institutions from diminishing the impact of contemporaneous penalties by offering term-by-term athletically related financial aid awards. If the Proposal No. 2003-24 is defeated, the committee believes legislation is necessary to ensure that the contemporaneous penalty is not reduced or manipulated by the awarding of term-by-term aid. This legislation should be considered emergency in that if Proposal No. 2003-24 is defeated the there will be nothing that prevents institutions from mitigating the impact of the contemporaneous penalty for the 2005-06 academic year, which is the first year that the contemporaneous penalty must be applied.

2. *INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.*

a. Definition of "retention" for APR data collection modified. The committee approved the following definition of retention for purposes of the APR effective with the 2004-05 cohort:

- **A student-athlete is retained for purposes of the APR if he or she returns to the member institution for the next regular academic term and is enrolled as a full-time student as of the fifth week of classes or the official census date of the institution, which ever is earlier.**

The current definition of retention does not tie the awarding of the retention point to institutional census data. The new definition of retention will allow for a significant portion of institutions to use official census data for retention, thereby reducing institutional burden when computing each team's APR. The new definition also will address unique enrollment situations that result in a student-athlete's enrollment after the first day of classes and elicit true academic retention by requiring a student-athlete to remain enrolled full time through most institutional official census dates. Additionally, the committee believes that the new definition is clear and balances institutional differences with the data collection needs of the APR.

b. **New deadline to file APR/APC data**. The committee approved a new deadline of six weeks after the first day of classes for the fall term for filing APR and APC data effective with the fall 2005 data collection. By moving the current data reporting due date from four to six weeks after the start of classes in the fall term provides institutions additional time to provide data. Additionally, the new definition of retention approved by the committee will require a later data submission date because retention would be defined as being enrolled as of the fifth week classes or the official census date for the institution, which ever is earlier. The committee believes that moving the due date to six weeks represents a reasonable balance between the needs of member institutions and the committee's need to have adequate time to review and compile accurate data for purposes of calculating APR scores and determining those teams subject to the contemporaneous penalty.

c. **Editorial revisions to the academic performance program legislation**. The committee approved editorial revisions of NCAA Division I Bylaws 15.5.7, 15.5.7.1, 15.5.7.3 and editorial revisions to Bylaws 15.5.7, 15.5.7-(a), 15.5.7-(b) and 15.5.7.1.1. [Attachment E] The committee believes these changes were consistent with the intent of the legislation and clarified the legislation to permit the membership to apply the rules consistently.

d. **Interpretation relative to the application of the contemporaneous penalty for student-athletes who have exhausted eligibility.** The committee reviewed and approved an interpretation clarifying the application of Bylaw 15.5.7.2 (Limitations on Re-Awarding Financial Aid – Exception) for student-athletes who have exhausted eligibility in the sport in which the aid was awarded. [Attachment F] The committee requested that the staff publish this interpretation in the same manner that all other "official" interpretations are published to provide adequate notice to the membership of the existence of the interpretation. This interpretation, in conjunction with Bylaw 15.5.7.2, would exempt the countable aid received by the following student-athletes from the contemporaneous penalty:

(1) A student-athlete who does not use all of his or her seasons of competition but exhausts his or her five-year clock.

(2) A partial or nonqualifer who fails to earn a fourth season of competition by graduating prior to the start of his or her fifth year.

(3) A fall sport student-athlete who concludes his or her competitive eligibility at the end of the fall term and does not return to the institution subsequent to the fall term.

(4) A student-athlete who concludes his or her competitive eligibility at the end of four years, the penalty would not apply.

e. Policy and Legislative Recommendations from the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics. The committee reviewed a report created by a task force of the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics and referred a number of suggestions in the report to subcommittees for further discussion.

Explanation of Semester versus Quarter APR Variance

Prepared by: NCAA research staff and NCAA research consultants.

In developing a one-year academic progress rate (APR) to be used as a measure of squad-level academic performance, it was envisioned that APR would serve as a real-time marker of longer-term academic performance as measured by some form of graduation rate (whether the federal rate or a graduation success rate). Rather simply, given no changes in a squad's behavior over a period of time we would expect a direct translation between APR and long-run academic performance. However, the simple manner in which we combine term-by-term eligibility and retention points for a yearly APR was found to produce an advantage for quarter schools over semester institutions that is based only on the number of reporting occasions and unrelated to academic performance. In simple terms, because (a) we discount the rate for students who "leave school when eligible," and (b) the reporting of APR is done at two occasions for semester schools but at three occasions for Quarter schools, then (c) a slight numerical advantage can accrue from the extra reporting occasion for the Quarter schools. Among many ways to correct for this potential numerical bias, the simplest correction formula found was an alteration of the APR at the Quarter schools by a small amount (the APR proportion raised to the power of 3/2. Some details on the choice of this calculation follow.

A simplified version of this principle can be seen in the relationship between yearly retention rates and the federal graduation rate. If 90% of some cohort remained in school each year over a 6-year period, we would expect a graduation proportion of $(.9)(.9)(.9)(.9)(.9)(.9) = (.9)^6 = .53$. This can also be displayed in terms of a hypothetical class of students:

100 students entering as frosh – 90% retained into year 2 translates to…
90 students re-entering in year 2 – 90% retained into year 3 translates to…
81 students re-entering in year 3 – 90% retained into year 4 translates to…
73 students re-entering in year 4 – 90% retained into year 5 translates to…
66 students re-entering in year 5 – 90% retained into year 6 translates to…
59 students re-entering in year 6 – 90% success rate translates to…
53 students graduating.

This relationship between retention rate and graduation rate resembles the formula for determining rate-of-return (e.g., compound interest) on some initial capital (i.e., a cohort of entering student-athletes). A higher retention rate leads to a greater number of graduates over time. Conversely, one can think of the rate-of-return as the non-retention rate – higher non-retention leads to a higher proportion of academic failure (as quantified by the federal graduation rate) over time. We assume in the example above that retention rate is constant over time for this class of students, but it is not a necessary assumption.

Now, our present translation from the APR formula developed by the Division I Academic Consultants group and the Division I Committee on Academic Performance

(CAP) to a longer-run academic performance measure is a bit more complicated than the previous example for at least two reasons:

(1) A combination of eligibility and retention is being used to as a short-term indicator of graduation rate. As a result of incorporating eligibility status into the formula, APR is expected to translate more directly to the proposed graduation success rate rather than the federal formulation.

(2) It was decided by these committees that student-athletes should be assigned eligibility and retention points for each academic term rather than at the end of each academic year.

The expectation of these committees was that using an APR based on term-by-term rather than year-to-year data would more accurately map the functional relationship between student-athlete academic progress and the long-run academic performance of the athletic teams they constitute. At the same time, the manner in which it was decided to combine term-by-term eligibility and retention points for a yearly APR produced an advantage for quarter schools over semester institutions that is completely unrelated to academic performance.

It should be noted that this quarter/semester school disparity in the meaning of APR was not initially anticipated. If one thinks of points earned as a proportion of total points possible in a given year, then the squads at semester and at quarter schools seem to be on equal footing. For example, students eligible and retained each term during a year receive 4 of 4 points (100%) at semester schools and 6 of 6 points (100%) at quarter schools. But, in digging deeper, NCAA consultants, members of the NCAA's technical advisory group (the Data Analysis Research Network), and even a few athletics administrators at quarter institutions noticed a strictly methodological advantage of being a squad at a quarter school.

Explaining this advantage using non-technical examples is difficult, but consider the following application of the previously described compound interest formulation. Assume APR to be in proportion form (i.e. a number between 0 and 1) rather than the form to be used in APR reporting (proportional APR times 1000). As calculated for semester schools, the term-by-term APR represents a weighted average of the APR for the two semesters; for quarter schools it is a weighted average of three single quarter rates. In other words, as defined, APR represents something like the average percentage of academic success for a squad each academic term. One could also think of it as one minus the average proportion of academic failure seen each academic term. An APR of .925 (or 925 in rescaled form) means that a given squad loses about 7.5% of the possible eligibility/retention points each term.

Go back to the simpler example of retention rate to federal graduation rate translation. If one wanted to directly translate the APR for a given semester (assuming the semester is a typical one across students) to a 6-year graduation rate, the formula $(APR_semester)^{12}$ could be used. For a quarter institution, it would be $(APR_quarter)^{18}$. From this, it is a bit more obvious that APR_year, APR_semester, and APR_quarter would not be expected to be equal given some set graduation rate (e.g., a 53% graduation rate would approximately result from APR_year=.90, APR_semester=.9485, and APR_quarter=.9655. Failure to retain 10% of students in a group in a given year is mathematically equivalent to 5.15% failure per semester or 3.45% failure per quarter). In other words, squads at quarter schools and at semester schools having exactly the same long-term academic behavior would be expected to have different APRs solely due to the current calculation.

A more concrete example employing actual patterns of student-athlete behavior shows this semester/quarter APR incongruity in another way. The three most common eligibility/retention patterns among student-athletes at semester schools (representing the yearly eligibility/retention patterns of 86% of all Division I S-As in 2003-2004) are the following (displayed as eligibility status term 1, retention status term 1, eligibility status term 2, etc.):

YYYY (eligible and retained each semester -- 69% of S-As)
YYYG (eligible and retained each semester, grad in spring -- 12% of S-As)
YYYN (eligible but not retained in spring quarter -- 5% of S-As)

The top three patterns at quarter schools are the quarter-school equivalents of those three patterns—YYYYYY, YYYYYG, and YYYYYN (85% of S-As at quarter schools had one of these patterns in 2003-2004).

Consider a hypothetical squad consisting of two student-athletes who were eligible and retained each term and a third student-athlete who was academically eligible but transferred after a fall sports season (so, after one quarter at a quarter school, one semester at a semester school):

S-As at Semester School	E/R Points at Semester School	S-As at Quarter School	E/R Points at Quarter School
YYYY	4 of 4	YYYYYY	6 of 6
YYYY	4 of 4	YYYYYY	6 of 6
YNXX	1 of 2	YNXXXX	1 of 2
Total APR	9 of 10 = .900		13 of 14 = .929

If we look at the points for the three semester-school athletes and the three quarter-school athletes as a proportion of the total possible, they appear identical – two students obtained 100% of the possible points and the third obtained 50%. However, the semester squad APR = 900 and the quarter squad APR = 929 (ignoring small squad size adjustments such as confidence boundaries for the moment, the semester squad would be subject to contemporaneous penalties and the quarter squad would not). Given that the academic behavior of each squad is essentially the same, it can be seen that the APR advantage for the quarter school is not justified. Indeed, one could even claim that any advantage in APR here should belong to the semester school. Given the very reasonable assumption that a year at a quarter school represents the same amount of progress toward a degree as a year at a semester school, the students at the semester school combined to successfully complete two and one-half years of schooling and those at the quarter school completed only two and one-third.

This represents only a single example. However, in looking at those three most common E/R patterns—YYYY, YYYG, and YYYN vs. YYYYYY, YYYYYG, and YYYYYN—one can see that each presents a similar advantage for the quarter-school students as displayed above. In other words, at least 86% of the individual E/R patterns will accrue APR benefits for quarter schools based on the current APR formula. Examination of the dozens of E/R patterns representing the other 14% of S-As shows that some may favor semester schools but many are neutral or favor quarter schools as above. Given these relative proportions, the advantages overwhelmingly favor quarter schools. An apt analogy of this semester/quarter differential may be the federal graduation rate/graduation success rate differential at NCAA institutions. It has been shown that graduation success rate is about 12 to 15 percentage points higher on average for these schools. It is the case though that the GSR for some institutions will actually be lower than the federal graduation rate. It is possible that some squads at quarter institutions will not have an APR advantage in a given year, but on the whole quarter schools do have an unintentional advantage. An alternate way of stating this issue is to say that some students at quarter schools are being weighted up to 1.5 times more than students at semester schools and given the observed patterns in the data, this weighting typically favors the quarter institutions.

Several methods for better equating APR for quarter and semester schools are possible. One method would be to change the manner in which APR eligibility/retention points are tabulated. A year-to-year APR (one eligibility and one retention point earned each year) could accomplish this.

A second method for equating semester and quarter school APR is to leave the original APR scoring system intact, but create a translation formula. Based on the principles detailed above, a number of statistical methodologies (e.g., survival analysis) and nonlinear transformations were postulated by various technical consultants. As a simple starting point, it was suggested that quarter-school APR (in proportion form) be raised to the (3/2) power. This simple translation is based upon the compounding principles described just above. It is anticipated that there are other formulas that may work the same or better at making this translation. However, initial analyses with the 2003-2004 APR data have shown that the formula seems to perform as desired. Consider the following characteristics of the APR distribution observed in 2003-2004:

	Semester Schools in Division I	Quarter Schools in Division I	Quarter School APR Distribution Transformed
Mean	955	971	957
Standard Deviation	58	31	46

Technical note: $APR_quarter_new = APR_quarter^{(3/2)}$

Note that the quarter schools in Division I do have a slightly higher graduation rate than the semester schools in Division I. However, this difference translates to an APR difference that is much more in line with the 2-point APR difference observed after transformation than the 16-point average difference observed prior to applying the quarter-to-semester translation.

A quarter-school advantage is manifest as a result of the current way of calculating APR. Correction for this numerical bias requires a change in how APR is computed or some APR transformation such as the one currently employed. But, as stated earlier, we do not unequivocally state that the simple $APR^{3/2}$ transformation employed is the optimal correction, because this depends on the empirical behaviors of the students at the semester and quarter schools. This numerical bias will be monitored and possibly altered as we obtain more APR data over the next few years.

Issues Related to Confidence Boundaries Around APR Scores

Prepared by: NCAA research staff and NCAA research consultants.

The way we have been viewing the APR indicators is as a set of binary events (eligibility and retention, yes or no) for each scholarship athlete. However, when we move to the team level we create an "APR Mean" as an "estimate" of the average behavior of the team. In this sense we are considering APR just like the graduation rates we have studied in the past, and we are making "inferences" about the "true rates" from these samples of behaviors. Of course, we can see how it is reasonable to view the APR as a "census" and the APR Mean to be like the percentage of votes in an election.

The CAP committee consensus view on this was that this yearly census is a one-time snapshot of a systemic process over the team's recent history, and it is that systemic process that we are attempting to infer. For this reason, the concept of a "4-year moving average" as a base for a "historical evaluation" was added, and the main goal was to get the best estimate of the average behavior by smoothing out any odd fluctuations that might emerge due to (a) aberrancies in any specific year, and/or (b) small samples. Thus, the "population" of interest is considered to be a 4-year cohort of students on a given squad and not the group of student-athletes on athletics aid during the 2003-2004 academic year. In fact, one could view the actual "population" of interest as some group of athletes over an even longer period. If that view is adopted, we could argue for keeping confidence intervals (CI) in place even after four years of data collection.

The need for a "contemporaneous" penalty was created after the 4-year cohort of interest was established, and this meant there was a need for an inference about the behavior in less than 4 full years. This led us to consider how to make this kind of inference in a uniform and fair way for both large and small sized teams. Our solution was to add a "margin of error" or "confidence interval" (CI) around the APR Mean based on the sample size of the team involved. We then suggested ALL teams be evaluated on their upper bound estimate (equal to the APR MEAN plus the CI).

The exact CI formulas we use are standard normal approximations for proportions, and appear in many places -- e.g., Hays, 1973, p.378-380. We found this normal approximation was simple but similar to the results from the standard errors of the rates in the multilevel logit model we used in the past to predict graduation rates (McArdle & Hamagami, 1994, JASA). There are other approximations that might even be more precise. However, in our review of several alternatives we thought these other approximations would be even more restrictive, and hence more punitive, so we chose this simple standard form. The choice of defining the upper bound estimate as "APR Mean+CI" (i.e., one CI only) was mainly selected for consistency and simplicity of presentation.

The net effect of using an upper bound estimate of the APR Mean is that a large team is virtually stuck with the APR Mean as their upper bound estimate because the CI is trivial, whereas a small team appears to get a break due to a larger CI. While this is due both to the APR mean and the squad size, it can create differences in the effective penalty cut. In the APR data we collected, we can calculate the following:

Team Sport	Average 1-year Squad Size*	The Required APR meeting The standard of accuracy
Men's Football	~81	905
Men's Baseball	~27	890
Men's Basketball	~12-13	875
Men's Golf	~8	860

* Multiplied by 2 to get the two year CI

* The required APR corresponding with the 2-year Minimum APR Upper Bound Estimate of ≥925.

Although it looks as if the small teams benefit more from this approach, it is simply an application of the standard principles of accuracy in decision making, and we are less sure that the observed one-year estimate resembles their longer-run APR Mean when the teams are small. Small teams with really poor behavior are not guaranteed to meet this upper bound APR rule. For example, on a squad of size n=13 (e.g., a basketball team), a loss of as few as 6 eligibility/retention points out of the 52 possible points (52 is the upper bound—only possible if all retention points lost during the spring semester) might put a team below the upper bound estimate (depending on the semester). In other words, a couple of transfers, a couple of bad academic terms, and one student leaving ineligible could put this team below the upper bound needed for the 925 cut.

In summation, the Committee on Academic Performance was concerned about issues related to teams of small sample sizes, especially before we have collected four years of data from all teams. Because of that, the CAP chose to institute a process that would include an examination of the CI around all scores before subjecting any teams to penalties. The CAP believed that this would be the most fair and defensible way of dealing with this issue.

Academic Performance Program
Contemporaneous Penalties Maximum Penalty

The following charts demonstrate the maximum contemporaneous penalties to be imposed on a team with a "cap" of ten percent of a team's maximum financial aid team limit, (rounded up to the next whole number for headcount sports).

Men's Sports

Headcount Sports	Max. Team Limits	Max. Penalty Per Year
Basketball	13	2
Football I-A	85	9

Equivalency Sports	Max. Team Limits	Max. Penalty Per Year
Baseball	11.7	1.17
Cross Country	5	.50
Cross Country/ Track & Field	12.6	1.26
Fencing	4.5	.45
Football I-AA	63	6.30
Golf	4.5	.45
Gymnastics	6.3	.63
Ice Hockey	18	1.80
Lacrosse	12.6	1.26
Rifle	3.6	.36
Skiing	6.3	.63
Soccer	9.9	.99
Swimming	9.9	.99
Tennis	4.5	.45
Trach	12.6	1.26
Volleyball	4.5	.45
Water Polo	4.5	.45
Wrestling	9.9	.99

Women's Sports

Headcount Sports	Max. Team Limits	Max. Penalty Per Year
Basketball	15	2
Gymnastics	12	2
Tennis	8	1
Volleyball	12	2

Equivalency Sports	Max. Team Limits	Max. Penalty Per Year
Bowling	5	.50
Cross Country	6	.60
Cross Country/ Track & Field	18	1.80
Fencing	5	.50
Field Hockey	12	1.20
Golf	6	.60
Ice Hockey	18	1.80
Lacrosse	12	1.20
Rowing	20	2.00
Skiing	7	.70
Soccer	12	1.20
Softball	12	1.20
Swimming	14	1.40
Track	18	1.80
Water Polo	8	.80

2005- ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE PROGRAM – CONTEMPORANEOUS PENALTY

Status:DRAFT

Intent: In equivalency sports, to specify that for institutions awarding aid on a term-by-term basis, the contemporaneous penalty applies to the amount of countable athletic aid awarded in the student-athlete's most recent regular academic term, multiplied by the number of regular terms in the institution's academic year. Aid awarded to a midyear enrollee shall be exempt from the application of this proposal.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.7.1, page 208, as follows:

15.5.7.1.1 Head Count Sports. In head count sports, the limitation on aid is applied to the full counter status (i.e., 1.0) for one full academic year (or the equivalent), regardless of whether the student-athlete was awarded a full or partial athletics scholarship**.**

15.5.7.1.2 Equivalency Sports.

15.5.7.1.2.1 Annual Awards. In equivalency sports, for institutions that award aid on an annual basis, the limitation is applied to the amount of countable aid awarded to the ineligible student-athlete in the most recent year of attendance prior to withdrawal from the institution.

15.5.7.1.2.2 Term-by-Term Awards. In equivalency sports, for institutions that award athletically related aid for a period of less than one academic year, the limitation is applied to the amount of countable athletic aid awarded in the student-athlete's most recent regular academic term (e.g., semester or quarter) multiplied by the number of regular terms (e.g., semester, quarter) in the institution's academic year; however, the limitation cannot exceed one full equivalency value.

15.5.7.1.2.2.1 Exception. An institution is not subject to the application in Bylaw 15.5.7.1.2.2 when aid was awarded for less than a full year to a student athlete who initially enrolled as a full-time student at the certifying institution at midyear (e.g., the beginning of the second semester or second or third quarter of an academic year). In such circumstances, the limitation is applied to the actual amount of countable aid awarded to the student-athlete in that initial term of enrollment.

Source: NCAA Committee on Academic Performance
Effective Date: Immediate
Proposal Category: Amendment
Topical Area: Academic Performance Program
Rationale: The committee supports Proposal No. 2003-24 (Financial Aid – Term and Conditions – Periods of Award), which would require institutions to award athletically related financial aid for a period of one academic year, except as otherwise specified. The committee supports this proposal because it is consistent with the intent of the Academic Performance Program (APP) in that it will prevent institutions from diminishing the impact of contemporaneous penalties by offering term-by-term athletically related financial aid awards. If the Proposal No. 2003-24 is defeated, the committee believes legislation is necessary to ensure that the contemporaneous penalty is not reduced or manipulated by the awarding of term-by-term aid. This legislation should be considered emergency in that if Proposal No. 2003-24 is defeated the there will be nothing that prevents institutions from mitigating the impact of the contemporaneous penalty for the 2005-06 academic year, which is the first year that the contemporaneous penalty must be applied.

Estimated Budget Impact: None.
Impact on Student Athlete's Time: None.

DI Proposal

ER-2004-38 ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE PROGRAM -- CONTEMPORANEOUS PENALTY FOR POOR ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

Status: Adopted - Final Process Diagram
Intent: N/A
Bylaws: Amend 15.5.7 , page 208 , as follows:

"15.5.7 Limitations on Re-Awarding of Financial Aid. A*n institution or* team that presents an academic progress rate below the standard rate, as determined by the Committee on Academic Performance, shall not re-award to an incoming prospective student-athlete (i.e., high-school, two-year transfer, four-year transfer) any financial aid countable toward team limits that was previously awarded to a student-athlete under the following conditions:

[15.5.7-(a) and 15.5.7-(b) unchanged.]

"15.5.7.1 Application. A*n institution* **team** subject to the re-awarding of financial aid limitations specified in this bylaw shall apply such limitation(s) **for one full-academic year and** at the next available opportunity, but not later than two academic years after the withdrawal of the student-athlete. **For purposes of this legislation, the academic year is composed of two full semesters or three full quarters beginning with first term of the traditional academic year (e.g., fall semester) and concluding with the final term of that same year (e.g., spring semester).**

"15.5.7.1.1 Maximum Institutional Limitations. A re-awarding of financial aid limitation assessed under this bylaw shall be applied to maximum institutional grant-in-aid limitations set forth in Bylaws 15.5.2, 15.5.3, 15.5.5 and 15.5.6. Contemporaneous penalties must be deducted from the maximum team financial aid limit. A*n institution* **team** that provides financial aid equal to the penalized team limit (i.e., maximum team financial limit minus the applicable penalties) may not reward the financial aid in excess of the penalized team limit to any student (including a continuing student-athlete).

[15.5.7.2 unchanged.]

"15.5.7.3 Waiver. An institution may request a waiver of Bylaw 15.5.7 to the Committee on Academic Performance if *the institution or* one of its teams is not eligible to re-award any financial aid countable toward team limits pursuant to Bylaw 15.5.7. The Committee on Academic Performance determination shall be final, binding and conclusive and not subject to further review by any other authority."

Source: NCAA Staff.
Effective Date: Immediate
Proposal Category: Editorial

Topical Area: Academic Performance Program
Rationale: N/A
Estimated Budget Impact: None.
Impact on Student Athlete's Time: None.

History

Dec 08, 2004 Submit; Submitted for consideration. Change made at the request of the Legislation Team liaisons to NCAA Incentive/Disincentive Working Group; statement regarding full academic year application appeared in an earlier draft of the proposal, but was inadvertently omitted during a subsequent revision; and penalty can only apply to a team not an institution.

Dec 08, 2004 Adopted

DI Proposal

ER-2004-39 ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE PROGRAM -- CONTEMPORANEOUS PENALTY FOR POOR ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

Status: Adopted - Final Process Diagram
Intent: N/A
Bylaws: Amend 15.5.7 , page 208 , as follows:

"15.5.7 Limitations on Re-Awarding of Financial Aid. An institution or team that presents an academic progress rate below the standard rate, as determined by the Committee on Academic Performance, shall not re-award *to an incoming prospective student-athlete (i.e., high-school, two-year transfer, four-year transfer)* any financial aid countable toward team limits that was previously awarded to a student-athlete *under the following conditions:*

"*(a) The student-athlete initially receiving the award* **who** renders himself or herself academically ineligible for the following academic year*;* and

"*(b) The student-athlete initially receiving the award* withdraws from the institution or does not remain enrolled for any reason at any time.

[15.5.7.1 unchanged.]

"15.5.7.1.1 Maximum Institutional Limitations. A re-awarding of financial aid limitation assessed under this bylaw shall be applied to maximum institutional grant-in-aid limitations set forth in Bylaws 15.5.2, 15.5.3, 15.5.5 and 15.5.6. Contemporaneous penalties must be deducted from the maximum team financial aid limit. An institution that provides financial aid equal to the penalized team limit (i.e., maximum team financial limit minus the applicable penalties) may not reward the financial aid in excess of the penalized team limit to any student *(including a continuing student-athlete)*."

Source: NCAA Staff.
Effective Date: Immediate
Proposal Category: Editorial
Topical Area: Academic Performance Program
Rationale: N/A
Estimated Budget Impact: None.
Impact on Student Athlete's Time: None.

History

Dec 14, 2004 Submit; Submitted for consideration. Change made at the request of the Legislation Team liaisons to Incentive/Disincentive Working Group; NCAA Division I Proposal No. 2004-103 was initially proposed as a modification of wording. The Division I Management Council defeated the modification of wording and moved the proposal into the system as Proposal No. 2004-103. At that time, the proposal could have been revised to include these changes. The revisions are consistent with how the bylaw applies after adoption of Proposal No. 2004-103 and were made for clarity purposes.

Dec 14, 2004 Adopted

Application of Contemporaneous Penalties for Student-Athlete who has Exhausted his or her Eligibility (I)

Date Issued: Jan 09, 2005
Type: Official
Item Ref: 1

Interpretation:

The Committee on Academic Performance confirmed that an institution may re-award the countable financial aid of a student-athlete who exhausted eligibility in the sport in which aid was awarded. For example, any countable financial aid awarded to a football student-athlete who exhausts his eligibility for football competition may be re-awarded to another student regardless of the team's Academic Performance Rate (APR) or the departing student-athlete's academic-eligibility or retention status in a subsequent academic term or terms.

The committee also noted that although the countable financial aid maybe re-awarded, the student-athlete shall be used in calculating the team's APR score for each term in which he or she received the aid, including the last term before withdrawal. [References: NCAA Division I Bylaws 15.5.7 (Limitation on Re-Awarding Financial Aid) and 15.5.7.2 (Exception)].