REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE MEETING
JULY 26-27, 2005

1. ACTION ITEMS.

a. Adjustment to Teams' NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR).

(1) Recommendation. The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance recommends the NCAA Division I Board of Directors support a revision to the policies governing calculation of teams' APR to allow adjustments as outlined in the attached directive. [Attachment A]

(2) Rationale. The APR is a metric that accounts for the academic eligibility, retention and graduation of student-athletes. The recommended directive provides guidance for the staff and the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting when reviewing APR adjustment requests and is based on each student-athlete's mitigating circumstances and whether those circumstances are beyond the control of the student-athlete, team and/or institution. The committee recognizes that there are some legitimate reasons why student-athletes are not retained and, in these instances, a team's APR should be adjusted. The committee believes that a team should not lose APR retention points when student-athletes are not retained due to limited circumstances that are outside the control of the student-athlete, team and/or the institution. In keeping with the goals of academic reform, such adjustments would be made only if a student-athlete who completes a term earns the eligibility point. With regard to student-athletes who pursue professional athletics opportunities, the committee reviewed professional draft data in the sports of men's basketball, baseball and football. The committee noted that the vast majority of drafted student-athletes from the 2003-04 data-set did earn the APR academic eligibility point in their last term. Additionally, the directive identifies circumstances that are within the control of the student-athlete, team, and/or institution or that cause a student-athlete to not be retained, which will not result in adjustment to a team's APR.

Absent from the list of acceptable APR adjustments is a student transferring for reasons other than discontinuation of academic program or other extraordinary circumstances. The committee believes that simply transferring from an institution while in good academic standing is not

reason enough to waive the retention point. The committee is not supportive of this change to the APR at this time. The committee recommends additional data be gathered to better understand the complexities related to transfer students. To this end, the committee has suggested that collection of data for the next two years to further examine the reasons retention points are lost to see what adjustments (if any) need to be made. The committee formally would consider changes to E + R after 2006-07 data has been collected (three years of APR data).

In addition, the committee approved the policies and procedures for adjusting teams' APR as outlined. [Attachment B] The policy provides institutions the opportunity to request adjustments based on the committee's directive. These procedures grant the staff the authority to make decisions, while maintaining an appeal process to the Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting.

b. Incentive APR Points for Graduation of Former Student-Athletes.

(1) Recommendation. The committee recommends the Board support a revision to the policies governing calculation of teams' APR to award a bonus of "1/0" APR point for a former student-athlete who left the institution without graduating and returns to the institution and graduates. This "1/0" will be awarded to the team's APR in the academic year (i.e., term) the former student-athlete graduates, provided the former student-athlete was included in the team's APR cohort during his or her tenure at the institution and did not earn the APR retention point in his or her last term in the APR cohort, or would have met the definition to be included in the cohort in cases in which the student-athlete attended prior to implementation of the APR.

(2) Rationale. The committee supports this incentive to encourage former student-athletes to return to the institution and complete their degrees while keeping the APR simple and predictive as a measurement. The ultimate goal of academic reform is increased student-athlete graduation rates and this is a direct incentive for institutions to identify and encourage former non-graduated student-athletes to return and graduate. The recommended "1/0" bonus restores to the team the APR point lost when the former student-athlete departed without graduating. This additional point ensures that the APR does not award more points to student-athletes who leave an institution then return at a later date to graduate than student-athletes who maintain academic eligibility and graduate within the

prescribed five-year period. The committee did not want to encourage the practice of institutions recommending that student-athletes delay graduation in order to obtain a bonus greater than students who graduate in the normal timeline.

c. Incentives Program.

(1) Recommendation. The committee recommends the Board indicate its support for a comprehensive incentives package beginning in the 2006-07 academic year to include public recognition initiatives for team academic achievement, financial rewards for top institutional academic achievers and grants for institutions/teams meeting other specified criteria (e.g., most improved).

(2) Rationale. The committee has developed a basic incentives framework that allows for individual team recognition and institutional financial rewards for approximately 25 percent of the Division I membership. Public recognition initiatives will focus on top achievers in each sport and could begin in 2006. Criteria for receipt of grants could include: team APR/GSR performance at a certain stipulated level (which all teams must meet in order for the institution to receive a grant); overall student-athlete academic performance at a higher level than the general student body; and/or significant APR or GSR improvement. Additional criteria may be developed as the program is implemented. Also, the program would include financial support for penalized teams that have shown an upward trend in APR, despite minimal institutional resources, so that they can continue progressive improvement. Finally, the committee noted these grants should not be used for campus athletics operations budgets. The committee wants to seek feedback regarding this framework for further review and definition during its fall meeting.

If the Board supports the concept, the committee recommends the staff identify sources of funding for this initiative which could include, surplus funds, future anticipated revenue increases and/or corporate partnership dollars. The committee believes the funds allocated for this initiative must be substantial enough to be meaningful and that $10 million annually would permit institutional awards of approximately $100,000 per institution. The committee recognizes that the 2006-07 budget may not include the full $10 million requested, but requested the staff identify a timeline for increasing this budget item over a series of years until the full figure is reached.

(3) Budget Impact. $10 million annually.

d. Consideration of Institutional Mission in the Contemporaneous-Penalty Waiver Process.

(1) Recommendation. The committee recommends the Board revise the policies governing requests to waive contemporaneous penalties to include the consideration of an institution's mission as follows:

- In all cases, for a team to be provided relief from contemporaneous penalties based on institutional mission, the team's multi-year APR must be 850 or higher. For teams benefiting from the squad-size adjustment, the team's upper-confidence boundary must be 850 or higher.

Automated waivers of contemporaneous penalties will be granted based on institutional mission for teams as follows:

(a) For teams with multi-year APRs from 850 to 924, the academic performance of student-athletes will be compared with the student body by first comparing the team's expected graduation rate, based on its APR, to the institution's student-body historical graduation rate (i.e., federal graduation rate).

(b) Any team with a projected-graduation rate, based on its multi-year APR, that is 10 percentage points or more above the most recent federal graduation rate for the student body will be provided an automated waiver of contemporaneous penalties, provided the team's multi-year APR is 850 or higher.

Institutions applying for contemporaneous-penalty waivers based on institutional mission will be reviewed as follows:

(a) For teams with multi-year APRs from 850 to 924, the academic performance of student-athletes will be compared with the student body by first comparing the team's expected graduation rate, based on its multi-year APR, to the institution's student-body historical graduation rate (i.e., federal graduation rate).

(b) Any team with a projected graduation rate, based on its multi-year APR, that is between zero and less than 10 percentage points above the student-body's federal graduation rate will be evaluated

through the contemporaneous-penalty waivers process. In order to receive a waiver, the institution must demonstrate that the institution has fewer resources than other Division I institutions with similar graduation rates or it graduates students at a higher rate than schools with similar institutional characteristics. The institutional characteristics to be used shall include a defined list of variables from the following categories:

(i) Who is served by the institution (e.g., average age of student body, percent of students residing on campus, proportion of student-athletes attending full time, per capita Pell dollars)?

(ii) What is the academic experience at the institution (e.g., admissions selectively, academic entrance requirements, academic characteristics of student-body)?

(iii) What are the available educational resources for the institution and its students (e.g., per capita education expenditures, tuition, student-faculty ratio, research dollars)?

Institutions are required to provide the necessary information to assess these variables. It is suggested that institutions include with their waiver applications the section of their most recent academic accreditation reports that detail this information.

(2) Rationale. Relief from contemporaneous penalties is warranted for teams that clearly perform at a demonstrated level above the student-body, but above a minimum standard. Moreover, relief should be provided for teams that are clearly performing above the general student-body without the institution having to make any type of formal request (i.e., automated). However, institutions that perform at a level slightly above or equal the student body should be allowed to demonstrate that they have fewer resources than other Division I institutions with similar graduation rates or that they graduate students at a higher rate than other schools with similar institutional characteristics. Finally, the committee believes there is a minimal level of academic performance below which no relief should be provided based on institutional mission (i.e., APR below 850).

e. Adjustment to Quarter School APR.

(1) Recommendation. The committee recommends the Board support an amendment to the policies governing calculation of teams' APR to alter the method equalizing the calendar differences between semester and quarter institutions. The committee recommends the weighted version of the computational formula for the calculation of a quarter school's APR be as follows:

$$\frac{ER_{FS}\,(\text{earned}) + ER_{WS}\,(\text{earned})}{ER_{FS}\,(\text{possible}) + ER_{WS}\,(\text{possible})}$$

ER = eligibility + retention points
FS = fall assessment + spring-"superterm" assessment
WS = winter-"superterm" assessment + spring assessment

An alternative form is:

$$\frac{ER_{F}\,(\text{earned}) + ER_{S\text{-}Super}\,(\text{earned}) + ER_{W\text{-}Super}\,(\text{earned}) + ER_{S}\,(\text{earned})}{ER_{F}\,(\text{poss}) + ER_{S\text{-}Super}\,(\text{poss}) + ER_{W\text{-}Super}\,(\text{poss}) + ER_{S}\,(\text{poss})}$$

Note that winter and spring "superterm" assessments are only equivalent to the current winter and spring eligibility and retention calculations conditional on the student being in the cohort in the final term of the superterm. If the student is not part of the cohort in that second term of the superterm (e.g., a spring superterm assessment is being made but the student dropped out of school in the winter quarter) then his or her eligibility and retention points derive from the first term of the superterm (winter in the case of a spring superterm calculation).

(2) Rationale. The committee received a report from the Data Analysis Research Network recommending this change based in part on analysis of the first-year APR data. The Data Analysis Research Network group unanimously recommends a different form of APR calculation for quarter institutions than the one currently used and a removal of the current statistical adjustment to quarter squad APRs (i.e., raising quarter school

APRs to the 3/2 power). This new APR for quarter schools will not necessitate any change to the APR data collection process. The fall-spring APR component will be computed based on eligibility and retention status at the end of the fall term (10 weeks) and at the end of the spring term (20 weeks combined across winter and spring terms). The winter-spring eligibility and retention assessments will be made at the end of the winter term (20 weeks across fall and winter terms) and at the end of the spring term (10 weeks). In the fall-spring calculation an individual who is retained and eligible in the fall and leaves the institution while ineligible at the end of the winter term would be counted as 2/2 at the first measurement opportunity and 0/2 at the second, thereby becoming a 2/4 for the year. In the winter-spring formulation, that individual would be counted as a zero-for-two at the first measurement opportunity and not included in the cohort for the second measurement period (thus, 0/2 for the year). Each rate is calculated across all individuals in the cohort and then the two rates are averaged (weighted based on each rate's denominator since they may be different) to create the new quarter squad APR. From the example above, the student leaving ineligible after winter quarter would contribute a two-for-six to the squad's APR under this new quarter-squad calculation versus two-for-four when the term-by-term calculation is not modified. Attachment C is provided detailing the Data Analysis Research Network's recommendations.

f. <u>Occasion-Four Penalties – Restricted-Membership Requirements</u>.

(1) <u>Recommendation</u>. The committee recommends the Board sponsor legislation for the 2005-06 legislative cycle to define the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP) restricted-membership penalty as follows:

(a) Restricted membership status shall apply to the institution's entire athletics program (i.e., all sports teams), rather than only the low-performing team, for a period of one year.

(b) If, at the end of the one-year restricted membership period, the penalized sports team does not improve enough to meet the benchmarks of the historical-penalty structure, the institution shall be reclassified as a corresponding member.

(2) <u>Rationale</u>. The committee noted the importance of severe penalties serving as deterrents within the historical-penalty structure. In addition,

the most significant penalties should apply when an institution has failed to raise a given team's academic performance over a period of several years of APR data collection and contemporaneous and historical penalties. This approach is consistent with the recommendation of the NCAA Division I Incentives/ Disincentives Working Group and with the approach used by the NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification for institutions failing to meet certification requirements.

(3) Budget Impact. None.

g. Transfer Exception for Student-Athletes Whose Teams are Subject to NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP) Penalties.

(1) Recommendation. The committee recommends the Board sponsor legislation for the 2005-06 legislative cycle to specify that the NCAA Division I Management Council may waive the one-year residence requirement under specified conditions for eligible student-athletes whose teams are subject to APP historical penalties.

(2) Rationale. The committee believes circumstances may arise in which it will be appropriate to permit certain student-athletes to transfer and be athletically eligible immediately at a different institution if their remaining opportunities to participate in postseason competition have been eliminated due to the imposition of APP Occasion-Three or -Four historical penalties. In those instances the committee should have the discretion to identify for the Management Council those student-athletes who are meeting academic eligibility requirements and should be given waivers of the transfer-residency requirement so they may pursue championship opportunities with another team. This practice is consistent with policies and legislation established in the Division I infractions and athletics certification programs. The effective date for this legislation would be August 1, 2006.

(3) Budget Impact. None.

2. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

a. APR and Contemporaneous Penalty Reporting Forms for Institutions after Data Submission. The committee approved the amended APR and contemporaneous penalty reporting forms intended to provide institutions a report

of their APR and contemporaneous-penalty information prior to issuing the public report. [Attachment D] The contemporaneous-penalty report form will identify student-athletes in the same manner the institution reports student-athletes' APP data (e.g., ID number).

b. **Process for Announcing Contemporaneous Penalties.** The committee finalized the process for announcing contemporaneous penalties and adjusted APRs. Though freedom of information laws vary from state to state, the process is designed to protect information from public review to the greatest extent possible until all adjustments, waivers and appeals have been finalized and the institution notified. The committee noted that in some states electronic submission of even preliminary data is subject to open records laws, and that in these cases, institutions may be required to provide data to the media before information is final.

c. **Occasion-Two Penalties – Prescribed Penalty Structure.** The committee continued development of a prescribed structure for penalties to be imposed when a team fails the second filter in the historical-penalty structure. The group supports a tiered penalty model in which more significant penalties will be prescribed for those teams scoring significantly below the to-be-established APR benchmarks, as compared to teams scoring just below the benchmarks. In addition, the group intends to propose that financial aid, recruiting and practice penalties be imposed each time a team fails the second filter (i.e., comparison within sport), regardless of whether the team meets the third filter (i.e., comparison against general student body). The committee will continue to refine the prescribed-penalties table [Attachment E] after reviewing two years of APR data in January 2006, with the goal of forwarding a final recommendation in April 2006. In the interim, the committee hopes to solicit membership feedback regarding the concepts outlined in the initial draft of the prescribed-penalties table.

d. **Application of Contemporaneous Penalties to Teams That Award Scholarships Totaling Less Than the NCAA Maximum Team Limit.** The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Subcommittee on Penalties and Rewards discussed the possibility that some teams may avoid "taking" contemporaneous penalties due to the fact that they do not offer the maximum amount of financial aid permissible under NCAA legislation. The group heard a presentation from the NCAA research staff outlining the number of teams that actually would have avoided the financial impact of contemporaneous penalties (based on 2003-04 academic performance) because they do not award financial aid at maximum permissible levels. Of concern to the Subcommittee on

Penalties and Rewards was the fact that a team may award different amounts of aid from year to year. As such, the Subcommittee on Penalties and Rewards observed that a team would need to submit its squad lists from the previous three or four years and that an average amount of aid awarded over that time would be calculated, with contemporaneous penalties taken from that average number. The Subcommittee on Penalties and Rewards believes that this approach would be administratively burdensome. Further, the Subcommittee on Penalties and Rewards believes that the current practice supports the purpose of the contemporaneous-penalty structure, which is to provide a "warning shot" to teams that need to change behavior, because even teams that do not award the NCAA maximum team limit are still subject to the publicity resulting from low APRs. Therefore, the Subcommittee on Penalties and Rewards supported retaining the status quo, with application of contemporaneous penalties to the NCAA maximum team limits.

e. **Checklist for Determining Contemporaneous Penalties.** The committee reviewed an updated systematic checklist that will be used to determine whether an institution is subject to contemporaneous penalties.

f. **Methods to Ensure Integrity of Submitted APR Data**.

The committee approved the following initiatives to ensure the accuracy and integrity of APR data:

(1) Development of the following educational initiatives for those individuals who collect and submit APR data on behalf of member institutions:

(a) Continued publication of existing resource materials (e.g., APP Data Collection Guide, APP Penalties and Rewards Guide, Committee on Academic Performance Policies and Procedures).

(b) NCAA staff will produce an annual educational online presentation that will review current changes to the APP. All individuals responsible for submitting and collecting data for the APR will be required to watch the presentation. Each institution will be required to submit to the NCAA written confirmation that all individuals responsible for collecting and submitting APP data have reviewed the presentation.

(c) Web broadcasts and/or teleconferences to explain and review APP data collection and waivers programs.

(d) Staff-conducted educational presentations relative to the APP (e.g., regional seminars, conference meetings).

(2) Conduct audits of institutional data submissions. NCAA staff will use the following protocol to determine institutions subject to an audit of APR data:

(a) NCAA staff will run validation reports for every institution data set and will review all warning messages on a case-by-case basis.

(b) NCAA staff will review historical comparisons of APR data with graduation rates to identify anomalies and significant increases in APRs from year to year.

(c) NCAA staff may conduct a full audit of an institution's APR data on findings from systematic audit measures as noted. NCAA staff, if warranted, will conduct a full review of an institution's APR, which may include an in-person campus review of an institution's APR data gathering and reporting methodologies.

Any errors or inconsistencies discovered through these audits will require the institution to explain or correct the questioned data. If the institution does not provide a satisfactory explanation or correct the data within two weeks, the institution's data is unusable and is considered not submitted, which results in the applicable penalty for nonsubmission (i.e., ineligibility for NCAA championships).

(3) Require the chief executive officer to approve the institution's procedures for collecting and submitting APR-related data.

(4) Addition of the APR to the checklist of required topics during the review of an institution's compliance program.

The committee noted that providing institutional personnel with educational materials regarding gathering and reporting APP data, and auditing that data are essential to ensuring the integrity and accuracy of the data. In addition, requiring

the chief executive officer to approve the institution's collection and submission procedures will ensure that the process is committed to writing and will assign specific responsibilities to designated individuals. Finally, adding the APR to the checklist of required topics in an institution's compliance review will ensure the APP is reviewed by an external agency at least once every for years.

The cost of these initiatives is $50,000 annually.

g. Institutions' Internal Procedures for Ensuring Academic Success.

The committee recommends that institutions review their internal procedures for ensuring that student-athletes are fully engaged in the academic program while participating in intercollegiate athletics competition. These procedures should be reviewed during normally scheduled compliance audits/reviews and institutional self-studies and this request will be forwarded to the Committee on Athletics Certification.

h. Academic Enhancement Plans for Teams Scoring Below 925.

The committee approved the sample academic-enhancement assessment and planning materials developed for teams scoring below 925 (with the squad-size adjustment). The sample academic-enhancement assessment and planning materials are intended to be tools to assist an institution in the review of its student-athletes' academic progress, as well as its academic support services. These materials will be posted on the committee's section of the NCAA Web site. The goal of this instrument is to identify areas that need improvement, as well as those of excellence. A successful academic-enhancement assessment and plan should include broad-based campus participation, including the athletics department staff, faculty members, and financial aid and academic services support staff. Finally, the implementation of such plans should be reviewed during compliance reviews, institutional self-studies and waiver reviews.

i. Occasion-Three Penalties – Timing of Competition Restrictions.

The committee amended its policies governing the historical-penalty structure to indicate that an institution subject to competition restrictions shall apply such restrictions in the same academic year in which the team fails the filter system. The committee recognizes that the timing of this type of penalty may affect

entities beyond the institution (e.g., conference members, bowl contracts). As a result, the committee believes that an institution should be allowed to file an appeal regarding the timing of the penalty based on these complexities.

j. **Transfer Student-Athletes' Eligibility for Athletics Aid.** The committee supported a recommendation from the National Association of Basketball Coaches that would require student-athletes who transfer to be academically eligible at the departing institution in order to receive athletically-related financial aid in the first year at the new institution. The committee acknowledged this issue is not directly within its purview and referred the issue to the NCAA Division I Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet for consideration.

k. **Educational Materials.** The committee approved the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program Data Collection Guide and the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program Penalties and Rewards Guide, both educational tools for the membership regarding the APP. The guides will be placed on the NCAA Web site on the committee's page.

l. **Establishment of a National Record of Academic Success for Coaches**. The Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting considered a request from the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics regarding the creation of a national head coaches' graduation-rate requirement that establishes a historical graduation rate for a head coach that would follow him or her from institution to institution. The Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting generally was supportive of the concept assigning a coach with some type of formal academic measurement; however, the subcommittee recognized that before such a rate can be used, a number of issues (e.g., appropriate measurement, tracking the rate over time) needed to be resolved. The Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting requested the APP system require the reporting of the names of each team's head coach. Recording names of head coaches will preserve the capability of establishing a national record of academic success for coaches in the future. Finally, the Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting agreed to continue to discuss this concept in the future.

m. **Excluding Student-Athletes Who Have Exhausted Eligibility and Have Not Graduated from the APR Cohort**. The Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting reviewed and did not support the concept of excluding a student-athlete who has exhausted his or her eligibility from the APR cohort. The subcommittee believes it is important to include those student-athletes who have not graduated in the APR cohort. One of the primary objectives of the APR and other academic measures is to measure the academic success of athletics teams and student-athletes with success defined as graduation. Therefore, an institution should remain accountable for ensuring the academic success and eventual graduation of student-athletes who have exhausted their eligibility.

n. **Studying the Impact of Walk-On Student-Athletes on the APR**. The Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting considered whether to continue to pursue a study of the effect of nonscholarship (walk-on) student-athletes in the APR calculation. The Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting did not support continuing such a study. It was the opinion of the Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting that the benefits of such a study would not outweigh the costs involved. In addition, the subcommittee noted if an institution or conference believes the current definition of the cohort is not representative of its student-athlete population, that institution or conference currently has the ability to request a new definition that is more representative of its team be used for purposes of APP data.

Committee Chair: Walter Harrison, University of Hartford, America East Conference
Committee Liaisons: Julie Cromer, Membership Services
Diane Dickman, Membership Services
Kevin Lennon, Membership Services
Todd Petr, Research
Bill Regan, Membership Services

ATTACHMENT A

NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate Adjustment Directive

Background

The NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) is a metric that awards points for academic eligibility/graduation (E) and retention (R). Eligibility is important as it measures a student's progress toward a degree at regular intervals. Retention is a crucial part of the APR because of the following:

1. The pilot data reflected that retention is an even stronger component of graduation than eligibility.

2. By awarding points for retention, potential issues related to "run-offs" and "recruiting mistakes" could be monitored and addressed.

3. Term-by-term retention points allow for a student to receive "credit" for every term he or she returns, even if he or she eventually transfers or is not retained for any reason. This "partial-credit" model has been seen as a significant improvement over the federal graduation rate and is a very important consideration when assessing E + R and other variants for the APR calculation.

The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance has approved this directive to provide guidance to the NCAA staff and the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting in reviewing APR adjustment requests.

Guiding Principles

Adjustments to a team's APR will be considered based on circumstances surrounding individual student-athletes. Adjustments generally will be reviewed in the context of whether the mitigating circumstances surrounding the individual student-athlete are beyond the control of the student-athlete and/or the team/institution. The committee recognizes that there may be some legitimate reasons why student-athletes are not retained, and in these instances, a student-athlete's retention point should be adjusted.

Circumstances Considered Beyond a Student-Athlete's and/or Team's/Institution's Control

In general, a student-athlete who leaves an institution at the end of a term and has not graduated will be a "1 for 2" or a "0 for 2" depending on whether he or she earns the eligibility point. Adjustments to this treatment will be granted only if stated conditions described below are met.

1. A student-athlete who is unable to complete the term due to circumstances outside of his or her control (e.g., student suffers from a serious medical condition early in the academic term), fails to earn an eligibility point and is not retained due to one of the accepted reasons for departure listed below in items 2a through 2i, except 2a and 2h, will be considered a "0 for 0." Students who do not complete the term for professional athletics reasons or because their degree program is discontinued are expected to complete a started term and will be considered under item 2.

2. The student-athlete who completes an academic term as a full-time student must earn the academic eligibility point for the last term in which he or she was enrolled in order to have the retention point adjusted. If the student earns the eligibility point, but is not retained as a full-time student the following term because of one of the reasons listed below, the student will be considered a "1 for 1." The retention point is not granted or denied; rather, it simply is removed from both the numerator and the denominator.

    a. The student-athlete's degree program was discontinued. This circumstance must be supported by documentation from the institution's registrar's office indicating that the student-athlete was enrolled in the specific degree program and the date the degree program was discontinued.

    b. The student-athlete's sport was discontinued. This circumstance must be supported by documentation from the institution's director of athletics indicating when the sport program was discontinued and when the announcement of the discontinuation was made.

    c. Situations clearly supported by contemporaneous-medical documentation, which states that a student-athlete is unable to participate in intercollegiate competition as a result of incapacitating physical or mental circumstances.

    d. The student-athlete is unable to attend an intercollegiate institution full time as a result of a life-threatening or incapacitating injury or illness suffered by a member of the student-athlete's immediate family, which is clearly supported by contemporaneous-medical documentation.

    e. Natural disasters (e.g., earthquakes, floods).

    f. Extreme financial difficulties as a result of a specific event (e.g., layoff, death in the family) experienced by the student-athlete or by an individual of whom the student-athlete is legally dependent. These circumstances must be clearly supported by objective documentation (e.g., decree of bankruptcy, proof of termination) and must be beyond the control of the student-athlete or the individual on whom the student-athlete is legally dependent.

g. Harassment. This circumstance must be clearly supported by objective documentation (e.g., police report).

h. The student-athlete departs the institution to pursue a professional athletics career. [Note: The committee will more clearly define the term "professional" for this purpose. This definition shall include a documented professional relationship with a professional team, organization or tour, receipt of significant prize money, and/or other acts clearly documenting the student's professional athletics career decision.]

i. Other unforeseen events and/or circumstances beyond the student-athlete's and/or institution's control.

Circumstances Considered Within a Student-Athlete's and/or Institution's Control

Circumstances that are considered to be within the control of the student-athlete and/or the institution include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. The student-athlete transfers to another institution for any reason not included in the section above.

2. The student-athlete departs the institution due to lack of playing time, or desire to play for a different coach.

3. The student-athlete departs the institution due to a coaching change.

4. The student-athlete departs the institution because he or she was placed on academic suspension.

5. The student-athlete departs an institution because of disciplinary problem(s) (e.g., crime, academic fraud, dismissed from team, positive drug test).

6. The student-athlete departs an institution because his or her team is subject to disciplinary measure (e.g., infractions sanctions, NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program penalties).

7. The student-athlete departs an institution because his or her athletically related aid was not renewed or was reduced.

NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate Data Adjustment Requests Policies and Procedures

Pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 23, the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance has the authority to provide exceptions to the calculation of the NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) prescribed in Bylaw 23.02.1. The decision to approve any exception to the calculation of the APR will be based on objective evidence that demonstrates that the normal process for accounting for the academic eligibility of the institution's student-athlete(s) and its success in retaining and graduating its student-athletes should not apply. The committee's decision shall be final, conclusive and not subject to further review by any other authority.

The NCAA staff and/or the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting will review all requests for exceptions to the calculation of the APR prescribed in Bylaw 23.02.1.

Adjustment Request Procedures

A member institution seeking an exception to the normal calculation of the APR shall submit an online request application to the NCAA national office after it has submitted its APR/Academic Progress Census (APC) data for the academic year for which the institution is seeking an adjustment. Requests to waive the normal calculation of the APR shall be considered for the most recent year of APR data submitted. The staff and/or subcommittee may consider requests for prior years only when:

1. Circumstances beyond the control of the institution prevented timely submission of the request;

2. The reason for missing the request deadline involved no fault of the student-athlete;

3. Supporting documentation for the waiver is available and complete; or

4. Institutions previously were not given the opportunity to seek APR adjustments (i.e., in fall 2005 institutions will be given the opportunity to seek APR adjustments for 2003-04 data).

All requests shall be submitted to the NCAA staff electronically via the online procedures provided by the NCAA.

The online adjustment application submitted by the institution will produce a signature page that must be signed by the chief executive officer, or his or her designee. The adjustment application shall set forth the reasons the institution believes that an exception to the normal calculation of the APR is warranted. In addition to the information included on the form, the institution may submit additional information and supporting documentation it believes is relevant to the request. The staff and/or subcommittee may request additional pertinent information before a final determination.

In some circumstances (i.e., degree program discontinued, dropped sport) no additional documentation must be submitted to the NCAA. In these instances, the director of athletics and the faculty athletics representative must certify in writing that the student-athlete met the conditions set forth in this section and must maintain the certification on file in the athletics department.

Review Procedures

On receipt of an institution's request, the staff will review the application to ensure it is complete, e-mail the applicant institution the status of the request and identify the staff member handling the request. No final decision will be rendered until the staff has received all required documentation.

The NCAA staff has the authority to render a decision for all adjustment requests. Staff decisions will be based on the following criteria:

1. The adjustment directive approved by the committee.

2. Mitigating circumstances and whether the mitigating circumstances were within the control of the member institution/team and/or student-athlete(s).

3. Academic performance of the individual student-athlete.

The staff/subcommittee has the authority to consider, deliberate and decide APR adjustment requests. After reviewing all information, the staff/subcommittee will render one of the following decisions:

- **Approval:** The staff/subcommittee determined that the institution's request demonstrated evidence that warranted an adjustment of the normal calculation of the APR for particular student-athlete(s).

- **Partial Approval:** The staff/subcommittee determined that the institution's request demonstrated evidence that warranted partial relief from the normal calculation of the APR. By issuing a partial approval, the staff/subcommittee is adjusting part of the normal calculation of the APR.

- **Conditional Approval:** The staff/subcommittee determined that the institution's request demonstrated evidence that warranted an adjustment to the normal calculation of the APR if specifically stated conditions are met by institution/team(s)/student-athlete(s). The staff/subcommittee will outline such conditions in its decision notification. Institutions/team(s)/student-athlete(s) that fail to meet the stated conditions will result in

the decision converting to a denial and the APR being recalculated using the normal method prescribed in Bylaw 23.02.1. In such circumstances, the institution/team(s) immediately will be subject to any penalties resulting from the recalculation of the APR.

- **Denial:** The staff/subcommittee determined that the institution's request did not demonstrate circumstances that warrant an exception to the normal calculation of the APR prescribed in Bylaw 23.02.1.

APPEALS/RECONSIDERATIONS OF ADJUSTMENT DECISIONS

Appeals of Staff Decisions

The committee has authorized the subcommittee to consider all appeals of staff decisions involving requests to adjust the normal application of the APR prescribed in Bylaw 23.02.1.

After the staff has acted on an adjustment request, the applicant institution may appeal the decision to the subcommittee. The subcommittee's determination shall be final and shall not be subject to further review by any other authority.

The subcommittee may conduct its deliberations by facsimile, telephone conference, e-mail or in person. Such deliberations shall involve only subcommittee members and NCAA staff members.

Appeal Procedures

A member institution that seeks to appeal a staff decision shall submit the online waiver appeal application to the NCAA national office. All appeals shall be submitted using the online procedures provided by the NCAA. The online appeal process will produce a signature page, which must be signed by the chief executive officer, or his or her designee, and be provided to the NCAA national office. The appeal must set forth the specific grounds on which the appeal is based and the rationale for the appeal.

The grounds for appealing a staff decision are limited to the following:

1. The staff deviated from its approved procedures; or

2. The findings of the staff are erroneous.

All appeals of a staff decision must be filed within five-business days of electronic notification of the staff's decision. Any appeal filed after five-business days must include an explanation of why the appeal was not filed within the prescribed period. The chair of the subcommittee shall determine whether any appeal filed after five-business days shall be considered.

Review Procedures

If a staff decision is appealed, a summary of the case, the institution's notification of appeal and any supporting documentation submitted by the institution will be sent to a member of the subcommittee. The subcommittee member will be responsible to review the institution's appeal. The subcommittee member can affirm the staff's original decision, at which time the appeal is considered denied and final, or request the subcommittee review the appeal. If the subcommittee reviews an appeal, a simple majority will be necessary for a decision.

Reconsideration

After the staff and/or subcommittee have acted on a waiver request, the institution may request the staff reconsider its decision if the institution submits new and/or additional information. The subcommittee may not consider requests with new and/or additional information until the staff has reviewed the new and/or additional information.

ATTACHMENT C

Report from the NCAA Data Analysis Research Network to the
NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance
Regarding the Appropriate Way to Measure the Academic Progress Rates
at Semester versus Quarter Schools

[Note: This document was created by the NCAA research staff and Research Consultants.]

Executive Summary

At its meeting May 24-25, 2005, the NCAA Data Analysis Research Network (DARN) had an extensive discussion regarding the issue of equating the NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) at semester and quarter schools. Based in part on analysis of the first-year APR data, the group unanimously recommends a different form of APR calculation for quarter institutions than the one currently used and a removal of the current statistical adjustment to quarter squad APRs (i.e., raising quarter school APRs to the 3/2 power).

Background

When the APR was first envisioned it was devised as a rate calculated for each Division I sports team based on a single annual assessment of eligibility and retention for each student-athlete on that team. That is, each student on any team could earn one-eligibility point and one-retention point for his or her team based on his or her academic behavior during the school year. This model treated all students equally, in that each would be measured at one point at the end of each academic year. The implicit assumption of such a measurement is that a year of study at a college or university employing a semester calendar is educationally equivalent to a year of study at an institution on a quarter schedule. However, in the process of finalizing the APR, membership representatives believed that it should be a term-by-term measure of academic performance, operating in concert with NCAA term-by-term progress-toward-degree standards. Once it was decided to make APR a term-by-term rate, a numerical complexity was created in that semester students could earn up to four points each year (eligibility and retention at the end of each of two semesters) while students at quarter schools could each earn up to six points (eligibility and retention at the end of each of three quarters). Depending on the actual behaviors of student-athletes at each type of school, it was postulated that this could lead to some inherent advantages for teams at quarter institutions. However, because no data were available to analyze academic behavior on a term-by-term basis, the first attempt to put term-by-term rates of semester and quarter squads on an equivalent scale prior to having first-year APR data was based on theoretical arguments, rather than empirical analyses.

The initial-statistical adjustment involved raising all quarter squad APRs to the 3/2 power. The members of DARN used a theoretical approach to arrive at this adjustment during meetings in 2004. However, the theoretical argument for using the current adjustment was not the only such theory to which one could subscribe. Another theory that had been posited is that no adjustment

at all is warranted, and that semester and quarter schools should be compared directly on the raw term-by-term APR. Dr. Donald Morrison, the faculty athletics representative at the University of California, Los Angeles, attended the May 2005 DARN meeting to discuss this approach with the group. A third theoretical analysis has been provided by Dr. Jack Evans who is the faculty athletics representative at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. This analysis essentially makes the case that student-athlete academic behavior is not randomly distributed among all terms at any school. Rather, students are more likely to lose eligibility and retention points at the end of the academic year than at any other time, and this has mathematical consequences in calculating APRs for schools with different numbers of terms.

As has been stated, all of these arguments were necessarily theoretical because no data were available to analyze actual student behavior on a term-by-term basis. The first year of APR data became available in April 2005 allowing for the testing of alternative models and assumptions. Two points became clear at the outset of the analyses and subsequent discussions. First, there may be no single correct answer for such a complex problem. Second, the data can and should play a prominent role in the evaluation of the various theoretical perspectives on the comparability of these rates. There may be multiple valid alternatives for dealing with the semester-quarter issue, but the data appear to show that some assumptions and models are not appropriate.

Early in their discussions, the members of DARN asserted that alternative term-by-term APRs or APR quarter-squad adjustments be judged against some criterion measure of academic performance. It was decided that a calculated "annual APR" (one point possible per year for eligibility and one point for retention as originally envisioned) is the appropriate gold standard against which the term-by-term alternatives should be compared. A comparison with annual APR was seen as most appropriate given the assumed equivalence of a year of schooling at institutions regardless of calendar, the original conceptualization of the APR and the difficulty equating APR with current federal graduation rates. This so called gold-standard comparison approach is similar to the approach the NCAA research staff, DARN and various NCAA committees have employed to make decisions on academic criteria for current initial-eligibility and progress-toward-degree standards.

Recommendation

After careful review of all arguments and the available data, the members of DARN strongly urge the Committee on Academic Performance to reconsider using an annual APR. The members of DARN believe that this rate, wherein each student at every school could earn one-retention and one-eligibility point per year, would best lead to a rate that is equivalent and fair for semester and quarter schools. No adjustment of the resulting rate or change in the student assessment process would be necessary to make APRs equivalent in meaning across institutions.

The committee members understood, though, that there may be practical, political and other nontechnical considerations that compel the Association to continue with a term-by-term APR. Therefore, they considered several options for equating term-by-term measurements at semester and quarter schools. Ultimately, the members of DARN agreed that the current calculation of term-by-term unadjusted APRs creates rates that are not comparable under conditions of differential numbers of eligibility and retention checks as a function of academic calendar differences. However, they also believe that the current (3/2 power) adjustment decreases APRs of quarter squads further than is appropriate given the relative standing of quarter and semester squads at NCAA member institutions on the annual APR. If left intact, this adjustment would result in APRs that are overly punitive to the teams at quarter institutions, especially those teams whose raw APRs were fairly low. Thus, the members of DARN believe that some modification of quarter-school APRs is necessary but that the current adjustment is not appropriate.

The forms of (or absence of) statistical adjustment considered were all based on specific assumptions about student-athlete behavior. Many of these assumptions were deemed debatable or simply inappropriate given actual first-year APR data. The members of DARN determined that the best way to equate the term-by-term APRs would be to adjust the student assessment process itself rather than the obtained term-by-term rate. By this logic, quarter-school APRs would, in essence, be based on two assessments of eligibility and retention during the school year, just as they are at the semester schools. One model reviewed involved checking eligibility status at the end of fall and spring quarters only; a second checked only at the conclusion of winter and spring quarters. Each of these models produced rates that were more highly correlated with an annual APR than either of the current term-by-term rates (that is, unadjusted or using the 3/2 power adjustment). However, there were significant sport-specific fluctuations observed in these rates related to differences in which quarter student-athletes within a given sport are most likely to face eligibility and/or retention issues. Therefore, the members of DARN are recommending that an averaging of the fall-spring and winter-spring rates be used to create the APR for quarter schools.

This new APR for quarter schools will not necessitate any change to the APR data collection process. The fall-spring APR component will be computed based on eligibility and retention status at the end of the fall term (10 weeks) and at the end of the spring term (20 weeks combined across winter and spring terms). The winter-spring eligibility and retention assessments will be made at the end of the winter term (20 weeks across fall and winter terms) and at the end of the spring term (10 weeks). In the fall-spring calculation an individual who is retained and eligible in the fall and leaves the institution while ineligible at the end of the winter term would be counted as two-for-two at the first measurement opportunity and zero-for-two at the second, thereby becoming a two-for-four for the year. In the winter-spring formulation, that individual would be counted as a zero-for-two at the first measurement opportunity and not included in the cohort for the second measurement period (thus, zero-for-two for the year). Each

rate is calculated across all individuals in the cohort and then the two rates are averaged (weighted based on each rate's denominator since they may be different) to create the new quarter squad APR. From the example above, the student leaving ineligible after winter quarter would contribute a two-for-six to the squad's APR under this new quarter-squad calculation versus two-for-four when the term-by-term calculation is not modified.

In the absence of an annual APR, this rate appeared to best put quarter and semester squad APRs on a comparable scale. The DARN group felt that whatever this measurement system lacks in simplicity is more than made up for in terms of accuracy. The weighted version of the computational formula for the calculation of a quarter school's APR is as follows:

$$\frac{ER_{FS}\,(\text{earned}) + ER_{WS}\,(\text{earned})}{ER_{FS}\,(\text{possible}) + ER_{WS}\,(\text{possible})}$$

ER = eligibility + retention points
FS = fall assessment + spring-"superterm" assessment
WS = winter-"superterm" assessment + spring assessment

An alternative form is:

$$\frac{ER_{F}\,(\text{earned}) + ER_{S\text{-}Super}\,(\text{earned}) + ER_{W\text{-}Super}\,(\text{earned}) + ER_{S}\,(\text{earned})}{ER_{F}\,(\text{poss}) + ER_{S\text{-}Super}\,(\text{poss}) + ER_{W\text{-}Super}\,(\text{poss}) + ER_{S}\,(\text{poss})}$$

Note that winter and spring "superterm" assessments are only equivalent to the current winter and spring eligibility and retention calculations conditional on the student being in the cohort in the final term of the superterm. If the student is not part of the cohort in that second term of the superterm (e.g., a spring superterm assessment is being made but the student dropped out of school in the winter quarter) then his or her eligibility and retention points derive from the first term of the superterm (winter in the case of a spring superterm calculation).

ATTACHMENT D

NCAA Division I 2004-05 Academic Progress Report Form

Institution:	Date of Report:

This report regarding the institution's academic progress rate (APR) is being provided based on data submitted by the institution for the 2004-05 academic year. These data will be reported publicly in winter 2005.

[Note: It is important to note that all information contained in this report is for two academic years only. This may lead to small sample sizes within certain sport groups. The NCAA anticipates reporting data only on the basis of a four-year rolling rate for all sports. In accordance with FERPA's interpretation of federal privacy regulations, institutions should not disclose statistical data contained in this report regarding students in cells made up of three or fewer students without student consent.]

Abbreviations in this report are defined below

APR Academic Progress Rate
E/G Eligibility/Graduation
R Retention

The following information notes the institution's overall APR, which includes all sports, as compared to all Division I institutions. It also includes separate data regarding the specific eligibility/graduation and retention rates for informational use by your institution.

Code	Two-Year APR	2004-05	2003-04
APR			
E/G			
R			

Information below note the institution's APR rates by sport. The two-year rate combines the 2003-04 and 2004-05 data. The two-year rate is used to determine teams subject to contemporaneous penalties.

	APR			Eligibility/Graduation			Retention		
Sport	Two-Year Rate	2004-05	2003-04	Two-Year Rate	2004-05	2003-04	Two-Year Rate	2004-05	2003-04
M Baseball									
M Basketball									
M X-Country									
M Football									
M Golf									
M Swimming									
W Basketball									
W Golf									
W Swimming									
W Tennis									
Sport									
Sport									
Sport									
Sport									
Sport									
Sport									

N=Number of student-athletes.
* Denotes data representing three or fewer student-athletes - In accordance with FERPA's interpretation of federal privacy regulations, institutions should not disclose statistical data contained in this report regarding students in cells made up of three or fewer students without student consent
** No APR.
^ Denotes APR that does not subject the team to a contemporaneous penalty because the team is performing better than the institution's general student body.

NCAA DIVISION I CONTEMPORANEOUS PENALTIES REPORT FORM
2004-05

Institution: _____ Date: _____

This report regarding the institution's contemporaneous penalties is being provided based on data submitted by the institution for the 2004-05 academic year. These data will be reported publicly in winter 2005.

Contemporaneous penalties are in effect based on a team's two-year NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) (i.e., 2003-04 and 2004-05) and based on an individual student-athlete's eligibility/graduation and retention status for the 2004-05 academic year.

Athletics teams with a two-year APR score below 925, including application of the appropriate squad-size adjustment, are subject to contemporaneous penalties. The following athletics teams at your institution fell below the established APR cup point and are subject to the noted penalty.

Men's Sports		**Women's Sports**	
Baseball	1.05	Ice Hockey	1.6
Basketball	2.0		
Football	2.0		

The following student-athletes received 0/2 APR points during a 2004-05 term and have subjected their respective team(s) to contemporaneous penalties equal to the value of the total countable aid awarded to the student-athletes in the 2004-05 academic year.

Men's Baseball	
Student ID Number	**Total Countable Aid Awarded**
109835	.25
109855	.30
109861	.50
Total	**1.05**
Maximum Penalty Value in Sport	**1.17**
Team 2005-06 Penalty	**1.05**

I-A Football		
Student ID Number	**Total Countable Aid Awarded**	**Initial Counter**
110543	1.0	1.0
Total	**1.0**	**1.0**
Maximum Penalty Value in Sport	**9.0**	**3.0**
Team 2005-06 Penalty	**1.0**	**3.0**

Men's Basketball	
Student ID Number	**Total Countable Aid Awarded**
109998	1.0
110000	1.0
Total	**2.0**
Maximum Penalty Value in Sport	**2.0**
Team 2005-06 Penalty	**2.0**

I-AA Football			
Student ID Number	**Total Countable Aid Awarded**	**Total Countable Aid Awarded (Equiv)**	**Initial Counter**
110685	1.0	.50	1.0
110787	1.0	1.0	1.0
110789	1.0	.75	1.0
Total	**3.0**	**2.25**	**3.0**
Maximum Penalty Value in Sport	**2.0**	**6.3**	**3.0**
Team 2005-06 Penalty	**2.0**	**2.25**	**3.0**

Women's Ice Hockey		
Student ID Number	**Total Countable Aid Awarded**	**Total Countable Aid Awarded (Equiv)**
110997	1.0	1.0
110999	1.0	.90
Total	**2.0**	**1.9**
Maximum Penalty Value in Sport	**3.0**	**1.8**
Team 2005-06 Penalty	**2.0**	**1.8**

Penalties that teams incur must be taken in 2005-06 is possible. Teams not able to take the applicable penalty in 2005-06 due to the institution already having received written notification(s) of acceptance of offers of athletics aid that prevent applications of the contemporaneous penalty without "taking away" a scholarship from an incoming freshman or a transfer student-athlete must take the penalty in 2006-07.

APP HISTORICAL PENALTY STRUCTURE -- PRESCRIBED PENALTY STRUCTURE FOR OCCASION TWO PENALTIES

APR Benchmark TBD 2005-06

APR Benchmark TBD 2005-06

APR Benchmark TBD 2005-06

APR SCORE	0 ----------	----------	----------	---------- 925	----------1000
Recruiting Penalties	Reduce evaluation opportunities by X%.*	Reduce evaluation opportunities by X%.*	Reduce evaluation opportunities by X%.*	NO HISTORICAL PENALTIES APPLIED. CONTEMP. PENALTIES MAY APPLY, DEPENDING ON "0/2" DEPARTURES.	NO PENALTIES APPLY.
Financial Aid Penalties	Automatically reduce scholarships by X% (by deducting from total aid offered). Require institutions to count exempted aid against their team limit. Extend CP through "0/2" student-athlete's anticipated seasons of eligibility/years to graduation. Eliminate 10% cap on CP (based on 0/2 departures).	Apply CP to total aid offered (not NCAA maximum limit). Require institutions to count exempted aid against their team limit. Extend CP through "0/2" student-athlete's anticipated seasons of eligibility/years to graduation. Eliminate 10% cap on CP (based on 0/2 departures).	Apply CP to total aid offered (not NCAA maximum limit). Require institutions to count exempted aid against their team limit. Extend CP through "0/2" student-athlete's anticipated seasons of eligibility/years to graduation.		
Playing/Practice Season Penalties	Reduce practice time by one day per week throughout the year.*	Reduce practice opportunities by X% (applied to overall number, timing determined by institution).*	Reduce practice opportunities by X% (applied to overall number, timing determined by institution).*		

*Penalized recruiting or practice time should be replaced with academic evaluation or academic support activities.
**Columns may be combined, depending on low-end distribution.

DRAFT

The National Collegiate Athletic Association
July 25, 2005 JLC:ban