**REPORT OF THE**
**NCAA DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE**
**OCTOBER 30, 2007, MEETING**

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

**1. Legislative Action Item.**

- **None.**

**2. Nonlegislative Action Items.**

**a. Implementation of Additional Occasion-Two Historical Penalties for Low-Performing Baseball Teams.**

(1) Recommendation. The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance recommends the NCAA Division I Board of Directors approve an addition to the Occasion-Two Historical Penalty structure to include a reduction in the length of the playing season and number of contests against outside competition for any baseball team subject to Occasion-Two Historical Penalties, as follows:

(a) A baseball team subject to Occasion-Two Historical Penalties that demonstrates significant improvement, as evidenced by a favorable review of the "improvement" factor, will be subject to a five percent reduction to the length of playing season and number of contests against outside competition, to be deducted from the applicable NCAA maximums.

(b) A baseball team subject to Occasion-Two Historical Penalties that does not meet the improvement review will be subject to a 10 percent reduction to the length of playing season and number of contests against outside competition, to be deducted from the applicable NCAA maximums.

(2) Effective Date. August 1, 2009. Notification of these penalties will occur during the 2008-09 academic year.

(3) Rationale. The committee developed this recommendation in response to the Board's referral of the issue, which originally was outlined in the report of the Baseball Academic Enhancement Working Group. The implementation of a penalty specific to baseball in the current Occasion-Two Historical Penalty structure will encourage continued behavioral changes for baseball teams, will limit the in-season time demands for

baseball student-athletes on those teams that have demonstrated poor academic performance and will provide for the greatest consistency with the current Occasion-Two Historical Penalty structure for all sports. These reductions to the playing season and number of contests must be taken in addition to any other reductions to the number of contests or length of playing season imposed on the team (e.g., Occasion-Two Historical Penalty requiring an additional day without countable-related activity or penalty imposed due to a violation of NCAA legislation). A baseball team subject to a reduction to the playing season and number of contests must impose such penalties the year after the institution receives notification of the penalty. All waiver requests regarding this penalty will be processed through the committee's existing waiver procedures for historical penalties.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.***

**1. Review of transfer data.** The committee continued its review of the impact of transfer student-athlete behavior on graduation rates and the NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR). The NCAA research staff provided comprehensive data demonstrating the academic impact of transferring and data regarding "0/2" student-athletes, which was analyzed in an effort to assess which variables were the most accurate in predicting "0/2" behavior. APR data confirms that retention is a strong predictor of graduation, as measured by either the federal methodology or Graduation Success Rate (GSR). The data also indicated that a student-athlete who presents a strong academic high school profile (e.g., ACT/SAT test, core-course grade-point average) is less likely to become an "0/2" student-athlete. In addition, those student-athletes who perform well academically and earn a large amount of academic credit in their first year of collegiate enrollment are more likely to receive a bachelor's degree. Based on the data presented, the committee considered a model in which the retention point for a transfer would be adjusted if the student-athlete presented a specified minimum academic profile (e.g., as indicated by the student-athlete's grade-point average). If approved, such student-athletes would earn a "1/1" in the final term in the cohort. The committee directed the research staff to develop additional models for consideration and to gather additional data for review during the committee's January 2008 meeting.

2. **Update regarding the Division I Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group.** The committee received an update regarding the work of the Division I Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group, which is charged with assessing factors that have contributed to the current academic climate in men's basketball and with developing strategies to enhance the academic performance and graduation rates in that sport. The group currently is doing much of its work in five subcommittees, and is in the preliminary stages of its efforts. The group intends to develop its final recommendations within the next 12 months. The committee expressed its support for the group's work and it is anticipated that the committee will receive periodic updates as the group continues its deliberations and will provide reaction to the group's recommendations prior to consideration by the Board.

3. **Update regarding access to athletics activities (e.g., summer workouts) incentive concept for women's basketball.** The committee received an update regarding the staff's work with the NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Issues Committee regarding the concept of providing the opportunity for increased access to women's basketball student-athletes through skill instruction as a possible incentive for teams achieving academic success. The Committee on Academic Performance was informed that the Women's Basketball Issues Committee is working with the research staff to gather relevant data (i.e., enrollment in summer school by women's basketball student-athletes) that will assist in determining if the incentive is both academically and athletically meaningful to the sport. It was noted that the women's basketball community has been focusing its efforts to grow the sport, to enhance player development and to maintain the high level of academic success of its student-athletes. It is anticipated that the Women's Basketball Issues Committee will consider this concept and review additional data at its January 2008 meeting, then will have a recommendation for the Committee on Academic Performance to review at its April 2008 or July 2008 meeting.

4. **Update regarding outreach to wrestling community.** An informal group of wrestling coaches and administrators met to discuss the current academic climate in their sport. The group reviewed data indicating a higher proportion of "0/2" wrestling student-athletes during the first year of full-time enrollment than in any other sport. The data also indicated wrestling student-athletes, including transfers, often do not perform well academically in their first year of full-time enrollment, but progressively improve in subsequent terms of enrollment. Further, the academic performance of wrestling transfers is lower than most other sports. The group will continue to examine the academic culture of wrestling and consider strategies to enhance the sport's overall academic performance. The group will continue its work over the next several months and will provide periodic updates to the committee.

5. **Annual GSR and Federal Graduation Rate Announcement.** The committee reviewed a summary of the most recent GSR and Federal Graduation Rate data and noted Division I student-athletes continue to perform well in the classroom and more are graduating from college. GSRs increased in many sports from 1995 to 2000, including men's basketball, football and women's basketball. The GSR in men's basketball increased nearly eight-percentage points during that period. In addition, the increased GSR has led to 850 additional student-athletes from the 2000 cohort earning their degrees than did in the 1995 cohort. The latest GSR figures show that 77 percent of student-athletes who began college from 1997 to 2000 graduated within six years. That four-year class average is unchanged from last year's data and is up from 76 percent two years ago. Additional GSR and Federal Graduation Rate data per institution, including data reported by ethnicity, were released October 31.

6. **Review of NCAA Proposals in the 2007-08 Legislative Cycle.** The committee reviewed several proposals in the current legislative cycle and expressed its position on the following proposals:

   a. **NCAA Proposal No. 2007-68 – Eligibility – One-Time Transfer Exception – Baseball – Nonscholarship Student-Athletes.** While current legislation allows a student-athlete in certain sports to use the one-time transfer exception provided the student-athlete was not recruited and has never received athletically related financial aid, the committee supports this proposal due to student-athlete well-being concerns. In addition, the committee noted that such student-athletes would not impact the original institution's APR since they would not have met the criteria to be included in the APR cohort, except for teams that do not offer institutional financial aid based in any degree on athletics ability.

   b. **Proposal No. 2007-73 – Financial Aid – Period of Institutional Financial Aid Award – One-Year Period – Exception – Exhausted Eligibility or Medical Noncounter.** This proposal specifies that a student-athlete who has exhausted eligibility and is exempt from counting in the institution's financial aid limit, or a student-athlete who is exempt from counting due to an injury or illness, may receive athletically related financial aid for less than one academic year. The committee supports this proposal and requests that the proposal be modified to require the financial aid agreement to include an academic agreement stipulating the minimum requirements the student-athlete must meet in order to be awarded athletics aid in the following term. The committee also requested stipulation that if the student-athlete is not awarded athletics aid for the subsequent term due to his or her failure to meeting the requirements of the financial aid agreement, he or she must be provided a hearing opportunity as outlined in NCAA Bylaw 15.3.2.4 for other nonrenewals. The committee referred its position and suggested

modification to the NCAA Division I Management Council and, specifically, to its Legislative Review Subcommittee for review and consideration.

7. **Directive for Review of Conditionally Approved Occasion-One Historical-Penalty Waivers.** The committee approved the policies and procedures for review of conditionally approved Occasion-One Historical-Penalty waivers. The current policies and procedures provide the staff and the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Subcommittee on Appeals with the authority to conditionally approve an Occasion-One Historical Penalty. Because of the progressive nature of historical penalties and the single-year APR goals assigned as conditions for a conditionally approved waiver, the policies and procedures provide for a timely review of whether the conditions have been met and allow institutions appropriate notice as to whether the team would progress to the next level of historical penalties. Additionally, the committee recognizes that there may be instances when mitigating circumstances could prevent a team from meeting the condition(s). Teams under such circumstances should have an opportunity to demonstrate why the condition(s) were not met or why the penalty should not be imposed. [Attachment A]

8. **Future Waivers for Teams that Meet their Conditionally Approved NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP) Penalty Waivers.** The Subcommittee on Appeals approved and provided guidance to the staff regarding teams that satisfied conditionally approved APP penalty waivers, but continue to be subject to penalties. Such a team generally may continue to receive conditional relief until the teams are not subject to APP penalties or the team/institution does not meet the condition(s) of the most recently approved waiver. The committee noted that such teams often have demonstrated meaningful improvement, have met APR Improvement Plan goals and should continue to be provided relief as long as the team continues to improve. The committee also recognized that it may take some teams longer to reach or meet the established benchmarks.

9. **Evaluating Institutional Resources and Team APR Improvement When Considering APP Penalty Relief.** The Subcommittee on Appeals approved the staff procedures for processing and reviewing APP penalty waivers based on team APR improvement and the institution's available resources. The staff procedures recognize the impact of available resources on an institution's ability to improve a team's APR in a relatively short timeframe.

10. **Awarding an Eligibility Point for Baseball Student-Athletes Ineligible Due to Fall Term Certification.** The committee approved an amendment to its policies and procedures to permit a baseball student-athlete who was not eligible to compete in the fall term to earn the eligibility point for that term if he would have been academically eligible

to compete in a subsequent term of the same academic year, but for the fall only certification requirement (Bylaws 14.4.3.1.3.1, 14.4.3.1.5.1, 14.4.3.2.3.1 and 14.4.3.3.1.2.1). This policy will become effective for the 2008-09 APR cohort. Currently, the fall term certification legislation requires a baseball student-athlete to be certified as academically eligible at the beginning of the fall term in order to be eligible for competition during any term of that academic year. The committee's policies require that a student-athlete must be academically eligible to compete in the next regular academic term in order to earn the eligibility point. Permitting a student-athlete to earn the eligibility point will provide greater incentive for the institution to continue monitoring the academic progress and engagement of the student-athlete. Additionally, permitting the student-athlete to earn the eligibility point accurately accounts for his academic progress and improvement during that term. Finally, this policy is consistent with the current policy in place for student-athletes who are serving an academic year in residence.

**11. APP Data Review and Educational Initiatives Budget.** The committee recommended budget allocations to support the APP Data Review Process and to further develop educational initiatives to assist the membership in its understanding of the APP. If approved, the recommended allocation of funds will be as follows:

a. A permanent annual budget request of $60,000 to hire an additional contractor to conduct the APP data reviews; and

b. A two year budget request, to be re-evaluated at the end of the two year period, for the following:

(1) $150,000 to retain outside consultants to assist institutions identified through the APP Data Review Process in developing and implementing needed changes to institutional processes (10 institutions at $15,000 per institution); and

(2) $50,000 for additional educational initiatives to be delivered by the NCAA staff.

The scope of the APP Data Review Process will be increased from 20 to 30 institutions for review during the 2008-09 academic year. The program also was expanded to include the review of APR Improvement Plans and GSR data. Given the increase in the number of APP data reviews, the need to complete the reviews in a timely manner, and continued interest in ensuring the integrity of APP data, additional resources are needed. Also, there is a need to hire consultants to work with institutions who lack resources, both monetary and personnel, to enhance their processes in the area of APP data submission

and in other challenges revealed by the data review, such as certification of eligibility for competition.

**12.** **APP Data Reviews.** The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting received a progress report on the 20 institutions selected to have their APP data reviewed during the 2007-08 academic year. In addition, the staff is completing the data reviews of four institutions for which part or all of the 2006-07 review was suspended.

**13.** **Consideration of a Request from a Member Institution Related to NCAA Division I Nonscholarship Football Teams and the Application of the APR.** The Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting reviewed correspondence from a member institution requesting that Division I nonscholarship football teams be excluded from APR calculations and related requirements. The institution asserted that the APR metric is not sensitive to the unique issues related to the recruitment and retention of student-athletes in nonscholarship football programs. The subcommittee was not supportive of this request and noted that the APP is intended to include all Division I sports teams, scholarship and nonscholarship. The subcommittee further noted that there is currently a process in place by which an institution may request an alternative definition of the APR cohort if the institution believes the current cohort definition may not reflect the uniqueness of its institution and/or teams.

**14.** **Inclusion of Student-Athletes Pursuing Professional Careers in the APR Cohort.** The Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting considered a possible amendment to the current definition of the APR cohort involving the removal of student-athletes who departed the institution to pursue professional athletics in later terms of enrollment at the institution. At the request of a member institution, the subcommittee considered several scenarios in which baseball student-athletes departed the institution to pursue professional athletics, re-enrolled at the institution on athletics aid in the term immediately following their departure and then withdrew from the institution for another professional athletics opportunity in that same term. In its discussion, the subcommittee reviewed the current NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate Adjustment Directive and aggregate data related to the number of adjustment requests received by the staff for professional departures. The subcommittee took no action at this time and requested that the staff collect additional data on the number of returning student-athletes who previously professionalized themselves, gather information on professional draft structures, and examine how such a change in the definition of the APR cohort would impact all sports. The subcommittee will continue its discussion at its January 2008.

**15.** **Calculation of Contemporaneous Penalties for Individuals Receiving Term-by-Term Financial Aid.** During its October 25, 2005, meeting the committee developed a formula

to calculate contemporaneous penalties earned by student-athletes who were enrolled in less than one full academic year and received athletics aid on a term-by-term basis. Current bylaws stipulate that athletics scholarships must be awarded for a period of one academic year, unless one of three possible exceptions applies (Bylaws 15.3.3.1 and 15.3.3.1.1). As a result of this rule change, institutions no longer have the option of awarding a term-only scholarship to a student-athlete who is at risk of losing the "E" and "R" points to reduce the value of a resulting contemporaneous penalty (e.g., a penalty of 0.5 rather than 1.0 scholarship for an institution with a semester-based academic calendar). Given this development, the previous action of the committee is outdated and, thus, the committee directed the staff to archive the interpretation.

**16.** **APR Improvement Charts.** The committee reviewed the NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate Improvement Table developed to communicate the minimum APR improvement needed to demonstrate meaningful improvement in the historical-penalty structure based on an average cohort size. The table was developed based on the committee's definition of meaningful improvement as a change in APR that is greater than would be expected due to typical year-to-year fluctuations. The chart replaces the improvement calculator used in 2006-2007 and will be posted on the Committee on Academic Performance Web site and within the APP data collection system. [Attachment B]

**17.** **Implementation of APR Improvement Plan Outreach and Reporting Requirement.** The committee received a report regarding outreach and assistance provided by the staff to institutions developing APR Improvement Plans. The online planning tool and submission system for APR Improvement Plans has been launched and is available to all institutions, including those who are not subject to the reporting requirement. Assistance to institutions has included staff reviews of drafts of APR Improvement Plans and staff participation in conference calls with campus APR Improvement Plan development teams. In addition, a series of APP "membership call-ins" was conducted to review APR Improvement Plan guidelines and submission requirements and to provide APP updates. Over 200 callers participated, representing 155 institutions and seven conference offices. Initiatives in the coming weeks and months will include a webinar offered in partnership with the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) and a session at the NCAA Convention.

**18.** **Implementation of the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program Supplemental Support Fund (SSF).** The committee received a report regarding the implementation of the Supplemental Support Fund. The SSF is available for new or enhanced programs developed to support academic reform and for professional development opportunities for individuals providing academic support services to student-athletes. Thirty-six limited-resource institutions are eligible for funding support

and application materials have been distributed to eligible campuses. A series of three educational workshops addressing APR policies and improvement strategies will be delivered this fall to all eligible institutions in partnership with the National Association of Academic Advisors (N4A).

**19. Educational Initiatives Update.** The committee received an update regarding educational initiatives conducted by the national office and partner organizations to assist institutions in implementing strategies to support academic reform on their respective campuses. The NCAA has established a formal partnership with N4A to deliver instructional APR improvement workshops and to develop a consultant's bureau available to provide reviews of academic support service programs, with an emphasis on strategies to improve APR. The educational initiatives for the 2007-08 academic year also include the NACADA partnership initiatives, including a fall 2007 webinar on APR Improvement Plans, the next offering of the online introductory course and the 2008 academic reform summer institute.

*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**

## Policies and Procedures for Review of Conditionally Approved Historical-Penalty Waivers

Pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 23, the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance has the authority to waive the application of Bylaw 23.2.1.2.1. The committee's decision shall be final, conclusive and not subject to further review by any other authority (Bylaw 23.3).

The staff and/or the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Subcommittee on Appeals will review all waivers of Bylaw 23.2.1.2.1.

**Initial Staff Review.**

After the institution has submitted the correct NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) and Academic Performance Census data, the staff shall review the data of all conditionally approved waivers from the previous year to confirm whether the stated condition(s) have been satisfied. If the stated condition(s) have been satisfied, the staff and/or subcommittee will provide written notification that the historical penalty is waived. However, if the stated condition is not satisfied, the staff will review the available APR data and other relevant information to determine if the staff may grant relief.

The staff may grant relief based on some or all of the following criteria:

1. If multiple conditions were assigned, the number of conditions met;

2. Historical academic performance of the respective team;

3. Size of variance between the team's most recent single year APR and the APR required as the condition;

4. Improvement in the team's APR, eligibility and/or retention APR;

5. Review the variables related to the institution's mission and level of resources and its relationship to the team's APR;

6. Implementation of the team's previously submitted APR Improvement Plan; and

7. Any additional information provided by the institution.

If relief is not provided, the staff/subcommittee will provide written notification to the institution notifying it that the condition(s) have not been satisfied, but that the staff will review the condition(s) again after the institution has submitted any APR adjustment requests. The institution's APP penalty report will be updated to reflect that the condition(s) have not yet been satisfied and the penalty will be calculated to provide notice to the institution of potential penalties, if on further review the condition(s) are not satisfied.

**Second Staff Review.**

Once the institution has submitted its APR adjustment requests, the staff will again review the available APR data. If relief is not provided, the staff/subcommittee will provide written notification to the institution that the conditionally approved waiver has not been satisfied and the team is required to impose the historical penalty at the next available opportunity. Additionally, if the team has become subject to historical penalties in the current academic year, it will then also be subject to the next occasion of penalty within the historical-penalty structure.

**Waiver Procedures.**

An institution that seeks to waive the application of Bylaw 23.2.1.2.1 for a historical penalty incurred due to its failure to satisfy the conditions of a conditionally approved waiver shall submit an online waiver application to the NCAA national office. The institution must submit its waiver request not later than seven days after final notification of failure to meet the condition(s). The online waiver application can only be submitted after it has received notification indicating that institution's team or teams are subject to the penalty imposed per Bylaw(s) 23.2.1.2.1 because of its failure to satisfy the conditions. All requests shall be submitted electronically to the staff via the Legislative Services Database for the Internet portal on the online application provided by the NCAA.

The online waiver application submitted by the institution will produce a signature page that must be signed by the chancellor or president. The waiver application shall set forth the reasons the institution believes that application of Bylaw 23.2.1.2.1 is not 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 case. The staff and/or subcommittee may request additional pertinent information before a final determination is made.

**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 all required documentation has been received by the staff.

The staff has the authority to render a decision for all waiver requests. Staff decisions will be based on some or all of the following criteria:

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

2. If multiple conditions were assigned, the number of conditions met, historical-academic performance of the respective team;

3. Size of variance between the team's most recent single-year APR and the APR required as the condition;

4. Improvement in the team's APR, eligibility and/or retention APR;

5. Review of the variables related to the institution's mission and resources and its relationship to the team's APR; and

6. Implementation of the team's previously submitted APR improvement plan and assessment and development of an updated plan.

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

**1.** **Approval**: The staff/subcommittee determines the institution' request demonstrated evidence that a waiver of Bylaw(s) 23.2.1.2.1 and/or 23.2.1.2.2 was warranted.

**2.** **Partial Approval**: The staff/subcommittee determines the institution's request demonstrated evidence warranting partial relief from the prescribed penalties. By issuing a partial approval, the staff/subcommittee is permitting the institution to partially waive the application of the penalties of Bylaw(s) 23.2.1.2.1 and/or 23.2.1.2.2.

**3.** **Denial**: The staff/subcommittee determines the institution's request did not demonstrate circumstances warranting a waiver of Bylaw(s) 23.2.1.2.1 and/or 23.2.1.2.2. The institution will be responsible for applying the designated penalty or penalties.

**Appeals/Reconsiderations of Waiver Decisions**

**Appeals of Staff Decisions.**

The committee has authorized the subcommittee to consider all appeals of staff decisions involving Bylaw(s) 23.2.1.2.1 and/or 23.2.1.2.2.

If the staff was not able to approve the institution's waiver request, the staff will forward the waiver to the subcommittee. The subcommittee's determination shall be final and shall not be subject to further review by any other authority.

**Occasion-One Appeals.**

The subcommittee will receive and review the original waiver application and decision rationale, conditions assigned to the institution/team, current waiver application and staff decision

rationale, and team APP data for the most recent academic year. The subcommittee may conduct its deliberations by facsimile, telephone conference, e-mail, internet or in-person meetings.

A simple majority of the subcommittee members present and voting is necessary for a decision. The chair, or person serving as chair on a particular appeal, shall not vote unless there is a tie vote among present and voting members. In situations where there is a tie vote, the chair shall cast the deciding vote.

Written confirmation of the decision must be provided by the subcommittee to the institution within 21-calendar days of the decision.

**Reconsideration.**

After the staff and/or subcommittee have acted on a waiver request, the institution may ask the staff or subcommittee to reconsider its decision if the institution submits new and/or additional information. Requests with new and/or additional information may not be considered by the subcommittee until the staff has reviewed the new and/or additional information.

**Reporting Staff Decision.**

The staff shall submit summaries of all decisions made by the staff to the subcommittee for their review.

# NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate Improvement Table

The historical-penalty structure is based on the principle that relief from historical penalties should be provided to those teams exhibiting meaningful improvement and outperforming expectations given institutional academic characteristics, institutional financial resources or academic levels in their sport. The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance defined meaningful improvement as a change in NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) that is greater than would be expected due to typical year-to-year fluctuations. Based on this standard, the following chart was developed to provide the minimum improvement needed based on an average cohort size.

This chart replaces the NCAA improvement calculator used in 2006-07.

| Average Cohort Size | Improvement in APR Needed to Demonstrate Improvement |
|---|---|
| 2 | 250 |
| 3 | 150 |
| 4 | 110 |
| 5 | 90 |
| 6 | 80 |
| 7 | 70 |
| 8-9 | 60 |
| 10-11 | 50 |
| 12-18 | 40 |
| 19-30 | 30 |
| 31+ | 20 |

For teams with a four-year multi-year APR, results of the following four tests are compared to the above chart to ensure that varied patterns of improvement are correctly credited. Meeting the standard indicated on the chart for any one of the four tests credits the team with APR improvement:

a. Comparing the most recent single-year APR to the previous single-year APR (e.g., 2006-07 single-year compared to 2005-06 single-year APR);

b. Comparing the most recent single-year APR to the multi-year APR for the previous two years (e.g., 2006-07 single-year compared to 2005-06 and 2004-05 multi-year APR);

c. Comparing the most recent single-year APR to the multi-year APR for the previous three years (e.g., 2006-07 single-year compared to 2005-06, 2004-05 and 2003-04 multi-year APR);

d. Comparing the multi-year APR from years four and three to the multi-year APR from year two and one (e.g., 2006-07 and 2005-06 multi-year APR compared to 2004-05 and 2003-04 multi-year APR).

(For teams with a three-year APR, improvement will be evaluated using Tests A and B.)

To determine if a team has demonstrated meaningful improvement toward an APR of 925, the following steps will be taken:

**Step No. One:** Determine variables for each test.

Determine the different variables to be used in each of the four tests. Please note that the APR adjusted for squad size should **NOT** be used for any variable in any of the four tests.

All multi-year APRs are calculated by adding all APR points and delayed-graduation points earned for the noted academic years and dividing that number by the total possible points that could have been earned. The raw APR is multiplied by 1000 to achieve the final APR.

For a team at an institution on a quarter calendar, the APR should be calculated based on the computation approved by the committee as outlined in the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program Data Collection Guide.

**Test One:** Variable One – 2006-07 single-year APR.
Variable Two – 2005-06 single-year APR.

**Test Two:** Variable One – 2006-07 single-year APR.
Variable Two – 2005-06 and 2004-05 multi-year APR.

**Test Three:** Variable One – 2006-07 single-year APR.
Variable Two – 2005-06, 2004-05 and 2003-04 multi-year APR.

**Test Four:** Variable One – 2006-07 and 2005-06 multi-year APR.
Variable Two – 2004-05 and 2003-04 multi-year APR.

**Step No. Two:** Calculate results for each test.

Insert variables in the respective formula and determine the result:

**Test One:** Variable One (2006-07 single-year APR) minus Variable Two (2005-06 single-year APR).

**Test Two:** Variable One (2006-07 single-year APR) minus Variable Two (2005-06 and 2004-05 multi-year APR).

**Test Three:** Variable One (2006-07 single-year APR) minus Variable Two (2005-06, 2004-05 and 2003-04 multi-year APR).

**Test Four:** Variable One (2006-07 and 2005-06 multi-year APR) minus Variable Two (2004-05 and 2003-04 multi-year APR).

**Step No. Three:** Determine the average cohort size.

Add the number of student-athletes in the cohort for each cohort year being used in the particular test and divide by the number of cohort years being compared. Average cohort sizes should be rounded appropriately to the nearest whole number.

**Step No. Four:** Review results.

Review the chart to determine if the results from Step No. Two are equal to or greater than the improvement corresponding to the average cohort size from Step No. Three. If it is equal to or greater for any one of the four tests, the team has demonstrated meaningful improvement.

## Example:

A basketball team had the following APR data for the past four cohort years:

2003-04
10 Student-athletes in the cohort.
31 APR points earned out of 38 possible APR points.
0 Delayed-graduation points.
Single-year APR of 816.

2004-05
13 Student-athletes in the cohort.
34 APR points earned out of 48 possible APR points.
0 Delayed-graduation points.
Single-year APR of 708.

2005-06
14 Student-athletes in the cohort.
52 APR points earned out of 56 possible APR points.
0 Delayed-graduation points.
Single-year APR of 929.

2006-07 13 Student-athletes in the cohort.
45 APR points earned out of 50 possible APR points.
1 Delayed-graduation points.
Single-year APR of 920.

**Step No. One:** Determine variables for each test.

**Test One:** Variable One - 2006-07 single-year APR = 920.
Variable Two - 2005-06 single-year APR = 925.

**Test Two:** Variable One – 2006-07 single-year APR = 920.
Variable Two – 2005-06 and 2004-05 multi-year APR = 827.

**Test Three:** Variable One – 2006-07 single-year APR = 920.
Variable Two – 2005-06, 2004-05 and 2003-04 multi-year APR = 824.

**Test Four:** Variable One – 2006-07 and 2005-06 multi-year APR = 925.
Variable Two – 2004-05 and 2003-04 multi-year APR = 756.

**Step No. Two:** Calculate result for each test.

**Test One:** Variable One (2006-07 single-year APR) minus Variable Two (2005-06 single-year APR).

920 – 925 = -5

**Test Two:** Variable One (2006-07 single-year APR) minus Variable Two (2005-06 and 2004-05 multi-year APR).

920 – 827 = 93

**Test Three:** Variable One (2006-07 single-year APR) minus Variable Two (2005-06, 2004-05 and 2003-04 multi-year APR).

920 – 824 = 96

**Test Four:** Variable One (2006-07 and 2005-06 multi-year APR) minus Variable Two (2004-05 and 2003-04 multi-year APR).

925 – 756 = 169

**Step No. Three:** Determine the average cohort size.

**Test One:** $\frac{\text{2006-07 + 2005-06 cohorts}}{\text{2 (number of years)}}$ = Average cohort

13 + 14 = 27/2 = 13.5 (round to nearest whole number)
Average cohort = 14

**Test Two:** $\frac{\text{2006-07 + 2005-06 + 2004-05 cohorts}}{\text{3 (number of years)}}$ = Average cohort

13 + 14 + 13 = 40/3 = 13.33 (round to nearest whole number)
Average cohort = 13

**Test Three:** $\frac{\text{2006-07 + 2005-06 + 2004-05 + 2003-04 cohorts}}{\text{4 (number of years)}}$ = Average cohort

13 + 14 + 13 + 10 = 50/4 = 12.5 (round to nearest whole number)
Average cohort = 13

**Test Four:** $\frac{\text{2006-07 + 2005-06 + 2004-05 + 2003-04 cohorts}}{\text{4 (number of years)}}$ = Average cohort

13 + 14 + 13 + 10 = 50/4 = 12.5 (round to nearest whole number)
Average cohort = 13

**Step No. Four:** Review results.

**Test One:** Step No. Two result = -5.
Average cohort size = 14.
APR improvement needed = 40 points.
Improvement **IS NOT** met.

**Test Two:** Step No. Two result = 93.
Average cohort size = 13.
APR improvement needed = 40 points.
Improvement **IS** met.

**Test Three:** Step No. Two result = 96.
Average cohort size = 13.
APR improvement needed = 40 points.
Improvement **IS** met.

**Test Four:** Step No. Two result = 169.
Average cohort size = 13.
APR improvement needed = 40 points.
Improvement **IS** met.

Questions regarding the application of APR improvement may be directed to:

Bill Regan
Director of Membership Services
bregan@ncaa.org
317/917-6697

Christine Simatacolos
Associate Director of Membership Services
csimatacolos@ncaa.org
317/917-6175