REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE
JUNE 28-30, 2010, MEETING

***KEY ITEMS*.**

1. **Examination of the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP).** The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance continued its comprehensive examination of the APP to determine the program's effectiveness in reaching the membership's goals of academic reform. This review will continue through the summer and fall and will include further discussions regarding the NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) metric, APP benchmarks, penalty structures, filters and waiver directives.

2. **Joint Meeting with the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet.** The committee conducted a portion of its meeting with the Academic Cabinet to review the initial-eligibility and two-year college transfer student-athlete standards, in order to formulate recommendations on these key issues. The two groups also discussed outstanding issues regarding the recommendations of the NCAA Division I Football Academic Working Group.

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. **Legislative Items.**

   - None.

2. **Nonlegislative Items.**

   - None.

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

1. **Examination of the APP.** The committee continued its extensive review of the APP and its examination of the principles and goals tied to the program. The committee agreed in principle to a set of goals and principles that guide the overall purpose of the APP; however, continued discussion will occur to ensure fairness to all institutions, regardless of mission, resources or any other relevant factors. In addition, the committee continued its examination of the relationship between the APR and actual graduation numbers. The committee continued to discuss possible avenues for using both the APR and graduation rates within the APP structure and options for incorporating graduation into the APR

metric. The committee raised a number of questions and issues that require further research and discussion as this examination continues throughout the summer and during the October meeting.

The committee examined the current APP penalty structure and discussed the effectiveness of APP penalties in meeting the goal of improved academic performance and progress toward graduation for student-athletes. Further, the group discussed possible changes to the penalty structure, which could include changes to the levels of and progression to penalties in addition to changes to the types of penalties levied on teams that are underperforming. The committee also continued a discussion regarding appropriate penalty benchmarks based on past changes to the APR calculation, as well as the improvement shown by teams. In addition to the review of the penalty structure and benchmarks, the committee continued its discussion on the appropriateness of each of the current filters in light of any possible adjustments to the penalty structure and benchmarks. The committee also discussed the possible inclusion of new filters to address other issues, such as graduation. These topics will be discussed again during the October meeting.

2. **Public Announcement of Penalties and Rewards and Related Public Relations Efforts.** The committee received a summary of the most recent public release of institutional APRs and APP penalties, which occurred June 9, 2010, and the Elite 88 awards for 2009-10, which was the inaugural year for these awards. As part of this discussion, the committee agreed to publish two lists for football for the public recognition awards effective with the 2009-10 APR data [i.e., one for Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) and one for Football Championship Subdivision (FCS)]. This change will provide opportunity for each distinct subdivision's football teams to be honored for top academic performance. In addition, this action is in alignment with the NCAA Championships structure. Further, the committee requested the staff to further develop for its consideration at a future meeting a concept to recognize teams who have achieved high enough APRs to receive public recognition for a specified number of years and public recognition for coaches based on long-term team APR performance.

3. **NCAA Division I Football Academic Working Group Report.** In a joint meeting with the Academic Cabinet, the committee reviewed the Football Academic Working Group's final report with a focus on outstanding issues related to the recommendations contained within the working group's report. The two governance bodies support the concept of requiring all football student-athletes to complete nine hours and earn the APR eligibility point during the fall term in order to be eligible for all games of the subsequent season. Football student-athletes failing to meet this requirement would be ineligible for

participation in the first four contests in the following season. The groups also supported the option of reducing this penalty from the first four contests to two contests if the student-athlete earns 27 credit hours by the end of the summer session. Data demonstrate that football student-athletes who earn nine credit hours during the fall earn more APR points during their academic careers and are more likely to graduate and less likely to become an "0/2" student-athlete. Further, requiring 27 credit hours will position the student-athlete for graduation within four and a half years. This, in conjunction with other progress-toward-degree requirements, will ensure that football student-athletes are progressing toward a degree. The groups agreed that first-year student-athletes should be allowed to use credit hours earned at the certifying institution during the summer before initial full-time enrollment and credit hours earned during the summer after the regular academic year to satisfy the 27 credit-hour requirement, but not the nine credit-hour requirement.

To address institutions following quarter-based academic calendars, the committee and cabinet recommended that football student-athletes be required to earn eight quarter hours in the fall term and, for those that fail to satisfy this requirement, be required to earn 40 quarter hours prior to the subsequent fall term in order to reduce the contest penalty. Research indicated the eight quarter-hour requirement generally is equivalent to the nine semester-hour requirement. Further, the 27 semester credit-hour requirement was selected because it positions a student-athlete for graduation in four and a half years. Requiring a football student-athlete at an institution with a quarter-based academic calendar to earn 40 quarter credit hours will position that student-athlete to graduate in an approximately equivalent period of time.

The committee and cabinet did not favor the working group's recommendation to no longer exempt the aid of "0/2" student-athletes who have exhausted eligibility when calculating contemporaneous penalties for FBS teams. The committee and cabinet agreed to take no action at this time regarding the recommendation in light of the committee's continued review of the APP, including the existing penalty structure, penalty-waiver filters and exceptions and cut scores. The two groups agreed that more time must be devoted to the study of time demands on football student-athletes and supported the Academic Cabinet in its effort to develop enhanced academic requirements for two-year college transfers that more accurately reflect the academic preparation most likely to lead to completion of a four-year degree.

4. Proposed Academic and Athletics Development Model for Women's Basketball. The committee reviewed the February 23, 2010, report of the NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Issues Committee and noted the following feedback for the group. The committee observed a noted difference between the women's basketball model and the one developed for men's basketball in that the proposal for women's basketball is

intended for all women's basketball student-athletes, rather than for only those identified as "at-risk." While the committee applauds the intent behind mandatory summer school attendance for all incoming freshman and transfer student-athletes who have signed athletically related financial aid agreements for the following academic year, it noted the financial burden this may place on institutions and potential timing issues for high schools that end in late June/early July and for international student-athletes. Additionally, the committee encouraged the Women's Basketball Issues Committee to consider the other concepts (e.g., definition of a prospective student-athlete) included in the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Academic Enhancement Group's report to determine their relevance, if any, to women's basketball.

5. **Review of Academic Eligibility Standards for Prospective Student-Athletes.** In a joint meeting with the Academic Cabinet, the two groups discussed issues related to both initial-eligibility standards and two-year college transfer standards. The NCAA research staff provided information that showed the benefits and consequences of the different initial-eligibility standard models in terms of the number of prospective student-athletes that would not have been eligible during the first academic year. In its review of the two-year college transfer standards, the group supported the continued examination of a model that would allow for remediation of academically underprepared prospective student-athletes during the first year of enrollment at the two-year college with no athletics competition permitted. The model would allow a prospective student-athlete to opt into a three-year program that would provide a delay to the start of his or her progress-toward-degree timeline until after the year of remediation. The committee was also supportive of the Academic Cabinet's desire to examine possible changes to two-year college transfer regulations, which could include an increased grade-point average requirement, more specific course requirements and a possible shift away from separate requirements for qualifiers and nonqualifiers. The group noted that the research staff will provide more detailed information related to these possible changes to the Academic Cabinet for its fall meeting.

6. **Academic Data Collection for Two-Year College Transfer Student-Athletes.** The committee approved an extension of the two-year college transfer student-athlete data collection, which is submitted each fall as part of an institution's Academic Performance Census (APC), for two additional APR data cohorts (i.e., 2010-11 and 2011-12) with a reassessment at the end of that time. The two-year extension will provide additional data on the outcomes (e.g., graduation) of two-year college transfers in prior cohorts, which may provide additional insights on the profile of a successful two-year college transfer and to assist with informing future academic policy decisions. This data collection includes the sports of baseball, football and men's and women's basketball.

7. **Review of Occasion-Three Historical Penalty Waivers.** The staff provided a summary of the decisions made by the staff and the committee for Occasion-Three Historical Penalty waivers submitted by institutions during the 2009-10 academic year. The staff made decisions on eight of the 10 waivers submitted, while the committee conducted in-person hearings for two teams. The committee reviewed and discussed the decisions made in the hearings as well as the decisions made by the staff to ensure consistency among all decisions and adherence to the committee's philosophy and directive. The committee also discussed the timing of implementation of Occasion-Three Historical Penalties when a condition placed on an approval is not met and agreed to review the application of these penalties to ensure that the timing is appropriate.

8. **Occasion-Three and -Four Penalty Waivers and Appeals of Waivers.** The committee amended its policies and procedures to reduce the submission timeline for Occasion-Three and -Four Historical Penalty waivers from 21 calendar days to 14 calendar days and reduced the appeals timeline from 21 calendar days to seven calendar days, effective fall 2010. These modifications will simplify the waiver process and make all APP penalty waiver submission and appeal processes consistent, while reducing the amount of time institutions must spend in the penalty waiver phase of the APR process. The committee also provided the staff with the authority to grant extensions of these timelines for institutions requesting additional time to submit a wavier and/or appeal. These requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis and will take into consideration the mitigation presented by the institution for the extension. The committee noted that institutions are aware of team's penalties well in advance of these submission deadlines, generally providing ample time for preparing waiver requests.

9. **Policies and Procedures for APP Data Review Outcomes on Penalties.** The committee amended its policies and procedures to require institutions involved in an APP data review to be advanced to the appropriate level of penalty, if it has been determined that the corrected data would have subjected the team to a penalty or to a different level of penalty than it was previously subject to. In the past, there have been occasions when a team's corrected data positioned the team to be subject to APP penalties when the team was not previously subject to such penalties due to inaccurate APRs. This has created situations in which teams that should have received APP penalties have not received those penalties. This modification provides fairness to the process, while not adding on past penalties that would create an unintended burden on the team. The committee also directed the NCAA Division I Committee of Academic Performance Subcommittee on Appeals to develop a directive to provide guidance to the NCAA staff for the waiver process for institutions facing these circumstances.

10. Policies and Procedures for Institutions that Submit Unusable Data. The committee amended its policies and procedures to create a multistep process to address situations in which institutions submit unusable data either during the APP data submission or the data review process. The first step in the process will involve an on-campus visit by the staff to review the documentation used to certify academic eligibility and to provide the institution with training on best practices for eligibility certification and data submission. In the year following the on-campus visit, the institution will be placed in a probationary period, which may include:

a. Recurring checks between the staff and the institution's certifying officer;

b. Required attendance for institutional representatives at NCAA Regional Rules Seminars and/or participation in APP webinars;

c. Creation of an academic certification and data improvement plan for review by the staff and/or the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting;

d. Submission of midyear academic data;

e. Continued ineligibility for postseason competition for all teams;

f. Ineligibility for public recognition of any high-performing teams and NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program Supplemental Support Fund (SSF) monies; and

g. Any additional corrective measures as determined by the Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting.

After the one-year probationary period, the NCAA staff will conduct a follow-up visit at the institution to determine if the identified issues have been resolved or not. If it is clear that the institution continues to have systemic issues with eligibility certification and/or data submission, the institution will continue to be subject to the conditions imposed in the probationary year. In addition, institutional representatives, including the institution's president, must participate in a meeting with the full committee in order to explain the continuance of the systemic data issues and the issues uncovered throughout the process would be provided to the NCAA Division I Administration Cabinet for its review as it relates to the institution's active Division I membership status. These amended policies will allow the staff to work cooperatively with the institution earlier in the process to reconcile the APP data while also holding the institution responsible for originally submitting unusable data. It also provides the opportunity for the committee to call on

senior-level institutional representatives to explain why improvements in APP data procedures are not being made.

11. Data Submission and Penalty Application Requirements for an Institution Transitioning its Athletics Program or Team from Division I or Discontinuing a Division I Sport. The committee amended its policies and procedures to include the APP data submission and penalty application requirements for an institution that transitions its athletics program or team from Division I or that discontinues a sport at the Division I level. Within the last year, the staff has been notified of two institutions that intend to transition its athletics program from Division I to Division III. Each situation presented unique circumstances.

Under the new process, once the NCAA staff receives written notification from the institution of its intention to transition its athletics program or team from Division I or to discontinue a sport at the Division I level, the institution/team will no longer be responsible for submitting APP data beginning with the academic year the staff receives notice. In addition, the institution/team will no longer be subject to new APP penalties, but must impose previously earned penalties that apply to the academic years the team/institution continues to compete as a Division I institution/team. The institution/team also will be excluded from any public release of APR and associated penalties, Graduation Success Rate (GSR) and head coaches' information and from the calculation and/or determination of any penalty filters. Further, the institution/team will no longer be eligible for any SSF monies and the public recognition for high academic performance. In addition, the institution/team no longer will submit APR adjustment requests, APP penalty waivers or APR Improvement Plans.

The approved policies also detail the process for instances when a team transitioning from Division I received a conditionally approved APP penalty waiver; when an institution's transition to another division or athletics organization is a multiyear process, and instances when an institution rescinds its decision to transition from Division I. The application of these policies generally shall be effective beginning the academic year the staff receives written notice of the institution's intention to transition from Division I or to discontinue a sport; however, the staff will have flexibility in determining the effective date for each provision based on the timing of receipt of notice.

12. NCAA Division I GSR Data Collection. The Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting received a report on the GSR data collection process for submission of data for the 2003-04 cohort, which was due June 1. It was noted that all institutions submitted the requisite data by the prescribed due date and the membership experienced positive results

with the new data collection portal, which used data imported from the APP data collection system for the reporting cohort.

13. **APP Data Reviews**. The Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting received an update on the progress of the 62 institutions involved in APP data reviews for the 2010-11 academic year. Twenty-seven of the institutions selected are reviewing GSR data, 31 institutions are reviewing APC and APR data and four institutions are reviewing GSR, APC and APR data. It is anticipated that all data reviews will be completed in the fall.

14. **APP Data Submission Requirements Related to Proposed Division I Membership Requirements.** The Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting confirmed that institutions seeking Division I membership under the proposed membership requirements will be required to submit APP data starting from the year in which the institution will be required to be in full compliance with Division I legislation, which will be year one of the four-year process. Under current committee policies, institutions or teams that are multidivisional members, provisional members or in the process of reclassifying to Division I are subject to the APP beginning with the first year in the membership process during which the institution is required to be in compliance with Division I legislation. Also, this timeline will allow the collection of sufficient data to determine if any team is subject to historical penalties, which may be a factor in electing an institution to active Division I membership. In addition, the proposed Division I membership legislation will eliminate provisional and multidivisional membership for new institutions. As such, current provisional and multidivisional institutions will continue to submit APP data under the current timeline and as required for all active Division I institutions and institutions.

15. **Joint Committee on Academic Performance and NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification Subgroup.** The committee received an update on the work of the subgroup, including a timeline for the completion of its work. The subgroup currently is comprised of three Committee on Academic Performance members and three members of the Committee on Athletics Certification. At this time, the staff is developing a draft framework for the subgroup to consider based on the identified focus and goals of the subgroup. The subgroup will conduct its work on scheduled teleconferences starting in July and continue through the fall. It is anticipated that a final report will be submitted to the Committee on Athletics Certification for its consideration in February 2011 and to the Committee on Academic Performance for its consideration in April 2011.

16. June 2010 Knight Commission Report on Intercollegiate Athletics. The committee reviewed the latest report from the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics, which called for financial and academic reforms in college sports and offered three principles for reform with several related recommendations. The committee noted that several of its initiatives already underway may address recommendations contained within the report.

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