REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE
SEPTEMBER 13-14, 2011, MEETING

***KEY ITEMS*.**

- **Comprehensive Package of Academic Proposals.** Charged by the NCAA Division I Board of Directors to provide it with recommendations regarding embedding academic success, the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance continued its review in three areas: initial eligibility, two-year college transfer requirements and the NCAA Division 1 Academic Performance Program penalty structure. This review is ongoing and it is anticipated recommendations will be forwarded to the Board of Directors for its October meeting.

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. Legislative Items.

- **None.**

2. Nonlegislative Items.

- **None.**

***INFORMATIONAL ITEMS*.**

- **Embedding Academic Success.** The committee continued its examination of legislation and policies in the following areas:

  1. Initial-Eligibility Standards. The committee received an update from Dr. Herman Holt, chair of the NCAA Division I Academic Cabinet which included preliminary recommendations regarding the current initial-eligibility standards. The Committee on Academic Performance did not make any final recommendations based on its review of initial-eligibilty standards during this meeting. However, the committee anticipates forwarding for Board consideration final recommendations in October. The Committee on Academic Performance's discussions centered on the following concepts:

     - Committee on Academic Performance supports a more rigorous academic standard for competition than for practice and receipt of athletically

related financial aid. Discussions centered on eligibility standards for practice and receipt of athletically related financial aid at the current nonqualifier level (e.g., 2.0 and sliding scale) or raising the grade-point average floor to 2.3 with the current sliding scale. The committee also supports a model in which practice is permitted in a student's first regular term of full-time enrollment if the new standard is met. However, within the first year, subsequent terms would require successful completion of nine semester or eight quarter hours.

- Committee on Academic Performance is also examining two potential models for increasing the minimum combination of high school core course grade-point average and ACT/SAT scores needed for competition in a student's first year of collegiate enrollment. Both models require better academic preparation than the current qualifier requirements. One model requires a high school core course grade-point average that is about one half of a grade point higher for any given test score than the current standard. The second model requires a high school core course grade-point average that is about one quarter of a grade point higher for any given test score than is required currently. Both options would result in an increase in the number of student-athletes who would be serving an academic redshirt year to help ensure their academic success (i.e., not eligible for competition but may practice and receive athletically related financial aid).

- The committee supported the concept of requiring students to complete 10 core courses prior to the start of the seventh semester of high school. Additional discussions will continue regarding whether such a requirement should include a specified number of courses in English, math and science. The discussion centered on the possibility of requiring that six or seven of the 10 core courses be in English, math or science.

- Consideration is being given to an effective date for students first entering college full time August 1, 2015, or after.

2. Two-Year College Transfer Academic Requirements. On the recommendation of the Academic Cabinet chair Dr. Holt, the Committee on Academic Performance supported the cabinet's amended effective dates to three legislative proposals in the 2011-12 Division I legislative cycle regarding two-year college transfers (i.e., NCAA Division I Proposal Nos. 2011-65, 69, 70). The proposals increase 2-4 college transfer academic standards; provide a year of academic readiness during

the initial year of two-year collegiate enrollment; and establish an appropriate appellate body for 2-4 transfer waivers. The cabinet amendments would result in all three proposals taking effect in 2012 rather than 2013. Committee on Academic Performance noted that no student-athlete currently enrolled in a two-year collegiate institution will be impacted.

3. Access to Championships and the APP Penalty Structure. The committee continued its review of the APP penalty structure in light of the Board's directive to include a postseason competition ban in the first level of penalties for teams with a multiyear Academic Performance Rate (APR) below 930. Committee on Academic Performance did not make any final recommendations in this area during the meeting. However, the committee anticipates forwarding for Board consideration final recommendations in October. The committee's discussions centered on the following concepts:

- The committee is exploring a three level penalty structure. The first-level penalties would include a ban on postseason competition and financial aid penalties. The second level adds additional penalties that would include playing season restrictions (e.g., practice and regular season competitions). The third level would be a menu of penalties the committee could choose from to impose on underperforming teams. Teams would continue to be subject to the third level and its menu of penalties in subsequent years if they continue to underperform academically. The menu of penalties could include restricted membership, coaching suspensions for a designated number of contests, fines and other penalties. Committee on Academic Performance is also considering whether a TV ban should be part of this list of possible penalties.

- At level one, consideration is being given to including a low resource filter (e.g., teams from schools in the bottom 15 percent of resources and with a 50 percent Graduation Success Rate (GSR) receive relief from the penalty). All other teams that fall below 930 would be subject to the postseason ban. The waiver threshold in level one would likely be very rigorous for approval with only those teams with truly extraordinary circumstances receiving relief.

- For levels two and three, the committee is discusssing an APR improvement filter. The definition of improvement will be reviewed and

may be revised to ensure this filter appropriately identifies teams making substantial academic improvement as defined by the committee.

- The committee generally supports a requirement that Division I conferences develop a policy regarding revenue distribution and automatic qualification for teams ineligible for postseason competition. The committee would not suggest what such policies should be, but rather simply require that each conference have a policy addressing these issues.

- The committee anticipates maintaining the current timeline for notification and application of penalties.

- The committee suggests changes in the penalty structure become effective for penalties imposed during 2012-13. This would mean for example, that championships and other postseason competitions (e.g., bowl games) conducted in 2012-13 would be impacted.

- The committee suggests a two-year timeline for implementation of the new 930 penalty benchmark. For the next two years an APR benchmark of 900 would be used for the new penalty structure. For example, for the postseason ban penalty, championships conducted in 2012-13 and 2013-14 would require a minimum 900 APR and championships conducted on or after 2014-15 would require a minimum 930 APR.

4. Progress-Toward-Degree Standards. The committee anticipates receiving recommendations from the Academic Cabinet regarding progress-toward-degree legislation after the cabinet's Februry 2012 meeting. The Committee on Academic Performance has been asked to report to the Board in April with recommendations in this area.

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