REPORT OF THE
NCAA DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE
JULY 12-13, 2011, MEETING

***KEY ITEMS*.**

- **Recommended Changes to the NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP).** The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance continued its examination of the APP. Based on a comprehensive review of the program and membership feedback, the committee forwards recommendations to the NCAA Division I Board of Directors for its consideration in August. The recommendations include changes to the penalty structure and the NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) penalty benchmark and filters used to identify academically underperforming teams.

***ACTION ITEMS*.**

1. Legislative Items.

- **APP Penalty Structure.**

(1) Recommendation. The Committee on Academic Performance requests the Board of Directors sponsor legislation for the 2011-12 legislative cycle to revise the APP penalty structure, as specified in Attachment A. The proposed single penalty structure will eliminate the current contemporaneous and historical penalties and replace them with a single five level penalty structure.

(2) Effective Date. 2015-16 will be the first year new APP penalties are imposed for impacted teams. Penalty reports issued in 2014-15 will reflect the new APR benchmark and new penalty structure. Attachment B provides additional detail regarding application of the effective date.

(3) Rationale. Data demonstrates that underperforming teams and institutions are positively influenced by the presence of some consequences for consistent academic underperformance. However, the primary purpose of the APP is not to penalize teams, but instead to strive for academic improvement. Penalties should not only serve as a reason for avoiding academic underperformance, but also through a cumulative and progress structure, serve as a motivating factor for teams and institutions to improve. The committee believes the new penalty structure will achieve the goals of the APP more effectively.

Specifically, integrating and streamlining the penalty structure will affirm the principle that the APP should be straightforward and understandable,

avoiding the complexities associated with the current two penalty structures. The contemporaneous-penalty structure has fulfilled its initial purpose, which was to bridge the gap between the inception of the APP and when historical penalties would eventually be applicable to teams. Thus, as was originally intended, this recommendation creates a single-penalty structure.

The waiver and appeals process will remain similar to the current historical-penalty structure with an initial NCAA staff review at Levels One through Four. The NCAA staff will not have the authority to render a decision on a waiver request at Level Five. All teams subject to Level Five penalties will appear before the committee for review and final penalty determination.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. Limited. There is some impact in IT costs associated with reprogramming the technology that calculate penalties and issues penalty reports.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.

a. New APP Penalty Structure, APR Penalty Benchmark and Filter.

(1) Recommendation. The committee recommends the Board approve the following revisions to the Committee on Academic Performance policies and procedures:

(a) Amend the APR penalty benchmark from the current multiyear rates of 900 and 925 to a multiyear rate of 930 or above in order to avoid penalties within the new penalty structure. The committee recommends the Board adopt this change during its August 2011 meeting, thus putting the Division I membership on notice of this higher APR standard prior to the 2011-12 academic year.

(b) Replace the current filter system used for determining historical penalties with a single filter system that is based on improvement and is available to all teams/institutions. This improvement filter would use the current five improvement tests and increase the minimum most recent single-year APR required to meet the filter to 930 which matches the recommended APR penalty benchmark.

(c) Approve a longer transition timeline for lower resourced institutions. For the first two years following implementation of the new penalty structure (i.e., 2015-16 and 2016-17 penalty implementation years), teams in the bottom 15 percent of resources as defined by committee policy, would satisfy the improvement filter by earning a most recent single-year APR of 900 or above rather than 930 or above. After these two years, all teams would be subject to a most recent single-year APR of 930 or above in order to meet the improvement filter.

(d) Amend the APP policy consistent with the penalties identified for each of the five levels noted in Attachment A.

(2) Effective Date. 2015-16 will be the first year new APP penalties are implemented for impacted teams. Penalty reports issued in 2014-15 will reflect the new APR benchmark and new penalty structure. Attachment B provides additional detail regarding application of the effective date.

(3) Rationale. The Board has continued to emphasize the importance of the APR penalty benchmark equating to an approximate minimum Graduation Success Rate (GSR) of 50 percent. It is estimated an APR of 930 equates to just above an approximate 50 percent GSR. Setting the benchmark at 930 ensures the Board's directive of a minimum 50 percent GSR is met, while also encouraging continued improvement of academic performance.

In the past only teams at institutions that met "improvement plus" (which included meeting improvement and either the resource, mission or by-sport filter) could earn relief from historical penalties based on demonstrated improvement. The new filter provides all teams at all institutions the opportunity to avoid penalties based on demonstrated improvement. With the creation of an improvement only filter the other current filters (i.e., by-sport comparison, resources and institutional mission) will be eliminated as automatic filters to determine if a team is penalized when the team is below the multiyear APR benchmark. Though these filters are no longer used in the automated filter system it is essential that resources and institutional mission continue to be considered in the overall APP efforts.

Data shows institutions with the lowest available resources take more time to demonstrate improvement than those institutions with higher resources. The additional two years provided for lower resourced teams/institutions

(i.e., bottom 15 percent) to meet the new 930 APR minimum for the improvement filter is consistent with these findings.

Beyond the two-year period, institutional mission will be considered through the waiver process. Currently, institutional mission is taken into consideration through a quantitative comparison of federal graduation rates for the student body at the institution and a projected federal graduation rate based on APR for the team. This filter compares historic rates as a proxy relationship for institutional mission. The new model would provide institutions the opportunity to explain the unique mission of the specific institution through the waiver process. This approach provides more consideration for all of the elements that contribute to the mission of the institution. The committee believes this is a more accurate and fair way to address unique institutional missions rather than the current formulaic method which has provided minimal relief.

While the committee believes this is the proper approach to take in the area of resources and institutional mission it notes it is important to continue to solicit feedback and engage the institutions that are most affected by institutional mission and resources. The committee will continue to engage lower resourced institutions, their presidents and chancellors and conferences over the next several years as these changes are implemented.

With the transition from a two-tiered penalty structure to a single penalty structure there is a need to adjust the minimum most recent single-year APR to meet improvement. The minimum most recent single-year APR, set at the APR penalty benchmark of 930 or above, ensures that a team is moving toward a multiyear APR at or above this new benchmark.

The committee requests the Board approve the 930 APR penalty benchmark during it's August meeting with an effective date consistent with application of the revised penalty structure. This puts the membership on notice immediately of this increased APR standard. If the Board provides notice in August 2011 and the new penalty structure is approved by the membership in August 2012, the first year the new penalties in 2015-16 will be based on three years of new data out of the four year APR cohort.

Lasty, the new penalty structure will be cumulative and progressive and will add earlier, and more stringent, financial aid penalties. In addition, increased playing and practice season penalties have been added to Level

Four. The fifth level would include all of the Level One through Four penalties plus a menu of penalties that the Committee on Academic Performance could possibly impose. Level Five would include restricted membership only as an option the committee could select, not as a legislated penalty, as it is currently. This provides the committee with a litney of penalties that more appropriately address the underperforming team.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. Limited. There is some impact in IT costs associated with reprogramming the technology that calculates penalties and issues penalty reports.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

b. Occasion-Three and -Four Historical Penalty Waiver Hearing Procedures.

(1) Recommendation. The committee recommends the Board approve a revision to the current Committee on Academic Performance policies and procedures for Occasion-Three and -Four Historical Penalty waiver hearings that requires the institutional staff member responsible for the implementation of the institution's APR improvement plan be in attendance at an institution's in-person penalty waiver hearing.

(2) Effective Date. Immediate.

(3) Rationale. Over the last three years the committee has increased its consideration of APR improvement plans during its Occasion-Three Historical Penalty waiver hearings. While the current policies and procedures encourage institutions to have in attendance the individual responsible for oversight of the APR improvement plan, it is not currently required. A number of institutions have not brought this individual to the hearing. With the increased focus on the creation and implementation of these plans it is essential that institutions be required to have this individual participate in the hearing. This requirement will not increase the number of institutional representatives who may attend the hearing, which is currently set at seven. Under this revised policy the required attendees will be: chancellor/president, director of athletics, head coach of penalized team, institutional staff member responsible for implementation of APR improvement plan, and three other individuals may participate at the institution's discretion.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. None.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact. None.

c. NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program Supplemental Support Fund (SSF).

(1) Recommendation. The committee recommends the Board approve and fund the APP Supplemental Support Fund for two additional years (i.e., 2011-12 and 2012-13).

(2) Effective Date. Immediate.

(3) Rationale. The APP Supplemental Support Fund's purpose is to support campus-based initiatives designed to foster student-athlete academic success at limited-resource institutions. Grants have been awarded in prior years for innovative solutions to barriers preventing student-athlete retention and progress-toward-degree completion. In addition, the program encourages sharing and adaptation of successful programs on all Division I campuses, including institutions that do not receive supplemental support. Continuing this fund will demonstrate the Association's commitment to a meaningful program that encourages academic achievement and facilitates academic improvement. Beginning in 2011-12, a criteria for the awarding of SSF funding shall require the institution to demonstrate a history of successful implementation of its APR improvement plan and describe how the initiative to be supported by the SSF is directly tied to the APR improvement plan. Such criteria would require a commitment of institutional resources to critical elements of the APR improvement plan. These institutional resources would be supplemented by the SSF award.

(4) Estimated Budget Impact. The program will be funded through incremental increases in funding from the NCAA Division I Academic Enhancement Fund. In the 2011-12 fiscal year, $955,000 will be available through the APP Supplemental Support Program and a two percent increase for 2012-13 for a total amount of $974,000.

(5) Student-Athlete Impact (Academics or Athletics). Will vary from initiative to initiative.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Division I Revenue Sharing Models Based on APR.** The committee received an update on discussions regarding inclusion of academic success (e.g., APR) within the Division I revenue sharing model. The committee is generally supportive of the concept and encouraged continued discussion surrounding this issue.

2. **APR Trends in Men's and Women's Track and Field.** The committee reviewed four-year and single-year APR data for men's and women's track and field which the NCAA Division I Championships/Sports Management Cabinet requested as it considers a request to eliminate track and field regionals. Specifically, concerns have been raised regarding the time demands placed on student-athletes as these events create scheduling conflicts with spring final examination periods on some campuses. A review of the APR data indicates that eligibility rates for track and field rank at or near the bottom among both men's and women's sports. Eligibility issues are more likely to arise in the spring and both male and female track and field student-athletes who compete only in track (not cross country) are more likely to become ineligible at the end of the spring term. These findings parallel eligibility issues that have been seen previously in other single-semester sports, particularly baseball and football. Given the importance of this issue, the committee encourages further analysis in order to identify the reasons for the lagging eligibility rates in track and field. The committee noted that there may be other reasons for the Championships Cabinet to consider eliminating track and field regionals absent APRs. However, based on data it is difficult to directly correlate the eligibility issues seen in track and field with competing in the track regionals and thus further study is warranted.

3. **2010-11 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 2010-11 academic year. The staff made decisions on 11 of the 15 waivers submitted, while the committee conducted in-person hearings for four teams. The committee determined that information regarding the use of Supplemental Support Funds for those institutions considered low-resource should be included in the materials submitted for future penalty hearings.

4. **Institutional Involvement in Contemporaneous Penalty Waiver Appeals.** The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Subcommittee on Appeals discussed whether or not institutions should participate on teleconferences when appealing a staff decision of a contemporaneous penalty waiver. Currently, institutions participate in teleconferences only when appealing a staff decision in an APP Occasion-Two Historical Penalty waiver. The committee determined that given the recommended changes to the

APP penalty benchmarks and structure, and the review of penalty waiver and appeal processes, it does not recommend any changes to the current processes at this time.

5. APR Adjustment Requests for Professional Athletic Departures Impacted by NBA and NFL Lockouts. The committee approved a policy amendment to address the potential impact the NBA and NFL lockouts may have on APR adjustment requests for lost retention points due to professional athletics. This temporary policy change will permit adjustment requests for football and men's basketball student-athletes who depart an institution to pursue professional athletics as a vocation and were not retained for the 2011 spring semester or quarter but have earned the eligibility point, to be documented as follows if the lockouts continue through fall 2011:

(a) If a student-athlete was drafted by any professional sports league (e.g., Canadian Football League, United Football League, NFL and NBA) in 2011 that is sufficient documentation.

(b) For undrafted student-athletes, it would be acceptable documentation if the student-athlete was invited to and/or participated in the 2011 NFL Scouting Combine or the 2011 NBA Draft Combine.

(c) For student-athletes who do not meet either of the above criteria, it would be acceptable documentation if the student-athlete signs a contract with a professional sports team or organization within one year following the end of the lockout in the respective sport.

With the potential for an NFL and NBA lockout, it is necessary to explore other ways in which an institution may document a student-athlete's departure for professional athletics in order to obtain the adjustment for the lost retention point. Generally, institutions document this type of request by securing a team's roster with the student-athlete's name. However, during the lockout players are not permitted to sign with a team or even tryout, which poses challenges to institutions seeking this adjustment since merely being drafted by a professional sports team is not currently sufficient for the adjustment. This recommendation provides institutions with some flexibility to document this adjustment given the unique situation of a possible lookout, while keeping the original intent of the directive for professional athletics departures intact.

6. APP Data Reviews. The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting received an update on the progress of the 60 institutions involved in APP data reviews for the 2011-12 academic year. The reviews for 26 of the 29 institutions selected for GSR reviews have been completed. The

reviews for the 31 institutions selected for the APR reviews have begun and it is anticipated that all data reviews will be completed by the APR data submission deadline for each institution.

7. **Calculation of the GSR for Student-Athletes Who Leave an Institution as Eligible and Subsequently Return to the Institution.** The Subcommittee on Data Collection and Reporting discussed the most appropriate GSR calculation for those student-athletes who leave the institution eligible and subsequently return to the institution within the six-year period but do not graduate. The subcommittee took no action at this time and requested that the staff research the frequency of these situations in each sport for future discussion.

8. **Public Announcement of 2010-11 APR Data, Penalties and Public Recognition Awards.** The committee received a summary of the most recent public release of institutional APRs and APP penalties, public recognition awards, and the Elite 88 awards for 2010-11, which was the second year for these awards. This spring's release also included the Head Coaches' APR Portfolio and the public recognition awards recognized football by subdivision [i.e., Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) and Football Championship Subdivision (FCS)] for the first time. This change provided the opportunity for each distinct subdivision's football teams to be honored for top academic performance.

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

ATTACHMENT A

NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program Recommended New Penalty Structure

The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance requests the NCAA Division I Board of Directors sponsor legislation to revise the current NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program penalty structure as noted in this attachment. This document outlines the penalties teams would be subject to at each level of the revised penalty structure. Beginning with Level Two, the new penalties introduced at each level are highlighted in **bold**. Note that current contemporaneous penalties will be eliminated.

Level One:

1. Public notice.

2. Financial aid penalty: 10 percent from total aid awarded (four-year average).

Level Two:

1. Public notice.

2. Financial aid penalty: Ten percent from total aid awarded (four-year average).

3. Playing and practice seasons (**four-hour reduction per week to 16 hours**, **as well as loss of one day**): Lost hours must be used for academic purposes.

4. (*Baseball only*): **10 percent reduction to the length of playing season and number of contests against outside competition.**

Level Three:

1. Public notice.

2. Financial aid penalty: 10 percent from total aid awarded (four-year average).

3. Playing and practice seasons (four-hour reduction per week, as well as one day): Lost hours must be used for academic purposes.

4. **Postseason Restriction.**

5. (*Baseball only*): 10 percent reduction to the length of playing season and number of contests against outside competition.

<u>Level Four</u>:

1. Public notice.

2. Financial aid penalty: **20 percent from total aid awarded (four-year average)**.

3. In-season playing and practice seasons (four-hour reduction per week, as well as one day): Lost hours must be used for academic purposes.

4. Postseason restriction.

5. Additional playing season restrictions, as follows:

a. For the penalized team, reduction from eight hours to four hours per week for athletics activities outside of the playing season. These four hours must be replaced with academically-focused activities. Of the remaining four hours of athletics activities, not more than two hours per week may be spent on skill-related workouts.

AND

b. For the penalized team, elimination of the nontraditional playing season/out-of-season practice in sports that maintain a legislated nonchampionship segment as well as football, which would include:

(1) Baseball: no fall practice or competition.

(2) Football: no spring practice.

(3) Softball: no fall practice or competition.

(4) Men's Volleyball: No fall practice or competition.

(5) Women's Volleyball: No spring practice or competition.

(6) Men's and Women's Soccer: No spring practice or competition.

(7) Field Hockey: No spring practice or competition.

(8) Women's Lacrosse: No fall practice or competition.

OR

c. **For a penalized team in a sport without a legislatively declared nontraditional playing season, a 10 percent reduction in the length of the playing season[1] and 10 percent reduction of allowable contests. [ATTACHMENT NO. 1]**

6. (*Baseball only*): 10 percent reduction to the length of playing season and number of contests against outside competition.

Level Five (Hearing only):

At Level Five, there will be **no staff review**, and all teams will proceed directly to a hearing in front of the committee. Under this approach, the committee will not determine the team's entire penalty until after the hearing has been conducted, although the penalty would automatically include (subject to committee waiver) all elements associated with Levels One through Four. In total, the committee would have the following penalties to choose from:

All penalties from Levels One through Four, including:

1. Public notice.

2. Financial aid penalty: 20 percent from total aid awarded (four-year average).

3. Playing and practice seasons (four hour reduction per week, as well as one day): Lost hours must be used for academic purposes.

4. Postseason restriction.

5. Additional playing season restrictions, as follows:

   a. For the penalized team, reduction from eight hours to four hours per week for athletics activities outside of the playing season. These four hours must be replaced with academically-focused activities. Of the remaining four hours of athletics activities, not more than two hours per week may be spent on skill-related workouts.

      AND

[1] This 10 percent reduction would be *in addition to* any in-season playing and practice restrictions that are levied, which begin at Level Two.

b. For the penalized team, elimination of the nontraditional playing season/out-of-season practice in sports that maintain a legislated nonchampionship segment as well as football, which would include:

(1) Baseball: no fall practice or competition.

(2) Football: no spring practice.

(3) Softball: no fall practice or competition.

(4) Men's Volleyball: No fall practice or competition.

(5) Women's Volleyball: No spring practice or competition.

(6) Men's and Women's Soccer: No spring practice or competition.

(7) Field Hockey: No spring practice or competition.

(8) Women's Lacrosse: No fall practice or competition.

OR

c. For a penalized team in a sport without a legislatively declared nontraditional playing season, a 10 percent reduction in the length of the playing season and 10 percent reduction of allowable contests. [ATTACHMENT NO. 1].

6. (*Baseball only*): 10 percent reduction to the length of playing season and number of contests against outside competition.

In addition to the penalties from Levels One through Four, the committee would have the legislated authority to implement any or all of the following additional penalties.

1. Additional financial aid penalties above the 20 percent of average aid awarded.

2. Additional playing and practice season penalties above: (a) The 4 hour reduction and loss of one day of practice in-season; and (b) The four hours per week reduction outside of season.

3. Restricted membership.

4. Contest reductions, which could include:

a. Full-season competition restriction.

b. Cancellation of nonconference contests.

c. Any contest reductions as determined by the committee.

d. No competition during institution's scheduled exam period and/or week(s) surrounding the exam period.

Additional policy determinations and recommendations regarding new penalty structure:

1. Transition from current to revised penalty structure.

   Teams that are subject to APP penalties under the new structure would continue to advance in the penalty structure as if no change had been made. For example, a team that was subject to an Occasion-One Historical Penalty under the previous penalty structure would be subject to the new Level-Two APP Penalty if the team did not meet the multiyear benchmark and was subject to penalty. A team that has not been subject to historical penalties in the past but does not meet the new benchmark and is subject to the penalty would be subject to Level-One APP Penalties.

2. "Three clean year concept."

   The "three clean year concept" outlined in the committees policies will be maintained within this revised penalty structure. In summary, this policy results in a team advancing to the next level of penalties unless it has not been subject to any penalties for three consecutive years.

3. Self imposition of penalties.

   The committee and/or staff may choose to recognize and incorporate a penalty that is not found within the prescribed list of penalties, but is implemented by the institution. The staff and/or committee can recognize and incorporate an institution's self-imposed penalty within the penalty waiver process, whether it is a coach-specific penalty or other alternative measure.

4. Appeals processes.

   The following process for appeals will be used at the various levels of the new penalty structure:

a. Level One: Appeals to be heard by the Subcommittee on Appeals via paper submission.

b. Level Two: Appeals to be heard by the Subcommittee on Appeals via telephone, with institutional involvement, the extent of which is to be determined.

c. Levels Three and Four: Appeals to be heard through in-person hearings with the full committee.

d. Level Five: All cases to be heard by the full committee without prior staff review.

5. Penalty reporting.

Institutions will be required to provide evidence to the NCAA staff that required penalties have been implemented, beginning at Level One Penalties. This requirement allows the staff and committee to ensure the integrity of the APP penalty structure.

6. NCAA Division I Board of Directors Academic Performance Program Historical Penalties Appeals Subcommittee Review.

Under the new penalty structure, institutions would maintain the ability to appeal the committee's decision to the Division I Board of Directors Subcommittee on Historical Penalty Appeals at Levels Three, Four and Five. The standard of review for that subcommittee would remain the same as well; in order to have a decision overturned an institution must demonstrate that the committee abused its discretion in applying the legislation and/or policy and procedures of the APP.

ATTACHMENT NO. 1

List of Playing and Practice Reductions for Applicable Sports in Level Four

The following list outlines the additional playing and practice season penalties that teams would be subject to at Level Four of the revised penalty structure. Note that these penalties would only apply to sports where there is not a legislatively declared non-traditional segment.

1. Men's and Women's Basketball:

a. Reduction of 10 percent of playing and practice days between first allowable practice and end of playing season.[2]

b. Reduction from 29 to 26 contests.[3]

2. Bowling:

a. Reduction from 144 day season to 130 day season.

b. Reduction from 26 to 23 dates of competition.

3. Cross Country:

a. Reduction from 144 day season to 130 day season.

b. Reduction from seven to six dates of competition.

4. Equestrian:

a. Reduction from 144 day season to 130 day season.

b. Reduction from 15 to 13 dates of competition.

5. Fencing:

a. Reduction from 144 day season to 130 day season.

b. Reduction from 11 to 10 dates of competition.

6. Golf:

a. Reduction from 144 day season to 130 day season.

b. Reduction from 24 to 22 dates of competition.

---

[2] The start date for men's and women's basketball varies depending on the year.

[3] For teams that plan to participate in a qualifying regular-season multiple team event (e.g., Maui Invitational), the reduction would be from 27 to 24 contests.

7. Gymnastics:

a. Reduction from 144 day season to 130 day season.

b. Reduction from 13 to 12 dates of competition.

8. Ice Hockey:

a. Reduction from 132 day season to 119 day season.

b. Reduction from 34 to 31 contests.

9. Men's Lacrosse:

a. Reduction from 132 day season to 119 day season.

b. Reduction from 17 to 15 dates of competition.

10. Rifle:

a. Reduction from 144 day season to 130 day season.

b. Reduction from 13 to 12 dates of competition.

11. Rowing:

a. Reduction from 156 day season to 140 day season.

b. Reduction from 20 to 18 dates of competition.

12. Rugby:

a. Reduction from 132 day season to 119 day season.

b. Reduction from 11 to 10 contests.

13. Skiing:

a. Reduction from 144 day season to 130 day season.

b. Reduction from 16 to 14 dates of competition in both alpine and nordic events.

14. Squash:

a. Reduction from 144 day season to 130 day season.

b. Reduction from 15 to 13 dates of competition.

15. Swimming and Diving:

a. Reduction from 144 day season to 130 day season.

b. Reduction from 20 to 18 dates of competition.

16. Tennis:

a. Reduction from 144 day season to 130 day season.

b. Reduction from 25 to 22 dates of competition.

17. Track and Field (Indoor or Outdoor only):

a. Reduction from 144 day season to 130 day season.

b. Reduction from 18 to 16 dates of competition.

18. Track and Field (Indoor *and* Outdoor):

a. Reduction from 156 day season to 140 day season.

b. Reduction from 18 to 16 dates of competition.

19. Water Polo:

a. Reduction from 132 day season to 119 day season.

b. Reduction from 21 to 19 dates of competition.

20 Wrestling:

a. Reduction from 144 day season to 130 day season.

b. Reduction from 16 to 14 dates of competition.

ATTACHMENT B

Timeline for the Implementation of the Recommended NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate Penalty Benchmark and NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program Penalty Structure

The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance recommends teams be subject to the penalties under the new penalty structure beginning with penalties imposed in the 2015-16 academic year. By fall 2015, teams will have received three years notice of the changes to the penalty structure. Penalized teams that perceive the change as mitigation for a waiver could make that argument in the APP penalty waiver process, but would not be automatically approved.

Overall Timeline Chart:

August 2011	Board of Directors provides notice of new 930 APR benchmark to the membership.	
2011-12	First year of data after notice.	April 2012 – Legislative proposals with new penalty structure potentially adopted.
2012-13	Second year of data after notice.	
2013-14	Third year of data after notice.	
2014-15	Fourth year of data after notice.	Penalty reports provided in 2014-15 notify member institutions of penalties under new structure based on previous four years of data. Three of the four years of data are after the Board notification to the membership.
2015-16		New penalties taken for first time in 2015-16.