What’s New?

• NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program penalty structure.
• Waiver process.
• Filters for limited-resource institutions.
APP Penalty Structure

**Level One**
- In-season CARA restriction (1 day and 4 hours replaced by academic support activities)

**Level Two**
- Level One elements +
- Out-of-season CARA restriction (4 hours replaced by academic support activities)
- +
- loss of nonchampionship segment/spring football OR 10% reduction in season and contests

APP Waiver Process

- One process for all levels of APP penalties and loss of access to postseason competition.

- Staff Decision → Subcommittee Appeal → Committee Chair Appeal For Postseason Access Only
APP Waiver Process

• Letter from the chancellor/president must accompany waiver request.

• One signature page for both waiver request and confirmation of data accuracy.

• Teams no longer required to submit a request unless they want relief (former Level-Three process).

• Level-Three in-person hearings eliminated.

APP Filters for Limited-Resource Institutions

Three filters:
1. 920 multiyear APR;
2. 940 two-year APR; or
3. 930 single-year APR and meets one of five improvement tests.

Filters can be used twice over the next five years; limited-resource institutions must decide if it will try to use the filters after submitting its data.

Filters require a NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate Improvement Plan that meets enhanced criteria established by the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics.
Deciding When to Use a Filter

- Things to consider:
  - Is the team able to use the mission filter to avoid loss of access to postseason competition this year?
  - Is next year a “better” year to use the filter?
  - What chance does the team have for an APP waiver?
    - Is the team facing first-time loss-of-access to postseason competition?
    - Does the data show sustainable improvement?

APR Improvement Plan Criteria for Limited-Resource Institutions to Use Filters

- Plan development team must include the highest ranking academic authority (e.g., provost).

- Staff may request a videoconference with the plan development team and the chancellor/president.
APR Improvement Plan Criteria for Limited-Resource Institutions to Use Filters

- Statement from the chancellor/president explaining plan implementation.

- Progress report on any long-term goals.

- All essential initiatives tied to critical issues must be implemented.

Education Programming for Limited-Resource Institutions

- Phase one focus is on certifying eligibility.

- Needs assessment on-line survey is active now.

- Focus groups to follow.
  - Want target audience to participate - what education is needed and what is the best way to get it.

- Roll out planned for December/January.
Cycle-Two APP Data Reviews

APP Data Reviews

• Cycle One began in 2006.

• Process established by the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance to confirm cohort composition and the correct awarding of eligibility and retention points.

• All Division I institutions received review of APR or GSR or both between 2006 and 2015.

• Committee on Academics confirmed they wanted to continue the process with Cycle Two.
Foundational Principles

• To ensure the accuracy of APP data used for identifying institutions and teams of excellence or deficiency under the APP.
• To ensure that Division I institutions are accurately certifying SAs for NCAA purposes.
• To ensure that all Division I institutions and any Division II and Division III institutions that sponsor a Division I sport receive some level of review each ten-year cycle.

Summary of Issues

• Forty percent of institutions reviewed during past three data review cycles have had some issue with certification of eligibility.

• Issues included:
  • Misapplication of some portion of progress-toward-degree legislation.
  • Certification form incorrect or incomplete.
  • Incomplete or inaccurate policies and procedures.

• Of those with issues, 20% of institutions required a campus visit.
CERTIFICATION ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Data Reviews</th>
<th>Eligibility Issues</th>
<th>PTD Issues</th>
<th>Certification Form Inaccurate</th>
<th>Policies &amp; Procedures Inaccurate</th>
<th>Required Campus Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16 (36%)</td>
<td>11 (24%)</td>
<td>7 (16%)</td>
<td>10 (22%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16 (42%)</td>
<td>8 (21%)</td>
<td>8 (21%)</td>
<td>9 (24%)</td>
<td>3 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13 (57%)</td>
<td>9 (39%)</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
<td>9 (39%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>45 (40%)</td>
<td>28 (26%)</td>
<td>20 (19%)</td>
<td>29 (27%)</td>
<td>9 (8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requested Documentation

- Squad lists.
- Financial aid documentation (e.g., screen shots from student information system).
- Documentation to demonstrate SA met criteria for exception.
  - 2.6 Transfer Adjustment – Tracer form confirming full-time enrollment at four-year institution, National Student Clearinghouse report.
  - Professional Athletics Adjustment – Roster confirming SA was on roster.
Requested Documentation

• Academic certification forms demonstrating a review of each element of the NCAA progress-toward-degree requirements with data (versus a “yes/no”).
• Official transcripts (provided by registrar’s office).
• Transcripts from previous institutions (for SAs who enrolled as transfers).
• Continuing eligibility policies and procedures.
• APP data collection and submission of policies and procedures.

Questions?