1. **Academic Metrics.** In response to a referral by the NCAA Division I Board of Directors, the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics continued a review to address enhanced and effective measurement of academic achievement, including campus-based comparisons, under the metrics. [Informational Item No. 1.]

2. **Discussion With American Council on Education Representatives.** As part of outreach by the committee to build stronger external relationships with educational organizations, representatives from ACE and the committee provided introductions and discussed their work in several topical areas, including academic metrics, interface with limited-resource institutions and historically black colleges and universities, and academically at-risk students. ACE and the committee will continue their discussions. [Informational Item No. 2.]

3. **NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program Penalty Waiver and Appeals Process.** The committee continued its review of the APP penalty waiver and appeals process, reviewing recommendations by the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals. The committee modified the process to create a single process for all penalty waivers and appeals. [Informational Item No. 3.]

4. **NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate Transfer Adjustment Criteria.** The committee continued its evaluation of the APR transfer adjustment criteria. The committee reviewed feedback from the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Data and approved core principles to guide evaluation of the criteria. The committee will review data obtained from the National Student Clearinghouse at an upcoming meeting to help determine whether changes to the criteria are necessary. [Informational Item No. 4.]

5. **Unusable Data Policy for APP Data Reviews.** The committee began a review of the unusable data policy for APP data reviews. The committee reviewed the data review process, discussed whether the process is satisfying its intended purpose and identified opportunities to potentially improve the process. The committee could take action to modify the policy at an upcoming meeting. [Informational Item No. 5.]

**ACTION ITEMS.**

1. **Legislative Items.**

   - **Noncontroversial Legislation – Academic Eligibility – Academic Performance Program – Penalties.**

     (1) **Recommendation.** Adopt noncontroversial legislation that (1) removes references to “multiple levels of analysis” and “progression of APP penalties” under the legislation; and (2) clarifies that APP penalties, including the
“levels” and “progression of penalties,” are determined pursuant to the policies and procedures of the APP as established by the committee.

(2) **Effective Date.** Immediate.

(3) **Rationale.** The committee serves as the division’s primary academic authority in the governance structure. The committee’s legislated duties and responsibilities include the authority to manage all policy pertaining to academic matters, perform all duties directly related to the administration of the APP and determine the appropriate standards on which APP penalties or rewards apply. Likewise, the legislation provides the committee the authority to adopt or revise APP policies and procedures. Determining the leveling and progression of APP penalties is a task necessarily associated with these duties and responsibilities and is a focus of the committee. The references under the legislation to “multiple levels of analysis” and “progression of penalties” are based on the APP policies and procedures; not vice versa. Accordingly, the legislation should be modified to eliminate reference to levels and progression of APP penalties that are already determined by the policies and procedures of the APP as established by the committee. The Board of Directors retains the authority to review, amend and/or act on any APP policy adopted by the committee. The recommended change will continue to allow for thoughtful, nimble governance by continuing to provide the committee flexibility to modify the leveling or progression of penalties as necessary with board oversight without legislative maintenance.

This proposal is recommended as noncontroversial legislation because broader consultation and debate are unlikely to improve the proposal in any substantial way, significant disagreement or alternative points of view will not be generated and there is no significant impact on existing or proposed legislation. Further, this legislation only clarifies what is already determined in the APP policy and procedures.

(4) **Estimated Budget Impact.** None.

(5) **Student-Athlete Impact.** None.

2. **Nonlegislative Items.**

   • None.
INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Academic Metrics.** In response to a referral by the Board of Directors, the committee continued a review to address enhanced and effective measurement of academic achievement, including campus-based comparisons, under the metrics. The committee reviewed and discussed the charge by the board, the committee’s tasks in response to the charge and the historical goals and elements of the APP. The committee also engaged in high-level, robust discussion on what is academic achievement, both on a national and campus level. During this discussion, the committee addressed several core tenets that will help frame the committee’s assessment of the APP, provide a target for committee review and enable the committee to determine the extent to which the APP could be enhanced to result in more effective measurement of academic achievement. Committee review in response to the board referral is ongoing and will continue throughout 2016-17.

2. **Discussion With American Council on Education Representatives.** As part of outreach by the committee to build stronger external relationships with educational organizations, the committee met with representatives from ACE for introductions and to discuss the work of ACE and the committee in several topical areas. These areas included academic metrics, interface with limited-resource institutions and historically black colleges and universities, and academically at-risk students. ACE and the committee also discussed best practices that could be used by the committee to provide guidance and expectations to the Division I membership to address local issues in those circumstances where such an approach could supplement the committee’s more traditional approach of prescriptive measures. ACE and the committee recognized that there could be opportunities for collaboration between the groups. ACE and the committee will work together to build off this initial discussion.

3. **APP Penalty Waiver and Appeals Process.** The committee continued its targeted review of the APP penalty waiver and appeals process as part of a comprehensive evaluation of the operational functions of the APP. The committee modified the process to provide a single process for all penalty waivers and appeals as specified in the Attachment. Under this recommended process, which is effective for penalty waivers and appeals processed beginning the 2016-17 academic year:

   a. Staff has the authority to render the initial decision on a penalty waiver;

   b. The Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals has the authority to consider all appeals of staff decisions;

   c. If a staff decision is appealed to the subcommittee, the appeal will be heard via some live communication mechanism;

   d. If the subcommittee denies access to postseason competition, the institution may appeal to the presidents on the committee, including the committee chair, based on the subcommittee's abuse of its discretion in denying the request;
e. If the presidents determine that the subcommittee abused its discretion, the full committee will review the appeal, and the full committee decision is final and not subject to further review; and

f. If the presidents determine that the subcommittee did not abuse its discretion, the subcommittee decision is final and not subject to further review.

Under the modified process, a letter signed by the institution’s chancellor or president is required to be submitted to staff with the institution’s penalty waiver. In addition, staff and the subcommittee are not permitted to impose additional penalties.

The committee recognized that having one penalty waiver and appeals process affirms the principle that the APP be straightforward and understandable and provides significant benefits to the membership. In particular, the burden on institutions involved in the process will be reduced as the process will be more timely, simple and efficient. The modified process also enhances institutional engagement by providing an opportunity for an institution's chancellor or president to be involved early in the penalty process, which will likely assist in facilitating change and improvement at an institution-wide level. Enhancing institutional engagement to facilitate change and improvement earlier than following a hearing many years later will provide a better educational experience for student-athletes.

The committee also noted that one process benefits the membership by allowing for more nimble, thoughtful governance. In particular, eliminating in-person Level-Three Penalty committee hearings will provide additional opportunity for the committee to focus on the strategic academic governance issues facing Division I while the subcommittee oversees and administers all aspects of the appeals process. This change supports the intended roles of the committee and subcommittee in the committee structure.

Likewise, under the modified process, the board will no longer assume the operational duty of reviewing appeals on Level-Three Penalty decisions by the committee. The committee agreed that this reinforces the board’s strategic focus under the new governance structure. Importantly, allowing institutions to appeal decisions of the subcommittee that deny access to postseason competition to the committee presidents on the basis that the subcommittee abused its discretion maintains appropriate presidential oversight of the appeals process.

Finally, the committee noted that the modifications will allow appeals involving loss of access to postseason competition to be processed more efficiently and timely, resulting in earlier notification to student-athletes of the ability to transfer should a team lose access to postseason competition as a penalty. [See subcommittee discussion at Informational Item No. 14a.]
4. **APR Transfer Adjustment Criteria.** The committee continued its evaluation of the transfer adjustment criteria. The committee reviewed feedback from the Subcommittee on Data, approved core principles to guide the evaluation of the criteria and discussed concepts for potential refinement of the criteria. The committee will review data obtained from the National Student Clearinghouse to assist in determining if changes to the criteria are appropriate. Although the review could conclude with no action taken, the committee could take action to modify the criteria at an upcoming meeting. [See subcommittee discussion at Informational Item No. 13b.]

5. **Unusable Data Policy for APP Data Reviews.** The committee began a targeted review of the unusable data policy for APP data reviews as part of a comprehensive evaluation of the operational functions of the APP. The committee discussed the data review process and reviewed initial feedback on opportunities to improve the process from the Subcommittee on Data. The committee agreed that the process is achieving its intended purpose and identified opportunities to potentially improve the process. In particular, the committee determined that additional ways to motivate institutions other than loss of access to postseason competition should be explored, that early involvement of the chancellor/president in the process may motivate compliance with requests by the subcommittee and tools for institutions to sustain best practices should be developed. The committee could take action to modify the policy at an upcoming meeting. [See subcommittee discussion at Informational Item No. 13a.]

6. **National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics Feedback on Postgraduate Academic Eligibility Legislative Proposals Recommended by Committee.** The committee reviewed feedback provided by the N4A on the proposals recommended by the committee for inclusion in the 2016-17 cycle that would enhance existing academic eligibility requirements for graduate and post-baccalaureate student-athletes. Specifically, in October 2015, the committee recommended that NCAA Division I Council sponsor legislation to: (1) require graduate student-athletes be fully admitted, degree-seeking graduate students enrolled in a designated graduate degree program; and (2) permit only academic credit that applies toward a designated degree program be used to satisfy the six-hour requirement. The N4A requested that the recommended proposal requiring graduate student-athletes be enrolled in a designated graduate degree program be modified to allow graduate student-athletes who remain at their undergraduate institution be eligible as undeclared, non-degree seeking graduate students, as permitted by institutional policy.

While recognizing the merits of the request by the N4A, including that many institutions offer “at large” graduate enrollment (i.e., enrollment without a requirement that student-athletes pursuing graduate studies enroll in a graduate program) and student-athletes may prefer to pursue “at large” graduate studies in lieu of a graduate degree program or second baccalaureate degree, the committee agreed that the recommended proposal should not be modified. The committee reaffirmed that student-athletes should be enrolled in a designated degree program while completing their athletics eligibility. In addition, the committee recognized that the recommended proposal ensures that graduate student-athletes obtain a focused, meaningful and comparable graduate-level academic experience while working toward obtaining a graduate degree.
The committee noted that the waiver process is suited to address extenuating circumstances. Likewise, the committee recognized that proposals in the 2016-17 cycle provide flexibility for student-athletes to pursue educational opportunities in a number of areas, including minors, certificate programs, cooperative educational work experience programs and study-abroad programs. Finally, the committee noted that the proposal could be modified during the legislative cycle by the membership. [See subcommittee discussion at Informational Item No. 15a.]

7. **Future Application of Temporary Review Analysis Within Waiver Processes.** The committee received an update on the review by the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics of how the temporary review analysis has been applied to progress-toward-degree, two-year college transfer and initial-eligibility waivers. The subcommittee agreed that the temporary review analysis should apply permanently as directed by Council. In addition, the subcommittee directed that staff continue to have flexibility to apply reasonable discretion in other cases that may justify departure from established waiver outcomes. The waiver directives will be updated to reflect the subcommittee’s guidance. The subcommittee will continue to consider opportunities to modify the legislation or directives pursuant to the temporary review analysis, as appropriate. [See subcommittee discussion at Informational Item No. 15b.]

8. **Core Curriculum Time Limitations and Use of “Plus One” or “Plus Three” Courses Under New Initial-Eligibility Standards.** The committee received an update and reviewed correspondence from the National Association for Coaching Equity and Development on the existing legislative approach to core curriculum time limitations in light of the pending effective date for the 2016 initial-eligibility standards. The committee noted that both initial-eligibility concepts are rooted in the predictive value of timely high school progression and graduation. The committee agreed that a departure from the existing approach at this time may be premature; however, the Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics will review the alternatives proposed by NAFCED in future discussions. [See subcommittee discussion at Informational Item No. 15c.]

9. **Redesigned SAT and Response by NCAA.** In March 2016, the College Board began administering the redesigned SAT. The NCAA has regularly communicated with the College Board regarding the timeline for administration and potential impact of the redesigned SAT on the initial-eligibility certification process for prospective student-athletes. The committee received an update on the availability of the test scores from the initial redesigned test and concordance tables (between current SAT and redesigned SAT). The committee also reviewed the NCAA Eligibility Center’s operational plan, as previously approved by the committee, for using scores from the redesigned SAT in the initial-eligibility certification process. Under the approach, the Eligibility Center will ensure the redesigned test has no adverse impact on a prospective student-athlete in the initial-eligibility certification process and the application of the 2016 initial-eligibility standards. As the committee continues to receive additional information regarding the redesigned SAT, the committee will evaluate how the redesigned SAT may affect the predictive value of the test and how to account for those changes within initial-eligibility standards.
10. **Medical Absence Waivers.** The committee received an update that the Subcommittee on Data will review education provided to the membership on medical absence waivers during the APP data collection on an upcoming teleconference.

11. **APP Policies and Procedures.** The committee reviewed and approved changes to the APP manual for the 2016-17 academic year as part of the committee’s annual review of the manual.

12. **Committee Roundtable Discussions.** The committee engaged in roundtable discussions to assess the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats for the committee in several topical areas related to support, influence, communication and committee structure. The discussions identified priorities, initiatives and strategic approaches to guide the committee and staff over the next several years.

13. **Reports of the Subcommittee on Data.** The committee reviewed the reports of the March 10, March 24 and April 14 teleconferences.

   a. **Unusable Data Policy for APP Data Reviews.** At its March 10 teleconference, the subcommittee began reviewing the unusable data policy for APP data reviews to determine whether the policy is accomplishing its intended goal of motivating institutions to cooperate fully with the APP data review process. The subcommittee recognized the process should be thoroughly evaluated to identify improvements. In particular, the subcommittee noted the benefits to earlier involvement of an institution's president in the process, that additional ways to motivate institutions other than loss of access to postseason competition should be explored and tools and regular communications with NCAA staff could be developed for institutions to sustain best practices. [See committee discussion at Informational Item No. 5.]

   b. **APR Transfer Adjustment Criteria.** At its April 14 teleconference, the subcommittee continued its discussion of the APR transfer adjustment criteria. The subcommittee discussed potential guiding principles and received an update on data to be obtained from the National Student Clearinghouse. The subcommittee emphasized the transfer adjustment criteria should align with predictors of eventual graduation. The subcommittee continued to note potential opportunities to refine the adjustment criteria and will use the data from the National Student Clearinghouse and membership feedback to determine if changes to the criteria are appropriate. The subcommittee intends to have final recommendations, which could include no change, for committee consideration during summer 2016. [See committee discussion at Informational Item No. 4.]

14. **Reports of the Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals.** The committee reviewed the reports of the March 14 and March 28 teleconferences.

   a. **APP Penalty Waiver and Appeals Process.** At its March 14 teleconference, the subcommittee continued its review of the APP penalty waiver and appeals process
and discussed the core tenets established by the committee to guide the review at the committee’s February 2016 meeting. The subcommittee modified its initial recommendation that a single process apply to all penalty waivers and appeals. Under the modified recommendation, the committee would continue to have authority to consider appeals involving teams subject to the loss of access to postseason competition for two or more consecutive years and the subcommittee would have authority to consider appeals of all other staff decisions via teleconference with full committee review under a showing of abuse of discretion. Despite the modification to the initial recommendation, the subcommittee recognized the efficiencies and benefits to the membership provided through its initial recommendation of a single process and that the full committee will continue the review at the April meeting. [See committee discussion at Informational Item No. 3.]

b. **Relief Available to Institutions Participating in APP Level-Three Penalty In-Person Hearings.** At its March 14 teleconference, the subcommittee considered what relief, if any, could be provided to institutions participating in an APP Level-Three Penalty in-person hearing, noting that student-athletes may transfer following a team losing access to postseason competition. The subcommittee supported the current waiver directive and did not support a modification of APP policy to provide additional relief to institutions participating in Level-Three Penalty in-person hearings. The subcommittee noted several modifications to the APP in 2016-17 that are designed to improve the overall process.

## 15. Reports of the Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics.

The committee reviewed the reports of the March 8 and March 16 teleconferences.

a. **N4A Feedback on Legislative Proposals on Postgraduate Academic Eligibility Requirements Recommended by Committee.** At its March 8 teleconference, the subcommittee continued its review of feedback provided by the N4A on the legislative proposals recommended by the committee for inclusion in the 2016-17 cycle that would enhance existing academic eligibility standards for graduate and post-baccalaureate student-athletes to engender a more meaningful academic experience for these student-athletes. The N4A requested that the recommended proposal requiring graduate student-athletes be enrolled in a designated graduate degree program be modified to allow graduate student-athletes who remain at their undergraduate institution be eligible as undeclared, non-degree seeking graduate students, as permitted by institutional policy. The subcommittee noted the merits of the N4A request, but concluded that the recommended proposal should not be modified. [See committee discussion at Informational Item No. 6.]

b. **Future Application of Temporary Review Analysis to Student-Athlete Academic and Initial-Eligibility Waivers.** At its March 8 and March 16 teleconferences, the subcommittee reviewed how the temporary review analysis has been applied to student-athlete academic (i.e., progress-toward-degree and two-year college transfer waivers) and initial-eligibility waivers over the past two years. The subcommittee
also discussed legislation and directive changes in 2017-18 and beyond based on the temporary review analysis. The subcommittee agreed the application of the temporary review analysis has been appropriate in the cases reviewed and that, as directed by Council, the temporary review analysis should apply permanently on a case-by-case basis. In addition, the subcommittee directed that staff continue to have flexibility to apply reasonable discretion in other cases that may justify departure from established waiver outcomes. The directives will be updated to reflect the subcommittee’s guidance. The subcommittee will continue to consider opportunities to modify the legislation or directive pursuant to the temporary review analysis, as appropriate. [See committee discussion at Informational Item No. 7.]

c. Core Curriculum Time Limitations and Use of “Plus One” or “Plus Three” Courses Under New Initial-Eligibility Standards. At its March 16 teleconference, the subcommittee reviewed the existing legislative approach to Division I core curriculum time limitations for prospective student-athletes in light of the pending effective date for the 2016 initial-eligibility standards. [See committee discussion at Informational Item No. 8.]

16. NCAA Division I Values-Based Revenue Distribution Working Group Update. The committee received an update on the Values-Based Revenue Distribution Working Group. The working group is responding to the charge by the Board of Directors that the Division I Revenue Distribution Plan reflect and enhance the division’s overarching commitments, including the commitment to sound academic standards and student-athlete academic performance at member institutions. The committee reviewed and discussed the work completed by the working group, concepts discussed by the group and guiding principles for distribution based on academic achievement. The committee will receive another update and continue to discuss guiding principles related to the working group’s review at the committee’s June meeting.

17. APR Public Recognition for 2015-16 Update. The committee received a summary of the release of public recognition for the 2015-16 academic year based on 2014-15 APR data.

18. APR Adjustment Requests for 2015-16 Update. The committee received an update on the APR adjustment cases and types of requests that were submitted by member institutions during the 2015-16 academic year.

19. Research Update. The committee received an update on national and sport-group APR averages and trends based on 2014-15 APR data.

20. NCAA Division I Institutional Performance Program Update. The committee received an overview of the IPP webpage, which became available to the membership in June 2015. The committee reviewed the functionality of the webpage, how to use the resources provided by the webpage and the ways in which the webpage provides information in a number of categories related to academics, including incoming characteristics (e.g., test scores and GPA), progress-toward-degree information and graduation outcomes for student-athletes.
The committee recognized that institutions could use the IPP to make informed campus decisions and track academic outcomes and realities. The committee may account for the IPP in future initiatives if and when appropriate.

21. **Educational Programming Update.** The committee received an update on academic-focused educational programming for the membership. Programming in the coming months will include a webinar and information session at the 2016 NCAA Regional Rules Seminars to educate administrators at limited-resource institutions on application of the modified APP improvement filter system for LRIs effective with submission of 2015-16 data in fall 2016.

22. **Academic Technology Update.** The committee received an update on the development of an academic portal, which will bring all APP processes under one umbrella. The membership will have opportunities to learn how to use the portal during Regional Rules Seminars in May and June. The first phase of the portal (APP and Division II Academic Tracking System data collection) is scheduled to be released to the membership in late summer 2016. The second phase (membership-wide graduation rates data collection) is scheduled to be released in fall 2016.

23. **Board of Directors Update.** The committee received an update on key items from the board’s February 29 and April 11 teleconferences.

24. **Council Update.** The committee received an update on key items from the Council’s February 8-10 and April 6-8 meetings.

25. **Reports of the Committee on Academics.** The committee reviewed and approved the full report of the February 1-2 meeting, the strategic report of the February 1-2 meeting to the board and the report of the March 24 teleconference.

26. **Strategic Priorities.** The committee reviewed its strategic priorities. The committee developed the priorities in an effort to provide more transparency and accountability to the membership.

27. **Priority Future Agenda Items.** The following have been identified as priority future agenda items for the committee:
   
   a. Response to Board of Directors referral to address enhanced and effective measurement of academic achievement, including campus-based comparisons, under the metrics.
   
   b. Review of initial-eligibility standards and waiver process.
   
   c. Evaluation of APR transfer adjustment criteria.
   
   d. Review of unusable data designation used during an APP data review.
e. Response to board referral to address the identification of and support provided to academically at-risk student-athletes.

28. Future Meeting Dates.
   a. June 20-21 – Indianapolis;
   b. October 10-11 – Indianapolis;
   c. February 2-3, 2017 – Indianapolis;
   d. April 18-20 – Indianapolis;
   e. June 20-21 – Indianapolis; and
   f. October 16-17 – Indianapolis.

Committee Chair: Roderick McDavis, Ohio University; Mid-American Conference
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1. Access to Postseason Competition:

2. APP Penalties:
   a. Level-One:

   b. Level-Two:

   c. Level-Three:

Modified APP Penalty Waiver and Appeals Process
(Effective beginning 2016-17 Academic Year)

- APP Penalties and Access to Postseason Competition: