

3-1-2006 NCAA Division I APR with Myles Brand, Walt Harrison, Eric
Christianson

1 (File: 20060301_apr_audio22m16.)

2 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: As you know, we are
3 announcing second year academic progress rates for all
4 Division I institutions.

5 Joining us here today is Dr. Myles Brand,
6 president of the NCAA; Dr. Walter Harrison, president of
7 the University of Hartford and chair of the NCAA Committee
8 on Academic Performance.

9 I'd like to turn now to Dr. Brand and
10 Dr. Harrison for opening comments. And then we'll take
11 questions.

12 Dr. Brand.

13 DR. MYLES BRAND: Thank you, Erik. The
14 bottom line is this, we are encouraged, indeed highly
15 encouraged, by the latest round of APR data, but there's
16 more work to be done.

17 Our goal is not to sanction teams and
18 schools, but rather to change behavior. And we are
19 starting to see some positive changes in behavior towards
20 academic achievement of student athletes.

21 In particular, 99 sports teams at 65
22 Division I colleges and universities will lose
23 scholarships because of poor academic performance and lack
24 of retention of their student athletes during the 2004/'5
25 academic year. Of those 99 sports teams, 9 are women, 90

1 are men's teams.

2 The data from the 2003/'4 academic year
3 indicated that as many as 350 sports teams could have
4 faced scholarship losses under the APR program. The squad
5 size adjustment or margin of error was important in some
6 of those schools not receiving sanctions at this time, but
7 they are at risk.

8 Indeed, 40 percent, approximately, of
9 baseball, men's basketball, and football teams, 728 teams
10 all told, are at risk for losing scholarships in future
11 years, but are now protected by the margin of error. If
12 they had these same scores in the future, two years from
13 now, or in some cases even one year from now, they would
14 lose scholarships.

15 Our process is to phase in the sanctions
16 and to enable teams and schools to make the appropriate
17 adjustments. So we are on track, but there's still a lot
18 of work to be done. We see the APR as an early warning
19 system for schools to make the changes. Otherwise because
20 of the upcoming historical penalties, which will be more
21 serious, they will be affected by those.

22 When a contemporaneous penalty is applied,
23 an institution may not re-award the scholarship of an
24 ineligible student athlete who left the school to another
25 student athlete, and this restriction is for one year.

1 For a team to lose a scholarship under the
2 contemporaneous penalties, a student athlete must have
3 failed academically -- flunked out, if you like. The
4 student athlete must have left the institution and the
5 team's APR must be below 925 out of a thousand. That is
6 to say, if a team, taking into consideration the squad
7 size adjustment, is below 925, that puts them at risk.
8 They lose a scholarship after that if a student athlete
9 goes what we call "0 for 2" -- is neither retained or
10 eligible.

11 An APR of 925 translates to approximately a
12 60 percent graduation rate using the graduate success
13 rate -- a far more accurate rate than the federal rate.

14 Along with your materials, you should have
15 also received not just a list of schools that are
16 sanctioned, but also a top 10 list of those sports teams
17 and institutions then that are doing well. And we've
18 looked at, for each sport, the top 10 percent points and
19 we're going to provide awards and recognition for those.
20 So we also want to encourage and reinforce success, as
21 well as change behaviors at the lower end.

22 The message for academic reform is clear.
23 Recruit student athletes who are capable of doing
24 college-level work; help them meet the standards for
25 progress towards a degree; help them remain enrolled so

1 they have an opportunity for a high quality education at
2 their college and university.

3 DR. WALTER HARRISON: This is Walter
4 Harrison.

5 I want to make comments in three
6 capacities. I want to say, first of all, that as a member
7 of the NCAA, I'm extremely proud of what the NCAA is doing
8 to take a leadership role in improving the academic
9 performance of student athletes. I'm especially proud of
10 Myles' leadership on this issue, and I want to
11 congratulate him for taking a tough, but fair, stand.

12 I also want to thank my committee, as a
13 chairman of that committee, for their hard work in this
14 effort. And I especially want to thank the staff for a
15 lot of very hard work. There are thousands of teams who
16 have all had to be calculated and dealt with fairly and
17 honestly, and there's an enormous amount of detail behind
18 all of these figures, and there are a lot of NCAA staff
19 who worked very hard to be fair and just.

20 I also want to say, as the chairman of the
21 committee, that I'm very pleased that the policies that we
22 have put in place are beginning to have an effect. I
23 agree with Myles that what we see here are the beginnings
24 of behavioral change because of these policies and that's
25 very gratifying to me. And I'm sure it is to my entire

1 committee, and I'm sure it is to the board of directors as
2 well.

3 We are -- as Myles said, these are
4 warnings, but they are tough warnings. And people who
5 have received penalties ought to have a clear message that
6 they need to change their policies and their procedures in
7 the way their teams are being supported by their
8 institution.

9 On the other hand, I think that because of
10 the squad size adjustment or the margin of error, we've
11 been fair in allowing institutions to make these
12 adjustments in realtime and to do it in a way that's
13 reasonable and rational.

14 And then, finally, as the president of an
15 NCAA institution, I'd want to say that I think that
16 there's a lot of data in the reports that each of us are
17 sent. I hope my colleague presidents will spend some time
18 looking at those reports. Obviously, if you've received
19 penalties in this realm, the message is clear. You need
20 to see what the problems are with those teams.

21 But it's equally important to take a look
22 at teams that -- whose multiyear APR is below 925, but who
23 have benefited from the small squad adjustment. As Myles
24 pointed out, those institutions need to get better quick,
25 because in future years, those adjustments get smaller and

1 then go away. And I can say, looking at my own
2 institution, for example, that I've got a couple teams
3 that I'm going to be asking questions about. So I hope
4 that my colleagues, among the presidents and chancellors
5 around the country, will do the same thing. I think this
6 program is doing exactly what it is meant to do. It's
7 meant to encourage institutions to recruit and support a
8 student athlete so that they can graduate and succeed in
9 life, and not only on the playing field.

10 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Thank you, Myles and
11 Walt.

12 We will now turn to our audience today for
13 questions. And Stacy, our operator will explain how you
14 can ask a question today.

15 THE OPERATOR: Thank you. The
16 question-and-answer session will be conducted
17 electronically. If you would like to ask a question,
18 please do so by pressing the star key, followed by the
19 digit 1 on your touch-tone telephone. If you are using a
20 speakerphone, please make sure your mute function is
21 turned off to allow your signal to reach our equipment.

22 Once again, that is star 1, if you do have
23 a question. And I'll pause for just one moment.

24 And we'll go to our first question from
25 Doug Lederman, Inside Higher Education.

1 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Doug, go ahead.

2 DOUG LEDERMAN: Dr. Brand and Dr. Harrison,
3 thanks for taking the time. There's a lot of information
4 here for us to absorb. So pardon me if I ask a couple of
5 questions.

6 You both I think made the statement that
7 you've seen progress. And I just want to make sure that I
8 understand the comparisons that you're making between last
9 year's numbers -- number of sports that would seem
10 susceptible to penalties and the ones that actually took
11 penalties this year. And when you talk about there being
12 progress, which factors -- it seems like there are a
13 couple of factors that mitigate against -- I mean, that
14 are added in from last year to this year -- the squad
15 size, and then also this comparison to the general student
16 body.

17 I wish you could -- I'm hoping you can talk
18 a little bit more about how that was applied and what
19 impact that had on bringing down the number of sports
20 susceptible to penalties this year, as opposed to last
21 year. Is my question clear? I'm sorry if it wasn't.

22 KEVIN LENNON: Yeah, it was. Doug, this is
23 Kevin Lennon. How are you doing?

24 DOUG LEDERMAN: I'm good, Kevin. Thanks.

25 KEVIN LENNON: Good. Thanks for that

1 question as well.

2 You know, I think when we frame the issue
3 of progress and what encourages us, first of all, clearly,
4 academic reform has taken hold on the campus in terms of
5 the understanding of all campus administrators and student
6 athletes of its importance. So in very broad terms, we
7 know and we feel that, on a regular basis, that people
8 understand what this is about.

9 You also think in terms of progress as it
10 relates to fairness. And as you'll recall, the
11 conversations that we have had with the membership through
12 the course of the year, and with the committee on academic
13 performance, that certain adjustments needed to be made to
14 the original APR program to address the issue of fairness
15 that you heard President Brand and President Harrison
16 talking about. And so the numbers do reflect new policies
17 that enforce the fairness component.

18 In particular the issue of institutional
19 mission is one that was factored in to both the waiver and
20 the adjustment process -- looking at institutions who
21 serve a different population and making appropriate
22 adjustments when we have athletic programs who, in fact,
23 are exceeding the regular student body in terms of
24 academic performance. So we can note that, and we can see
25 that, in fact, as a measure of progress.

1 Also, when you take a look at some of the
2 lower performing teams from the first year -- while it
3 doesn't apply across the board, many of those low
4 performing teams we have seen some improvement from one
5 score from the first year to the next. And so I think we
6 note that as an area of development. And that has been, I
7 think, one of the critical parts of this entire program is
8 taking the previously low-performing teams and encouraging
9 them to improve.

10 So I note progress in terms of move towards
11 fairness, and improve towards mission being considered,
12 and then finally just in terms of the lowest performing
13 teams getting better.

14 DOUG LEDERMAN: Do I get -- can I have a
15 quick follow up?

16 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Yeah. Go ahead, Doug.

17 DOUG LEDERMAN: Okay. So two quick things.

18 Is there a figure for the number of teams
19 that were excluded from penalties because of the student
20 body -- the general student body comparison? Is there a
21 figure comparable to -- I mean, you show figures for sort
22 of how many team -- fewer teams were penalized because of
23 the squad size adjustment. Is there something comparable?

24 KEVIN LENNON: This is Kevin again. There
25 were 63 teams that were given relief from the

1 contemporaneous penalties based on institutional mission.
2 That's the comparison.

3 DOUG LEDERMAN: And those we would be able
4 to find just by going through the individual -- I mean,
5 those would be noted in the individual student --
6 individual institution's reports; is that right?

7 KEVIN LENNON: Yes, that's correct.

8 DOUG LEDERMAN: Okay. And then I guess --
9 so and then I guess, just lastly, sort of summing up my
10 earlier question, is there an actual reduction when you --
11 besides the sort of teams that were exempted for these
12 various reasons, do you think there were -- were there
13 actually fewer teams from last year to this year that were
14 susceptible to penalties, except for the fact that they
15 were given these exemptions? Because that would be
16 another sign, obviously, of progress, if there were an
17 actual reduction.

18 KEVIN LENNON: Well, keep in mind that last
19 year, though, we weren't -- because there weren't any
20 penalties, you didn't have to apply any of the adjustments
21 and the waivers that were developed through the course of
22 the year to address the issue of fairness. So we went
23 back and took -- and made those adjustments to the first
24 year data based on the policies that the board of
25 directors has adopted.

1 I think your comparison, Doug, will be much
2 more relevant next year, as we actually then can see where
3 we are in terms of data from this two year aggregate to
4 next year's.

5 DOUG LEDERMAN: Right. I see the point.
6 Okay. Thanks.

7 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Next question,
8 please.

9 THE OPERATOR: Our next question comes from
10 Wendell Barnhouse, Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

11 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Okay. Wendell, go
12 ahead.

13 WENDELL BARNHOUSE: Thanks. Obviously in
14 the Big 12 there are quite a few teams baseball-wise with
15 some penalties. And it looks like baseball maybe, as far
16 as the, you know, Division I, I-A type schools got hit
17 maybe the hardest.

18 Are there any particular reasons why you
19 all think that baseball is having some problems
20 academically?

21 DR. MYLES BRAND: Yeah. I think that
22 base -- this is Myles. The baseball community is aware of
23 these issues and, in fact, is working hard and forcefully
24 to try and change it. One of the problems is that
25 baseball, more than football or even basketball, sends

1 student athletes off to the professional leagues in
2 their -- what would have been their senior year. And so
3 the baseball players really need to both finish their
4 academic requirements of that year to remain eligible, but
5 also have to meet our standards of 20, 40, 60, 80
6 percentage of their degree programs.

7 There's also a great deal more transfer in
8 baseball than there is in other sports. Because as you
9 know, baseball does not have -- you don't have to sit out
10 a year if you move between Division I institutions. And I
11 think that also may have some consequences for the
12 eligibility issues.

13 WENDELL BARNHOUSE: If I could follow up,
14 just I'm curious, as far as the historical penalties. And
15 at what point in time would those kick in and when there
16 might be any, you know, postseason penalties against a
17 team for, you know, continued academic problems? Any time
18 frame on that?

19 DR. WALTER HARRISON: That's a question
20 about -- your question is when do the historical penalties
21 begin to --

22 WENDELL BARNHOUSE: Yeah. I mean, at what
23 point -- in other words, at what point -- is it a year,
24 two years? In other words, when would something like that
25 start to take effect? And when would -- you know, if a

1 team or a school is not measuring up, as far as the APR,
2 is it one year or two year when they might -- where there
3 might be like a sanction for a postseason? I guess is the
4 question.

5 DR. WALTER HARRISON: Well, you asked two
6 questions. You asked when is -- when does it begin? And
7 when is year three of the historical penalties?

8 WENDELL BARNHOUSE: Okay.

9 KEVIN LENNON: Yeah. Next year, actually,
10 warning letters would go out to institutions based on
11 three years of APR data that they would be subject to
12 historical penalties.

13 And I would note that President Harrison's
14 committee and the board will be making those decisions in
15 the very near future, exactly where those cut lines are.

16 WENDELL BARNHOUSE: Okay.

17 KEVIN LENNON: The following year after the
18 warning, the actual penalties would be implemented. And
19 there you begin with scholarship reductions, recruiting
20 restrictions, and playing season adjustments that would
21 follow in the next phase.

22 It is after that particular phase, then you
23 begin to contemplate postseason restrictions. And I think
24 the first year for that -- I believe the first year that
25 that would be possible would be -- I think it's '08/'09.

1 WENDELL BARNHOUSE: Okay. And one other --
2 just on looking at the chart or the printout on the team
3 subjects due contemporaneous penalties, as far as when we
4 say if somebody's losing a number of scholarships, is it
5 the total head count penalty? Is that what we would look
6 at, as far as saying that they -- this certain school is
7 losing a certain number of scholarships? Or am I not
8 reading that correctly?

9 KEVIN LENNON: Yeah, this is Kevin. That
10 would obviously depend on whether it's a head count or an
11 equivalency sport.

12 WENDELL BARNHOUSE: Okay.

13 KEVIN LENNON: The board approved a cap of
14 10 percent -- no more than 10 percent -- that could be
15 implemented. So with the head count, using basketball as
16 an example, that would be no more than two.

17 WENDELL BARNHOUSE: Right.

18 KEVIN LENNON: You have other equivalency
19 sports such as Division I AA football, as an example, a
20 cap of 10 percent would be 6.3 percent.

21 WENDELL BARNHOUSE: Okay.

22 DR. MYLES BRAND: Wendell, I want to
23 emphasize one final point. We are intentionally phasing
24 in both these sanctions and the more harsh historical
25 penalties in order to allow time for the schools to adjust

1 their academic programs.

2 Our goal is, again, to change the
3 behaviors, and we want to make this realistic so that
4 we're doing it in a time frame when they can actually make
5 those changes.

6 WENDELL BARNHOUSE: Right. And the
7 question most people will have is that, you know, that's
8 the kind of penalty that would really tend to get people's
9 attention, if you don't make the postseason. So that's
10 the kind of time frame I was looking for, and you all
11 answered my question. Thank you.

12 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: You bet. Next
13 question, please.

14 THE OPERATOR: We'll move to Mark Alesia,
15 Indianapolis Star.

16 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead.

17 MARK ALESIA: Hi, Kevin, how many waivers
18 were denied?

19 KEVIN LENNON: We had a total of about
20 90-some waivers. You had many that related to mission.
21 And I believe we had 63 of those that were actually
22 granted as it related to institutional mission.

23 We had 30 other waivers that were filed.
24 And of that group, there's a series of kind of iterations,
25 if you will -- some fully approved, Mark; some partially

1 approved; some conditionally approved based on academic
2 recovery plans that were aggressive that said the school
3 is going to move forward; and then some that were denied
4 flat out.

5 Of the denied, of that last -- of that 30
6 group, we had 16 that were denied flat out.

7 MARK ALESIA: Thank you.

8 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Next question, please.

9 THE OPERATOR: We'll go to Ted Lewis,
10 New Orleans Times.

11 TED LEWIS: Yes, Kevin. I noticed that
12 Tulane was one of the schools that did not submit their
13 information. Are Tulane and the University of New Orleans
14 being exempted in any way from this year because of the
15 hurricane?

16 KEVIN LENNON: This is Kevin. No, they're
17 not. We're just -- we're engaged with Tulane, in
18 particular, and several other institutions, to make sure
19 that we have all the accurate information and data before
20 we release anything to the press. That's one reason why
21 there will, in fact, be a second release that will involve
22 Tulane.

23 But they've both indicated they're ability
24 to provide this data, and we're doing all we can to help
25 them with that submission.

1 TED LEWIS: The other part, though, between
2 Tulane University and New Orleans, any other school that
3 might have been affected by the hurricanes, are -- in the
4 future, when you're looking at this year's data, will
5 there be any consideration given for that?

6 KEVIN LENNON: Yeah. I think the goal of
7 cap -- and certainly President Harrison can speak to this
8 as well, and the board -- is to be as fair and accommodate
9 institutions who find themselves in difficult situations.

10 In this instance, the institution said that
11 they were able to provide the data. And, again, we're
12 doing all we can to help them with that submission.

13 DR. WALTER HARRISON: But I would agree. I
14 think we'd be as sensitive as we could under a waiver
15 process to something that was involved with a natural
16 disaster.

17 TED LEWIS: Thank you.

18 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Next question, please.

19 THE OPERATOR: Jack Carey, USA Today.

20 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Jack, go ahead.

21 JACK CAREY: Dr. Brand, is the association
22 concerned -- there seems to be quite a large number of
23 historically black schools that are being sanctioned here.
24 I think there's six in the NEAC and three in the SWAC. Is
25 that an issue you folks will get a little harder or work

1 with these schools more?

2 DR. MYLES BRAND: Yes, it is an issue. A
3 number of those institutions received mission exemptions.
4 We need to take into account the student body and a number
5 of other financial issues affecting the schools. So yes,
6 we are concerned.

7 But there were a number of institutions
8 that, even under those conditions, were not performing as
9 well for the student athletes as they were for the rest of
10 the student body.

11 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Next
12 question, please.

13 THE OPERATOR: It will come from Scott
14 Cooper, Sacramento Bee.

15 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Scott, go ahead.

16 SCOTT COOPER: First question is what
17 are -- how is it handled in the situation if a team does
18 not give out scholarships? There's a few situations out
19 there, either teams moving into D-1 or in certain schools,
20 but they just give financial Grants-in-Aid and academic
21 scholarships, but not sports awards?

22 KEVIN LENNON: This is Kevin. Keep in mind
23 that the cohort of individuals or those who are on
24 athletic scholarship, we do have some exceptions for those
25 that simply do not offer any athletic scholarships, such

1 as the Ivy League, and I believe the status there would be
2 active recruited status.

3 One important point to note, though, is
4 that the financial penalties that would accrue to an
5 institution that underperforms or a team that
6 underperforms is based on the maximum financial aid total.
7 So, in fact, if a school does not offer the full allotment
8 of an athletic scholarship, they may actually not feel
9 that penalty, if you will, because they're not offering
10 the maximum number. However, has the historical penalties
11 continue to be rolled out, it's safe to say that that will
12 actually catch up with those institutions.

13 So it provides temporary relief if you're
14 not a fully funded program, but down the road, the
15 historical penalties will begin to address that type of
16 underperforming program.

17 SCOTT COOPER: Because of things like the
18 postseason restrictions, you mean?

19 KEVIN LENNON: Yeah. And actually maybe
20 even at the first level. And again, President Harrison
21 can certainly speak to this. Those decisions have yet to
22 be made.

23 But historical penalties again are designed
24 for those who have been habitually underperforming. And
25 there may be a sense that those financial aid restrictions

1 at the first level of penalty may not, in fact, be
2 anchored on simply how many scholarships you offer, but
3 may simply be anchored more on just your lack of academic
4 performance for four years.

5 SCOTT COOPER: And as a quick follow-up,
6 can you explain the difference a little bit between the
7 historical and contemporaneous?

8 DR. WALTER HARRISON: Sure. This is Walt.
9 I mean, I'll give you the theory of it. The
10 contemporaneous penalties are the loss of scholarships
11 capped at 10 percent of the allowable scholarships.
12 They're meant to be warnings to institutions and the teams
13 that you're headed on the wrong course, you need to turn
14 yourself around.

15 Historical penalties, which begin to take
16 effect next year, are based on more years' data and are
17 more severe, because they're meant to capture the worst of
18 the worst. They're meant to look at teams that have
19 underperformed year after year after year, and they become
20 quite severe as they go on.

21 So the penalties we're announcing today,
22 which we call contemporaneous penalties, are warning
23 penalties. The historical penalties will be much more
24 severe.

25 SCOTT COOPER: Thank you.

1 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Next question, please.

2 THE OPERATOR: Brian Bennett, Career
3 Journal, Louisville, Kentucky.

4 BRIAN BENNETT: Yes. You mentioned that
5 teams that qualified under the squad side adjustment are
6 still kind of at risk. I'm wondering is there a certain
7 number or level where teams should really be worried? I
8 see some teams that maybe have like a 920 and then some
9 teams that are like 905. Is there any way to calculate
10 that?

11 DR. MYLES BRAND: I think the short answer
12 is that any team that is below 925 or even hovering near
13 925 is at risk.

14 BRIAN BENNETT: Okay. And will there be a
15 squad side adjustment again next year, since there will
16 only be three years of data at that point?

17 DR. MYLES BRAND: That's correct. And
18 there will be a squad size adjustment the following year.
19 But remember, each year, it is less. It disappears in the
20 fourth year. And so that it actually becomes more
21 difficult to catch up as time goes on because the number
22 of years of data is larger.

23 BRIAN BENNETT: Okay. Thanks.

24 THE OPERATOR: We'll go next to Karen
25 Mitchell, Columbia Missourian.

1 JODI UPTON: Hi. I had a question on how
2 the APR of 925 is predictive of a Graduation Success Rate
3 of 60 percent, I think is what you said today. And
4 previously that was reported as it was predictive of a
5 success rate of 50 percent.

6 DR. MYLES BRAND: Yeah. The difference
7 there is that the earlier prediction was based upon the
8 federally mandated rate, which does not include transfers
9 in and out of the program. And that could, on average,
10 take one-third of the students out of the calculation.

11 The Graduate Success Rate does count in
12 transfers in and transfers out of the program, therefore,
13 including all students, and hence is more accurate. It's
14 on the basis of more accurate information, looking at all
15 the student athletes, it equates to approximately a
16 60 percent Graduate Success Rate.

17 JODI UPTON: And you don't expect that to
18 change with another year's worth of data or anything?
19 That should be set?

20 DR. MYLES BRAND: It might change, but very
21 modestly, depending upon what the data set looks like. I
22 think the data set is large enough that the changes will
23 be minimal.

24 JODI UPTON: Thank you.

25 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Next question, please.

1 THE OPERATOR: We'll go to Eddie Timanus of
2 USA Today.

3 EDDIE TIMANUS: Yes. Kevin, I think
4 probably you would be the one to answer this. I'm a
5 little confused here on this 10 percent cap with respect
6 to some sports. For example, you mentioned 1AA football
7 specifically with an equivalence of 63, which should be a
8 6.3 cap, but we're seeing some 9s here on some 1AA
9 programs as far as the head count would go for actual
10 scholarship losses.

11 What's the measuring stick that we should
12 be looking for?

13 KEVIN LENNON: Thanks for the opportunity
14 to clarify that, Eddie. That column that you have over
15 there relates to the head count of 9, and that actually is
16 something that applies to both 1A and 1AA.

17 The fact that they have a limitation of the
18 63 Grants-in-Aid is where the 6.3 comes into place. So
19 you're right, you saw the 9 down there in the head count,
20 but you saw the actually penalty there being the 6.3.

21 EDDIE TIMANUS: So what kind of penalties
22 then would be applied in terms of actual numbers of
23 athletes? What do the institutions have to do now, I
24 guess?

25 KEVIN LENNON: I appreciate that again.

1 There would be the penalty of the 9 on the
2 overall head count; and a penalty of the 6.3 in terms of
3 the Grants-in-Aid; and then the 3 in terms of the initial,
4 so it complies across all the columns.

5 EDDIE TIMANUS: So the 3 applying to the
6 incoming class then?

7 KEVIN LENNON: Yeah.

8 EDDIE TIMANUS: Gotcha, okay.

9 KEVIN LENNON: And the 1A is the 9 overall,
10 and you saw then with the three initial.

11 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Kevin, anything else
12 to -- on that point?

13 KEVIN LENNON: No. Thank you, Eddie.

14 EDDIE TIMANUS: Thank you.

15 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Next question, please.

16 THE OPERATOR: Go to Tim Griffin, San
17 Antonio Express News.

18 TIM GRIFFIN: Couple questions for you
19 guys. First of all, several of the major men's basketball
20 coaches have said that they won't change the recruiting
21 philosophies to steer away from the very, very top
22 athletes who might end up with a good opportunity to turn
23 pro in less than a four or five year graduation period.
24 Does that concern you that coaches are that adamant about
25 wanting to do that?

1 And then I've got another question after
2 you answer that.

3 DR. MYLES BRAND: If a student athlete
4 remains academically eligible, and then after a year or
5 two or three goes to a professional league, they're not an
6 0 for 2, and therefore not subject to the penalty. We've
7 taken that into account.

8 However, if a coach recruits a student who
9 is not capable of doing the academic work of the
10 institution and they flunk out, whether they go to the
11 pros or not, there's a penalty to be paid. And while it
12 may only be scholarships right now -- and although that's
13 a serious penalty -- when we start in the future
14 withholding the ability to participate in postseason play,
15 I think you can't ignore it.

16 TIM GRIFFIN: Okay. And then one other
17 question is while these same coaches are talking about how
18 difficult it is for just an average person to understand
19 this.

20 One coach that I talked to mentioned that
21 he needed to take an academic course in interpreting the
22 APR. Does that concern you that when you start talking
23 about equivalency caps and things like that, that this
24 isn't going to be readily broken down by the average
25 person? And then also the people that have to worry about

1 getting their players eligible?

2 DR. MYLES BRAND: You know, that's an
3 interesting question. For every complex problem, there is
4 a simple solution that's wrong. I mean, these same
5 coaches always talk about fairness. And they're right to
6 talk about fairness.

7 When you talk about fairness, you have to
8 take into the complexities of the situation, and you have
9 to make sure that all the details are accounted for. So
10 if we didn't do that, certainly we would be criticized for
11 trying to paint everyone with the same brush and be
12 unfair.

13 The fact of the matter is you can always
14 criticize this program if you're not comfortable with
15 stressing the academic effects of a college education.
16 And so we are really working hard to make sure that
17 everyone -- every coach and every student athlete, every
18 athletic director knows that if you're going to play in
19 our games, you're going to be a real student.

20 TIM GRIFFIN: Okay. Thank you.

21 DR. WALTER HARRISON: Could I just add
22 something to that? You know, I realize that as in all
23 rating and ranking systems there are complexities, but the
24 message, as Myles said, should be pretty clear. If
25 current students aren't capable of doing the academic work

1 at your institution, then provide them with enough support
2 so that they can succeed. That doesn't strike me as very
3 difficult. It's pretty simple.

4 And so what this APR rate actually measures
5 is how well you're doing those two things. If you're
6 doing them well, you're going to score well; if you're
7 not, you're going to be getting penalties.

8 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Thank you. Next
9 question, please.

10 THE OPERATOR: We'll go to Mike Meier with
11 Davis Enterprise.

12 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead, Mike.

13 MIKE MEIER: Hi. I just have a couple of
14 questions about how these penalties will be phased in. Is
15 it going to be -- so these scholarship productions that
16 are in this list, are those going to show up in next year,
17 the 2006/'07 year? I mean, how does that work in terms of
18 when these scholarships are taken away?

19 KEVIN LENNON: This is Kevin. Some of
20 those scholarships, those contemporaneous penalties will
21 be felt in this academic year, the '05/'06. For those
22 institutions who are subject to the penalties, who were
23 not able to take the penalty this year, they will take
24 that penalty next year. It really is first available
25 opportunity, and at the earliest point you can. So some

1 are taking it this way; those who can't take it this year
2 will take it next year.

3 MIKE MEIER: And for a school that has a
4 head count penalty of 9, that means that they can have 9
5 fewer people on aid; is that right?

6 KEVIN LENNON: That's correct.

7 MIKE MEIER: Okay. Thank you.

8 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Next question, please.

9 THE OPERATOR: We'll go to Brad Wolverton,
10 Chronicle of Higher Education.

11 BRAD WOLVERTON: Is it easy to -- is there
12 a way to calculate, without going into some of the details
13 about head count penalties and equivalency penalties and
14 the other language you use here, to just say how many
15 total scholarships are being revoked at these colleges?

16 KEVIN LENNON: You know, it's Kevin.
17 That's -- looking at some of our data friends as well, and
18 that's a little bit of a tough total for us to get at this
19 point in time.

20 We can tell you how many penalties teams
21 are subject to, in terms of the loss of scholarships. But
22 the issue that I referenced earlier about how close they
23 are to the maximum financial aid total and whether or not
24 they're under that or will really feel the penalty, Brad,
25 it complicates that exact number.

1 So I would just encourage, for your
2 purposes, to note how many scholarship -- or how many
3 teams are penalized at this rate of scholarships. I think
4 that's about the closest that we can do at this point in
5 time.

6 BRAD WOLVERTON: And one other question.
7 You mentioned, Kevin, that some of the teams -- some of
8 the penalties will be felt this academic year.

9 Can you give some clarity to that? Just
10 explain how that would -- how a team could, you know, be
11 penalized and put that in place right away?

12 KEVIN LENNON: Some actually -- you know,
13 this is the public release where we're providing all of
14 the data for all of the institutions. Many institutions
15 knew much earlier in this academic year whether they were
16 going to be subject to a penalty or not. Some actually
17 then were able to plan, as it related to this year and
18 their offering of financial aid, or just where they
19 current squad size happened to be this year. If they were
20 able to take the penalty this year because they were in a
21 position to do so with their squad size, they were
22 required to do so.

23 Others, obviously based on their academic
24 calendar, may not have known whether they were subject to
25 a penalty, went through all the waiver process, et cetera,

1 and then very recently learned that they have a penalty.
2 Well, their squads may be full right now. They have
3 student athletes in all of those slots. Those
4 institutions would then take those penalties the following
5 academic year.

6 BRAD WOLVERTON: Thanks.

7 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Next question, please.

8 THE OPERATOR: We'll go to our follow up
9 from Ted Lewis, New Orleans Times.

10 TED LEWIS: Yes, I wanted to clarify. On a
11 1AA football team that you have listed as losing 6.3 --
12 I'm sorry -- yeah, losing 6.3 on the total equivalency and
13 three initial counters. Does that mean they can then sign
14 no more than 22 people next year? And that they can only
15 have, like, be 59 on scholarship then?

16 KEVIN LENNON: I'm going to turn it over to
17 my colleague Julie Cromer to clarify this for you.

18 TED LEWIS: Okay.

19 JULIE CROMER: Rather than 22, it actually
20 would be an initial counter class potentially of 27,
21 because in 1AA football, the initial counter maximum is 30
22 versus the 1A football maximum which is 25. So you're
23 separating by initial counters, which would be 27
24 possible; by overall counters, which would be 9 subtracted
25 from the 85 number we have in 1AA football. And then at

1 the same time, the total value of scholarship dollars that
2 is awarded by that team must include a penalty of 6.3,
3 subtracted from the overall value possible of 63.

4 TED LEWIS: Understand. Thank you.

5 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Next question, please.

6 THE OPERATOR: We'll go to Pete Thamel of
7 the New York Times.

8 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Pete, go ahead.

9 PETE THAMEL: Yeah. Thanks, Erik.

10 Guys, I'm looking at -- I'm just looking at
11 the number -- the names of the schools, if you will, and
12 the penalties in the sports. And it just seems to me,
13 when I think about, you know, if you want to just go BCS
14 conferences to throw like a generic, you know, that people
15 can relate to, it doesn't seem like there's a ton of those
16 schools on there. I mean, does that -- you know, big name
17 schools in the sports that, you know, people watch on TV
18 and that generate money.

19 Have those schools done a good job
20 adjusting since the last thing you've done? Are there
21 waivers? I mean, it just seems like there's sort of a --
22 I mean, a lack of -- that Joe on the street can relate to
23 of teams that are really, you know, being impacted. And
24 perhaps they've adjusted.

25 DR. MYLES BRAND: Pete, this is Myles.

1 There has been adjustment. And that's the good news, that
2 a number of teams, particularly those high profile or
3 paying good attention have made a number of adjustments.
4 That's part of it.

5 In some cases there's waivers. And let me
6 give you a specific example. You might recall that we are
7 encouraging schools to bring back old players.

8 PETE THAMEL: Okay.

9 DR. MYLES BRAND: And have them graduate
10 and you get an extra point, a bonus point. And so some of
11 those schools have taken advantage of the fact that there
12 are some players that they could bring back who will now
13 get a degree. And that's a good thing.

14 And so, you know, we have a number of
15 former athletes now who have degrees, and we count that as
16 a success.

17 PETE THAMEL: Okay. Is there a time limit
18 on that?

19 DR. MYLES BRAND: No. But you will run out
20 of players at some point.

21 PETE THAMEL: Thank you.

22 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Next question, please.

23 THE OPERATOR: We have a follow up from
24 Wendell Barnhouse, Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

25 WENDELL BARNHOUSE: Right. It's kind of

1 along the lines of what Ted Lewis was asking. For
2 instance, in the contemporaneous penalties, I'm looking at
3 like Oklahoma State and baseball. It says the total
4 equivalency penalty is 1.17. And Joe, that's 1.17 of a
5 scholarship basically, or the cost of a scholarship that
6 they're penalized; is that correct?

7 JOE: That's correct.

8 WENDELL BARNHOUSE: And then as far as the
9 NA and the total initial counter penalty, why is there an
10 NA there? Or what does that mean?

11 JOE: There's no initial counter rule in
12 the sport of baseball.

13 WENDELL BARNHOUSE: Okay. That's why
14 that's not there. And if I could, if -- was the squad
15 size adjustment decision -- how much that would -- how
16 much did that affect baseball? And would -- if you all
17 hadn't done that, would baseball have taken an even harder
18 hit, do you think?

19 DR. MYLES BRAND: The answer is yes, they
20 would have taken a harder hit. And I think what that
21 means is that a number of the baseball teams are at risk.

22 DR. WALTER HARRISON: Now, everybody at the
23 NCAA knows that I know least about data of anyone in the
24 room. But I think it's true that the smaller the sport,
25 the smaller the number of athletes on a team, the larger

1 the adjustment is. So a sport like football is going to
2 have the smallest adjustment and a sport like golf, which
3 has whatever small number of scholarships are, is going to
4 have the largest adjustment.

5 WENDELL BARNHOUSE: Thank you.

6 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Wendell, this is Erik.
7 I might add that we have background information related to
8 the maximum limits on scholarships and how to understand
9 the penalties on our academic reform web resource page.

10 WENDELL BARNHOUSE: Yes, I've seen all
11 that. That's an excellent resource. I just haven't had a
12 chance to read it all, and I wanted to make sure I would
13 understand it by getting it explained in English. But I
14 appreciate it. Thanks.

15 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Very good. Next
16 question, please.

17 THE OPERATOR: Follow up from Doug
18 Lederman, Inside Higher Education.

19 DOUG LEDERMAN: Hi. I just wanted to
20 clarify one thing in your news release. The eight
21 institutions that it says have not completed the process,
22 is it -- can we assume that those are all institutions
23 that sought waivers and they just haven't been -- or are
24 appealing in some way? I just want to clarify why
25 they're -- what that means?

1 KEVIN LENNON: This is Kevin. They're just
2 not all through the process yet. But you're right, the
3 majority of those -- and we talk about process -- they're
4 still processing adjustment and waiver requests.

5 DOUG LEDERMAN: Okay. All right. Thanks.

6 THE OPERATOR: We'll go to /O mar Kelly,
7 South Florida Sun Sentinel.

8 OMAR KELLY: I just had a question in terms
9 of Florida A&M situation. With a school, which is already
10 put on penalties in terms of NCAA sanctions, how does that
11 impact their scores and their penalties that they
12 presently have?

13 KEVIN LENNON: This is Kevin. I think --
14 and Walt can certainly speak to this as well -- I think
15 the Committee on Academic Performance and the board were
16 pretty clear that this would simply go as an additional
17 penalty on top of their penalty already for the
18 infraction.

19 These are two separate things. There is an
20 academic contemporaneous penalty, and it would simply be
21 added on to what they currently have.

22 OMAR KELLY: Okay.

23 DR. WALTER HARRISON: Yeah, I agree. I
24 don't -- I really -- I haven't been involved with any
25 individual situations, but this is meant to measure

1 academic performance, not other things for which you would
2 get penalties for infractions.

3 OMAR KELLY: Okay. So on top of the
4 scholarship limitations that they have to put themselves
5 in -- under for violating NCAA policies, they also have
6 this reduction of, you know, 8 or 6.3 scholarship. I'm
7 not fully understanding. You know, there's one here
8 where -- I'm just looking at football -- value of overall
9 financial aid penalty, 8. But then total accountable
10 eight awarded is 6.3. What is the difference between
11 those two numbers?

12 JULIE CROMER: The difference between the
13 two numbers is that one reflects a number of student
14 athletes versus the amount of scholarship dollars awarded.
15 It's very complicated in 1AA football because they have
16 limits in all three areas. They count the number of --
17 literally the number of players on the sidelines who are
18 receiving aid, as well as calculating the overall amount
19 of aid they're receiving. Not all of those players are
20 receiving full Grants-in-Aid. Some of them might be
21 receiving half a Grant-in-Aid, for example, or the
22 equivalent of half. And they would be reflected as a .5
23 in the equivalency column, rather than a one --

24 OMAR KELLY: Okay.

25 JULIE CROMER: -- in the head count column.

1 OMAR KELLY: Okay. So, for instance, total
2 accountable, so in -- specifically asking about Florida
3 A&M, because this is, I guess, the best basis I can find,
4 they will lose in scholarship 6 points -- the equivalent
5 of 6.3 scholarship athletes in football?

6 JULIE CROMER: The equivalent of 6.3
7 scholarships is the equivalent of 8 overall student
8 athletes.

9 OMAR KELLY: Or 8 overall student athletes.

10 JULIE CROMER: Actually, it's both.

11 OMAR KELLY: Oh, actually both?

12 JULIE CROMER: Yes.

13 OMAR KELLY: So they lose eight student
14 athletes for football and 6.3 scholarships?

15 JULIE CROMER: Yes. But keep in mind, you
16 know, every time you award a student athlete a dollar of
17 aid, that student athlete shows up in both columns. So
18 you would be -- in essence, there's a possibility that
19 across those eight students they lost, 6.3 total
20 scholarships would have been awarded, so it's the same
21 set. Does that make sense?

22 OMAR KELLY: Oh, okay. I think I -- yeah,
23 I think this -- it's trying to make sense. This is
24 probably the most complicated thing I've read in years.

25 JULIE CROMER: It is very complicated.

1 OMAR KELLY: Thank you.

2 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Next question, please.

3 THE OPERATOR: We'll go to Joel Chow, WBNS
4 TV.

5 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: Go ahead.

6 JOEL CHOW: I was wondering how that a
7 former athlete come back help in the adjustments? And how
8 far back can these players be?

9 DR. WALTER HARRISON: Well, you get a bonus
10 point for each student athlete that comes back and
11 graduates. And you can -- that can go back forever. So
12 if you can find a nice 83-year-old person who wants to
13 come back and finish their degree, I suppose you can.

14 I mean, the truth is, I mean, to be quite
15 honest, you're clearly going to be -- usually it's going
16 to be people who graduate -- or who should have graduated
17 a few years ago and have come back and finished. And as
18 Myles said, we want to encourage that behavior.

19 But I personally know of at least one
20 famous student athlete who came back about 25 years after
21 he should have graduated and completed his degree. So I
22 think, you know, it's open to anybody. It's more likely
23 going to be people who should have graduated a few years
24 ago. But for each person who comes back and graduates,
25 you get an extra point.

1 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: We'll go to the next
2 question.

3 THE OPERATOR: We have a follow up from
4 Omar Kelly, South Florida Sun Sentinel.

5 OMAR KELLY: Just addressing that in terms
6 of athletes coming back, now, they aren't allowed to be on
7 scholarship; right? It's just basically they have to pay
8 their own way? Or are they on scholarship?

9 DR. WALTER HARRISON: Well, the school
10 could give them a scholarship, but they can't get an
11 athletic Grant-in-Aid.

12 OMAR KELLY: Okay.

13 DR. WALTER HARRISON: You know, the school
14 might give them an academic scholarship or some other
15 scholarship. And that's up to the institution. But
16 they're not on athletic aid, so that's the key point.

17 OMAR KELLY: Okay.

18 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: We'll go to our next
19 question.

20 THE OPERATOR: And there are no further
21 questions at this time.

22 ERIK CHRISTIANSON: We thank you for
23 joining us today. A reminder that on our web site,
24 NCAA.org is an academic reform web resource page with a
25 lot of helpful information regarding academic reform and

1 APR. Thank you for joining us today.

2 THE OPERATOR: And that does conclude
3 today's conference. Thank you for your participation.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25