

Evaluation of the Self-Study

Accuracy

The University of Colorado, Boulder, self-study report was relatively well written, thorough and documented, with exceptions noted by the NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification in their original analysis. The self-study report covered all essential items, contained reliable and accurate data, reached sound conclusions, and was consistent with peer-review team interviews and analyses. Furthermore, the peer-review team was able to verify that the information contained in the self-study report was consistent with the information gathered through on-campus interviews with university officials.

Institution Response:

No response entered.

Broad-Based Participation in the Self-Study Process

Colorado adhered to the principle of broad-based participation in the self-study process with the exception that the steering committee did not include students, student-athletes, alumni leaders and faculty. This deficiency was not present in the self-study subcommittees that included administration, athletics staff, students, student-athletes, regents and alumni. The subcommittees were truly representative of the campus.

The steering-committee composition was made up of the chancellor, provost, faculty athletics representative, director of athletics, senior woman administrator and all chairs of the various subcommittees.

The on-site work of the peer-review team found that the self-study was made available in draft and final form to the university community for review, comments and reaction on the athletics department Web site. Copies of the draft and final reports were not placed in the library. The steering committee and subcommittees did not appear to actively seek out campus constituency involvement outside the appointed members of the committee and its subcommittees. For example, open discussion sessions were not scheduled for individuals not in the formal self-study process.

Institution Response:

No response entered.

Governance and Commitment to Rules Compliance

1.1 Mission of the Athletics Program and the Institution

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

The CAC did not identify any issues.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

Institution Response to the Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

1.2 Institutional Control, Presidential Authority and Shared Responsibilities

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

The CAC did not identify any issues.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

Institution Response to the Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

1.3 Rules Compliance

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

1. Operating Principle 1.3 stipulates that a clear and unambiguous commitment to rules compliance must be a central element in all personnel matters for individuals involved in the intercollegiate athletics program. In order to demonstrate conformity with this operating principle, an institution must include a statement regarding the importance of rules compliance in all of the following for all administrative staff and coaches inside the athletics department: contracts or letters of appointment, performance evaluations and job descriptions. According to page 26 of your institution's self-study report, "...the Provost informs the Athletics Director and other supervisors, including head coaches and supervisory staff, that they need to include knowledge and application of rules compliance as criteria in annual evaluations of their coaches and staff." However, there was no evidence that a statement regarding the importance of rules compliance was included in the performance evaluations for those administrative staff members inside the athletics department who have rules-compliance responsibilities. Therefore, your institution must demonstrate that a statement regarding the importance of rules compliance is included in the performance evaluations for administrative staff and coaches inside the athletics department.

Institution Response to the Analysis

The inclusion of rules compliance performance in evaluations of administrative and coaching staff members has varied by supervisor within the department. Letters of offer and job descriptions include a statement about compliance with NCAA, conference and institutional rules. Additionally, the department's compliance manual, approved by the Chancellor's Compliance Committee, details every compliance responsibility for department staff, student-athletes, and campus staff with compliance responsibilities.

The Provost's Office will review all annual evaluations of coaches and staff in the athletics department to ensure that knowledge and application of rules of compliance were part of the evaluation criteria. The department has also created a uniform policy and evaluation questionnaire to be used by every supervisor. This procedure includes evaluation of rules compliance efforts and performance [forms available for the Committee or Peer Team review]:

Performance Evaluations and Plans

Every staff member in the Athletics Department will be evaluated by his or her supervisor on at least an annual basis. Evaluations and plans for Classified staff will follow state rules for coaching meetings and evaluations. Performance evaluations and plans for exempt professionals will be conducted either at mid-year or near the end of the spring, as appropriate. All supervisors are encouraged to conduct mid-year coaching sessions at a minimum. Exempt professionals evaluations will use forms approved by the Provost [below]. All evaluations and professional development meetings should include opportunities to discuss the goals of Athletics 2010, including the environment in the department and on-campus for minorities and women, and efforts to comply with university and NCAA rules.

The institution will adjust its Plan for improvement to reflect the implementation of the performance evaluation policy, including evaluation on rules compliance efforts by staff.

Peer-Review Team Report

Does the peer-review team believe that the committee's observation has been addressed? Yes

Rationale to support the Peer-review team's conclusions:

The institution's written response indicated that letters of offer and job descriptions will include a statement about compliance with NCAA, conference and institutional rules. In addition, the department's compliance manual currently details rules-compliance responsibilities for all staff members, student-athletes and campus staff with compliance responsibilities.

The department of athletics has created a uniform policy and evaluation questionnaire to be used by all supervisors. This procedure includes evaluation of rules-compliance efforts and performance. The provost's office will review all annual evaluations to ensure that knowledge and application of rules compliance were part of the evaluation criteria. This will also include any position with compliance responsibilities outside of the department of athletics.

The provost indicated during the interview that he personally followed up with the department of athletics to ensure that the uniform policy and evaluation questionnaires were being used by the appropriate supervisors.

The institution provided the peer-review team with letters of offer and job descriptions that included language about commitment to and performance on compliance issues for all department and campus-wide staff with compliance responsibilities.

Institution Response to the Peer-Review Team Report

None.

2. Operating Principle 1.3 stipulates that a clear and unambiguous commitment to rules compliance must be a central element in all personnel matters for individuals involved in the intercollegiate athletics program. In order to demonstrate conformity to this operating principle, an institution must include a statement regarding the importance of rules compliance in all of the following for all administrative staff outside the athletics department associated with athletics: contracts or letters of appointment, performance evaluations and job descriptions. The committee reviewed page 27 of your self-study report and noted that your institution has recognized the importance of rules compliance for all university staff associated with the athletics department. However, there was no evidence that a statement regarding the importance of rules compliance was included in the contracts or letters of appointment, performance evaluations and job descriptions for those administrative staff members outside the athletics department who have rules-compliance responsibilities. Therefore, your institution must demonstrate that a statement regarding the importance of rules compliance is included in the contracts or letters of appointment, performance evaluations and job descriptions for those administrative staff members outside the athletics department who have assigned rules-compliance responsibilities.

Institution Response to the Analysis

The Provost's Office will review job descriptions for and letters of appointments to directors and staff in the Student Affairs Division, who are involved in rules-compliance activities (which includes certification of eligibility, academic advising, admissions and financial aid), to ensure that the importance of rules of compliance are stated in these documents. In addition, the Provost's Office will review all annual evaluations of directors and staff in Student Affairs, who are involved in rules-compliance activities, to ensure that knowledge and application of rules of compliance were part of the evaluation.

The institution will adjust its Plan for improvement to reflect the implementation of the performance evaluation policy, including evaluation on rules compliance efforts by staff outside the athletics department who have compliance responsibilities. Staff letters of appointment and job descriptions will also include unambiguous language about compliance responsibilities.

Peer-Review Team Report

Does the peer-review team believe that the committee's observation has been addressed? Yes

Rationale to support the Peer-review team's conclusions:

As stated in the institutional response, the university has developed a plan for improvement to include statements regarding the importance of rules compliance in all personnel documents for staff with rules-compliance responsibilities. Also, the provost office will review job descriptions and letters of appointment for those involved in rules-compliance activities to ensure that the importance of rules compliance is stated in the documents. In addition, the provost office will review all annual evaluations to ensure that knowledge and application of rules compliance were part of the annual evaluation.

The peer-review team reviewed letters of appointment, job descriptions and performance evaluations for those administrative staff members outside the athletics department who have been assigned rules-compliance responsibilities. Each of the documents had statements regarding the importance of rules compliance.

Institution Response to the Peer-Review Team Report

None.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

Institution Response to the Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

Academic Integrity

2.1 Academic Standards

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

1. Operating Principle 2.1 requires academic standards and policies applicable to student-athletes to be consistent with those adopted by the institution for the student body in general or the NCAA's standards, whichever are higher. Page 54 of your self-study report describes the process by which student-athletes are admitted and identifies the agencies vested with this responsibility. Specifically, on page 54, your institution states, "The Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) has established a floor of 103 with a window of exceptions for students who fall below that index number based on individual evaluation of each student's case and consideration of other relevant admission factors." Based on that statement, it appears there is a process by which student-athletes can be admitted through a "second-level" or subsequent review process. However, there is no comparison or explanation of the differences between the percentage of freshman student-athletes receiving athletics aid who were admitted through this special admission process and the percentage of freshman students generally who were so admitted. Furthermore, the chart on page 85 of your self-study report is incomplete and does not list the percentages of those students admitted through the special admission process which would enable your institution to compare and explain any differences between the two groups. Therefore, your institution must complete the chart on page 85 and also compare and explain any differences between freshman student-athletes receiving athletics aid and freshman students generally who were admitted through a special admission process.

Institution Response to the Analysis

It was the University's intention to explain that CU-Boulder does not have any "special admission" or "second-level" process for student-athletes and, consequently, the "chart" you've asked us to complete is not applicable.

Here is the University's admissions principle: all students are admitted under a single, unified process.

That single, unified process will have multiple steps for some students, but none of those steps are special for student-athletes' they apply to all applicants where appropriate.

We have prepared a revised version the relevant section on admissions to, hopefully, make the single, unified admissions process clearer.

Please remove from 2.1.5 our response beginning with the sentence, "At CU-Boulder admissions decisions for all students" and ending with the sentence, "whereas student-athlete transfers usually will have until May 15." Substitute all of the following for that material.

At CU-Boulder admissions decisions for all new freshmen are based on multiple criteria: high school grades, quality of high school course work, scores on standardized exams (either the ACT or the SAT), time-dependent trends in academic performance in high school, and other indicators (such as home schooling, G.E.D. equivalency tests, etc.). Admission decisions for new transfer students are based on the same high school criteria as well as academic performance and level of coursework at previous collegiate institutions.

Additional admission consideration may be given but is not limited to the following: students from socio-economically or ethnically underrepresented populations on the Boulder campus; educationally disadvantaged students; first generation students; athletes; nontraditional students; geographically underrepresented students; students with talents in the performing arts; and legacies. Consideration may be given to students who have received academic awards or who have participated in noteworthy extra-curricular activities. Community or work experience can also be given consideration.

Students are admitted to CU-Boulder one of two ways. If the high school and/or college academic credentials are high enough, the student is "automatically admitted" by a computer program that reads the academic data from our student information system. For the fall 2004 term, CU Boulder had 19,280 freshmen applications of which 6,546 were admitted by the computer. The other 12,734 freshmen applications were read and a decision made by a member of the Office of Admissions professional staff.

The admissions staff member can ask for a second opinion on an admission decision where a student's academic record might indicate a need for additional academic assistance if the student is to be admitted. This second opinion can come from the Directors of the McNeil Academic Program, the Minority Engineering Program, the Women in Engineering Program, the Minority Arts and Sciences Program, the Office of Disability Services, the Student Academic Services Center, the Herbst Academic Center for Student Athletes, or the Leeds School of Business McNeill Program to name a few examples. In addition the admission staff has liaisons with all of colleges and schools for consultation on these students as well. For Fall 2004, of the 12,734 applications that were manually read, approximately 1,000 received a second opinion before the admission decision was made.

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education has established an index score that is a linear combination of high school GPA plus ACT or SAT scores. For CU-Boulder, the CCHE has established a floor of 103 with a 'window' of exceptions for students who fall below that index number based on individual evaluation of each student's case and consideration of other relevant admission factors.

For Fall 2004, there were 16,380 new freshmen accepted for admission (including 46 scholarship athletes). Of the new freshmen, 2,239 had a CCHE index below 103 (14%). Fourteen were scholarship student athletes (30%).

Admission procedures are applied to student-athletes in the same way they are applied to all applicants to CU-Boulder. The final decision on admissions rests with the Executive Director of Admissions, Dr. Barbara Schneider.

For potential scholarship student-athletes, the initial interest comes from the coaches of the various sports indicating their potential desire to recruit that individual to CU-Boulder. The coaches provide the Herbst Academic Center for Student Athletes the names and academic transcripts from the student-athlete's high school or transfer institution, as appropriate. The Admissions Office, working with the Herbst Academic Center staff, makes an initial, informal and unofficial assessment of the student's qualifications with respect to CU-Boulder's requirements. If the student's prospects look positive from an academic admissions perspective, the coaches may then proceed with normal recruiting efforts. If the student's situation does not look positive, the relevant coaches will be so informed and, in general, discouraged from recruiting such students. In any case, formal admission does not occur until the student makes formal application to be admitted to the University via standard protocols and the Admissions Office makes a final, binding decision based on the criteria listed in the preceding paragraphs.

An element in the admissions process that may be different for student-athletes as well as certain categories of very highly qualified students is the application deadline. The freshman application deadline is normally February 15. However, applications from student-athletes from certain sports such as track and field and tennis, which have spring seasons or students deciding at the last minute they do not want to attend the service academies, may be accepted on a case-by-case basis throughout the summer. Similarly, transfer students are expected to apply by April 1 but applications after this are considered on a space available basis.

Peer-Review Team Report

Does the peer-review team believe that the committee's observation has been addressed? Yes

Rationale to support the Peer-review team's conclusions:

After reviewing information contained in the institutional response and interviewing the director of admissions, it was clear the institution does not have a special admission policy for student-athletes. The university does have a single, unified process that may include many steps for some students. However, the institution did have a special admission at one time, but discontinued using their "wild card" admission policy in 1999.

Admissions decisions for all new freshman are based on multiple criteria including high-school grades, quality of high-school course work, scores on standardized exams, time-dependent trends in academic performance and other indicators.

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education has established an index score for admissions that is linear in combination of high-school grade-point average and ACT or SAT scores. For Colorado, that index number is 103 with a window of exceptions for those students that fall below that index number. This index number is used for admitting all students to Colorado.

Colorado also uses the predictive grade-point average in the admissions decision process. This is an internal projection of academic success based on a comparison of applicant qualifications with those students in previous years. The predictive grade-point average varies by college due to weighting of grades and the SAT/ACT score. Each student that applies to Colorado is subject to the same process. The director of admissions stated this is the main predictor used in the admission decision process.

When students apply to Colorado, their grade-point average and test scores are placed into a computer program which will determine whether a student is admitted to the institution based on their predictive grade-point average. If the student meets the predictive grade-point average for the institution they have applied to, the student is automatically admitted to Colorado. However, if the student does not meet the projected score, the student will have their file reviewed by an admissions counselor. Last year there were around 20,000 applicants. 6,546 were evaluated and admitted by computer, another 12,734 were manually read by the admissions counselors and approximately 1,000 were reviewed for a second opinion before an admission decision was made.

Admission procedures are applied to student-athletes in the same manner as they are applied to all applicants to Colorado. A final decision on admission rests solely on the executive director of admissions.

Institution Response to the Peer-Review Team Report

None.

2. Operating Principle 2.1 states that if the graduation rate of student-athletes as a whole or for any student-athlete subgroup is significantly lower than that of other student-athletes or comparable student-body groups, this disparity shall be analyzed, explained and addressed (through specific plans for improvement) by appropriate institutional authorities. After reviewing your institution's student-athlete graduation rates on pages 61 and 62 of your self-study report, the committee noted that the average graduation rates for football and men's basketball were below that for male students in general. In addition, the average graduation rate for women's basketball was below that for female students in general. After reviewing your plan for improvement on page 65 of your self-study report, the committee noted a lack of specific steps to achieve the goal of increasing your graduation rates for football and men's basketball. Moreover, there was no explanation for the deficiency in women's basketball student-athlete graduation rates when compared to students generally only that "the women's rate of graduation for basketball fell substantially below the levels for other athletes and for the over-all student body for this time period." Therefore, your institution must create and implement specific steps to achieve your intended end result of graduation rates for football and men's basketball student-athletes being equal to that of your male general student body. Furthermore, your institution must analyze, explain and, if necessary, address (through specific plans for improvement) the deficiency in graduation rates of women's basketball student-athletes. Plans for improvement must contain the following required elements:

- a. Identification of issues or problems;
- b. Measurable goals your institution intends to achieve;
- c. Steps to achieve the goals;
- d. Specific Timetables;
- e. Individuals/offices responsible for carrying out the specific actions; and
- f. Institutional approval.

Institution Response to the Analysis

Our reported itemized and listed multiple specific steps CU-Boulder has implemented to increase the graduation rates of all student-athletes including, but not limited to, football and basketball (men's and women's). Briefly, they include

- (a) Reorganization of the reporting structure of Athletics, so that the Chief Academic Officer of the campus has primary administrative responsibility,
- (b) Reorganization of the Herbst Academic Center to report to the Director of Admissions,
- (c) Addition counseling staff members in the Herbst Academic Center,
- (d) Implementation of a new Life Skills course taught by the Life Skills coordinator,
- (e) Expansion and upgrade of computing facilities in the Dal Ward center for student's academic use, and
- (f) Termination of the so-called "wild-card" admissions program for student-athletes.

The University of Colorado has set, as our graduation goals for student-athletes, graduation rates which are substantially similar to that segment of the student body as a whole, which enters CU-Boulder with similar academic credentials. We believe this is the fairest, most legitimate 'statistical control group' for comparison because of the substantial documentation between graduation success at an institution of higher education and the level of academic preparation at the time of entry. (Further details below). We recognize that on a statistical basis, football and men's basketball players enter CU-Boulder with levels of academic preparation at the lower end of what we admit. We have provided extensive documentation of the academic preparation levels for both student-athletes and non-athletes. The campus provides additional data below, where we compare graduation rates of student-athletes to non-athletes who were admitted to CU but have substantially similar levels of academic preparation (predicted grade point average). We believe that we can realistically improve the men's football and men's basketball rates to match that segment of the non-athlete student body within three or four years by a combination of the steps sketched out above and detailed throughout our report. The "measurable goals" would be substantially similar six-year graduation rates for student-athletes and non-athletes of similar academic preparation.

As indicated for football, men's basketball and, especially, women's basketball standard graduation rate calculations, as shown below, can be strongly influenced by transfers of students who were in academic good standing. The issues there do not directly reflect weaknesses in academic preparation, performance or progress, but relate mostly to outside factors such as home sickness, preference for a different coaching style, etc.

The women's basketball program stands as a prime example of where the graduation rates are actually dominated by transfers, not academic issues.

As we said in the original report, those primarily responsible for overseeing efforts to improve our graduation rates include the Chancellor, the Provost, the Athletics Director, the Director of the Herbst Academic Center, the coaches, the faculty and, of course, the students themselves.

This report has been approved by the NCAA Certification Steering Committee, which constitutes institutional approval.

Graduation Data

We here present a further tabulation of recent graduation patterns, which also include an accounting of students who transferred to other universities or otherwise left CU-Boulder in good academic standing. Following the table labeled Graduation Rates for student-athletes, entering fall 1997 by end of summer, 2003 insert the following section:

2004 NCAA Graduate Rates Survey Analysis

The University of Colorado at Boulder

January, 2005; Mark Nelson

Total Number of Entering Freshman on Athletics Aid in 1997-98 = 56

Total Number of Entering Freshman on Athletics Aid in 1997-98 Graduated Within Six-Years = 27 (48%)

Total Number of Entering Freshman on Athletics Aid in 1997-98 who Transferred and/or Separated from the Respective Sport = 21 (38%)

Total Number of Entering Freshman on Athletics Aid in 1997-98 who Exhausted their Eligibility at CU (35) and Graduated (27) = 77%

Graduation Rates of Those Exhausting Eligibility from 1988-89 through 1997-98 = 83%

Sport-by-Sport Breakdown:

Men's Basketball

Number in Cohort = 5

Graduated = 2 (40%)

Transferred = 3

Left in Good Academic Standing = 3

Women's Basketball

Number in Cohort = 6

Graduated = 1 (17%)

Transferred = 5

Left in Good Academic Standing = 5

Football

Number in Cohort = 18

Graduated = 8 (44%)

Transferred = 3

Left or Exhausted Eligibility in Good Academic Standing = 7 (2 active in the NFL)

Left or Exhausted Eligibility in Poor Academic Standing = 3

Men's Golf

Number in Cohort = 4
Graduated = 2 (50%)
Transferred or Separated from Team = 2
Left in Good Academic Standing = 1
Left in Poor Academic Standing = 1

Women's Golf

Number in Cohort = 3
Graduated = 2 (67%)
Transferred = 1
Left in Good Academic Standing = 1

Men's Skiing

Number in Cohort = 2
Graduated = 1 (50%)
Transferred = 1
Left in Good Academic Standing = 1

Women's Skiing

Number in Cohort = 1
Graduated = 1 (100%)

Women's Soccer

Number in Cohort = 6
Graduated = 4 (67%)
Transferred = 2
Left in Good Academic Standing = 2

Men's Tennis

Number in Cohort = 1
Graduated = 0 (0%)
Separated from Team in Good Academic Standing and Still Enrolled at CU = 1

Men's Track & Field

Number in Cohort = 5
Graduated = 3 (60%)
Transferred = 2
Left in Good Academic Standing = 2

Women's Track & Field

Number in Cohort = 4
Graduated = 2 (50%)
Transferred = 2
Left in Good Academic Standing = 2

Women's Volleyball

Number in Cohort = 1
Graduated = 1 (100%)

Please insert the paragraph below immediately following the paragraph that follows Table 2 and ends with the following the sentence: "the proportion of athletes declines steadily with increasing levels of academic preparation."

We conclude from these analyses that a higher proportion of student-athletes come to CU-Boulder with substantially lower levels of academic preparation than the student body as a whole. However, we note that our general campus recruiting efforts aim to attract some students to CU with other skills, qualifications, attributes which can contribute to the intellectual, ethnic, cultural, and geographic diversity of our campus although they may comprise a statistically larger share of those admitted with comparatively lower levels of academic preparation. With respect to student-athletes, our campus goal is to retain and graduate those athletes at rates roughly equal to those for the rest of the student body who come in with similar levels of academic preparation. For example, Table 2 immediately above, shows that we admitted 27 students who were not on athletic scholarships and 23 students who were, all of which had a predicted grade point average less than 2.0. Our campus goal is to have those two categories of students graduate at substantially similar rates. We believe this is a fairer, more precise graduation rate comparison than comparing, for example, graduation rates of football players to the student body as a whole.

Insert the following in section 2.1.11 immediately after the paragraph that ends "leave school even if in good academic standing."

We here state that our explicit graduation rate goals for student-athletes are that they match the general student population arriving at CU with comparable levels of academic preparation (see Table 5 above). We next provide exemplary figures for three years of data which illustrate that goal (based on predicted grade point average). The absolute number of individuals in these lowest PGPA strata will always be small so caution in interpreting patterns is always recommended. To improve student-athlete graduate rates to match their counterparts, the athletic programs need to improve graduation rates in this segment of students around 5 to 6%, a goal we think realistic and achievable over the next three or four years. The primary responsibility for achieving this improvement lies with the Herbst Academic Center, the Athletics Director's office and the Office of the Chancellor.

Percent of new freshmen who entered during fall of 96 or 97 or 98 combined and graduated in 6 years or less and who fit into the two lowest strata of predicted grade point average.

Population with predicted GPA < 2.0

Category N Mean percent graduating

—

Non-athlete 37 38%

Athlete 14 36%

—

Population with predicted GPA < 2.2

Category N Mean percent graduating

—

Non-athlete 153 42%

Athlete 35 40%

Peer-Review Team Report

Does the peer-review team believe that the committee's observation has been addressed? No

Rationale to support the Peer-review team's conclusions:

After reviewing the institutional response, it has been determined that Colorado has implemented several steps to increase the graduation rates of football and men and women's basketball. However, the institution does not have a stand-alone plan to help increase the graduation rates of these teams when compared to students generally.

The institution provided the following steps:

- (a) Reorganization of the reporting structure of athletics so that the chief academic officer of the campus has primary administrative responsibility;
- (b) Reorganization of the Herbst Academic Center to report to the director of admissions;
- (c) Additional counseling staff members in the Herbst Academic Center;
- (d) Implementation of a new life skills course taught by the life skills coordinator;
- (e) Expansion and upgrading of computing facilities in the Dal Ward Center for students academic use; and
- (f) Termination of the so-called "wild-card" admissions program for student-athletes.

While these steps may help assist in increasing graduation rates, there was no stand-alone plan available for review to determine whether or not the institution has a plan in place to assist in achieving the actual goal. During interviews with committee members, it was confirmed a plan was not in place to assist in meeting this goal.

Institution Response to the Peer-Review Team Report

The University of Colorado at Boulder shares the NCAA concerns about the past graduation rates of student-athletes in our football and basketball programs. In preparing this response to NCAA queries, the Chair of the Academic Integrity subcommittee has taken the lead in writing draft responses, which were then presented to all members of the subcommittee. The subcommittee's draft work was also reviewed and endorsed by members of the newly-formed Academic Policy Board for Athletics, composed of faculty, staff and students. Following revisions and emendations, the subcommittee's consensus recommendations were submitted, as draft, to the Chair of the NCAA Certification Committee, Vice Chancellor Stump. Following another round of review, the response was approved by the Chancellor and submitted to the Certification writer and copied to all subcommittee members.

A reasonable, honest, realistic and achievable academic goal for the graduation rates of our student-athletes is for them to graduate at the same rate or higher rate than other students admitted to the campus with similar levels of academic preparation. We know that academic preparation levels, incorporated into our Predicted Grade Point Average value, calculated for all incoming students, constitute a powerful influence on academic performance in general and graduation rates in particular. Consequently, we think it appropriate to expect our student-athletes to meet or exceed the graduation rates of the rest of the student body, stratified by comparable levels of preparation. We will continuously measure and monitor this comparison strategy as we employ this method for all incoming students.

We have taken several concrete steps to improve graduation rates and are optimistic those efforts will prove effective.

In conclusion, as can be seen from this list of enhancements we will make and have already made, we have a very serious commitment to assisting and supporting our student-athletes in their academic endeavors. However, we have not chosen to construct a stand-alone system for (only) football and basketball players. We describe our reasons and rationales below.

The University of Colorado at Boulder believes there are very strong and distinct advantages to investing our resources into a fully integrated, cohesive academic support program for our student-athletes. In particular, we note:

(1) the positive influence that student-athletes who are academically successful (and that includes most of our student-athletes) can have on their peers in other sports who may still be trying to learn how to be academically successful

(2) the high risk of inappropriate stigmatization of certain groups and individuals by administratively highlighting, isolating and making conspicuous their potential academic difficulties, implicitly

(3) the general strategy of divisiveness (segregation even) which would occur if some student-athletes were shunted off into a specially tailored program, with differential treatment and support, from other student-athletes which would go against our view that greater integration and connectedness among student-athletes as well as between student-athletes and the rest of the student body is the direction likely to be most productive in the long run

and

(4) the over-tones of racial bias which could well be accentuated by implementing a 'stand-alone' plan for football and basketball players which employed the strategy of a special program just for them

For CU-Boulder's situation, we respectfully but firmly assert that we should invest all available academic support resources into a fully integrated academic support program for all our student-athletes which encourages interaction, inter-mingling and lots of contact between students from all our sports programs (and other students, as well). As we reported earlier, we have substantially increased our investments in these areas and are optimistic they will be of ever greater assistance to the academic success of all our student-athletes.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

Institution Response to the Opportunities for Enhancement

Elements		Steps		
Issues in the Self-Study	Measureable Goals	Steps to Achieve Goals	Individuals/Officers Responsible for Implementation	Specific Timetable for Completing the Work
Concerns about the past graduation rates of student-athletes in our football and basketball programs.	A reasonable, honest, realistic and achievable academic goal for the graduation rates of our student-athletes is for them to graduate at the same rate or higher rate than other students admitted to the campus with similar levels of academic preparation.	We have reorganized our academic support program (Herbst Academic Center) in such a way that the Director of the Herbst Center now reports directly to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and indirectly reports to the Director Admissions. The purpose of this re-alignment is to better integrate and connect the process of recruiting student-athletes to the process of recruiting all other students. We aim for a unified process with a single set of academic rules and criteria.	Vice Chancellor/Director of Admissions	Completed 2004-05
		Expand the physical space facilities for the Herbst Academic Center in order to better serve our student-athletes. In particular, we have expanded to 2,400 sq. ft. making room for: *A computer laboratory with 30 computers *A classroom for tutoring that includes an additional 5 computers *Office space for 10 staff members *The Varsity Room includes individual study nooks, each equipped with a desktop computer, and provides a quiet study and tutorial space throughout the day *A reference library with more than 800 sources	Assistant AD for Student Services	Spring 2005
		Hire a new full-time person who holds the title of 'Life Skills Coordinator' who teaches a new, required, formal course in areas of special interest to student-athletes taking into consideration their special circumstances in the CU Boulder campus. In addition, this person counsels students individually in helping them make the transition to college life with a much higher degree of individual responsibility and autonomy than many have experienced before.	Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Asst AD for Student Services	Completed 2004-05
		Add counseling staff and every student-athlete is assigned an individual counselor to support, assist and guide them through the issues necessary for successful adjust to CU-Boulder and, ultimately, to successful accomplishment of their degree goals. We now have four full time counseling staff in addition to the H.A.C. Director position	Assistant AD for Student Services	Completed 2004-05

Elements		Steps		
Issues in the Self-Study	Measureable Goals	Steps to Achieve Goals	Individuals/Officers Responsible for Implementation	Specific Timetable for Completing the Work
		Student-athletes are required to sign a contract outlining their obligation to the program and need to be aware that any concerns and/or problems with their academic progress may be shared with their respective head coach. It is the aim of this program that all student-athletes will work honestly and diligently to improve their academic standing as student-athletes at the University of Colorado	Assistant AD for Student Services.	2004-2005 and ongoing.
		We have increased the financial commitment to our H.A.C., especially over the last 2-4 years and we anticipate significant gains in the academic measures for our student-athletes. We reported these details in our main submission in sections 2.1.2 and in 2.1.3, Academic Connections.	Athletic Department and Student Affairs.	Completed.
		Established a faculty Academic Policy Board and they are now beginning their work with especial interest in student-athletes' academic performances.	Faculty Athletics Representative	Completed 2004-05.
Edit element to input the issue.	Develop a Faculty Mentor Program that will begin in the fall semester of 2005. This program is designed to bridge the gap between the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics and the campus faculty by involving faculty members in most facets of our athletics teams. They will serve as academic mentors, as well as a faculty resource to the HAC staff, coaches and student-athletes by offering their insight into the academic performance of each student-athlete and overall team goals related to academic success.	The Faculty Mentor Program will be advertised to all faculty this spring, interviewed and selected over the course of the upcoming summer by a group consisting of input from the HAC staff, Director of Athletics, Head Coach and student-athletes.	Herbst Academic Center (HAC) and the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics	Fall 2005

2.2 Academic Support

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

The CAC did not identify any issues.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

Institution Response to the Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

2.3 Scheduling

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

1. Operating Principle 2.3 requires institutions to demonstrate that written policies are established in all sports to minimize student-athletes' conflicts with class time and/or final examination periods due to participation in intercollegiate athletics, consistent with the provisions of NCAA Constitution 3.2.4.12. In order to demonstrate conformity with this operating principle, your institution must clearly communicate these policies to student-athletes and staff. The committee reviewed pages 79 and 80 of your self-study report and was unclear as to how the policies regarding missed class time are communicated to student-athletes (e.g., published in the institution's student-athlete handbook, published in the appropriate faculty/staff manual, discussed during team meetings). Therefore, your institution must provide evidence that written policies established in all sports to minimize student-athletes' conflicts with class time and/or final examination periods due to participation in intercollegiate athletics are clearly communicated to student-athletes and staff.

Institution Response to the Analysis

Insert this additional paragraph as the last one within section 2.3.2 immediately following the sentence "tuition if the student is on scholarship."

These policies are communicated to our student athletes in several ways.: (1) it is included on page 21 of the student-athlete handbook that each recruit and student-athlete receive from our office, (2) the Herbst staff discusses this process with each team at the beginning of the school year in a team meeting and (3) they explain the process to each student-athlete when they come to their office to receive their "class absence" letter at the beginning of each semester.

Peer-Review Team Report

Does the peer-review team believe that the committee's observation has been addressed? Yes

Rationale to support the Peer-review team's conclusions:

The institution presented evidence that policies regarding missed class time are communicated through the student-athlete handbook (located on page 21). The academic services staff discusses the process with each team at the beginning of school in team meetings. They reinforce the process with student-athletes individually when they come to the academic services office to receive their class absence letter at the beginning of each semester.

The director of academic support services confirmed the missed class process during the interview. Counselors are responsible for assisting their respective teams with missed classes. In addition to the normal procedure, counselors assist the student-athletes with a reminder e-mail to their student-athletes a week or two prior to competition and travel. This was confirmed during the meeting with the student-athlete advisory committee representatives. The student-athlete advisory committee representatives believed their academic counselors did an outstanding job in assisting them with communicating missed class time to their professors.

Institution Response to the Peer-Review Team Report

None.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

The peer-review team suggests that a policy be put in place to assist all students with missed classes. There does not seem to be any real policy to assist students for excused, missed class time. Some students seemed to be penalized for missed class, whether it is excused or not.

Institution Response to the Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

Fiscal Integrity

3.1 Financial Practices

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

The CAC did not identify any issues.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

Institution Response to the Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

3.2 Fiscal Management and Stability

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

The CAC did not identify any issues.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

Institution Response to the Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

3.3 Established Fiscal Policies and Procedures

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

The CAC did not identify any issues.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

Institution Response to the Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

Equity, Welfare and Sportsmanship

4.1 Gender Issues

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

1. Operating Principle 4.1 requires an institution to formally adopt a written plan for the future for the intercollegiate athletics program that ensures the institution maintains a program, or continues progress toward a program, which is equitable for both genders. Further, institutional plans for improvement must be written, stand-alone documents that are developed with broad-based participation and contain the following minimum required elements:

- a. Identification of issues or problems;
- b. Measurable goals the institution intends to achieve;
- c. Steps to achieve the goals;
- d. Specific timetables;
- e. Individuals/offices responsible for carrying out the specific actions; and
- f. Institutional approval.

In addition, institutions must have an active gender-equity plan at all times. Lastly, the gender-equity plan must extend five years into the future and address each of the 13 program areas to be reviewed for gender issues. The committee reviewed your institution's gender-equity plan located in the supplemental information and determined that while all 13 program areas are addressed with issues identified, the committee determined that your institution did not resolve these issues through measurable goals with steps to achieve these goals. For example, your institution noted deficiencies in several program areas, including, but not limited to: facilities, locker rooms and support services for several men's and women's sports; however, there appeared to be a lack of measurable goals for each issue identified. Furthermore, the steps to achieve the goals do not appear to address any of the issues identified. Therefore, your institution must provide evidence demonstrating the revision of its current gender-equity plan to ensure that the plan contains all of the required elements, specifically that all issues identified have measurable goals and steps to achieve those goals.

Institution Response to the Analysis

The University of Colorado, through its campus committee for Gender Equity Certification, has added the following information to its five-year gender equity plan. The University is also revising its excel chart for the 13 program-areas of gender equity review to add a column for "Goals." CU will shift items currently indicated as issues to address from the current status and steps columns to more clearly define its goals for the next five years.

Equipment: Add under Steps, first item regarding the Nike contract: "Continue to" evaluate...

Scheduling:

Current Status: Discussions exploring an indoor practice facility for tennis and indoor driving range golf are ongoing with the campus and local developers, both as it relates to CU's South Campus property and to other campus and community sites.

Goal: Identify at least an interim site for tennis and develop a funding plan by 2009. Identify project costs and funding sources for a golf facility by 2007.

Travel:

Steps To Achieve: Create (and evaluate results) an all-sports survey based on 2004-05 and 2005-06 travel by teams: road schedule; distances traveled to each site; number of travel days; number of missed class days.

Responsible: Gender Equity subcommittee.

Explore the cost of a single provider of charters needed sports vs. a sport-by-sport negotiation for best lease rates - Business Office will be responsible.

Timetable: Change to 2006-07 (for current budgetary restrictions and results from the above survey)

Tutors: Add a comment under Current Status - summer school - that women are being given priority for use of the Student-Athlete Opportunity Fund summer school allocation. In the summer of 2004, women received \$20,452.38 of the \$20,721.22 SAOF summer school funds. Add under steps - continue to provide greater summer school support for female athletes through the SAOF with an ongoing timetable. Responsibility rests with the SWA.

Lockerrooms:

Steps To Achieve: Take advantage of the delay in the addition of bleachers to Potts Field (track), to explore the cost and a feasibility study of a combined bleachers/locker facility which would affect five teams (track and field, soccer, skiing), 233 student-athletes (125 female) by spring 2006.

Responsibility: Facilities Committee.

Carlson Gym lockerroom remodels have been added to the most recent Facilities Capital Projects Listings, which would affect seven teams (volleyball, track and field, cross country), 225 student-athletes (115 female). The Gender Equity Committee recommends high priority. Responsibility: Facilities Committee.

Immediately pursue funding for either/both projects: Foundation.

Continue to monitor CU-South Campus development discussions between the city of Boulder and campus. An eventual development approval would include lockerroom facilities for seven teams (men's and women's tennis, track and field, cross country, soccer), 261 student-athletes (142 female). [student athlete numbers are based on 2003-04 EADA participation figures]

The Certification Committee for Gender Equity adds the following as explanation to the Peer Team: the South Campus has been identified as the future site of varsity athletics and recreational facilities for CU students. The campus is in ongoing discussions with the City and County of Boulder about the timeline for development, flood plain analysis and impact studies. Until these discussions conclude, facilities projects on South Campus will be limited. Because the campus goal is to place several facilities there, some facilities projects in the meantime must be intermediate fixes of current problems.

Housing/Dining: Prioritize the return of tennis and golf back into training table by 2007-08.

Support Services: Under golf and tennis - delete the "staffing is inadequate" comment and change the computer equipment comment to women's golf and tennis coaches received computer upgrades to their office equipment prior to the 2004-05 academic year.

Correct the 2.75 FTE comments for soccer; the correct number is .50 FTE.

Track and field and ski team office remodels are currently part of the Facility's Committee Capital Projects Listing. Updated furniture is a priority.

Medical Services: Through annual student-athlete exit surveys, continue to monitor and correct any perceptions of football players having preferential treatment and entitlement to services. That is an ongoing project.

Gender Equity Survey - A new Professional Development policy has been implemented requiring time off for every employee to attend a single training each year. A new Performance Evaluation policy is in place with standard questions about gender equity climate, professional development and career goals with mid-year evaluations encouraged to assist staff improve their performances over the remainder of the fiscal year.

The sub-committee is currently developing professional development surveys for both staff and student-athletes to be completed by the summer of 2005 and distributed the following fall.

Peer-Review Team Report

Does the peer-review team believe that the committee's observation has been addressed? Yes

Rationale to support the Peer-review team's conclusions:

Colorado has complied with the above stated requirements by developing a revised written stand-alone gender-equity plan that analyzes 11 of 13 program areas. However, there is a separate category for athletics scholarships in the plan. This program area is addressed in the self-study report and the university stated that the United States Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights has found the institution in compliance. Similarly, the stand-alone plan does not specifically include a section focusing on accommodation of interests and abilities. Although this program area is addressed on pages 98 and 99 of the self-study report, it should be included in the plan. The plan identifies deficiencies, the manner in which they are proposed to be corrected and those individuals assigned responsibility for addressing them over the next five years.

The plan also sets forth the steps the institution believes will be necessary to undertake. The revised plan should be clearly labeled "Gender-Equity Plan 2005-10" and each program area and page of the plan identified by number to enhance the plan's presentation.

The revised plan addresses shortcomings previously identified in the institution's own analysis, but found by the Committee on Athletics Certification to be insufficiently addressed. The Committee on Athletics Certification's comments centered on the observation that the original plan identified deficiencies, but did not present corresponding goals and steps to achieve their correction.

The Committee on Athletics Certification evaluation noted, by way of example, deficiencies in the areas of facilities (particularly locker facilities) and support services. The revised plan now sets forth goals for the improvement of track, cross country, volleyball, soccer and skiing locker rooms. It also addresses other facilities, including the development of a multipurpose fieldhouse on the institution's south campus and a remodel/expansion of the Coors Event/Conference Center, both targeted for 2010. The campus process involving the facilities committee, the continuation of negotiations with the city of Boulder for the development of the south campus and plans to engage in fundraising to support these projects are identified. In the area of support services, the revised plan provides for increasing funds available through fundraising for all sports to enhance their administrative staffing capacity and to assign priority to upgrading the office furniture for skiing and track.

The institution's commitment to undertake these steps was confirmed by on-campus interviews with members of the gender-equity subcommittee, an associate director of athletics, the interim director and the interim chancellor. A consultant has been hired to assist in increasing revenue through higher attendance at events, the licensing of radio rights and sponsorships, the sale of premium "sky box" tickets and other marketing activities. The need to enhance fundraising is broadly recognized and is a part of the department of intercollegiate athletics "Athletics 2010" long-range plans. This long-range plan is intended to compliment the institution's overall long-range plan.

Additional program areas, however, were also identified in which the institution wishes to improve. In some of these areas the institution has been notified by the Office of Civil Rights that it is already in compliance with legal requirements. These areas are: travel and per diem, summer school accessibility, coaches, medical and training facilities, dining facilities and recruitment. These areas are on pages 101 through 104 and 108 respectively of the institution's self-study report. The institution has included goals, steps and potential funding sources in the revised plan to address each of these issues. Additional information for a number of these areas was provided in on-campus interviews by an associate director, including: 1) additional potential sources of funding for summer school attendance; 2) adjusting scheduling patterns in treatment facilities to deal with heavy usage by the football team; 3) potential use of student opportunity funds to support wider availability of training tables; 4) consideration of the establishment of an eating facility in the department of intercollegiate athletics (open to all students) to meet training table needs; and 5) identification of funds in the director's control to assist in the recruitment of female student-athletes in extraordinary circumstances.

Institution Response to the Peer-Review Team Report

None.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

Colorado has established a number of committees and subcommittees to deal with gender, diversity and student-welfare issues. The interrelationship of these entities was not entirely clear to the reviewer; however, the end result appeared to satisfactorily address all major issues. Should the institution maintain this committee structure, a flow chart or matrix would facilitate future reviews.

Institution Response to the Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

Elements		Steps		
Issues in the Self-Study	Measureable Goals	Steps to Achieve Goals	Individuals/Officers Responsible for Implementation	Specific Timetable for Completing the Work
Athletics Scholarships.Edit element to input the issue.	Edit element to input the goal.	Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
		Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
Accommodation of Interests and Abilities.Edit element to input the issue.	Edit element to input the goal.	Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
		Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
Equipment and Supplies.Edit element to input the issue.	Edit element to input the goal.	Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
		Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
Scheduling of Games and Practice Time.Edit element to input the issue.	Edit element to input the goal.	Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
		Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
Travel and Per Diem Allowance.Edit element to input the issue.	Edit element to input the goal.	Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
		Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
Tutors.Edit element to input the issue.	Edit element to input the goal.	Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
		Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
Coaches.Edit element to input the issue.	Edit element to input the goal.	Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
		Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
Locker Rooms, Practice and Competitive Facilities.Edit element to input the issue.	Edit element to input the goal.	Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
		Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
Medical and Training Facilities and Services.Edit element to input the issue.	Edit element to input the goal.	Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
		Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
Housing and Dining Facilities and Services.Edit element to input the issue.	Edit element to input the goal.	Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
		Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.

Elements		Steps		
Issues in the Self-Study	Measureable Goals	Steps to Achieve Goals	Individuals/Officers Responsible for Implementation	Specific Timetable for Completing the Work
Publicity.Edit element to input the issue.	Edit element to input the goal.	Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
		Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
Support Services.Edit element to input the issue.	Edit element to input the goal.	Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
		Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
Recruitment of Student-Athletes.Edit element to input the issue.	Edit element to input the goal.	Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.
		Edit step to input the step to achieve goal.	Edit step to input responsibility.	Edit step to input step's timetable.

4.2 Minority Issues

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

The CAC did not identify any issues.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

Institution Response to the Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

4.3 Student-Athlete Welfare

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

The CAC did not identify any issues.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

Institution Response to the Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

4.4 Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

The CAC did not identify any issues.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

Institution Response to the Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

Individuals Interviewed on Campus

Name	Title
Barry, Ceal	head women's basketball coach
Burianek, Jon	senior associate director of athletics facilities development and business affairs
Clough, David	engineering
DiStefano, Phil	interim chancellor/faculty athletics representative
Diggle, Pam	museum associate curator and professor, biology
Duncan, Cal	chairman and associate professor, Leeds School of Business
Finn, Moe	director of football operations
Grant, Mike	associate vice chancellor, academic affairs
Hale, Pauline	executive director, university communications
Hansburg, David	associate vice chancellor, student affairs
Hoch, Hannah	women's golf
Hutmacher, Cortney	women's track and field
Kaempfer, Bill	associate vice chancellor, academic affairs and professor
Kelley, Anne	head women's golf coach
Kenneally, Nicole	head women's tennis coach
Koeltzow, Tara	tri-student body president
Koth, Lindsay	women's golf
Lengyel, Jack	interim director of athletics
Manning, Julie	monitoring coordinator, compliance
May, Chris	special assistant, internal affairs/business office
Morrison, Karen	associate director of athletics/senior woman administrator
Neguse, Joe	tri-student body president
Newlands, Carly	women's track and field
Patton, Ricardo	head men's basketball coach
Porecca, Ric	vice chancellor budget, planning and analysis
Rokos, Richard	head skiing coach
Schneider, Barb	executive director of admissions
Stanton, Garrett	associate chair and professor, chemical and biological
Steinhauer, Peter	regent
Sterling, Nick	skiing
Wetmore, Mark	head track and field coach
Winterbotham, Sam	head men's tennis coach
Yoshinaga-Itano, Christine	vice chancellor for diversity and equity
Zimmerman, Austin	women's volleyball

Institutional Records Reviewed on Campus

Records Reviewed
Big 12 compliance reviews of the department of athletics
Office of Civil Rights review
compliance manual
documentation related to conference involvement in reviewing the rules-compliance program
equity in athletics disclosure act forms
exit interviews
facility schedules
information regarding academic performance of sport teams
job descriptions, letters of appointment/contract and performance evaluations for athletics staff and individuals outside the athletics department with compliance responsibilities
major infractions case 2002
media guides
organizational chart
policies and procedures for the department of athletics
published policies of the governing board
regents committee on athletics
regents policies
secondary-rules violations over the last year
squad lists
steering committee minutes
student-athlete eligibility forms
student-athlete handbook
subcommittee minutes