

A white metal bench is positioned on a green artificial turf field. The bench is in the foreground, and the background is a vast expanse of the same turf. The top portion of the image is a solid blue horizontal band containing white text.

# THE STUDENT-ATHLETE, ACADEMIC INTEGRITY, and INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

**ACE**<sup>®</sup> American  
Council on  
Education<sup>®</sup>  
*Leadership and Advocacy*



*This report was produced by the Division of Government and Public Affairs and the Office of the General Counsel at the American Council on Education. University of Georgia Professor David Welch Suggs Jr. also contributed.*



ACE and the American Council on Education are registered marks of the American Council on Education and may not be used or reproduced without the express written permission of ACE.

American Council on Education  
One Dupont Circle NW  
Washington, DC 20036

© 2016. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

## Introduction

In April 2016, the American Council on Education (ACE) convened a diverse group of college and university presidents, athletic directors, and other campus and other higher education leaders for a Roundtable discussion focused on ensuring that intercollegiate athletes have legitimate and meaningful opportunities to be *student-athletes* at their respective institutions. The discussion settled firmly on a shared perspective that:

- Intercollegiate athletics programs at all levels must respect the primacy of the academic enterprise and remain firmly grounded in it.
- Intercollegiate athletics provides a significant educational opportunity when aligned with the mission of the institution.
- Institutions must enable their student-athletes to have access to the same range and quality of academic pursuits as other students.
- Academic integrity cannot be compromised by our colleges and universities, or by members of their campus communities.

The meeting was held at the request of the ACE Board of Directors, which comprises a group of college and university presidents and chancellors from across the spectrum of American higher education institutions, and whose concern was sparked by much-publicized incidents of student academic fraud involving intercollegiate athletics. The ACE Board asked Council staff to undertake discussions last year with a wide array of campus and athletic leaders and others regarding the proper role of athletics in a campus environment where academic integrity and a well-rounded student experience are the top institutional priorities. The results of these discussions suggested to the ACE Board the value of convening a Roundtable to identify and analyze the challenges and complexities associated with providing and maintaining a robust intercollegiate athletics program in an environment that embraces and respects the primacy of the academic mission, and to make recommendations for ensuring a proper balance between the two. In addition to optimizing the student-athlete experience, this could help colleges and universities—as well as their student-athletes—avoid fraud and misconduct that can derail academic (and athletic) progress, bring dishonor to institutions (and their teams, coaches, and student-athletes), and call into question the value and vitality of intercollegiate sports.

The rich conversation at the April 22, 2016 ACE Roundtable: “The Student-Athlete, Academic Integrity, and Intercollegiate Athletics” forms the basis for this paper, which is intended to frame these issues and provide ideas for college and university presidents and chancellors about how to oversee intercollegiate athletics and ensure that an institution's athletics culture is in full alignment with its primary mission and academic values. In particular, the Roundtable participants concluded that certain best practices should be developed and widely disseminated.<sup>1</sup>

The best practices in this document are based on the following key themes:

- **A culture of integrity**—A healthy intercollegiate athletics program requires that all members of the campus community—trustees, presidents, faculty, athletic directors, administration, coaches, staff, students,

---

<sup>1</sup> There have been other efforts to address best practices. For example, see this 2013 report from the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics, which is more specific to practitioners in the area of academic advising of student-athletes: [http://grfx.cstv.com/photos/schools/nacda/sports/nfoura/auto\\_pdf/2013-14/misc\\_non\\_event/N4AAcademicIntegrity.pdf](http://grfx.cstv.com/photos/schools/nacda/sports/nfoura/auto_pdf/2013-14/misc_non_event/N4AAcademicIntegrity.pdf).

and student-athletes themselves—understand the importance of academic integrity and the primacy of the academic experience for student-athletes.

- **Integration**—Intercollegiate athletics can provide significant and memorable opportunities for shared experiences, not just for the student-athletes, but for the entire institutional community. As an integral part of the fabric of a college or university, athletics should not be siloed and managed in a way that ignores its integration in and support of the academic mission of the institution.
- **Management of risk**—Campus leaders’ attentiveness to athletics within an institution’s overall enterprise risk management structure is prudent and sensible. Intercollegiate athletics is a high-reward area for institutions and students alike, but with those rewards also come potential risks. Without proper supervision, athletics can be overlooked in institutional risk management efforts and should be monitored on an ongoing basis.

## Context

The overwhelming majority of America’s intercollegiate athletics programs provide student-athletes with a life-changing experience during their time on campus. In many instances, graduation rates of student-athletes are higher than those of their student peers across every demographic group, and a recent national survey found that among college alumni, higher rates of former student-athletes are succeeding in terms of having a sense of purpose; having the support of strong social networks; being true members of a community; and having good physical health.<sup>2</sup>

There is an appropriate place for intercollegiate athletics within a college or university setting, but only as long as it is guided and managed by the values that steer the entire academic enterprise. While intercollegiate athletics can be an enormously positive experience for student-athletes and an asset to most institutions, it can also present a unique set of challenges for campus leaders. If administrators, head coaches, athletic directors, other athletic staff, and faculty and staff across the entire campus do not respect, support, and indeed, contribute to the education of student-athletes, and help maintain the core academic mission within a culture of integrity, the enterprise does not belong on a college campus.

Maintaining a successful athletics program requires balancing two key interests: the academic and personal outcomes for individual student-athletes and the collective purpose that athletics provide for the institution and community. Depending on the size of the institution, those purposes can take many forms. At small colleges, a quarter or even a half of the student body might play sports, making varsity programs an important recruitment and enrollment strategy.<sup>3</sup> At colleges and universities with higher-profile programs, spectator sports create a culture that attracts students and energizes a broad swath of the campus community, including students, alumni, fans, donors, and civic supporters.<sup>4</sup>

However, excessive pressures to win exist and are felt at all levels of competition. Coaching football, men’s

---

<sup>2</sup> Gallup, Inc. 2016. *Understanding Life Outcomes of Former NCAA Student-Athletes*. <http://www.gallup.com/services/189056/understanding-life-outcomes-former-ncaa-student-athletes.aspx>.

<sup>3</sup> Shulman, James L., and William G. Bowen. 2001. *The Game of Life: College Sports and Educational Values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

<sup>4</sup> Clotfelter, Charles T. 2011. *Big-Time Sports in American Universities*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

and women's basketball, or other high-profile sports is a high-risk, high-reward profession. Olympic and other lower-profile sports are often influenced by the culture of big-time sports. At many colleges and universities, the pressure comes from parents, alumni, and students—and often from the student-athletes themselves.

Presidents and chancellors can find themselves in challenging positions. The performance of intercollegiate teams can be of utmost importance to donors, community leaders, students, and other constituent groups. Yet often campus leaders do not ascend to the highest levels of institutional leadership with direct experience in athletics, particularly if they come from careers in education, research, medicine, or business. Nonetheless, ACE, along with organizations such as the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics, has emphasized the unique opportunity for presidents to be the ultimate force for accountability and integrity in intercollegiate athletics, in light of their leadership role in shaping and maintaining academic mission and institutional integrity.

Under the direction and authority of the president, there is also an important campus network of individuals who shape the academic experiences of student-athletes and create a supportive environment that enables their success. It is vital that the values and interests of this network—coaches, counselors, faculty, and others—are aligned with the institution's core mission and values.

In summary, intercollegiate athletics can enhance the life of a college or university. Games and events can be important touchstones for a campus community and its identity. The experience of managing academic and athletic commitments, and learning the lessons taught in each venue, can be a rich one for those involved, but an intercollegiate athletics program can only succeed if it is in alignment with the academic mission of the institution and is part of the institution's overall culture of integrity.

## **The Way Forward: Academic and Athletic Values**

Three key themes emerged from the discussion on how best to ensure that athletics programs operate in the interests of their participants. While different campuses may employ a variety of approaches to policy and organizational structures, the following principles should inform all institutions' work. **Best practices for institutions to consider are noted in bold.**

### **Ensuring a Culture of Integrity**

The most critical component of an institutional strategy is a shared understanding of the importance of academic values and the standards to which employees and students alike will be held when it comes to academic integrity.

The intercollegiate athletics infrastructure and attentiveness to the overall student-athlete experience should be integrated into the fabric of the institution and its governance. **Boards, campus executives, and athletics departments should publish and operate under clear mission statements that stress that educational values, practices, and mission will determine the standards by which intercollegiate athletics programs are conducted.**

**Institutional athletics mission statements should clearly outline the authority, responsibility, and accountability for the governance of the athletics program; they should underscore that authority is vested in the president and that the academic success, welfare, health, and safety of student-athletes are paramount.** Presidents

must be engaged, informed, and realistic, and hold staff and student-athletes accountable. As one president put it in remarks during the Roundtable, to be an effective college or university leader, you must have athletics “in your heart.”

Ultimately, student-athlete admissions, as well as academic eligibility and capability to participate in intercollegiate athletics, is an institutional—not athletics department—responsibility. Presidents should have informed comfort in their institutions’ student-athlete admissions standards and the courses of study available to and pursued by the student-athlete cohort. **Presidents, provosts, and other college and university administrators need to communicate values and expectations to athletic directors, athletic staff, and coaches clearly and frequently.**

**“Bright lines” should distinguish acceptable and unacceptable behaviors. Performance expectations and year-end assessments of athletic directors, athletic staff, and coaches should be meaningfully informed by student-athlete academic attainment compared against relevant and appropriate benchmarks.** Having clear expectations and regular reviews of whether programs are meeting institutional expectations is the best defense against the pressure outside interests can bring to bear on individuals in a win-at-all-costs approach to college athletics.

Neither the athletic director nor the faculty athletics representative (FAR), who serves under NCAA regulations as a liaison between faculty, academic affairs, and athletics, should be—or be perceived as—operating outside the direct and accountable chain of presidential oversight and authority. Given the important “connective tissue” and watchdog role FARs can play on campus when it comes to academic integrity and intercollegiate athletics, the president should select or be involved in the selection of the campus FAR, and the FAR should have regular access to the president. Faculty representatives, with the president’s imprimatur, can reinforce a culture of integrity in communications with the athletic staff and faculty and help to ensure that appropriate monitoring is being implemented.

In addition, FARs should have regular interaction with the athletics compliance office, institutional general counsel, and academic services staff. To facilitate their success, many campuses have instituted periodic reviews of FARs, and some have established renewable terms of service, while also weighing the value of having experience in that position.

**Academic advising and support operations for student-athletes should report to (or have regular access to) senior academic executives, such as chief academic officers, ensuring that there is regular access, communication, and oversight.** In many cases, chief academic officers, other senior academic leaders, or vice presidents of student affairs are well-positioned to supervise or regularly review the policies and procedures for such operations, although care should be taken to ensure that academic support reporting and budgeting are aligned.

**Athletic directors, athletic staff, and coaches should not have supervisory responsibility over or influence the selection of academic support staff for specific teams.** Advising should provide student-athletes with academic support and counseling that is adequate and appropriate for their progress toward a degree and graduation and facilitate their ability to fully pursue their individual academic interests.

**Each academic year should open with an education session or sessions for administrators, the athletic direc-**

tor, athletic staff, coaches, and student-athletes that should underscore the academic expectations for student-athletes and outline institutional academic supports for student-athletes.

**Athletics academic advisory councils, often comprising faculty and executive-level campus decision makers, may serve as advisors and report to the president on matters of academic integrity involving athletics.** Such councils should be independent of the athletics department and can develop policy recommendations and advise both the president and athletics and academic departments. They may also provide insights to athletics and campus academic departments about class scheduling that might best accommodate student-athletes' schedules.

In addition to reporting lines that provide direct oversight and avoid potential conflicts, it would be wise to broaden the base of engagement in campus athletics programs by a wider range of faculty and programs, well beyond the engagement of an athletic council and the FAR. If relationships are established and strong, there is open communication and a better understanding of student-athlete time demands, and institutions are more willing to be open to flexibility in classes and exam protocols. More people engaged in, or at least aware of, the day-to-day life of athletics programs and student-athletes would potentially lift the enterprise out of silos that prevent athletic staff and student-athletes from participating fully in other campus programs.

Regional accreditors are well positioned to ask questions regarding matters of academic integrity that can explore and identify the root causes of academic misconduct. **Accreditors should review current practices regarding matters of academic integrity—including those that impact student-athletes—in institutional self-study processes and make informed decisions as to whether they are adequate.** The NCAA placed a moratorium on its institutional certification process in 2011 and created the Institutional Performance Program (IPP), which provides information on data and best practices.<sup>5</sup> However, a fuller examination of individual institutions' programs may be beneficial. Many athletic conferences also retain external parties to conduct audits of their member institutions' rules compliance programs. Individual campuses can also direct external audits of key areas relating to athletics rules compliance.

One of the key considerations discussed at the Roundtable was the need for regular, extensive monitoring of academic behavior patterns, particularly but not exclusively among student-athletes. **Colleges and universities should have regular processes in place to identify and monitor situations involving unusual course or major "clustering" involving student-athletes.** For example, some institutions require that courses or majors (or both) with a specified enrollment percentage of student-athletes trigger a review by the provost or a committee of campus leaders including representatives of the provost's or president's office and the FAR. Such processes should address changes in distributions of majors and courses, retention rates across all sports and student-athlete demographics, and analyses of diversity among administrators, coaches, athletes, and support staff. The NCAA is considering updates to its IPP that could be a vehicle to make these data more useful for enhancing institutional policy.

**Annual audits of the athletics program should also be conducted by the institution, and dashboards (using**

---

<sup>5</sup> The NCAA IPP academics dashboard provides information regarding current and trending academic data by sports team, gender, and ethnicity. Institutions can use the data to assist them in making informed decisions related to personnel, budget, and academic services needed for student-athlete success, and to determine if specific teams and student-athlete groups need more assistance than others: <http://www.ncaa.org/governance/ncaa-division-i-institutional-performance-program-resources>.

NCAA Institutional Performance Program and/or other institutional data) should be considered to monitor areas such as admission, academic progress, and graduation rates against the student body as a whole as well as against peer institutions. Institutions should consider the use of the NCAA's Academic Performance Program and/or outside or third-party audits of academic eligibility standards and policies to ensure an independent, unbiased review.

One idea discussed by the Roundtable participants is understanding not only that academic expectations are placed upon student-athletes, but also that **athletics programs should be organized and evaluated based on their success in providing learning and personal growth experiences for student-athletes.** Such an approach would require a significant reimagining of the enterprise, but it would affirm the core belief that colleges and universities have athletics programs because they represent significant educational opportunities aligned with the mission of the institution. It would enhance the role of coaches as educators and would require evaluating them as such, not merely on the basis of wins and losses.

## Integration

**There should be a very high bar established in setting policies that separate student-athletes from other students.** Every effort should be made so that a student-athlete's life on campus mirrors as closely as possible the life of all students. Colleges and universities must be mindful of all of the things that limit a student-athlete's time, including those intended to be beneficial, such as mandatory study hall. Student-athletes are capable of taking full advantage of the opportunities available to them when they are permitted to do so.

**Institutions that offer additional options in an academic pursuit (study abroad, internships, research, etc.) should make them available to any and all students, including student-athletes.** This is a top-down issue. If the president, chief academic officer, and athletic director encourage and maintain an educational environment that enables student-athletes to take advantage of major academic opportunities or internship/externship options, then it will be respected by coaches and athletic staff. Coaches need to understand and appreciate that student-athletes are students first, and need to be flexible in scheduling practices and travel to ensure academic preparation and opportunity. The NCAA will consider several legislative modifications in an effort to ensure that student-athletes do not forego available academic opportunities in order to maintain their athletic eligibility.<sup>6</sup>

**Particular attention should be paid to diversity in hiring within athletics programs as well as institutions as a whole.** Because of the opportunities for multicultural relationship-building and recruiting in athletics, **colleges and universities should make an effort to hire athletic directors, athletic staff, and coaches from different backgrounds who can be relatable role models for student-athletes.**<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Specifically, during the 2016–17 legislative cycle, the Division I membership will consider proposals to address access to available cooperative educational work experiences (e.g., co-op, internship, practicum, and student teaching), study abroad programs, and optional academic minor programs.

<sup>7</sup> The NCAA Board of Governors on August 3, 2016 approved a “Pledge and Commitment to Promoting Diversity and Gender Equity in Intercollegiate Athletics.” Presidents and chancellors at NCAA member colleges and universities are encouraged to sign a diversity and inclusion pledge, committing their institutions to achieving ethnic and racial diversity and gender equity in college sports hiring practices.



## Management of Risk

Risk cannot be eliminated, but it can be mitigated. Colleges and universities manage risk in many different areas, such as research integrity, financial management, and student travel abroad. **Athletics should be integrated into an institution's overall risk management portfolio and compliance strategy, which then requires formal and frequent evaluation and the involvement of college or university auditors, counsel, and compliance staff.**

**Institutions need to have clear, unambiguous policies and protocols regarding how they will act when alleged academic misconduct is reported.**<sup>8</sup> They should be certain and clear about the application of these policies and protocols when athletic directors, athletic staff, coaches, or student-athletes are implicated or involved.

Institutions, especially large universities, increasingly employ risk managers to help identify and mitigate risk for campuses. In too many cases, institutions have not developed appropriate policies detailing how they will investigate academic misconduct allegations and respond to cases in which violations are found. This can result in investigations taking too long or being mishandled, and harming an institution's reputation in the process. That is why clear policies need to be in place in advance.

When athletics programs, athletic directors, athletic staff, coaches, or faculty come under scrutiny for academic misconduct involving student-athletes, campus leaders could avoid an ad hoc approach by already having in place a faculty-informed, institution-appropriate set of policies and procedures. Investigative practices and deliberative processes that exist on campuses for other forms of misconduct, such as research misconduct, can be models, but whatever process is used, it should be known in advance, so that it can be deployed without uncertainty or delay. Importantly, ultimate responsibility for having a clear process in place—and insisting that it be followed—rests with the president.

As a practical matter, the nature and scope of an investigation of individual or systemic academic misconduct involving student-athletes may require the engagement of independent, experienced third parties (such as law firms that specialize in these issues). At the very least, **the responsibility for and undertaking of such investigations should be a functional responsibility of campus officials outside of athletics.**

Academic misconduct is a pressing issue for all students, not just student-athletes. However, in the case of athletics, academic misconduct frequently has a specific goal—enabling an athlete to compete—that requires careful monitoring.

On April 7, 2016, the NCAA's Division I Council approved legislative changes to specifically address matters of academic integrity and misconduct. The adopted legislation aims to strike a balance between an institution's role in adjudicating its own academic integrity issues with the NCAA's role in reinforcing and upholding the association's core academic principles. These changes—which reinforce the importance of institutional control of academic matters—merit support. Initial enforcement of these new provisions will be key. Similar legislation will be discussed in Division II and Division III in the coming year. Athletic conferences should consider adopting their own specific standards for institutional governance, oversight of athletics, and academic integrity.

---

<sup>8</sup> An NCAA legislative requirement, effective August 1, 2016, mandates that all Division I institutions have academic misconduct policies and procedures in place and take steps (within their own individual institutional frameworks) to ensure that student-athlete conduct adheres to those rules.

## Concluding Thoughts

The benefits of having or participating in an intercollegiate sports program outweigh the challenges, as long as athletics remains accountable to the same culture of integrity that is expected from every other aspect of the institution. Presidents must lead, and ensure that student-athlete academic integrity is a driving force that aligns with institutional mission. This does not mean that cases of academic misconduct involving student-athletes will never occur. However, it is hoped that this paper offers presidents guidance with which to ensure a culture of integrity. Cases of academic misconduct should be the isolated exceptions to the norm. Campuses must be vigilant against misbehavior; develop systems to manage, identify, and mitigate the potential risks; and deal with incidents swiftly and effectively when they do occur.

The bottom line is that presidents and the institutions they lead must always stress the primacy of the academic mission, the absolute necessity of an intercollegiate athletics program operating within the context of an overall institutional culture of integrity, and the fact that student-athletes on our campuses are, first and foremost, students in programs of higher education. If they do not, the potential for academic malfeasance can wreak havoc on personal careers and institutional reputations, as well as undermine the integrity of all of American higher education.

The diverse missions and structures of institutions with athletics programs mean that campuses need to determine their own structures, processes, and procedures. But from the college or university president to the last player off the bench, all participants need to have a clear understanding of what is expected from student-athletes' academic experiences.

We hope that this document invites reflection, spurs dialog, and provides useful guidance that enables college and university presidents and chancellors to examine their policies in these areas, and to ensure that their institutions are fostering environments where student-athletes leave college prepared to tackle the challenges that face them with a better understanding of the world and the opportunities it holds for them.

## Summary of Recommendations for Presidents, Chancellors, Trustees, and Other Institutional Leaders

ACE's Roundtable: "The Student-Athlete, Academic Integrity, and Intercollegiate Athletics," held on April 22, 2016 to examine issues of academic integrity and intercollegiate athletics, reflected a shared perspective among participants regarding the primacy of the academic enterprise, student-athlete access to academic pursuits, and an uncompromising focus on academic integrity. A number of best practices emerged from the discussion. They are summarized here.

### Ensuring a Culture of Integrity

- Boards, campus executives, and athletics departments should publish and operate under clear mission statements that stress that educational values, practices, and mission will determine the standards by which intercollegiate athletics programs are conducted (p. 3).
- Institutional athletics mission statements should clearly outline the authority, responsibility, and accountability for the governance of the athletics program; they should underscore that authority is vested in the president and that the academic success, welfare, health, and safety of student-athletes are paramount (p. 3).
- Presidents, provosts, and other college and university administrators need to communicate values and expectations to athletic directors, athletic staff, and coaches clearly and frequently (p. 4).
- "Bright lines" should distinguish acceptable and unacceptable behaviors. Performance expectations and year-end assessments of athletic directors, athletic staff, and coaches should be meaningfully informed by student-athlete academic attainment compared against relevant and appropriate benchmarks (p. 4).
- Academic advising and support operations for student-athletes should report to (or have regular access to) senior academic executives, such as chief academic officers, ensuring that there is regular access, communication, and oversight (p. 4).
- Athletic directors, athletic staff, and coaches should not have supervisory responsibility over or influence the selection of academic support staff for specific teams (p. 4).
- Each academic year should open with an education session or sessions for administrators, the athletic director, athletic staff, coaches, and student-athletes that should underscore the academic expectations for student-athletes and outline institutional academic supports for student-athletes (p. 4).
- Athletics academic advisory councils, often comprising faculty and executive-level campus decision makers, may serve as advisors and report to the president on matters of academic integrity involving athletics (p. 5).
- Accreditors should review current practices regarding matters of academic integrity—including those that impact student-athletes—in institutional self-study processes and make informed decisions as to whether they are adequate (p. 5).



- Colleges and universities should have regular processes in place to identify and monitor situations involving unusual course or major “clustering” involving student-athletes (p. 5).
- Annual audits of the athletics program should also be conducted by the institution and dashboards (using National Collegiate Athletic Association Institutional Performance Program and/or other institutional data) should be considered to monitor areas such as admission, academic progress, and graduation rates against the student body as a whole as well as against peer institutions (p. 5).
- Athletics programs should be organized and evaluated based on their success in providing learning and personal growth experiences for student-athletes (p. 6).

### **Integration**

- There should be a very high bar established in setting policies that separate student-athletes from other students (p. 6).
- Institutions that offer additional options in an academic pursuit (study abroad, internships, research, etc.) should make them available to any and all students, including student-athletes (p. 6).
- Particular attention should be paid to diversity in hiring within athletics programs as well as institutions as a whole (p. 6).
- Colleges and universities should make an effort to hire athletic directors, athletic staff, and coaches from different backgrounds who can be relatable role models for student-athletes (p. 6).

### **Management of Risk**

- Athletics should be integrated into an institution’s overall risk management portfolio and compliance strategy, which then requires formal and frequent evaluation and the involvement of college or university auditors, counsel, and compliance staff (p. 7).
- Institutions need to have clear, unambiguous policies identifying how they will act when academic misconduct is reported (p. 7).
- The responsibility for and undertaking of such investigations should be a functional responsibility of campus officials outside of athletics (p. 7).

## Appendix

### Roundtable: The Student-Athlete, Academic Integrity, and Intercollegiate Athletics

The American Council on Education (ACE) gratefully acknowledges the participation of the following individuals in its Roundtable, held on April 22, 2016. The contents of this report reflect the focus and tenor of that discussion, and offer potential avenues for consideration, but do not represent the specific opinion or endorsement of any single participant. It is hoped that this document will prove to be a valuable guide to campus leaders working on this important issue.

#### List of Attendees

*(Titles reflect positions at the time of the meeting.)*

Claire Adkins, Student-Athlete, James Madison University (VA)  
Jonathan R. Alger, President, James Madison University  
Kevin Anderson, Athletic Director, University of Maryland  
Steve Ballard, Chancellor, East Carolina University (NC)  
Dan Bartholomae, Executive Associate Athletic Director, University of Pittsburgh  
Judith A. Bense, President, University of West Florida  
Pamela J. Bernard, Vice President and General Counsel, Duke University (NC)  
Molly Corbett Broad, President, American Council on Education  
Sasho Cirovski, Head Coach, Men's Soccer, University of Maryland  
Andrew C. Comrie, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, University of Arizona  
Christine L. Copper, Professor of Chemistry and Faculty Athletics Representative, United States Naval Academy (MD)  
James Danko, President, Butler University (IN)  
John J. DeGioia, President, Georgetown University (DC)  
Mark Emmert, President, National Collegiate Athletic Association  
E. Gordon Gee, President, West Virginia University  
Walter Harrison, President, University of Hartford (CT)  
Chad Hawley, Associate Commissioner, Policy, Big Ten Conference  
Amy Hecht, Vice President for Student Affairs, The College of New Jersey  
Christopher B. Howard, President, Robert Morris University (PA)  
Cornelius M. Kerwin, President, American University (DC)  
Renu Khator, Chancellor, University of Houston System, and President, University of Houston  
William E. (Brit) Kirwan, Chancellor Emeritus, University System of Maryland  
Susan Martin, Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor, The University of Tennessee Knoxville  
Horace Mitchell, President, California State University, Bakersfield  
Patricia C. Ohlendorf, Vice President for Legal Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin  
Amy Perko, Executive Director, Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics  
Lee Reed, Director of Athletics, Georgetown University (DC)  
Brian Shannon, Paul Whitfield Horn Professor of Law, Faculty Athletics Representative, Texas Tech University

Kendall Spencer, Student-Athlete, University of New Mexico

Jon Steinbrecher, Commissioner, Mid-American Conference

John B. (Jack) Swarbrick Jr., Vice President and James E. Rohr Director of Athletics, University of Notre Dame (IN)

Paul Tagliabue, Senior Of Counsel, Covington & Burling LLP

Lori E. Varlotta, President, Hiram College (OH)

Belle S. Wheelan, President, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges

Nancy L. Zimpher, Chancellor, State University of New York