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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Intercollegiate athletics in the United States currently face serious challenges. Charges of drug abuse and criminal acts by athletes, recruiting violations by coaches and boosters, financial mismanagement by administrators, and low graduation rates for players have rocked institutions across the country. Growing budget constraints have led to increased competition for institutional funding and booster contributions. According to commentators from the national media, the sports world, and university campuses, college athletics have become such a big business that student athletes are spending too much time improving their athletic skills and too little effort on their academic progress. As a result, universities are struggling to define appropriate roles for their intercollegiate athletic programs and to maximize both academic and athletic performance.

In hopes of addressing these fundamental concerns, the Knight Commission, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), and university presidents have initiated a series of reforms in intercollegiate athletics. In 1991, the NCAA adopted
regulations to limit recruiting practices, out of season training schedules, and practice time. In addition to these limits, the reforms also include new requirements for athletes and universities which are intended to promote improved academic achievement. These new guidelines call for the completion of classes and credits on a stricter schedule and require higher grade point averages for athletes. The reforms also require that each university provide academic counseling and tutoring services for all recruited athletes.

A limited number of colleges and universities have employed academic advisors since the 1970s. Additional programs have been initiated in the past three years as institutions have anticipated NCAA reforms. With the passage of Proposition 29 at the 1991 NCAA convention, all remaining Division I universities and colleges will be required to make academic counseling and tutoring services available to their athletes. The reforms mandated by Proposition 29 are currently being implemented at the University of Montana and Idaho State University. The NCAA has allocated $25,000 per year for each Division I school to establish these academic counseling and tutoring programs. The University of Montana and Idaho State University have recently hired coordinators of athletic academic services. At the University of Montana,
representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences, the University College, and the Athletic Department prepared an extensive job description and list of qualifications for the position. It took more than one year for the University to create and fill this position. Marie Hibbard was officially on line July 1, 1992. At Idaho State University, by contrast, Nancy Graziano was hired without systematic study after a brief two month recruitment period.

DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM

The NCAA's Academic Performance Study (1991) indicates that less than one half (47.6%) of all incoming freshman student athletes entering Division I universities in 1984 and 1985 graduated from the schools at which they matriculated as freshmen. While it is difficult to determine how this graduation rate compares with that of non-athletes, the fact that less than one half of entering freshman student athletes graduate in five years adds to the perception that college athletes are not making adequate academic progress.

The demands placed on student athletes in terms of time, effort, and commitment are tremendous. These demands not only come from instructors, classmates, and family, but also from coaches, teammates, and fans. The difficulty of
combining academic progress and athletic success has led to a series of regulations and reforms by the NCAA. Among those adopted in 1991 was Proposition 29. This proposal called for the availability of academic counseling and tutoring services for all recruited student athletes at Division I schools and provided annual funding for such services. The problem to be considered in this paper is how universities can best implement this proposal. Specific research questions to be addressed are:

1. What are the objectives of Proposition 29?
2. What are the appropriate duties and responsibilities of the coordinators of athletic academic services?
3. To whom should the coordinators be accountable?
4. How can the coordinators best serve the interests of their individual institutions and its student athletes?
5. How does the coordinator position at the University of Montana compare with the position at Idaho State University?

This research will provide information for institutions seeking to establish or improve their academic counseling and tutoring services for student athletes.
METHODOLOGY

Historical research, a review of current literature on the subjects of academic counseling for student athletes and recent NCAA reforms, and a series of interviews were used to complete this study of policy formulation and implementation. Sources of information included the NCAA, university athletic administrators, coaches, athletes, academic advisors, and professionals in the fields of sports psychology and counseling. Primary sources at the University of Montana included Dean James Flightner of the College of Arts and Sciences, Dr. Robert Lindsay, professor of history and NCAA faculty representative, Associate Athletic Director Kathy Noble, and Marie Hibbard. At Idaho State University, Nancy Graziano and Ted Anderson, Head Women's Basketball Coach, provided information on the implementation of Proposition 29. The primary focus of analysis is the University of Montana. The implementation of policy at Idaho State University is added as a point of contrast, describing the potential for diversity of implementation at peer institutions.
PLAN OF PAPER

Chapter Two provides an overview of the problems facing student athletes concerning their academic and athletic progress as well as attempts to address those problems. Chapter Three describes the formulation of Proposition 29 which requires academic counseling and tutoring services for all Division I athletes. Included are the historical background of Proposition 29 and the rationale which led to its acceptance by the NCAA. Specific research questions concerning the appropriate roles, responsibilities, and autonomy of the coordinators of athletic academic services are the topic of Chapter Four. Chapter Five includes conclusions and recommendations for the optimal implementation of the coordinator of athletic academic services position at Division I institutions. These recommendations and conclusions will be developed through the investigation of the specific research questions outlined above.
Concerns about the academic progress of student athletes are not new. The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) was formed in the early 1900s, in part to address academic problems. Additional demands for reforms were presented in the 1960s and 1970s resulting in the formation of the President's Commission in 1984 and the Knight Commission in 1989. The problems related to academic standing of athletes continue to be a major topic of reform. The most recent attempt by the NCAA to improve academic progress was a series of reforms adopted at the 1991 and 1992 national conventions.

HISTORY OF THE NCAA

The first attempt to address the problems of intercollegiate athletics on a national level came as a result of President Theodore Roosevelt's call for an investigation into the growing number of deaths occurring in college football. This
investigation resulted in the formation of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States in 1906. The goals of this organization were to establish high ethical standards in college sports, develop physical education programs in schools, and to promote intramural sports. In 1910, this organization became the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA).

From 1910 until 1922, the NCAA and individual conference organizations gained increasing control over intercollegiate athletics. Attention was focused on eligibility standards, rules of competition, and fairness. Since 1922, the scope of NCAA control has gradually widened to include eight basic principles. These principles are related to the subjects of amateurism, institutional control and responsibility, sound academic standards, financial aid, recruiting, ethical conduct, post season contests, and out of season practice. In 1938, the NCAA first addressed itself formally and officially to the problems of institutional conduct in intercollegiate activities. The Declaration of Sound Principles and Practice for Intercollegiate Athletics, which formally addressed these principles, was added to the NCAA constitution in 1939. Because the NCAA's stated role at this time was educative, not regulatory, there were originally no provisions for enforcement of these principles.

With the adoption of the Principles For the Conduct of...
Intercollegiate Athletics, commonly known as the Sanity Code, in 1948, the eight principles were no longer mere guidelines, but enforceable regulations which member institutions must follow. Following a series of amendments to the Sanity Code regulations, NCAA sanctions were first imposed on a member school in 1953. By that year, the NCAA membership had grown to over six hundred institutions. As membership in the NCAA grew, so did the range of its regulations and investigations. Between 1953 and 1965 the NCAA's Enforcement Program investigated 449 cases covering a broad range of violations.¹ In 1966, the NCAA convention approved legislation which restricted financial aid by member institutions to students with a 1.600 GPA. Since the late 1960s, the NCAA has continued to expand its role in the regulation of intercollegiate athletics, particularly in the area of academic performance of athletes.

Throughout its history, the NCAA has faced the same basic criticisms of intercollegiate athletics. The 1906 investigation that prompted the formation of the organization listed the following arguments against the continuation of intercollegiate football.
1. Football has become a profession; it is no longer a sport.
2. Football takes too much time and interest from academic work.
3. Football programs, for all their expense, benefit relatively few students.
4. Football is an academic nuisance.
5. The large gate receipts make football a commercial enterprise.

The Carnegie Report on Intercollegiate Athletics (1929), resulted in a list of concerns almost identical to that of the 1906 report. The Sanity Code of 1948 was added to address a similar set of complaints noted by the membership of the NCAA, and in a report released in 1990, the Knight Commission identified the same basic problems, not only in football, but in all intercollegiate athletics. The NCAA and others interested in intercollegiate athletics continue to seek solutions to problems of professionalism, cost, and poor academic progress among student athletes.

INCREASING DEMANDS FOR REFORM

Despite the reform efforts of the NCAA, the integrity of intercollegiate athletics was undermined during the 1960s and 1970s as athletic departments developed operating methods and objectives totally separate from and often opposed to the educational aims of the schools they represented. According to Atwell, university administrators and faculties "tacitly
conceded that abuses of intercollegiate athletics were not their business". Because athletic departments often claimed to be self-supporting, faculties often adopted a "let them do their own thing" attitude. The resulting scandals were widespread, ranging from point shaving to misappropriation of athletic department funds and alterations of student transcripts.

At least three such scandals surfaced at the University of Montana during the 1970s. Football coach Jack Swarthout was indicted in 1975 on charges that he had illegally taken work study monies intended for student athletes and plowed them back into the football program. Grizzly basketball player Michael Ray Richardson was the subject of a February 4, 1985 Sports Illustrated article describing his poor academic career in high school and at the University of Montana. Not only did Richardson not graduate, but according to the article he had not acquired even basic reading and writing skills. Despite these weaknesses, Richardson was able to maintain his athletic eligibility at the university. One of Richardson's teammates, Lee Johnson, was declared ineligible in 1977. In violation of NCAA rules, Johnson had taken the GED after a stated deadline. He also had not taken summer courses included in his official transcript. The University forfeited
eleven games and Johnson transferred to a school in Texas where he continued to participate in intercollegiate basketball.

As a result of similar infractions across the country, educational leaders called for reforms in intercollegiate athletics. In 1979, the American Council on Education (ACE) proposed major reforms intended to tie athletic departments to the educational missions of the universities and colleges which they represented. None were approved. In 1982, ACE appointed a twenty-six member committee to plan the implementation of their reforms. Following a number of meetings during the next year, the members finally decided in August, 1983, "there isn't any way for us to reform it (the NCAA)." Therefore, the committee proposed that a ruling committee of university presidents, the "Presidents' Board", be instituted to take charge of the NCAA and be given power to veto or modify NCAA regulations.

The ACE proposal to establish a powerful "Presidents' Board", Proposition 35, was introduced at the 1984 NCAA convention, but was defeated on a voice vote. No roll call vote was taken among the delegates, most of whom were athletic directors and coaches. The same delegates proposed a "Presidents' Commission" with only advisory powers. This "Presidents' Commission" was adopted by the convention with
the passage of Proposition 36. At the 1985, 1986, and 1987 conventions, the "Presidents' Commission" suggested reforms concerning academic guidelines and lengths of seasons, but the proposals were defeated by convention delegates. As an advisory board, the "Presidents' Commission" had no power to modify NCAA regulations. In 1988 and 1989, no reforms were offered, indicating that the "Presidents' Commission" recognized that it had no influence over the NCAA.

In 1989, the Knight Foundation established a twenty-two member commission to propose solutions for ongoing problems in intercollegiate athletics. The Knight Commission, consisting primarily of university presidents, proposed three basic and binding principles for intercollegiate athletics.

1. **Academic Integrity**: The college must graduate at least the same percentage of student-athletes as it does students who are not athletes.

2. **Fiscal Integrity**: All funds derived from athletics must go directly to the university and be dispensed only by the university.

3. **Continuous Auditing**: Just as academic programs are checked and accredited, just as university accounts are audited regularly, there shall be a continuous, ongoing audit by an outside agent, under the NCAA, with an annual report on the state of athletics from an academic, financial, and moral point of view.5

The Knight Commission's reform proposal, sometimes called the "1+3 Program", was designed to take control of
intercollegiate athletics from athletic directors and place it in the hands of university presidents in order to reestablish "real institutional control"6, and implement the three binding principles. Given the track record of previous reform efforts, some members of the Knight Commission questioned the potential for future success. As co-chairman Theodore Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame noted, "There have been reform movements going back to President Teddy Roosevelt and they have all failed."7 He identified the millions of dollars available through television rights and box office receipts as the source of temptations to become "Number One" at any cost. Despite such concerns, the "1+3 Program" was introduced by university presidents at the 1991 NCAA convention in New Orleans as a series of one hundred and nineteen propositions. Fearing that failure to reform from within would result in Congressional action, the NCAA convention adopted the Knight Commission reforms.

Intended to operationalize the "1+3 Program", the proposals adopted in 1991 covered a broad range of subjects, including the duties and responsibilities of the Executive Committee, administrative procedures, exit interviews for athletes, employment of and compensation for coaches,
recruiting, eligibility and academic requirements, financial aid, awards and benefits, playing seasons, practice limits, academic counseling and tutoring services, and administrative regulations. The principle of academic integrity was a major focus of the reforms. Despite concern that the academic requirements might prove too inflexible, reaction to the changes were generally positive. According to David L. Warren, President of Ohio Wesleyan University, "The tide had turned on the question of academic requirements". Hunter R. Rawlings III, writing in Sports Illustrated, noted that the "emerging consensus between athletic directors and coaches and university presidents is a healthy development."

**ACADEMIC-RELATED PROBLEMS**

Among the many reforms outlined above, those adopted at the 1991 convention dealing with academic requirements and academic counseling and tutoring services for athletes provide the focus for this paper. Graduation rates for student athletes have been a primary subject of investigative reporting and NCAA reforms. Four of the propositions passed by the NCAA in 1991 dealt specifically with the academic progress of student athletes. Anecdotal evidence of the lack of
academic progress by specific athletes or programs is widespread. From 1972 to 1985, for example, none of the more than fifty black men's basketball players at Memphis State University graduated. At North Carolina State, only eleven of forty three men's basketball players graduated between 1980 and 1989. Nine others were still in school and twenty three had left school without their degrees. Fifteen of those had been suspended from the university. Only 12% of the black recruits in the University of Indiana men's basketball program graduated during the 1980s.

Several studies of large blocks of student athletes have not confirmed this anecdotal evidence. A 1984 study by the American Association of College Registrar and Admissions Officers concluded that student athletes consistently had higher academic success than non-athletes. In another study, McKerrow and Daly found that student athletes at the University of Maine had a higher graduation rate than non-athletes. In his 1969 thesis, Gary Johnson noted a contradictory set of results in such studies. According to Johnson, studies by Hall, Slushed, and Savage all indicated that grade point averages (GPAs) and graduation rates of student athletes were lower than those of non-athletes.
Studies by Jones, Ray, Rehberg and Schafer, and Edwards, by contrast, indicated that the GPAs and graduation rates of student athletes equalled or surpassed those of non-athletes. \(^{14}\) Johnson's research on student athletes at the University of Montana indicated that GPAs and graduation rates of student athletes were very similar to those of non-athletes in 1965, but declined in the late 1960s while those of non-athletes improved. \(^{15}\) The most recent figures at the University of Montana come from data compiled by Jim Oloman in the Institutional Research Office. This research indicates that 32.77\% of the student athletes that entered the university in 1983 and 1984 graduated within six years of enrolling, while the overall graduation rate for those entering the university was 28.30\%. \(^{16}\)

This wide range of contradictory evidence indicates the difficulty involved in attempting to compare GPAs and graduation rates between student athletes and non-athletes. There is no commonly accepted definition of graduation rate. Rates may be based on four year, five year, or six year periods from the date of initial enrollment, and may include or exclude students who start at one institution but graduate from another. Until an acceptable and practical definition of
graduation rate is established, statistics will have little value. Consequently, the implementation of the first principle of the Knight Commission's "1+3 Program", academic integrity, will be difficult to assess. Universities will not be able to compare graduation rates of student athletes and non-athletes unless a more widely accepted and viable definition is established.

Adding to the problematic issue of comparing graduation rates is the fact that record keeping by universities has been abysmal. Stephen Figler cites a study commissioned by the Academic Senate of the California State University System which included questions on academic matters. To the question, "What percentage of your student athletes earn a baccalaureate degree?", thirteen of nineteen respondents indicated that this information "was not known". According to the study, two of the other six institutions claimed graduation rates of 85% and 90%, figures that appear to be inaccurate.17

In order to clarify and standardize data on the graduation rates of student athletes, the NCAA has initiated a ten year longitudinal study that began with the 1984 school year. The research covers 85 Division I institutions and calculates graduation rates by dividing the number of graduates after five years by the number of student athletes who had entered the institution during the initial year of the survey.
According to this survey, 45.7% of all student athletes graduate in five years. The NCAA will use this base data to evaluate the effectiveness of its recent reforms intended to increase academic achievement. The study does not compare the graduation rates of student athletes and non-athletes, but does consider the reliability of four predictors of academic success. The four predictors considered by the NCAA study are high school GPAs in core courses, entrance exam scores, GPAs by race, and exam scores by race. Establishment of the reliability of those four predictors will aid academic counselors as they seek to promote the academic progress of student athletes.

Summary

A primary purpose of the NCAA has been to maintain the academic integrity of its member schools. All of the research concerning the academic progress of athletes indicates that improvements can be made. Consequently, four reforms intended specifically to increase graduation rates and academic performance were adapted by the NCAA in 1991. The first provides for stricter entrance requirements for freshman student athletes based on a combination of high school GPAs in
core classes and entrance exam scores. The second limits in-season practice time to twenty hours per week. The third requires that student athletes reach stated milestones in terms of credits toward graduation and credits in their major that must be met during each year of their college careers. The fourth reform, Proposition 29, requires that all Division I schools provide academic counseling and tutoring services for all recruited athletes. This requirement has been matched with a $25,000 annual NCAA grant. The proposal does not specify how such services should be implemented or how the money should be spent. The next chapter will describe the development of Proposition of 29, including the rationale which led to its acceptance by the NCAA.
CHAPTER THREE

FORMULATION OF PROPOSITION 29

Various forms of academic counseling and tutoring services have been available to student athletes during the history of intercollegiate athletics. Programs ranging from simple study halls monitored by coaches to full time academic advisors for specific teams have existed at all levels of post-secondary institutions. During the 1980s, a growing number of institutions reported having a person on staff dealing with academic or psychological support services specifically for athletes. A proposal to mandate academic counseling for all student athletes recruited by Division I schools was first made by Ronald Bowes of Duquesne University in 1986. Bowes' proposal, made in an article in The Academic Advisor, resulted in the formulation of Proposition 29 which was adopted by the 1991 NCAA national convention. Academic counseling and tutoring services are now mandatory for all Division I schools under Bylaw 16.3.1, which became effective August 1, 1991.
The National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics (NAAAA) was founded in 1975 as an organization of individuals concerned with the academic progress of students involved in intercollegiate athletics. Currently the group includes approximately five hundred members divided into four regional associations. Members of the NAAAA include academic advisors, athletic administrators, faculty representatives, and coaches. Until 1992, the NAAAA held an annual convention during the week preceding the NCAA national convention. Starting in 1993, the annual convention of the NAAAA will meet independently of the NCAA convention. Richard McGwire, past president of the NAAAA, says that the change in convention schedule was a result of the convoluted politics that prevail in the NCAA and the NAAAA's need for autonomy. The NAAAA is currently working as a grassroots based organization for the exchange of ideas among professionals involved in academic advising. The group is concentrating on the formulation of legislation presented to the NCAA in hopes of improving academic progress by athletes. NAAAA representatives testified before the Knight Commission and advocated the passage of Proposition 29 and the "1+3 Program.

A survey of post-secondary institutions completed by
Griffith and Figler in 1982 reported that 78% of the Division I respondents had someone other than a coach providing "special advising assistance to athletes beyond the normal institutional advisory process." These individuals came from a wide range of backgrounds in counseling, psychology, education, and athletics. In their 1983 study, Gurney, Robinson, and Fygetakis reported that approximately 27% of the academic advisors at Division I schools came from a coaching background. Another 31% came from professional counseling backgrounds, and the remainder were paraprofessionals and graduate students. The majority of the institutions studied provided academic monitoring, general academic advising, tutoring, and study tables, but less than one half offered career or personal counseling, remedial reading, or test assessment. These researchers noted that such services were "sometimes viewed by faculty as willfully impeding the normal academic programs of student athletes." Neither of these studies evaluated the effectiveness of existing academic advising and tutoring programs.

The number of academic advisors at Division I schools increased during the 1980s. This is indicated by the growth of the NAAADA and the fact that 80 of the 88 institutions
represented in the organization were Division I schools. In 1986 one member of the NAAAA, Ronald Bowes of Duquesne University, called for legislation to require that each Division I institution provide at least one full time advisor for their athletes. In a recent interview, Bowes noted that he believed that athletes were treated "very roughly" by universities, with marginal students seldom receiving necessary academic help.\(^5\) He stated that universities have a responsibility to serve their athletes and to "show a genuine concern for their life success."\(^6\)

Bowes' recommendation for mandatory academic counseling and tutoring services was introduced as Proposition 29 at the 1991 NCAA convention. The proposition was one of 119 offered by the Presidents' Commission in an attempt to implement the "1+3 Program". The proposal was introduced in the following form:

**Academic Counseling.** Division I member institutions shall provide general academic counseling and tutoring services to all recruited student athletes. Such counseling and tutoring services may be provided by the department of athletics or through the institution's nonathletics student support services.\(^7\)
The printed rationale for Proposition 29 was listed as follows:

An institution that recruits a student athlete owes that individual the opportunity to receive a comprehensive educational experience. This proposal would require that as a minimum standard, the institution make academic counseling and tutoring services available to such recruits. Its objective is to maximize the academic performances of student athletes.\(^8\)

Gerald Turner, President of the University of Mississippi, moved for the adoption of the proposal. He noted that the proposal did not specify how individual institutions would implement the program of services.\(^9\) It would be the responsibility of each institution to decide if the services would be provided through the athletic department or through the institution's nonathletics student support services. With the support of the Atlantic Coast Conference, the Big East Conference, the Big Ten Conference, the Big West Conference, the Patriot League, the South East Conference, and the Sunbelt Conference, the proposal was approved by a vote of 286-5. The NCAA also voted to provide $25,000 for each Division I school for each year through 1997 in order to help fund these services.

The amended bylaw does not specifically define how to implement these services or how to spend the annual NCAA funding. Ambiguities concerning the establishment of
academic counseling and tutoring services for student athletes, the appropriation of NCAA funds, and the responsibilities and accountability of coordinators of academic services provide difficult questions to be answered by each of the individual Division I institutions. Specific research questions concerning the appropriate roles, responsibilities, and autonomy of coordinators are the topic of the next chapter.
Although the NCAA mandated academic counseling and tutoring services for all recruited athletes at Division I institutions and appropriated funds to help establish these services, it provided little direction for institutions in terms of how to implement the proposal. Consequently, individual schools have had the opportunity to develop programs at their own discretion. Through this process, each institution has attempted to develop a Coordinator of Athletic Academic Services position which meets the objectives of their own academic and athletic programs and the needs of their student athletes. In each case, questions concerning the objectives of Proposition 29, the appropriate duties and responsibilities of the coordinator, and the degree of autonomy and accountability for the position have arisen. These questions are addressed in this chapter.
OBJECTIVES OF PROPOSITION 29

Specialists in the field of academic advising and counseling for student athletes, the NCAA, and individual institutions each have articulated their own objectives for the position of Coordinator of Athletic-Academic Services (CAAS). The objectives of Ronald Bowes and the other professionals who initiated Proposition 29 include identification of marginally qualified student athletes, support intended to foster academic progress and degree completion rather than maintainance of athletic eligibility, and counseling to address the specific needs of Division I student athletes. The objectives of the NCAA include improved academic progress by student athletes and the continuation of NCAA authority over intercollegiate athletics. In addition to the objectives stated above, individual institutions have developed specific objectives to meet their individual circumstances. Primary among these are developing and delivering a comprehensive program of support services for student athletes and utilizing the CAAS position as a liaison between the academic and athletic departments of the institution. Although the interested parties have defined the objectives of Proposition 29 differently, they all share the belief that the primary role of the CAAS position is to improve the opportunity for student athletes to reach their academic
potential.

When Ronald Bowes first suggested mandatory academic counseling and tutoring services for all athletes in Division I schools in 1986, he proposed that the main objective of such services be to identify and assist marginally qualified students. The number of "special authority admissions", those students entering institutions without meeting general admission standards, is approximately 27% of all football players and men basketball players. This compares to only 4% of total university enrollments. The willingness of institutions to admit marginal students in order to gather quality athletes creates a need for special support services. The fact that many student athletes are academically disadvantaged creates a need for special academic services of the kind that the CAAS can provide.

Since 1981, the University of Michigan has provided tutoring and counseling services for its football players. Administrators questioned the validity of SAT scores and high school GPAs as predictors of academic success at the university and argued that restricting the number of marginal admissions would not be as effective as selecting well-motivated student athletes and providing them with effective academic support on campus. The group reported that "the
NCAA and the college should be responsible for providing extensive academic support services to all incoming freshmen, especially those who are 'at risk'". According to University of Michigan statistics, of the more than one hundred students who entered the football program between 1981 and 1986 only two left the university for academic reasons. This indicates that through the early identification of "at risk" student athletes, counseling and tutoring services can be provided more efficiently, resulting in increased graduation rates. The University of Michigan has made this early identification of marginal students a primary objective of their program of academic support services.

A second major objective of CAAS positions is to provide the services necessary to promote academic progress and degree completion rather than simply maintaining eligibility. Research by Peter Adler and Patricia Adler indicates that the vast majority of entering student athletes have high expectations for their academic careers. However, due to the intensity of training and the difficulty of achieving both academic and athletic success, many athletes, especially males, adjust their individual goals as they move into their second and third years. The primary objective of these athletes
becomes the maintenance of their athletic eligibility and not the completion of their degrees. Atwell describes the role of an academic advisor as defending "the centrality of academic enterprise" and seeing that graduation, and not the mere continuation of eligibility, is the objective of student athletes.\textsuperscript{5} Adler and Adler support this view of the CAAS position and call for proactive counseling to avoid situations in which eligibility is more important and more convenient than graduation.\textsuperscript{6}

Coakley has described the role conflicts faced by student athletes and the coping methods that they develop to resolve these conflicts. Many student athletes must struggle to fulfill their responsibilities in the classroom and on the playing field. Coping methods developed by student athletes in this setting include a merging of roles, compartmentalization, modification of expectations, the neglect or deemphasis of the student role, and withdrawal from the academic program.\textsuperscript{7} Because they cannot merge, compartmentalize, or modify their dual roles, many student athletes choose to neglect or deemphasize their role as students, or withdraw from the academic setting altogether. In either case, student athletes fail to graduate. This outcome is demonstrated in cases such as that of the
North Carolina State University mens' basketball program. From 1980 until 1989, only eleven of 43 recruited players graduated. Many of those that remained in school were pursuing "no coherent course of study". According to Coakley, "an awareness of this situation has been one of the factors leading to the creation of the specialized position of the 'brain coach' or 'academic coordinator'". Finally, commenting on the passage of Proposition 29 and the remainder of the "1+3 Program", David L. Warren of Ohio Wesleyan University claimed, "The tide has turned on the question of academic requirements." He predicted that graduation would become the goal of student athletes, replacing the inappropriate goal of maintaining eligibility. The accuracy of this prediction is yet to be determined.

A third objective proposed for CAAS positions is meeting the special needs of student athletes. Despite recent NCAA regulations that have forced reductions in practice time, out of season training, and number of contests, student athletes still face the conundrum described in 1971 by former professional football player Dave Meggyesy. Speaking of his college career, Meggyesy said, "It was next to impossible to be a legitimate student and a football player too." This problem is especially
prevalent at Division I schools where the importance of winning programs and fund raising often surpasses that of academic success and results in special admissions for marginal students. Consequently, student athletes are more differentiated from nonathletes at Division I schools than their counterparts at Division II and Division III institutions. Richard McGwire, CAAS at the University of Virginia and a supporter of Proposition 29, specifically identifies football and basketball players at Division I schools as those most in need of academic support services.13

Collegiate student athletes have pressures and perceptions affecting their lives that few nonathletes experience. According to the 1991-92 NCAA Manual,

"A member institution shall limit its organized practice activities, the length of its playing seasons, and the number of its ... contests and or dates of competition in all sports, ... to minimize interference with the academic programs of its student athletes." (Bylaw 17.01)

This statement recognizes the unique time demands placed on student athletes. It fails, however, to recognize the emotional and ethical demands which are created by institutions or self imposed by the athletes. Despite the NCAA restrictions, athletes often feel they owe more of their time and effort to their coaches than to their academic programs. This is most
common at Division I institutions where athletic ability is the primary reason for recruitment.

In addition to the pressures placed on them by coaches, fans, and alumni, student athletes must also manage other factors that make them unique. Athletes are often in the spotlight on campus. They are "public figures". Because of their size and often their race, student athletes frequently stand out in a university setting. For example, when Michael Ray Richardson missed a series of class meetings for an education course at the University of Montana in 1978, the professor noted the absence because Richardson was "the only 6'5" black male enrolled in the class".\(^{14}\) Similarly, when Shannon Cate was charged with shoplifting in 1988, the story was reported not only in Missoula, but across Montana and around the Big Sky Conference. According to McKerrow and Daly, "What would otherwise be minor news confined to the 'police beat' of the local paper (or ignored entirely as being unnewsworthy) ends up being reported as if it were major news."\(^{15}\)

Not only are student athletes subjected to outside demands and limited in their privacy, they may also hold perceptions different from those of their fellow students.
Research by Hahm, Beller, and Stoll indicates that in the areas of moral reasoning and ethical development, athletes are less developed and reasoned than non-athletes.\textsuperscript{16} The atmosphere of the athletic program does not assist in their growth in moral reasoning. The gap identified by Hahm, Beller, and Stoll widens as athletes, especially males, complete their years of eligibility. Peer pressure and the anti-academic atmosphere often present in athletic programs frequently retard the ethical development of student athletes. These results are indicative of the coping methods described by Coakley.

Student athletes often neglect their role as students and withdraw from the academic process. Finally, male student athletes are often caught up in the hype and attention paid them at their college or university. This notoriety builds a false perception about the potential for careers in professional sports. Chances of a college athlete participating at that level are low. Of 18,000 Division I athletes, less than two hundred move on to the professional level.\textsuperscript{17} Figler states that many athletes require counseling to "re-orient them toward a future that is unlikely to include sports as a primary focus."\textsuperscript{18} Many supporters of Proposition 29 see the development of counseling and support services directed at meeting the special needs of
student athletes as a primary objective of the implementation of CAAS positions at Division I institutions.

A fourth objective, articulated by the NCAA, was to avoid future criticism and possible regulation of the organization. Although the NCAA's stated objective in establishing Proposition 29 was to "maximize the academic performances of student athletes", it appears to have had a broader objective when it considered the one hundred and nineteen propositions intended to operationalize the "1+3 Program". In a speech to the convention on January 16, 1991, NCAA Executive Director Richard D. Schultz stated, "If the NCAA doesn't reform college sports, there are others less qualified waiting in the wings to do it for us." There can be little doubt that the passage of Proposition 29 and the other proposals presented at the 1991 convention was an attempt by the NCAA to maintain both the credibility of intercollegiate athletics and its own authority through the implementation of the "1+3 Program". Specifically, Proposition 29 is intended to help establish the Knight Commission's first principle for intercollegiate athletics, academic integrity. The NCAA criterion for attainment of this objective is that each college must graduate at least the same percentage of student-athletes as it does students who are not
athletes. The ongoing ten year longitudinal study of graduation rates among student athletes currently being completed by the NCAA is an attempt to assess the attainment of this goal.

Individual colleges and universities have established additional objectives for their CAAS positions. These objectives are based on the mission statements or philosophies of each institution and/or its athletic department. Specific to this study are the objectives established at the University of Montana. Those involved in establishing the objectives for the CAAS position at the University of Montana included James Flightner, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Bill Moos, Athletic Director, Kathy Noble, Associate Athletic Director, Melanie Hoell, Assistant Director of the University College, Robert Lindsay, Professor of History and NCAA Faculty Representative, and Robin Pflugrad, assistant football coach. In addition to these members of the Proposition 29 Implementation Committee, Marie Hibbard, after being hired as the first CAAS, also proposed objectives for the position.

The two major objectives identified by this group included the development and delivery of a comprehensive program of academic services, academic advising, and counseling services for student athletes, and service as a liaison between the
athletic and academic programs at the university. These objectives fall within the scope of Proposition 29 while addressing the specific needs of the University of Montana. The role as a liaison is a unique objective. Although it was not identified in the literature noted above, it does attack the heart of the problem present on college campuses. The mission of the athletic department does not always match that of the university. The athletic department is often seen as a separate entity, serving its own purposes and subject only to its own rules. Yet, logically, only through the coordination of the services and resources available in the academic and athletic programs can the progress of individual student athletes be maximized both academically and athletically.

The objective of creating a comprehensive program of academic services was developed by the committee which established the CAAS position at the University of Montana. As will be seen below, this objective was included in the Notice of Position Vacancy, the Position Description, the statements of committee members, and in the materials prepared by Marie Hibbard as she began her work as the CAAS. The Position Description, printed by the College of Arts and Sciences in December of 1991, described this objective in the following
6. Duties and Responsibilities of the Position:
The Coordinator of Athletic Academic Services is responsible for the development and delivery of a comprehensive program of academic services, academic advising, and counseling for student athletes. . . . The Coordinator develops and administers a specialized academic support system for athletes and plans and coordinates an academic advising delivery system.

The Notice of Position Vacancy, dated February 3, 1992, includes the following statement:

Description of Position:
Develop and implement a comprehensive program for providing individualized admissions information, academic advising and assistance, academic and study skills, counseling to foster retention and success, academic eligibility review, and NCAA compliance for the 200-250 UM student athletes.

Kathy Noble, Associate Athletic Director and member of the Proposition 29 Implementation Committee, said that in meeting this objective the CAAS would "assist those struggling", and suggested that "at risk" student athletes should be worked with on a weekly basis. According to Robert Lindsay, NCAA Faculty Representative and committee member, the primary objective was to provide academic counseling and advising to student athletes. Marie Hibbard, hired as CAAS in the spring of 1992, included statements
concerning the development and delivery of a comprehensive program of academic services in her description of the goals and objectives for the CAAS position. Her primary objective, according to this document, is to "design, introduce, and implement a comprehensive academic and personal support program for student-athletes at the university".23

During the process of implementing Proposition 29 at the University of Montana, the individuals involved identified a second major objective. The objective is to eliminate what James Flightner calls "a clash of cultures".24 He proposed that the CAAS help to eliminate the animosity, conflict, and distrust which exists between the academic and athletic programs at the University. The objective, according to Flightner, is the development of the CAAS position as a liaison between these two, frequently conflicting, programs. Because the CAAS has one foot in each of these "clashing cultures", he or she is in a position to coordinate the resources and services of the two in order to best serve student athletes and the institution.

In the Agency Classification Request filed with the State Department of Administration in December 1991, the Proposition 29 Implementation Committee included the
following statements concerning the liaison role of the CAAS:

1. . . . to forge a strong relationship between athletic and academic endeavors at the University of Montana.
2. The individual in this position assumes a highly charged and responsible role for the College of Arts and Sciences and the Intercollegiate Athletic Department.
3. There will be extensive professional coordination with the Associate Director of Intercollegiate Athletics.

The Position Description and Notice of Position Vacancy for the CAAS also address the liaison function of the position. The Position Description includes the following statements under Duties and Responsibilities:

1. . . . forging a strong relationship between athletic and academic endeavors at the University of Montana.
2. . . . communication and consultation with both the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Associate Director of Intercollegiate Athletics.
3. The individual serves as a liaison for academic faculty, athletic department staff, and student services personnel to promote successful recruitment and retention of student athletes.
4. Liaison with campus academic, administrative and athletic office representatives, and NCAA representatives.

Finally, the Description of Position section in the Notice of Position Vacancy states that the CAAS will "act as a liaison between the College of Arts and Sciences, faculty in the academic departments, the Intercollegiate Athletics Department, faculty athletic representatives, and University of Montana administration and student services offices."
Individuals involved in the implementation of Proposition 29 at the University of Montana had different ways of describing this liaison role. Melanie Hoell believes that athletes are too often removed from the academic program of the university and says that the CAAS must "draw student athletes into the academic community more broadly". She notes that this position presents an opportunity to "bring athletics and academics together". She sees an "automatic mesh" between the CAAS, the University College, and Academic Advising. The CAAS can best meet this objective by letting student athletes know what services are available on campus. Also indicative of the importance of the objective of serving as a liaison are the comments of Robert Lindsay and Kathy Noble. Lindsay says that "diplomacy is a key" because the CAAS will face "lots of demands from the different interests on campus". According to Noble, the CAAS "needs the blessing of everyone on campus", and should provide "better atmosphere and cooperation on campus".

Professionals in the field of academic advising, the NCAA, and individual institutions have identified two major problems facing student athletes. First of all, student athletes are often widely differentiated from non-athletes in terms of race,
academic preparation, economic, cultural, and social background, and personal goals. Second, once on campus, student athletes often find a situation where the academic and athletic programs seek different goals and serve divergent purposes. As indicated in this chapter, the objectives of the CAAS position at the University of Montana have been established in response to these identified needs. The CAAS at the University of Montana is expected to develop and implement a comprehensive program of evaluation, academic advising, and counseling to meet the special needs of student athletes and to serve as a liaison between the academic and athletic interests on campus.

**APPROPRIATE DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR THE CAAS**

Proposition 29 included no job description for the CAAS position, requiring only that academic counseling and tutoring services be provided for all recruited student athletes. Consequently, the duties and responsibilities of the CAAS vary from institution to institution. This flexibility was necessary at the time of passage because of the range of services available to athletes and the structure and size of athletic programs at various institutions. Schools with established academic counseling and tutoring services for athletes used the
annual NCAA funds to expand their programs by purchasing computers and other equipment, providing facilities for advising and tutoring, and hiring support personnel. The University of Montana (UM) and Idaho State University (ISU), however, used the funding to create CAAS positions on their campuses. Because of the limited resources available at UM and ISU it was essential that the CAAS position not become a dumping ground for the duties and responsibilities of others in the academic and athletic departments. The implementation processes at UM and ISU were quite different, but the duties and responsibilities of the CAAS on both campuses are similar. Those duties and responsibilities to be assumed by the CAAS were the subject of much discussion as UM established the position on its campus.

The implementation of Proposition 29 has been quite different at individual Division I schools. At the University of Michigan, academic counseling and tutoring services for student athletes have been provided since 1981. The athletic program at Michigan currently includes twenty-one varsity sports and 536 student athletes. NCAA funding provided through Proposition 29 has been used to enhance existing academic advising and tutoring services. Boise State University initiated its version of a CAAS position more than
ten years ago. The athletic program at Boise State involves over 350 athletes. Because there was an established program at Boise State, the Proposition 29 grant money has been used to fund an assistant to the CAAS who is responsible for those athletes in the "Olympic Sports" and to provide additional tutoring services.

By comparison, the athletic programs at UM and ISU each include between 200 and 270 student athletes. When Proposition 29 was passed in 1991, each athletic program included study halls and tutoring services for their athletes. However, because there was no established coordination of services between the academic and athletic portions of the institutions, the NCAA grant money from Proposition 29 was used to establish a CAAS position at each institution. While BSU was able to hire an assistant to the CAAS in 1991, ISU's first CAAS, Nancy Graziano, had no office, secretary, or computer and was carrying her files in cardboard boxes while working from a desk located next to the copy machine in the athletic department office. Six months later Marie Hibbard was hired to fill the CAAS position at UM. Her position was advertised as three-quarters time, twelve months a year, and with a salary less than $24,000 per year. According to those with similar jobs at peer institutions, Hibbard will actually
work an average of fifty to sixty hours per week as CAAS.

At both UM and ISU, there was concern that the position would become a "dumping ground" for others involved in the athletic and academic departments and that the CAAS would take on too many duties and responsibilities. Fred Goode, CAAS at Boise State University, anticipated that there would "be some dumping as coaches and administrators attempt to use the coordinator". Dr. Robert Lindsay, NCAA faculty representative at UM, expressed concern that coaches, especially those in the football program, athletic administrators, and the faculty representative could easily pass duties on to the CAAS. Nancy Graziano complained that coaches sometimes failed to plan ahead and needed her assistance at the last minute and noted the concern of administrators that she might take on too many responsibilities. Dr. James Flightner, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at UM, stated that the first hire as CAAS must withstand these pressures and be able to establish his or her own responsibilities.

The processes used to create an appropriate job description and list of specific duties and responsibilities for the CAAS position at UM and ISU were quite different. At UM, the
process took over six months with representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences, the University College, the Athletic Department, and the NCAA faculty representative meeting to design the job description, position announcement, and hiring process and to determine the compensation for the position. There were over one hundred and thirty applicants for the job and Marie Hibbard did not take the position until June, 1992, nearly eighteen months after the passage of Proposition 29. Her job description included five general areas of responsibilities and twenty-four specific duties. In contrast, the CAAS position at ISU was established and filled by August, 1991, one year faster than at UM. No job description was established prior to the hiring and the search committee was dominated by the athletic department. It included an athletic administrator, three coaches, and an admissions officer. In December 1991, Nancy Graziano had seen no official job description and was in the process of defining the duties and responsibilities of her position. Graziano found that the duties she was performing at ISU were included in the job description developed by the Proposition 29 Implementation Committee at UM. She predicted that the position at UM would include more administrative duties and paper work dealing with NCAA compliance and student tracking than the job
description indicated.

The role of the CAAS is expressed through those duties and responsibilities assigned to the position at each institution. The NCAA requires only that student athletes receive academic counseling and tutoring services. At Boise State University, where such programs have been available for more than ten years, the current CAAS, Fred Goode, sees his role as that of a facilitator. According to Goode, his primary duties are to tie athletics in with the rest of the university, educate the educators about the role of athletics and the conflicts facing student athletes at the university, and to track the academic progress of student athletics. In this role, Goode spends more time with faculty and coaches than with athletes. He has a full-time assistant, graduate assistants, and tutors that deliver specific services to athletes. He is actively involved in the recruiting process, helping to identify appropriate scholarship candidates. He also serves as a mediator to help balance the expectations placed on student athletes by coaches and faculty members.

At institutions like ISU and UM where the CAAS has few financial or personnel resources, the duties and responsibilities of the CAAS position involve more direct contact with student athletes. For example, at ISU Nancy Graziano screens
prospective recruits, gives campus tours for athletes, assists students in the registration process, organizes, provides, and evaluates tutors, tracks student progress, and serves as a liaison between the "Upper Campus", athletics, and the "Lower Campus", academics. She meets with coaches and athletes on a daily basis, often waiting until after practices to deal with individual student needs. Graziano has developed a set of forms necessary to administer a more efficient and effective tutoring program and is writing a student handbook for athletes. Because she had no official job description when hired, she has had to establish her own duties and responsibilities, primarily at the direction of the athletic department.

The duties and responsibilities of the CAAS at the University of Montana were more clearly defined by the Proposition 29 Implementation Committee and subsequently have been modified by Marie Hibbard. Members of the committee anticipated a variety of duties for the CAAS. In general, Kathy Noble anticipated duties similar to those of the CAAS at Boise State University, but restricted by limited resources. She expected the CAAS to identify and assist struggling student athletes and believed that the first hire would determine the specific duties of the position.35 Dr.
James Flightner wanted a detailed job description in order to insure that the position was not dominated by the needs and wishes of the athletic department. Dr. Robert Lindsay saw academic counseling as a primary responsibility of the position and also suggested that the CAAS assist in collecting data and documentation for NCAA and Big Sky Conference reports.

Through their discussions, the committee was able to combine these visions of the position and to identify five areas of responsibility and twenty-four specific duties for the CAAS. At the University of Montana, the CAAS is expected to:

1. Develop and administer academic advising services. Included duties are assessment of student athletes, presentation of workshops, and administration of study skills, tutorial, and academic resources.

2. Plan and coordinate an academic advising delivery system. The CAAS will provide academic counseling for student athletes in the University College, monitor student athletes at risk, and conduct new student orientation for recruited student athletes.

3. Coordinate academic eligibility and compliance efforts. Included duties are the review and evaluation of academic records of prospective and enrolled student athletes, processing of athletic review forms, and maintaining eligibility records.

4. Prepare student tracking and program review reports. The CAAS will implement a computer tracking system, review records for successful completion of requirements, and prepare related reports.

5. Serve as a liaison with campus academic, athletic, and administrative offices and the NCAA representatives. Specific duties include serving on related committees, promoting on campus awareness
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of academic issues related to student athletes and coordinating regular reviews of student athletes' academic program effectiveness.\textsuperscript{38}

Since taking the position in June, 1992, Marie Hibbard has been able to more completely define the duties and responsibilities of the position at UM. She has found the job description and her expectations of the duties of the position to have been accurate. She has provided proactive counseling, learning assistance programs, and reactive monitoring for student athletes. According to Hibbard, the number of student visits to her office increased considerably between August, 1992 and April, 1993. Student traffic was especially heavy during preregistration periods as Hibbard assisted athletes trying to organize their class schedules. She also met with each team at least twice during the year to discuss NCAA and Big Sky Conference rules and to inform athletes about the academic advising and tutoring services available to them on campus. As Nancy Graziano predicted, Hibbard found that administrative duties, primarily dealing with NCAA eligibility compliance and student tracking, took a larger percentage of her time than the job description anticipated. Because of limited resources, Hibbard has not been able to meet with individual student athletes as frequently as she had hoped.\textsuperscript{39}
The duties and responsibilities of the CAAS at UM and ISU are similar. Each is serving as a liaison between the academic and athletic programs on campus. Each is actively involved in the provision of academic counseling and tutoring services for student athletes. At both institutions, the CAAS tracks the academic progress of student athletes and provides data for the NCAA and the Big Sky Conference. Finally, because each position is new and because resources are limited, both Nancy Graziano and Marie Hibbard feel unable to provide all of the services that are needed.

AUTONOMY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Nationally, the first plans to provide academic assistance for student athletes were initiated and controlled by athletic departments. When Ronald Bowes proposed academic counseling and tutoring services for all recruited athletes at Division I schools, he argued that the programs should be housed outside the athletic departments of the institutions. Proposition 29, which required these services starting in 1991, allowed individual schools to decide whether these services should be provided through the department of athletics or by student support services outside the department.

Consequently, each institution that has created a CAAS
position since 1991 has had to address questions of autonomy and accountability. Idaho State University and the University of Montana have taken different approaches to these questions. While both institutions have created positions with similar duties, the autonomy of the position and the accountability of the CAAS at ISU is considerably different from that at UM.

Ronald Bowes argued that academic counseling and tutoring services must be taken out of the hands of athletic departments. According to Bowes, services provided through and controlled by athletic administrators and coaches have not met the needs of student athletes. His proposal, which was modified and adopted as Proposition 29, required that academic counseling and tutoring services for student athletes be accountable to the Director of Student Life, the Dean of Students, or an academic administrator on each campus. Bowes stated that intercollegiate athletics add to the missions of universities and colleges and that the CAAS at each institution must work closely with, but not report directly to the athletic department. He also argued that as long as the CAAS was accountable to athletic administrators and coaches the goal of academic services would be to maintain eligibility and not to complete degrees. Bowes concluded that athletic
departments were more concerned about team success than the "life success" of individual student athletes.41

The plan presented at the 1991 NCAA convention by the Presidents' Commission called for required academic counseling and tutoring services for all student athletes, but provided no direction in terms of the autonomy or accountability of the program. Proposition 29, a revision of Ronald Bowes' 1986 plan, states:

Such counseling and tutoring services may be provided by the department of athletics or through the institution's nonathletics student support services.42

The rationale for this broad flexibility in the provision of services was explained by the wide range of programs and administrative plans already in existence. In addition, a plan mandating that the services be housed outside the athletic department would have had little chance of being adopted by the delegates at the convention. This wording put the decisions on the autonomy and accountability of the CAAS position directly into the hands of individual institutions, including ISU and UM. These two universities have reached different conclusions as to the autonomy and accountability of the position. The CAAS at ISU apparently has less autonomy than the CAAS at UM. The accountability of the CAAS position is directly to the Athletic Director at ISU while at UM
the CAAS reports directly to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

At UM the committee that set up the CAAS job description sought to create a position with the independence necessary to best serve student athletes. Committee members were concerned that if specific duties and courses of action were initiated by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences or the Athletic Director, the CAAS position would become a dumping ground. Dr. Flightner, Kathy Noble, and Melanie Hoell agreed that the first hire must have the opportunity to establish the parameters of the job. Flightner contended that a good first hire would establish the integrity of the position. He acknowledged that he lacked the time or expertise to play an active role in the direct supervision of academic advising and tutoring services for student athletes.45 Marie Hibbard is pleased that her office is located in the University College, away from the athletic department and the College of Arts and Sciences. She feels that autonomy has allowed her to be more successful in her work.44

The degree of autonomy and accountability of the CAAS positions at UM and ISU are defined in the job descriptions and by supervisors and the current position holders. Marie
Hibbard described herself as "independent" in her position and in the development of the academic services program. Nancy Graziano stated that she is autonomous in terms of "daily decisions", but works with the athletic director when questions arise concerning the priorities of the program. The athletic director at ISU often initiates these meetings. By comparison, in nine months on the job, Hibbard has taken a number of issues to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Athletic Director, but no such discussions have been initiated by the administrators. Graziano identifies herself as part of the athletic department at ISU. Her office is housed in the athletic department offices and she spends most of her time working on the "Lower Campus". It is too early in the development of the CAAS positions at UM and ISU to determine the degree of effectiveness of these two administrative plans.

The accountability of the CAAS positions at ISU and UM also differ. Graziano reports directly to the Athletic Director, Randy Hoffman, while Hibbard officially reports to Dean James Flightner of the College of Arts and Sciences at UM. According to Melanie Hoell, the organizational chart includes informal "dotted lines to Kathy Noble and me
Having watched the position develop, Hoell states that Hibbard spends 5/6 of her time working with academics and 1/6 of her time with athletics. With a large degree of autonomy and an emphasis on academic concerns, Hibbard has been able to concentrate on her role as a liaison between athletics and academics and her responsibilities dealing with the counseling needs of individual student athletes.

Despite the fact that the CAAS positions at ISU and UM have similar duties and responsibilities, the administrative framework of the positions is quite different in terms of autonomy and accountability. Nancy Graziano clearly works for and with the athletic department at ISU while Marie Hibbard has separated herself from the athletic department at UM. Hibbard apparently is more autonomous in her position as well. These differences would provide for an interesting follow-up study regarding the relative effectiveness of those CAAS positions directly responsible to the athletic department and those directly responsible to the College of Arts and Sciences.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The lengthy process of establishing a CAAS position and selecting a first hire has been successful in initiating a coordinated program of academic counseling and tutoring services for student athletes at the University of Montana. Not only has the process resulted in a viable set of duties and responsibilities, significant autonomy, and accountability, but it also served to increase understanding between athletic and academic programs. In reviewing the process of establishing academic counseling and tutoring services at Division I schools including UM and ISU, it has been possible to draw conclusions concerning the implementation process and recommendations for maintaining the integrity and expanding the scope of the CAAS position. It has also been possible to identify problems facing the CAAS position, possible limits on its effectiveness, and topics for future study.
CONCLUSIONS: THE IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS TO DATE

A major objective of the implementation committee was to establish the CAAS position at UM as a liaison between the academic and athletic programs on campus. The implementation process served that purpose. During an interview with Dr. James Flightner early in the process, he declined to comment on this research on the grounds that the hiring process was "too political" to be discussed. He later identified the central difficulty in the process as a "clash of cultures" between athletics and academics. The implementation process has allowed these two clashing cultures an opportunity to meet, discuss their individual and joint objectives, and develop a position description that meets the needs of both departments. Even before the CAAS position was filled, the process had served to create the liaison role for the first hire. In contrast, the hiring process at ISU was dominated by the athletic department. This process has limited the liaison role of the CAAS on that campus.

The primary disadvantage of the implementation process at UM was the length of time necessary to make the first hire. The CAAS at ISU was at work nearly one year before UM completed the hiring process. The rapid hire at ISU gave
the CAAS on that campus a head start in the development of the position and gave ISU's student athletes an extra year of coordinated services. In the long run, the CAAS position at UM may be more effective due to the extensive preparation made for the first hire.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
MAINTAINING THE INTEGRITY OF THE CAAS POSITION

At the University of Montana, because funding and personnel are limited, the CAAS must meet the basic objectives listed in the job description. Recommendations One through Four address this obligation.

RECOMMENDATION ONE

The CAAS must continue to build the liaison role. Without the support of the academic departments, all attempts to meet position objectives will be limited or ineffective. In order for the CAAS to succeed, she must have the support of all the factions involved in the process of educating student athletes. Academic advising, assisting students in meeting the requirements for graduation, is the responsibility of the faculty of each of the academic departments. The role of the CAAS is to provide academic counseling and tutoring services. Any attempt to assume the role of academic advisor will infringe upon the responsibilities
of the faculty and serve to isolate the CAAS. Therefore, the CAAS must provide counseling services for student athletes while serving as a liaison with the faculty members that provide academic advising.

**RECOMMENDATION TWO**

The CAAS must continue to assist in the recruitment and retention of student athletics seeking degrees. Essential in this process are the accurate assessment of the qualifications of potential athletes and the provision of proactive counseling and tutoring services. Successful orientation programs must be provided, especially for minority students and junior college transfers. The CAAS must identify those student athletes at risk during their freshman and sophomore years and concentrate the limited resources of the position on those in need.

**RECOMMENDATION THREE**

The CAAS must stress graduation and not athletic eligibility. Pressure from coaches and peers often result in student athletes selecting inappropriate courses. The purpose of the institution is the education of students, not the development of winning teams.
RECOMMENDATION FOUR

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of academic counseling and tutoring services, the CAAS must continue to collect data for the NCAA ten year longitudinal study of graduation rates. These data will provide valuable information as to the appropriate use of the resources of the position.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

IMPROVING ACADEMIC COUNSELING AND TUTORING SERVICES FOR STUDENT ATHLETES

In addition to the basic objectives described for the CAAS position, additional counseling services and curriculum must be provided for student athletes. The CAAS is in a position to implement and facilitate these additions. Recommendations Five through Nine address these changes.

RECOMMENDATION FIVE

In order to allow the CAAS to facilitate the personal development of student athletes, additional resources must be committed. The current $25,000 annual grant from the NCAA is not sufficient to maximize what Ronald Bowes calls "life success". Such "life success" is not guaranteed by good win/loss records, impressive individual statistics, or high GPA's. It is achieved through the individual development and
personal growth that is the mission of all educational institutions. This mission will not be achieved until education is the number one goal of athletic departments and their supporters. The CAAS, with appropriate resources, can help to attain this goal. When additional resources become available, the CAAS will be able to expand services for student athletes. These services would reach beyond the current NCAA objective of higher graduation rates and provide opportunities for improved personal development. This research has identified four specific areas of concern that should be addressed as services are expanded.

**RECOMMENDATION SIX**

The CAAS must provide assistance in the moral and ethical development of student athletes. Recent studies indicate alarming deficits in these areas as athletes become isolated from the academic programs of their institutions. These deficits are most obvious in males and are demonstrated by the pragmatic and cynical actions and attitudes of these athletes which are often supported by coaches and athletic administrators.

**RECOMMENDATION SEVEN**

The CAAS should assist student athletes as they seek appropriate coping methods. The various pressures placed on
student athletes result in the student/athlete conundrum. Too often, drug and alcohol abuse, psychological stress, and physical fatigue lead to neglect and the de-emphasis of the student role. Student athletes cope by withdrawing from their academic programs. The CAAS can help student athletes to identify more successful coping methods through role conflict counseling and self-concept counseling.

RECOMMENDATION EIGHT

Student athletes must be treated as individuals, not as members of a homogeneous group. Academic counseling and tutoring services should be provided based on individual need. The CAAS must identify the needs of individual athletes in order to maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of services.

RECOMMENDATION NINE

The growth of intercollegiate athletic programs for women must be addressed by the CAAS. Current research indicates that female student athletes are facing personal development problems similar to those long seen in males. The CAAS must be prepared to meet the additional needs of female athletes as they face greater role conflicts and increasing time commitments. Early identification and intervention for female student athletes at risk is essential.
POTENTIAL PROBLEMS IN THE CAAS POSITION

In addition to the identification of possible areas of improvement and growth in the CAAS position, this research has also highlighted two potential problems that could disrupt academic counseling and tutoring services. Either of these problems could result in a failure to meet the needs of student athletes.

PROBLEM ONE

The large number of administrative duties currently being completed by the CAAS at UM is restricting her ability to provide academic counseling for student athletes. The fear that the position may become a dumping ground for such duties is still a primary concern. The bureaucratic regulations established by the NCAA created most of this paperwork. Limiting the position to three quarter time and expecting the CAAS to complete a heavy workload of administrative duties detracts from the completion of stated objectives. To meet these objectives, funding must be increased and administrative duties must be limited. The CAAS should spend no more than 30% of her worktime on student tracking and compliance efforts. These duties should remain primarily in the hands of the NCAA faculty representative.
**PROBLEM TWO**

There is a potential loss of autonomy of the position, with either the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics or the College of Arts and Sciences gaining control. The CAAS was recently identified in the University of Montana Kaimin as "the athletic department's academic advisor". It is critical that the CAAS work with, not for, the athletic department. If autonomy is surrendered, the liaison role of the CAAS would be destroyed and the focus of the position could degenerate to eligibility counseling or acting as a watchdog over the athletic department. This loss of autonomy would preclude the CAAS from meeting its primary objective, serving the needs of student athletes. As a servant of either the Intercollegiate Athletic Department or the College of Arts and Sciences, the CAAS would be less able to assist student athletes achieve their total "life success". In order for the CAAS to be successful, she must work for individual student athletes.

**POTENTIAL FOR FUTURE STUDY**

This research has been completed as the CAAS position has been implemented on the University of Montana campus. Two additional topics for possible study have been identified during this research. Each could provide valuable insights as
to the comparative effectiveness and efficiency of the CAAS positions at similar institutions. A comparison of the implementation process at ISU, which was completed in less than three months, and the lengthy process which took place at UM could provide valuable insights about autonomy, accountability, and the liaison role. There is also potential for a study comparing the effectiveness of the CAAS at ISU, who is accountable to the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics, and the CAAS at UM, who is accountable to the College of Arts and Sciences.
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