Spring 2014 Athletic Review

Purpose:
On an annual basis, all campuses will review the course grade-point averages calculated for student-athletes and other student subgroups versus nonstudent-athletes and other identified subgroups. A summary of student-athlete comparisons will be included in the required Board of Governors’ Intercollegiate Athletics Report, beginning in 2014.

In addition, campuses will develop a common threshold or definition of clustering by student-athletes or other student subgroups that will trigger an automatic review of flagged courses to determine whether there were any irregularities in the reasons clustering occurred. (December 2013)

Finding:
Athletes accounted for 2.94% of the undergraduate student headcount in spring 2014. Therefore, as I reviewed the results of our reports, I looked for anomalies where significantly more than these percentages of each were athletes. I did not find anything that hinted of special treatment for athletes. I looked at major, instructor, course, coaches as instructor, and prior term grading distributions. The only data point of concern is the one coach who is teaching their own athlete. Even so, this is not significant enough to warrant immediate attention, only careful monitoring in future terms.

Major Distribution (% Athlete)
You might expect athletes to gravitate towards declaring particular majors. I did not find that to be the case this spring. Some majors you would expect to attract athletes, but there are some majors identified that do not fit this profile. Here are the declared majors with proportionally high percentages of athletes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>% Athletes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC-Statistics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Physical Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Physics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Finance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Anthropology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Exercise Science</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Science</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>14.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-International Business</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Pre-Physical Therapy</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>12.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec/Sport Leadership/Tourism Mgt</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>12.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation Management</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education (Licensure)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Accountancy</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Hlth Education</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Pre-Dentistry</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Art History</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Athletic Training</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Special Education</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Studies</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Class Distribution (%Athlete)
I looked for courses subjects with a high representation of athletes. Athletes have to adhere to progress towards degree requirements that are often more stringent than our own. They are advised to take courses like EVS and EXS that can double and/or triple count in their degree program. Athletes tend to be attracted to ASL courses, because of their natural use of “see, then do” programming. Here are the results for course subjects with high percentages of athletes. I did not find anything significant or suspicious.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Athletes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASL – American Sign Lang</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXS – Exercise Science</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>15.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC – Recreation</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>11.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVSL – Environ Sci Lab</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>10.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEA – Health</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>9.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAT – Latin</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>8.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGS – Women’s &amp; Gender Std</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>5.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT - Portuguese</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLA – Business Law</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>4.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN – Finance</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>4.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRN - Gerontology</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMM – Quantitative Methods</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>4.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPS – Operations Mgt</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>4.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor Distribution (%Athlete)
Upon further review of all the instructors with a percentage rate about 40%, it can be articulated back to a course in University Studies that double or triple dips in their degree program. Nevertheless, I will flag these particular instructors, and review their grade distribution at the end of the semester. I find nothing significant or suspicious, just something to keep an eye on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boren, Mark E</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeycutt, Larry R</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>48.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yates, Jenny L</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>41.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennes, Megan Elizabeth</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schultz, David J</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badarinathi, Ravija</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finelli, Christopher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nye, Allison Hope</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bean, John J</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes, Christian G</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>23.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett, John P</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardoim, M Sonja</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumeral, Elizabeth Ashley</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>21.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schell, George P</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosgrove, Amanda Rebecca</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schlag, Amy E</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Independent Study/Internship Distribution (%Athlete)

As the Chapel Hill case involved independent study work, my next step was to look at the course numbers to see if 491s, 492s, or 498s were taken by athletes more than by the general population. I did not find this. None of these independent course numbers showed a percentage of athletes higher than average for that term’s offerings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Athletes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIO 491-042</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLR 491-801</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEA 491-004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXS 491-004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO 491-032</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 491-001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 491-021</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO 491-005</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO 491-003</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 491-002</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coaches instructing their own athletes

Last semester we noticed coaches that were teaching PED courses were instructing 1-2 of their own players. This semester, there is only one athlete who is being taught by their own coach, Cynthia Ho. Last semester a discussion occurred with the Director of the School of Health & Human Services, and we do not feel that this is of significance; however it could be misconstrued if shared publicly. We will continue to work with the Athletics Department in future semesters to ensure this does not happen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Athletes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ho, Cynthia</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, David Bruce</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonetti, Anthony J</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunn, Luther Bernard</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprecher, James R</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrester, Daniel</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spring/Summer Grade Distribution (%Athlete)

The last parameter I check in this round was grades. Overall, athletes’ grades were about the same as non-athletes’ grades. Below are the grade averages for the past two terms. I want to show that there is not a huge increase from term to term, as well as the athletes are right in-line with the rest of the student body. I have more detail on this, but no individual trends are noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Athletes</td>
<td>3.017</td>
<td>3.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td>3.222</td>
<td>3.108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers presented above are real. Of course, the conclusions I mention are my own. I would be happy to dig deeper or share my raw data with others for different perspectives on this. However, having gone through the exercise, I am confident that we do not risk the type of problems that we have seen elsewhere in the system.

Future Study

- Continue identifying athletes studying under their respective coach. Work with athletic support services to recommend (not require) other options for students falling into this category.
• Continue monitoring these data points each semester, prior to the registration deadline and following census.
• Continue reviewing before and after registration closing, allowing us to be proactive in addressing potential problems.

If you have additional questions, please contact Jonathan Reece or myself.

Respectfully Submitted,

Craig Funderburk
NCAA Eligibility Specialist

Jonathan Reece
University Registrar