A Report to the President by the UNC Task Force on Athletics and Academics

August 1, 2011

Purpose of the Task Force

As the structure and complexity of college athletics continues to evolve, the University of North Carolina recognizes the importance of maintaining integrity at the intersection of athletics and academics. There always will be areas of risk in the athletics environment and it is the role of university leaders to make every effort to minimize those risks. NCAA bylaw 11.1 requires that a "culture of compliance" must be strongly encouraged, maintained, and improved in each athletics program. With these critical issues in mind, President Tom Ross created the UNC Task Force on Athletics and Academics in January 2011 to evaluate the current status of academic support services and issues of academic integrity across the UNC system. The Task Force was asked to address the following charge by President Ross:

a. Identify and prioritize institutional risks in intercollegiate athletics related to academic integrity and NCAA compliance; and

b. Review and propose best practices related to these risks with special emphasis on academic support services and tutoring for student-athletes.

As university leaders considered this charge, we recognized the importance of promoting the academic integrity of all athletics programs in the UNC system, while also giving credence to the fact that there is a strong desire to be competitive, and in some sports considerable financial rewards are available for successful athletes. The Task Force remains particularly concerned about the student-athlete because student success, defined in different ways across the system, remains our primary objective and responsibility.

We understand that all constituent institutions with athletics programs desire to be successful; however, research suggests that an extremely small percentage of student-athletes ever make a living in their sport. Hence, it is essential that all constituent institutions place the academic success of the student-athlete as the first priority and not allow compromises in reaching this goal.

Ultimately, the purpose of this effort is to assist the student-athlete. The academic expectations set by each constituent institution should be applied to all members of the student body at each specific university; however, it must be recognized that there are often added expectations for student-athletes due to their visibility and the inevitable attention that some receive. Athletics participation is an integral part of the student experience and the integrity of these valuable learning experiences should be protected to the maximum extent possible.

The Task Force is comprised of representatives from across the UNC system, including chancellors, athletics directors, leaders of academic support services, and academic leaders (See Attachment 1). It convened five times between February 18 and August 1, 2011.

Core Values and Principles

The UNC Task Force on Athletics and Academics believes that core values and principles must be considered when campus leaders make decisions involving academic integrity in athletics. With this in mind, the Task Force recognizes that substantial variation exists across the constituent institutions—including the nature of the NCAA division, conference affiliation and support, size, tradition and funding mechanisms. Hence, the risks associated with academic integrity vary, as do the appropriate strategies to control them. Therefore, the Task Force is not recommending prescriptive practices for any individual campus; however, we do intend for our work to help educate each campus and their governing boards about the range of potential risks and control strategies. Also, we strongly recommend that the UNC system become more engaged in minimizing the risks we identify below. One excellent way for this to happen is to create better monitoring and oversight capacity within the system (see section on recommendations).

The Task Force believes the following core values should guide decision-making about athletics programs across all divisions:

- ***Academic integrity*** is vital to the UNC system and each campus. Integrity is the *Sine Qua Non* of our institutions and system;

- Athletics enterprises are ultimately ***accountable to and controlled by the chancellor*** of each campus. The UNC Policy Manual, 1100.1, makes clear the authority and responsibility of the chancellors to control admissions, ensure student progress toward the baccalaureate degree, ensure tutorial programs are administered by academic offices, and control many other aspects of the athletics enterprise.

- ***Academic Affairs*** must be well integrated and fully in control of support services related to athletics (UNC Policy Manual, 1100.1). For the most part, effective practices make the most positive difference when athletics teams and enterprises are well integrated into the academic functions of the campus.

- Risks to the student-athlete and to institutional academic integrity increase in the high profile revenue sports; therefore, greater institutional controls are required in these areas.

The Task Force recognizes and believes that these specific core values and principles are integral to successfully blending the line of academics and athletics for student-athletes at our respective universities today.

Primary Risks and Control Strategies

Numerous risks and challenges are associated with college sports. This Task Force concentrated on the admissions processes for student-athletes, academic standards and support services, and organizational and evaluation procedures related to compliance and academic support services. Additional other issues are obviously important—ranging from Title IX to selection of coaching staffs to booster and alumni involvement in athletics.

The Task Force concentrated on six risk areas of primary importance. In each section below, the definition and scope of the risk is provided, followed by a discussion of its importance and examples of risk minimization strategies.

1. **The Admissions Process for At-Risk Student-Athletes:** The ***admissions process*** for student-athletes that do not meet the institution's standard admissions requirements and the impact on academic support services is primary risk area #1. This area is of concern to the UNC system because it determines the academic caliber of student-athletes each institution admits and correlates to the ensuing retention and graduation success for these student-athletes.

   Every coach understands the importance of recruiting and landing top-notch athletes; pressures to attract the four-star and five-star athletes are enormous. These pressures, and the media attention they generate, create many of the problems and risks identified in this report. Student-athletes who are not ready for college—and therefore unlikely to be able to make satisfactory progress towards a degree—require additional resources to keep them eligible (let alone able to ensure graduation). Resultant pressures for inappropriate tutoring or other support services, and even academic fraud, can all be exacerbated by the pressure to land the elite athlete.

   A review of the UNC Minimum Course Requirements (MCR) and Minimum Admission Requirements (MAR), including exceptions to these policies and to the individual institution's admissions profile, was conducted. The Task Force reviewed the process for special admits across the system and proposes several examples of effective practices that can be adapted by institutions to meet their individual needs and profiles. The overriding philosophy endorsed is that the chancellor of each institution must be aware of the process and be an active participant in the admission of exceptions/special admits. Ultimately, the chancellor is responsible for the academic and athletic integrity of the institution.

   In addition, the Task Force recommends that reports be generated within each institution to ensure that the number of MAR exceptions for each institution is within the guidelines set forth by the UNC Board of Governors, which is 1% of the accepted freshmen each year. The reports will also track the academic progress of all exceptions beyond their freshman year to determine if institutions are being successful at retention and graduation of these student-athletes. Further, the Task Force encourages institutions to conduct an analysis of each individual team to determine which teams are admitting the largest percentage of student-athletes who are academically less prepared. If the academic record of a team is not acceptable to the standards on that campus (e.g.: low retention rates,

inadequate progress towards degree, etc), then those teams should be given less flexibility during the admissions process than those with a demonstrated track record of appropriately supporting that group of student-athletes. These data should be regularly reviewed by committees created by the chancellor that represent the core academic mission of the institution. At East Carolina University, for example, an "Academic Success Committee" is primarily responsible for admission of student-athletes with special talents, housing issues, and numerous other factors that affect the performance of the student-athlete. The committee is composed of both academic vice chancellors and athletics leaders within the university.

Coaches and athletics departments should be held accountable for ensuring that full evaluations are conducted of the prospective athletes that they recruit. Motivation, character, and previous conduct records (from high school or junior college) can be integrated into the recruitment profile. This regularly occurs at some institutions. In addition, in cases where an athlete has experienced behavioral problems or academic issues, involvement of faculty and academic support personnel is recommended during on-campus visits. This kind of integration of athletics and academics also sends a message to the recruit that academic success is expected. UNC-Chapel Hill, North Carolina State University, and UNC Charlotte have established effective means to integrate academic support staff into the evaluation of recruits.

The Task Force also reviewed and discussed the minimum requirements needed on campus to support special admitted (as defined at each institution) student-athletes. The consensus is to encourage all UNC institutions to strive to have all athletics academic support units achieve Program Certification from the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics (N4A). At the present time, not all UNC institutions are capable of meeting the minimum requirements for program certification. All institutions should work toward achieving this recommendation. As a starting point, all institutions are capable of having their lead athletics academic staff member achieve Individual N4A Professional Certification.

The admissions process on each campus is unique to that campus and its individual needs. However, each campus is required to abide by the Minimum Admissions Requirements (MAR) and Minimum Course Requirements (MCR) as set forth by the UNC Board of Governors. The processes used on each campus to evaluate the admission of these special admit student-athletes must satisfy NCAA requirements of faculty involvement to meet NCAA Certification Requirements.

2. **The Definition of Academic Success for Student-Athletes:** This section focuses on issues with eligibility waivers, retention, graduation, and other indicators that the student-athletes are students first. The following principles are recommended as a starting point to guide the definition of "academic success."

   From the initial recruiting contact, through the process of admissions and integration into campus life, it is the institution's responsibility to reinforce to the student-athlete that we expect them to be successful academically, not just "eligible." Academic success should be a constant for all students… meaning all students should stay in school, find an academic major of interest, and graduate with demonstrated competencies that will prepare the

student-athlete for life after athletics. All student-athletes need that preparation.

Success must be measured at the individual student-athlete level. While the Academic Progress Rate (APR) and Graduation Success Rate (GSR) are important aggregate measures of academic progress and graduation for a team as a whole, the unit of success is the student-athlete.

"Academic success" is the journey by a student-athlete through all aspects of an education that culminates in a degree. While the focus of the Task Force is "academics," support for the integration of social and extracurricular activities as part of the collegiate experience is also important.

Student-athletes who have exhausted athletic eligibility, chosen to leave the team, or are injured should receive the same set of academic support services as provided to eligible and competing student-athletes.

There is an institutional responsibility and accountability for all dimensions of a student-athlete's success. It is up to the institution to define the best means to accomplish this success. The chancellor and senior leadership, inclusive of the athletics director and coaches, should create the understanding that academic success is an expectation.

We must recognize that coaches are a substantial influence on student-athletes due to their role as the main point of contact for their respective team; therefore, all coaches should be held accountable for the academic success of the student-athlete and understand that they are instrumental in the academic success of student-athletes. Many institutions are including various measures of academic performance in coaches' contracts.

3. Ethical Standards for Student-Athletes: As a member of the Task Force stated from the outset of this focus area discussion, academic dishonesty is "anything that is presented for evaluation for a grade that is not your own."

The research for this section consisted of a review of each Student Code of Conduct from the constituent institutions within the UNC system. We focused on identifying common themes and principles that related to topics such as plagiarism, fabrication, deception, cheating, bribery, sabotage, professorial misconduct, and impersonation. Our review also involved searching for a definition of academic dishonesty by the NCAA, but we confirmed that the NCAA has not yet issued a formal definition for this term. The NCAA does provide guidelines for academic standards and academic integrity.

Ultimately, our review of honor codes and academic policies led to the identification of the following themes regarding academic misconduct:

- **Cheating –** Any type of attempt to receive unauthorized or unapproved academic assistance during any type of school-related activity, including tests and graded work.

- **Plagiarism –** Using someone else's work as your own without giving appropriate credit to the original creator.

- **Bribery –** Paying or giving a form of payment to another in order to personally benefit from the misrepresentation of academic work.

- **False information –** Providing any information that is not true to faculty and/or staff related to your academic work or the work of another person.

- **Lying –** Creating excuses or untruthful reasons why academic work cannot be completed.

The Task Force recommends that it is an effective practice for the people and the offices that support student-athletes to openly discuss and reinforce the importance of ethical behavior, as well as ensure accountability for appropriate ethical conduct. Successful ethical education starts with the coaches and with recruiting, but must become a routine aspect of their life on campus.

An effective practice involves strong orientation prior to the first class. Numerous universities have ethical guidelines and ethical training sessions that alert the student-athlete to appropriate academic behavior and what constitutes fraud. Some universities require the student-athlete to sign codes of ethical conduct, and many strong academic support programs spend considerable time during the first two years reinforcing their academic responsibilities and what tutors can and cannot do for them. Some institutions have found it an effective practice to adopt honor codes and statements of ethical practices for student-athletes, and we recommend this practice for consideration by each constituent institution.

One such effective practice for encouraging ethical behavior is the use of mentors in the athletics programs. In general, research indicates that mentoring programs are designed to enhance the academic and social integration of students. When student-athletes and students in the general population are involved in a mentoring program, they are engaged in a process by which a person of experience and expertise is guiding them towards achievement of specific goals. Usually, a trusting and committed relationship is formed that extends beyond the student's college experience. Below are two examples of effective mentoring programs—one within the UNC system and one from an out-of-state institution:

North Carolina A&T University: This program is centered around a Student-Athlete Mentor (SAM) who has the role of assisting student-athletes in developing skills and knowledge required to ethically complete assignments or academic tasks for courses in which they are enrolled. Primary responsibilities of the SAM include providing assistance to student-athletes in the following areas: ethical expectations, study skills, test-taking, writing skills, learning strategies, time management skills, and all other skills needed to succeed academically.

Rutgers Faculty Mentoring Program for Student-Athletes: The Rutgers University Faculty Mentoring Program for Student-Athletes (RU FacMenSA) aims to foster understanding between the university's faculty members and staff and student-athletes and to provide these individuals with role models outside their normal academic and athletics environments. The program is designed to be flexible in its scope and encompassing in its vision, so that both may garner maximum benefit from the program. Student-athletes may ask faculty members and staff to serve as informal career counselors, general life advisors, mature adults in whom to confide *in loco parentis*, or in other appropriate functions. Approved by the president of the university, this program has also been endorsed by the executive vice president for academic affairs, the Board of Governors committee on intercollegiate athletics, the academic athletic oversight committee, and the office of the director of intercollegiate athletics.

4. Academic Support Staff and Tutors: The selection, training, and evaluation of tutors paid by the athletics department and the academic support staff must be a critical area of focus for institutions. The term "institutional control" refers to the efforts an institution makes to comply with NCAA legislation. A meaningful process to select, train, and evaluate tutors and academic support staff is an important component of demonstrating institutional control.

Further, this should be an area of concern for the UNC system because it is a critical element in maintaining the academic integrity of the institution. In the past, there have been several institutions that have experienced academic problems that involved personnel (full or part time). While the Task Force agrees that a determined individual can choose to break the rules, it is the institution's responsibility to aggressively put processes and practices in place to mitigate the risks, and when they occur, to forcefully sanction those who violate institutional rules or threaten academic integrity.

An important task in defining how academic support services will be delivered on their campus is determining who will serve in the full-time and part-time roles to deliver these services. The recruitment of both full-time and part-time staff should include a careful screening process to ensure that people with the highest level of integrity are hired. Attempts should be made to weed out "fans" from the process. These are individuals seeking these types of positions for the sole purpose of gaining more access to student-athletes. A consistent recruiting and review process should be established to ensure a thorough process is in place. These types of positions are ones that people often recommend their "friends and neighbors" for. Having a consistent process in place will ensure that each prospective candidate is required to go through the same meaningful review process before an offer of employment is made.

The Task Force reviewed several effective practices at UNC institutions as well as other institutions with reputations for high quality in both athletics programs and student-athlete support programs. These practices included processes of broad interest such as those for hiring, training, and supervising academic support personnel at UNC Charlotte, UNC-Chapel Hill and North Carolina State University. N.C. State has created a "Provost's Athletics Roundtable" to provide the university's chief academic officer updates on the issues brought to the table by the faculty athletics representative, athletics director, and director of the academic support program for student-athletes. East Carolina University has implemented an Academic Success Committee with the purpose of protecting and enhancing the academic integrity and academic success of all athletic programs. The committee is advisory to the chancellor and can make recommendations regarding any issue the committee deems important to the academic integrity and success of the student-athlete. Outside of the UNC system, strong and innovative practices were identified at Indiana University and the University of Alabama-Birmingham.

In addition, the training of both tutors and academic support staff is critical to ensuring integrity in college athletics. Per NCAA Bylaw 10.1b, tutors employed by the athletics department are responsible for complying with all relevant NCAA legislation. To provide institutional control, individuals hired to provide tutorial support to student-athletes should go through a training session prior to the first tutoring session and should continue throughout their employment.

Participation in training sessions also should be mandated and encouraged for full time academic support professionals. Academic support professionals should be trained on the NCAA progress toward degree requirements and all relevant academic legislation. Institutions are vulnerable if the professionals providing academic guidance to the student-athletes are not knowledgeable about the NCAA rules and regulations. An additional effective practice is to require that all staff who have contact with student-athletes—including tutors, facility monitors, mentors, and many others—sign an ethical conduct pledge to comply with all NCAA rules, to report all possible violations, and to ensure that a student-athlete's work is their own.

Providing regular feedback to the tutors is important to the quality and retention of our students. Full time staff should also be evaluated based upon the goals of the academic support program. Feedback specific to each full-time staff member should be collected from student-athletes, coaches with whom there is working contact, faculty with whom there is working contact (if applicable), and the academic support administrator to whom the staff member reports.

It became clear to the Task Force that huge discrepancies exist across universities within the UNC system in terms of resources for academic support services. A pool of central funds, available through the General Administration, would be a helpful mechanism to support smaller and underfunded universities to establish effective academic support services. As we have suggested, this is a central contact point to the student-athlete and if not done properly can lead to numerous problems. The Task Force believes that academic support programs are one of many vital areas, such as compliance, in need of enhanced financial resources; therefore, they should have the opportunity to successfully compete for available funds in the athletics department during the resource allocation process.

Regardless of available funding, we recommend that each constituent institution evaluate the organizational location of its academic support services. While the funding for these services often has to come from athletic revenue, they can report to academic leaders, such as the provost, associate provost, or dean. At East Carolina University, the entire academic support program was recently moved to the provost's office, indicating that the function is fundamentally academic in nature.

A related practice is to create a faculty advisory committee to the academic support service. This may be particularly helpful with ethics training and monitoring of the services provided by tutors.

5. **Capacity of Compliance Operations and Organizational Structures:** The NCAA does not publish or prescribe a "best-practices" model for compliance operations, organization, or reporting structure at member institutions beyond what is provided in the Division I Certification Self-Study materials. Discussions regarding the adequacy of institutional control during investigation or enforcement proceedings typically focus on the following: (a) what formal institutional policies and procedures were in place at the time the violation of NCAA rules occurred; (b) whether those policies and procedures were adequate; and (c) if adequate, were those policies being monitored and enforced.

   UNC constituent institutions sponsoring intercollegiate athletics were surveyed

during the spring 2011 semester to determine their compliance and academic support service organization and functional capacity. Analysis of the survey results suggests a number of possible recommendations for improving institutional compliance and academic support service unit organization. The following recommendations emerged from this study:

1. Establish or maintain a direct reporting and accountability structure between the institutional athletics director and university chancellor.

2. Establish or maintain an institutional academic committee which regularly monitors and evaluates the activity of the institutional academic support service unit(s) or functions. This is especially critical in the Non-BCS Division I institutions that are dependent on non-athletics institutional personnel for much of their compliance and academic support services.

3. Raise the level of institutional awareness of the compliance vulnerabilities which may be created by the extreme compliance staff-to-team ratios that exist at the Non-BCS institutions.

4. Create a compliance and infraction investigation and reporting structure which is ultimately accountable to a senior administrator outside of the department of athletics.

5. In an effort to create a culture of compliance, it is recommended that institutions provide an additional, external, direct reporting framework for the senior compliance officer to an individual or office outside of the department of athletics. This practice need not be uniform at all institutions, but at a minimum, it is strongly recommended that there be a legitimate communication link between the senior compliance officer and a senior administrator outside of athletics.

6. Foster an institutional culture that embraces compliance activities as a valuable support function, not a distasteful but unavoidable policing effort.

7. Regularly evaluate the risk(s) associated with intercollegiate athletics, and prioritize compliance and academic support functions according to that risk paradigm.

The most essential practice related to compliance functions that support athletics enterprises is to prevent the isolation that is so common…especially the isolation of major revenue sports from the rest of campus. Chancellors should maintain and ensure regular communication with the leadership of athletics, as well as any teams perceived to be in academic jeopardy or with low APR scores. In spite of numerous measurement difficulties and questionable incentives, the Academic Progress Rate gives chancellors the opportunity to closely monitor and control athletic teams in which the academic progress is a concern. This control is in fact required by the UNC Code (see section 1100.1).

Chancellors must also ensure routine communication with the athletics department. One effective practice is to include athletics leadership in the senior leadership team of the university and require regular attendance. According to the 2010-11 NCAA Division I Manual, Article 6 regarding institutional governance states that "A member institution's president or chancellor has ultimate responsibility and final authority

for the conduct of the intercollegiate athletics program and the actions of any board in control of that program." At East Carolina University, the chancellor holds monthly meetings with the senior compliance director, the faculty athletics representative, the provost, and the university risk manager.

Finally, as stated in the section on academic support staff, the Task Force recommends that compliance officers also have a full opportunity to compete for valuable resources in the athletics department during the resource allocation process.

6. **Independent Review of Compliance and Athletic Programs:** At the Division I and II levels, the NCAA Manual is over 350 pages. Within this manual, the membership attempts to provide guidance and regulation for all areas of intercollegiate athletics. These rules and regulations change on a yearly basis, while attempting to stay current with the state of college athletics. As a member of the NCAA, each institution is responsible for establishing a compliance office to oversee the NCAA rules and regulations. Compliance staffs, across the country and within the three divisions, can vary in size from a one person office to an office of seven or eight individuals.

   Despite the size of the staff or operating budget, each institution is held equally accountable for the same rules and regulations, while creating and attempting to maintain an environment of "Institutional Control." These staffs must educate, monitor and regulate all aspects of intercollegiate athletics. This is a very difficult task and almost impossible to ensure that all areas are compliant with NCAA rules. However, in order to keep improving the compliance and academic support programs, it is imperative that these programs are reviewed. These reviews are not just a mandatory checklist, but are also barometers of integral programs that help strive towards the goal of institutional control.

   In 1991, the Knight Commission developed the "one-plus-three model" that proposed accountability through a certification process, which would require an in-depth institutional self-study and peer review. In 1993, the NCAA adopted a certification process that focused on four key areas in a self-study which included: governance, academic integrity, financial integrity and equity, welfare and sportsmanship. Over the last 20 years, this process has changed and been refined, but through all cycles —governance and academics are still strongly rooted in this self study.

   Since 2003, the NCAA has required, as a part of its certification as a NCAA institution, that each institution must conduct a review of their compliance program. This must occur once every four years by "an authority outside of the athletic department." In 2009, with the start of the third cycle of the NCAA certification process, a review of the academic support programs is a requirement for certification. As with the compliance review, the academic support reviews must be conducted once every four years by "appropriate academic authorities outside of the department of intercollegiate athletics." These reviews of compliance and academic support programs will allow institutions and athletic departments to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of their programs. The outcomes of these reviews will provide administrators a checklist of areas that needed to be reviewed on an annual basis.

Recommendations for the UNC System

Chancellors and campuses are primarily responsible for each of the six risk areas identified in this report. The extent of the risk and its immediacy vary tremendously across the constituent institutions. As we have pointed out, the resources available to address these risks also vary tremendously... by at least a factor of ten from the largest Division I programs to the smaller campuses and programs.

That said, the Task Force believes that these risks will continue to increase... in large part because of the money and prestige associated with athletics success, as well as a series of cultural and technological factors that make some forms of academic misconduct easy to commit and virtually impossible to prevent.

The specific charge to the committee has been met through the discussion of the effective practices associated with the six primary risk areas in the report. In addition, we have three broad recommendations that are intended to increase vigilance and scrutiny of the athletics enterprise and to heighten the awareness of the tensions that can occur between athletics programs and the core missions of the institution.

1. Integration of Athletics Programs

Consistent with core values 1 and 3 (see page 2), most athletics programs can be better integrated into the academic mission of the institution. While we all recognize the great entertainment value of athletics, that function should not be considered as separate, inconsistent, or at odds with the other published mission statements of the constituent institutions.

Chancellors are primarily responsible for this integration and they frequently need strong support from their own boards, the General Administration, and the Board of Governors to prevent the isolation of athletics programs that can occur. Strong pressures for isolation can come from extremely well-paid coaches, from alumni and booster clubs, and from quasi-independent athletic associations. Those pressures usually lead to mistakes or loss of integrity if not closely monitored.

Integration of athletics into the core mission of the institution is not easy, but it is not rocket science. Successful practices to achieve this goal include: frequent communication with the institutional Board of Trustees; inclusion of athletics leaders in the executive leadership team of the university; having compliance offices report directly to the chancellor; ensuring control of academic support services and tutoring by the chief academic officer; and, regular campus discussions of the athletics enterprise (e.g.: at Faculty Senate meetings).

2. System Oversight and Monitoring

The risks are not manageable by the campuses alone; assistance is needed at the UNC system level, conference level, or other forms of oversight. While the NCAA provides a compliance oversight function, more attention must be paid to the academic integrity function. For example, the NCAA's FLAG program (Facilitating Learning and Achieving Graduation) is one external resource the Task Force recommends to help institutions manage the academic risks of student-athletes. If academic success of the student-athlete and academic

integrity of the teams and the programs are regularly discussed on campus and monitored at a system and conference level, the authority of the chancellors can be significantly enhanced.

Among the effective practices reviewed by the Task Force, these four are recommended for consideration by the president:

A. *Academic Integrity Review:* The Atlantic Coast Conference, as well as other athletics conferences, includes an academic integrity review as a component of the overall compliance review for its members, intended to ensure the quality of the academic experience and protection of integrity for its members. This is an excellent model for other conferences and/or the UNC system. For example, the UNC system should consider offering a similar service for constituent institutions who are not members of the ACC. This could be done on a revolving basis, or perhaps based on a request for a separate review by the chancellor. UNC Charlotte, for example, includes a review of certain components of the athletics enterprise by the university's internal auditor on an annual basis.

B. *Board of Governors Review:* At least annually, the Board of Governors should review a report from the president on the progress of each institution in terms of academic success (such as the APR) and academic integrity of its athletics programs. The University of North Carolina is a national leader across a range of vital characteristics of the public university; strong, visible reviews will make an important statement about our system and will further support the work of the chancellors to integrate athletics and academics.

C. *General Administration Involvement:* Because so many pressures exist to be competitive—and sometimes to ignore the reality of what happens in big time college sports—the president and vice presidents of UNC must be the strongest allies of the chancellors. Regular discussions with the chancellors and provosts of constituent institutions can help to heighten the awareness of the risks and disseminate the best practices across the system. Additionally, regular meetings and discussions among UNC system athletics directors should be conducted and should include a discussion on academic integrity. The Task Force was impressed by the range of strong, effective practices already used among the constituent institutions. This will assist the president in conversations with the Board of Governors. In addition, we suggest that the UNC system encourage constituent institutions to adopt many of the effective practices in this report. Specific examples include:

   i. Effective practices at UNC-Chapel Hill, NC State, and UNC-Charlotte to integrate academic support staff into the evaluation of recruits

   ii. ECU's Academic Success Committee

   iii. N.C. A&T's Student-Athlete Mentor Program

   iv. The Provost's Athletic Roundtable at N.C. State

   v. Innovative practices for academic support staff and tutors at the University of Alabama - Birmingham

D. *Expectations for Coaches:* While chancellors and Boards of Trustees largely determine coaches' contracts and expectations, the worst pressures for competitiveness frequently come at the local level. Clear statements of support by the Board of Governors and President regarding the responsibility and accountability of coaches—especially in the areas of academic success and compliance—can be of significant help to the chancellors. The board should consider guidelines for coaches' contracts that address the coaches' responsibility for appropriate team academic performance measures and accountability for violations of academic integrity.

3. Funding

Outside of the BCS athletics programs, adequate funding for the recommendations of this report is almost universally an issue. The issue is magnified considerably for smaller universities that do not enjoy TV contracts, large conference distributions, or other annual revenue streams. We have shown that revenues are ten times higher (or more) at the BCS schools than at many constituent institutions. This makes vital functions such as strong compliance reviews, academic support (with all the required training and monitoring necessary), and other elements of the academic infrastructure much harder to realize.

The Task Force recognizes the need for additional revenues for many North Carolina universities. A portion of state appropriations could be considered for use at the General Administration to help support constituent universities to achieve or enhance the recommendations of this report. Additionally, as stated throughout the report, it is our recommendation that critical support areas, such as academic services and compliance, have the opportunity to compete for available funding during the athletics department's resource allocation process. Just as a new or existing sport would have the chance to compete for such resources, we recommend that vital support functions have the same opportunity.

We also encourage the president and Board of Governors to identify additional funding options, including private donations, to ensure more resources are available to constituent institutions, and especially to those universities with smaller athletic expenditures.

UNC Task Force on Athletics and Academics

Steve Ballard (chair)
Chancellor
East Carolina University

Brian Battle
Senior Associate Athletic Director
UNC Greensboro

Charlie Cobb
Athletic Director
Appalachian State University

Thomas Conway
Vice Chancellor & Chief of Staff
Fayetteville State University

Jack Evans
Former Faculty Athletics Representative
UNC Chapel Hill

Lisa Hibbs
Athletic Academic Services
UNC Charlotte

Earl Hilton
Athletic Director
NC A&T State University

Rebecca Nelms Keil
Coordinator for Athletics
UNC Asheville

Carrie Leger
Associate Athletics Director
for Academics & Student Services
North Carolina State University

Bruce Mallette
Senior Associate Vice President
Academic & Student Affairs
UNC General Administration

Ingrid Wicker McCree
Athletic Director
North Carolina Central University

Charlie Nelms
Chancellor
North Carolina Central University

Angelia Nelson
Assistant Athletic Director
Elizabeth City State University

U.P. 12-016