

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics

**A National Study of Faculty at
NCAA Division I
Football Bowl Subdivision Institutions**

**Prepared for the
Knight Commission
on Intercollegiate Athletics**

**By
Dr. Janet H. Lawrence
Lori A. Hendricks
Molly C. Ott
The University of Michigan
Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education**

October 15, 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to publicly acknowledge the contributions from a number of groups without whom this study would have been impossible. We are grateful for the support, guidance, and feedback offered throughout the course of the study by the Knight Commission project advisory group. We also benefited tremendously from interviews conducted with over sixty faculty across the nation during the early phases of the project. Their generous participation informed the survey instrument construction and the framing of this report, and their hospitality during our visits to their campuses was much appreciated. Finally, we are grateful to all faculty who participated in the survey. Their responses were thoughtful and compelling, and we hope that this report does them justice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	PAGE 4
LIST OF FIGURES	PAGE 6
LITERATURE ON FACULTY VIEWS OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS	PAGE 7
DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE SURVEY	PAGE 10
SURVEY SAMPLE	PAGE 12
DATA ANALYSIS AND STUDY FINDINGS	PAGE 16
SECTION ONE: BELIEFS, PERCEPTIONS, AND SATISFACTION	PAGE 18
SECTION TWO: FACULTY GOVERNANCE PRIORITIES AND CONCERNS ABOUT INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS	PAGE 43
SECTION THREE: CAMPUS CONTEXT	PAGE 52
STUDY SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS	PAGE 73
REFERENCES	PAGE 92
APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT	PAGE 95
APPENDIX B: TABLES	PAGE 120
APPENDIX C: FIGURES	PAGE 161

List of Tables

Table 1.	Demographic Characteristics of the Sample
Table 1A.	Governance Involvement of the Sample by Academic Rank, Experience Teaching Student-Athletes, Race, Gender
Table 1B.	Governance Involvement of the Sample by Discipline
Table 1C.	Experience of the Sample Teaching Student-Athletes by Governance Involvement, Race, Gender
Table 1D.	Experience of the Sample Teaching Student-Athletes by Discipline
Table 2.	Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics for Total Sample – Frequency Distributions for Governance Items
Table 2A.	Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores on Governance Items by Governance Involvement
Table 3.	Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics for Total Sample – Frequency Distributions for Academic Items
Table 3A.	Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Experience Teaching Student-Athletes for Academic Items
Table 3B.	Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Discipline for Academic Items
Table 3C.	Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Academic Rank for Academic Items
Table 4.	Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics for Total Sample – Frequency Distributions for Finance Items
Table 4A.	Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Governance Involvement for Finance Items
Table 4B.	Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Discipline for Finance Items
Table 5.	Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics for Total Sample – Frequency Distribution for Governance Items
Table 5A.	Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Governance Involvement for Governance Items
Table 6.	Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics for Total Sample – Frequency Distribution for Academic Items
Table 6A.	Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Discipline for Academic Items
Table 6B.	Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Academic Rank for Academic Items
Table 6C.	Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Experience Teaching Student-Athletes for Academic Items
Table 7.	Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics for Total Sample - Frequency Distribution for Finance Items

List of Tables, cont.

Table 7A.	Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Governance Involvement for Finance Items
Table 8.	“Don’t Know” and “No Opinion” Responses for Total Sample
Table 9.	Priorities for Faculty Governance Groups – Total Sample
Table 9A.	Priorities for Faculty Governance Groups by Governance Involvement
Table 9B.	Priorities for Faculty Governance Groups by Discipline
Table 9C.	Priorities for Faculty Governance Groups by Academic Rank
Table 10.	Faculty Concerns about Intercollegiate Athletics
Table 10A.	Faculty Concerns about Intercollegiate Athletics by Governance Involvement
Table 10B.	Faculty Concerns about Intercollegiate Athletics by Discipline
Table 10C.	Faculty Concerns about Intercollegiate Athletics by Academic Rank
Table 11.	Estimates of Joining Reform Efforts and Perceived Chance of Success
Table 12.	Beliefs and Perceptions of General Campus Context Predicting Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Total Sample
Table 13.	Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics Predicting Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics
Table 14.	Lower Athletic/Lower Academic Institutional Characteristics
Table 15.	Lower Athletic/Higher Academic Institutional Characteristics
Table 16.	Higher Athletic/Lower Academic Institutional Characteristics
Table 17.	Higher Athletic/Higher Academic Institutional Characteristics
Table 18.	Faculty Concerns about Intercollegiate Athletics by Taxonomy Group
Table 19.	Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores within the Taxonomy for Governance Items
Table 20.	Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores within the Taxonomy for Academic Items
Table 21.	Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores within the Taxonomy for Finance Items
Table 22.	Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores within the Taxonomy for Governance Items
Table 23.	Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores within the Taxonomy for Academic Items
Table 24.	Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores within the Taxonomy for Finance Items
Table 25.	Frequency of Responses for Total Sample to Follow-up Question from 1992 Harris Poll Survey: Emphasis Given to Importance of Intercollegiate Athletics
Table 26.	Frequency of Responses for Total Sample to Follow-up Question from 1992 Harris Poll Survey: Opinion of Intercollegiate Athletics
Table 27.	Frequency of Responses for Total Sample to Follow-up Question from 1992 Harris Poll Survey: Primary Goal of Intercollegiate Athletics

List of Figures

- Figure 1. Individual Items Comprising the Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics Indices
- Figure 2. Individual Items Comprising the Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics Indices
- Figure 3. Individual Items Comprising the Beliefs and Perceptions of General Campus Climate Indices
- Figure 4. Individual Items Comprising the Satisfaction with the General Campus Climate Indices
- Figure 5. Descriptions of Concern Categories
- Figure 6. Institutional Categories
- Figure 7. Institutional Categories – Select Characteristics
- Figure 8. Institutional Response Rates

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics: A National Study of Faculty at NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision Institutions

In its 1991 and 2001 reports, the Knight Commission called on faculty to join other members of the academic community and act together to restore the balance of athletics and academics on campus. In 2006, members of faculty reform groups approached the Knight Commission to propose a summit on the role of faculty in maintaining a healthy relationship between academics and athletics on campus. The commission agreed to host such a summit. To lay the groundwork for discussions at the summit, the Knight Commission authorized a national survey of faculty members at NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision universities.

The main goal of the *Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics Survey* (Faculty Survey) is to examine professors' beliefs about and satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. The investigation also identifies faculty members' primary concerns about intercollegiate athletics and gathers preliminary data on whether they would join campus-based initiatives aimed at ameliorating these concerns. Further, the survey assesses whether professors think such activities would lead to meaningful change on their campus.

The first part of this Report provides background information on the development and administration of the Faculty Survey. The second part explains the data analyses and highlights key findings.

Literature on Faculty Views of Intercollegiate Athletics

Intercollegiate athletics on American college and university campuses have been a source of controversy and debate since their inception (Savage, Bentley, & Smiley, 1929; Thelin, 1996). Supporters assert that "college sports are significant in defining the essence of the American college and university" (Toma, 1999, p. 82). They highlight benefits associated with athletics programs, such as financial donations (Grimes & Chressanthi, 1994; Rhoads & Gerking, 2000), positive public perceptions of graduates (Lovaglia & Lucas, 2005), and local community goodwill (Gumprecht, 2003; Toma, 1999). Balancing such positive claims, however, athletic departments are condemned for devaluing the university's core academic mission, engaging in

excessive commercially-driven behavior, and permitting scandalous and unethical behavior on the part of coaches and student-athletes (Bok, 2003; Duderstadt, 2003; Shulman & Bowen, 2001).

Throughout the history of higher education there have been periodic calls for the reform of intercollegiate athletics (Thelin, 1996). In the early 1990s, the emphasis was on presidential control (Knight Commission, 1991), but recent proposals and reports have called on faculty to become more involved in reforms and to spearhead policy formulations both on their campuses and at a national level (Bernard, 2003; Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, 2004; Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, 2005; Splitt, 2004; NCAA Presidential Task Force on the Future of Division I Intercollegiate Athletics, 2006). To date, however, little systematic information has been collected nationally that can inform efforts to enlist faculty assistance.

Extant literature suggests differences in faculty views likely mitigate their reactions to calls for reform. One study of faculty at a National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I university indicates that many faculty may have interest in participating in athletics governance (Kuga, 1996). The most commonly cited impediment to becoming involved is the high time commitment that faculty perceive is required, and some also worry that they do not have the necessary competencies and skills. The degree to which faculty in general believe that they can contribute in a meaningful way and facilitate change in their campus athletics programs is not addressed in the literature. Faculty holding formal athletics governance positions believe the most power over intercollegiate athletics at their institutions rests in the hands of the athletic director (Solow, 1998). Where athletics-related decisions are concerned, the athletic director is perceived to have more power than the institution's president, board of trustees, faculty, or alumni.

Further complicating the situation, faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletics are not uniform (Putler & Wolfe, 1999; Wolfe & Putler, 2002). Some studies suggest that differences in faculty views may be attributed to *campus setting*, but the evidence is mixed. Cockley & Roswal (1994) and Norman (1995) find that faculty employed at NCAA Division I institutions are less satisfied with intercollegiate athletics programs on their campuses than faculty from institutions affiliated with Divisions II, III, or the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics. Engstrand (1995) shows that compared to faculty from Division III schools, those at Division I

are more likely to agree that faculty at their institutions resent athletics and believe that athletic department personnel engage in practices of questionable ethics.

Echoing the critiques of national reform groups, several researchers find faculty in NCAA Division I universities believe that intercollegiate athletics is disconnected from the academic mission of their institutions and the traditional athletic department goals of conference or national championships, victories over traditional rivals, and providing a forum for community and campus entertainment lack importance (Trail & Chelladurai, 2000; Engstrand, 1995). Asked to characterize what they believe should be the goals of their campus' intercollegiate athletics program, faculty at a single NCAA Division I institution report that student-athletes' academic achievement is most important (Trail & Chelladurai, 2000). Briody (1996) finds that compared to students and administrators, faculty perceive that their campus athletics program has a negative impact on a university's overall academic reputation. However, Engstrand's research (1995) shows that faculty at NCAA Division I institutions believe intercollegiate athletics provides a form of student entertainment, helps to develop positive personal characteristics among student-athletes, and promotes alumni support. Noble (2004) finds that faculty at schools with better records have more favorable attitudes towards athletics than do faculty at schools with less successful teams.

Individual faculty characteristics such as academic rank or length of time spent at a given university may affect how faculty view intercollegiate athletics. Faculty who have been employed at their institution for between one and five years are more likely to agree that a winning athletic team unifies their campus than faculty with longer tenures (Engstrand, 1995). Harrison (2004) and Noble (2004) show that disciplines may also be an important influence on faculty attitudes, as those from Kinesiology and Physical Education have more positive views of the role that athletics plays at their institution and more positive images of their campus' athletics program. Kuga (1996) finds men may be more "reform-oriented" than women in their views of intercollegiate athletics. Cockley and Roswal (1994) suggest that faculty who work more directly with athletics in governance positions are more satisfied with their institutions' athletic programs compared to others who are not at all involved. Furthermore, Friesen (1992) finds Faculty Athletics Representatives (FARs) at NCAA Division IA universities have significantly more positive attitudes toward academic, financial, gender, and social issues related to their campus's athletics program.

Finally, three competing perspectives on the attitudes of faculty toward student-athletes are evident in the literature (Engstrom, Sedlacek, & McEwen, 1995). Some contend that faculty have negative stereotypes and prejudicial views toward student-athletes due singularly to their status as athletes (Baucom & Lantz, 2001; Engstrand, 1995). Others wonder if faculty offer unfair assistance or preferential treatment to their institution's student-athletes (Weber, Sherman, & Tegano, 1990). A third group finds that faculty view student-athletes no differently from other students on their campuses (Harrison, 2004).

Researchers who study college and university faculty often observe that it is impossible to speak of faculty as a homogenous group. The mixed findings from past studies, combined with the recent calls for greater engagement of faculty in reform initiatives highlight the need for a comprehensive national study of faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletics. Similarities and differences in their views uncovered in the present investigation can help guide the efforts of local as well as national groups that share the common goal of enhancing intercollegiate athletics on our nation's campuses.

Development and Administration of the Survey

Instrument Design

The development of the Faculty Survey progressed through three phases. Discussions about the content commenced with a meeting of a faculty advisory committee convened by the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics (September 2006). Prominent themes that evolved during this meeting were then followed up in interviews with faculty and members of the provost's office on five campuses that differed in size, location and control (November 2006 – February 2007). A questionnaire was drafted based on previous research, the advisory committee discussion, the interviews, and documents from groups such as the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), and the NCAA. The draft questionnaire was piloted with project advisors from the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics and a group of faculty from the University of Michigan (January-April 2007).

The Faculty Survey probes both faculty beliefs about intercollegiate athletics and their understanding of the general campus climate of their universities. The inclusion of these two sets of

questions enabled the researchers to consider faculty views of and concerns about intercollegiate athletics in conjunction with their beliefs about related conditions in other university domains.

The Faculty Survey is organized around three theoretically distinct yet interrelated aspects of intercollegiate athletics and general campus climate, specifically: governance, finance and academic. *Governance items* assess faculty involvement in, perceptions of and satisfaction with general campus decision-making bodies such as faculty senates and with athletics-specific governance roles and committees, such as FARs and campus athletic advisory committees. Faculty views of campus leadership, including the president and athletics administrators, are also examined. *Finance items* focus on faculty perceptions of their institutions' economic well being, campus priorities that guide budgetary decisions for the campus generally and intercollegiate athletics specifically, and commercialization activities. *Academic items* inquire about admissions and advising policies and practices as well as students' academic performance and faculty colleagues' attitudes toward student-athletes. In all cases, the frames of reference faculty were asked to use were their campus, their classes, and their local colleagues.

The survey instrument includes both open-ended and Likert-type questions distributed across five sections:

- I. Perceptions and Beliefs items (Likert-type questions) ask faculty to indicate the extent to which they believe selected institutional policies and practices as well as behaviors and attitudes of students, student-athletes, campus administrators, coaches and faculty apply to their campuses.
- II. Satisfaction items (Likert-type questions) have respondents indicate their satisfaction with general and athletics-specific policies, practices and conditions on their campuses (e.g., use of special admissions for high school athletes who do not meet regular academic standards) as well as student, administrator and faculty behavior related to governance, academics, and finance (e.g., student-athletes are good representatives of my university in their public behavior and statements to the press).
- III. Campus Priorities items ask individuals to indicate on a scale of Very Low to Very High the priority they believed faculty governance groups must give over the next five years to each of 13 areas, including intercollegiate athletics.
- IV. Major Concerns are identified by means of an open-ended item that asks faculty to indicate what most concerns them about intercollegiate athletics on their campus. Those respondents who state a concern are asked to (a) indicate the chances they would join a campus-based initiative to address this problem and (b) estimate the likelihood that such an activity would result in meaningful change on their campus.

- V. Demographic questions inquire about the respondents' careers (e.g., tenure status, field of teaching, years at institution) as well as their experience with faculty governance, intercollegiate athletics and student-athletes, their sources of information about intercollegiate athletics, their current investment of time in undergraduate teaching, research and service, and their personal experiences as student-athletes.

An open-ended question that asks respondents how they define academic integrity is also included along with four items from a 1992 survey conducted for the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics by Lou Harris Research and Polling. The latter set of items gathers data on faculty views of intercollegiate athletics beyond their own campuses (for results, see Tables 25, 26, and 27 in Appendix B).

The Faculty Survey was made available to respondents both online and in paper format. The online version was programmed so that a participant could exit the survey at any time and return. On average, the questionnaire requires 20-30 minutes to complete. (See Appendix A for paper version of Faculty Survey.)

Survey Administration

The Faculty Survey was launched on April 12, 2007 and remained live through May 22, 2007. Individual emails inviting participation were sent to faculty by the research team along with three follow-up messages.

Survey Sample

The Faculty Survey was distributed to a purposive sample of faculty at 23 institutions selected to represent the 119 colleges and universities classified as Football Bowl Subdivision (formerly Division I-A) in 2006 by the NCAA. One institution was chosen from the independents and two institutions were randomly selected from each of the eleven Football Bowl Subdivision conferences. The smallest number of faculty contacted at a single institution was 244. The largest was 1,246. The institutional response rates ranged from 12-34%.

The institutions from which the purposive faculty sample is drawn represent the diverse array of campuses that comprise the NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision (See Table 1):

- Three institutions are private and 20 are public.
- Six universities are land grant institutions.
- All institutions offer post-baccalaureate degree study and five grant medical degrees.

- One university is located in the North East, six in the South East, five in the Great Lakes states, two in the Plains, five in the South West, one in the Rocky Mountains, and three are in the Far West.
- Core institutional expenses in 2006 ran from a low of \$111,000,000 to about \$2,000,000,000.
- Undergraduate enrollments in 2006 ranged from 2,800 to 42,000, with an average enrollment of 20,400.
- Student selectivity of the general student body at the selected institutions in 2006, as indicated by ACT Composite 50th percentile, varied from 19 – 32. The overall mean for the sample is 24.3.
- Five-year graduation rates for the general student body at each university ranged from 29-95%, with an average of 55%.

(Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System - IPEDS)

The institutions also differ in the size and on-field success of their intercollegiate athletics programs. (See Table 1) According to NCAA records and Equity in Athletics Data Analysis sources:

- The smallest number of varsity teams at a single institution is 12 and the largest is 22; the average is 16 teams.¹
- During the 2005-2006 academic year, the number of student-athletes on each campus who participated in intercollegiate athletics ranged from 391-989.
- Overall athletics success varies widely. The all-time total number of national intercollegiate championships won by each university ranges from zero to 23.
- The smallest number of appearances in the men’s NCAA basketball tournaments by a single campus is one and the largest is 31.
- The football teams on one campus have competed in 52 post-season bowl games while on another, the football teams have appeared in only one bowl game.
- Since 2001, the majority of sampled universities had no NCAA major infractions and several had one or more.

(Sources: Official 2007 NCAA Men’s Basketball Records Book, Official 2006 NCAA Divisions I-A and I-AA Football Records Book, NCAA Major Infractions Case Search Website and Equity in Athletics Data Analysis Cutting Tool Website)

¹ The NCAA officially considers cross country, indoor track and field and outdoor track and field as separate sports. Because many of the participants in those three sports are the same individuals, EADA combines all track and field/cross country into one category. The number of teams used in this report are according to EADA reports.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Characteristics		Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
University Governance	No Current Governance Involvement	442	21.7%
	Academic Department Only	590	29%
	School or College Only	85	4.2%
	Institution Only	129	6.3%
	More Than One Level Not Including Institution	271	13.3%
	More Than One Level Including Institution	516	25.4%
Intercollegiate Athletics Governance	No Athletics Governance Involvement	1762	86.4%
	Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR)	32	1.6%
	Campus Athletics Board (CAB)	92	4.5%
	Institutional NCAA Certification Team	19	.9%
	Other	63	3.1%
	Involvement in Two Governance Roles	56	2.7%
	Involvement in Three Governance Roles	16	.8%
Gender	Male	1428	70.3%
	Female	604	29.7%
Race	White	1813	90.9%
	Non-White	181	9.1%
Discipline	Humanities	311	15.2%
	Kinesiology & Physical Education	46	2.2%
	Mathematics	100	4.9%
	Music	78	3.8%
	Natural Sciences	278	13.6%
	Professional Fields (Education, Business, Engineering)	687	33.5%
	Social Sciences	327	15.9%
	Other	224	10.9%
Academic Rank	Professor	976	47.7%
	Associate Professor	610	29.8%
	Assistant Professor	409	20%
	Other	51	2.5%
Experience Teaching Student-Athletes	Yes (Current or Previous)	1585	76.6%
	No	484	23.4%

Note. Table summarizes data from six survey items. Frequencies for some items are less than 2,071 due to non-responses. Percentages calculated for each category of characteristics are based on the number of responses to that particular item.

To maximize the number of faculty with governance experience and with student-athletes in their classes, the samples drawn at the 23 universities are intentionally structured to include: (a) faculty currently involved in campus governance at the institutional level (e.g., faculty senates) or in roles associated with the oversight of intercollegiate athletics (e.g., FARs, members of campus athletics advisory boards) and (b) faculty with tenure track appointments in fields/disciplines that typically enroll larger numbers of undergraduate students and, as a result have a higher probability of interacting with student-athletes. The selected disciplines are biology, business, chemistry, education, engineering, English, history, mathematics, music, physical education, kinesiology, political science, psychology, romance languages, and sociology.

Guided by the selection criteria, a purposive sample of 14,187 faculty was identified and e-mail addresses were collected from publicly available online and printed directories provided by each institution. Out of this group, 13,604 individuals received the email requesting that they participate and 3,005 completed the survey, for an overall response rate of 23%.² Adjusted for those who did not fully complete the survey, faculty on sabbatical, emeritus faculty, non-tenure track faculty, and administrators inadvertently included, the final individual sample used in the analyses is 2,071.

The demographic characteristics of the study sample are displayed in Table 1.³ The largest proportions of respondents are male (70%) and White (91%). Almost half (48%) are professors, 30% are associate professors, and 20% are assistant professors. Those in the “other” category are non-tenure track faculty who serve on a campus governance committee.

The largest number of respondents (34%) teach in professional fields (i.e., business, education and engineering) and the smallest number teach kinesiology or physical education (2%). About 77% (n=1,585) of the faculty report they are currently teaching or had taught student-athletes in the past. In addition:

- 15% of sampled faculty were, themselves, varsity student-athletes in college;

² This response rate is typical for online surveys. See Sheehan, K. (2001, January). E-mail survey response rates: A review. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 6(2). Retrieved from <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol6/issue2/sheehan.html>

³ The sample profile on race and gender mirrors the profile nationally. This information may be found in the *IPEDS 2007 Digest of Educational Statistics*. See Appendix B, Tables 1A through 1D for more details.

- 21% report little to no contact with student-athletes on their campuses, in or out of class;
- A small fraction, 1.5%, supervise tutors who work with student-athletes;
- Approximately 39% attend athletic competitions on their campuses; and
- Most obtain information about intercollegiate athletics from multiple sources: around 57% get their information from campus news, 61% from local news, 47% from national news, 38% from the Internet, 32% from sports-specific media, 19% from education media, 25% from friends outside of the university, 46% from faculty colleagues, and 32% from official campus publications.

Over three-quarters of the respondents (79%) are involved in some level of university or athletics governance, while 22% report no current involvement in governance. Of those involved in governance, half (47%) are involved in faculty governance at the school/college level (e.g., department and college executive committees), while 32% are engaged in campus-wide non-athletic governance activities (e.g., faculty senates). About 86% of the sample has never served in a governance role with responsibility for intercollegiate athletics. Among the 14% who are involved in athletics governance, 10% (n=206) have served as a Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), as a member of the campus athletics advisory board, as a member of their institution's NCAA certification team, or in some other role. The remaining 4% (n=72) have served in multiple intercollegiate athletics governance roles. (See Table 1C Appendix B)

Data Analysis and Study Findings

The primary goals of the Faculty Survey study are to find out from faculty:

- how they characterize intercollegiate athletics on their campuses;
- how satisfied they are with its governance, academic and financial aspects;
- what most concerns them about intercollegiate athletics; and
- what priority they think their campus faculty governance groups must give to intercollegiate athletics.

Consideration is also given to:

- how faculty perceptions, satisfaction, priorities and concerns about intercollegiate athletics may be affected by variations in their career experiences and campus context; and
- what faculty estimate are the chances that (a) they would engage in campus activities aimed at ameliorating their personal concerns about intercollegiate

athletics and (b) such an activity would lead to meaningful change on their campus.

A detailed picture, clearly illustrating the diverse array of faculty opinions about intercollegiate athletics, is created from the frequency distributions for individual survey items (Study Findings - Section One). The relative priority that professors believe faculty governance committees on their campuses must give to intercollegiate athletics is ascertained by comparing its standing with the rankings of other areas with which it competes for attention. The aspects of intercollegiate athletics of most concern to faculty are identified through their responses to an open-ended question (Study Findings - Section Two).

Two different approaches are used to distinguish the effects of campus context on faculty views of intercollegiate athletics (Study Findings - Section Three). In the first, analysis of variance statistical techniques were applied to find out if and how faculty beliefs about *intercollegiate athletics* are affected by their perceptions of the norms, behaviors, policies, and practices in campus domains other than intercollegiate athletics – *general campus climate*. In the second analysis, an experimental taxonomy was created to search for variations in the perceptions of faculty who work in universities that differ in academic and athletics success. The taxonomy enabled researchers to place each sampled university into one of four categories based on its athletic performance (competitive achievements of their football and men’s basketball teams) and academic performance (selectivity of the general student body and the academic performance of football and men’s basketball student athletes). Faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletics within each of the different institutional categories were then examined. The taxonomy is explained further with the study findings.

Study Limitations

This study assesses faculty views of intercollegiate athletics on their own campuses.⁴ The purposive sample is limited to faculty in NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision universities and it is designed to maximize the chances that

⁴ Several items from the 1992 study conducted for the Knight Commission by Lou Harris Research and Polling are repeated to find out if beliefs about the general intercollegiate athletics enterprise have changed over time. (See Appendix B, Tables 25, 26, and 27 for the results.)

respondents (a) have contact with student-athletes in class and/or (b) currently serve in campus level and intercollegiate athletics governance roles. Generalizations based on the findings should take these sampling parameters into account.

For several survey items, the number of “Don’t Know” and “No Opinion” responses is large, i.e., 33% or greater. The frequency distributions display these data, and a section later in this Report discusses the “Don’t Know” and “No Opinion” responses as a group (p. 40).

Unless otherwise noted, the results describe the perceptions of faculty.

Section One: Beliefs, Perceptions, and Satisfaction

1a. What do faculty believe about intercollegiate athletics on their campuses and how do faculty perceptions differ?

The beliefs and perceptions scales included in the Faculty Survey allow respondents to indicate if a statement is not relevant to their campus (Not Relevant) or if they lack sufficient knowledge to respond (Don’t Know). Faculty who do not choose these response options indicate the extent to which they think a statement applies to their campus: Not at All, Slightly, Moderately or Very Much. For the purpose of discussion, these last four response options are collapsed into two categories: Not at All to Slightly applicable, indicating little to no correspondence between the statement and a faculty member’s perceptions of her or his campus, and Moderately to Very Much applicable, indicating a reasonably good fit with her or his views.

Perceptions of Governance Aspects

Total Sample

The majority of faculty believe intercollegiate athletics is an auxiliary enterprise that is organizationally separate from the academic domain. Many think their governance roles are ill defined and that faculty oversight is weak. Most faculty believe it is not common practice for administrators to involve faculty governance in the budgeting process for either the athletic department (49%) or academic units (49%). However, the majority (54%) of faculty believe administrators on their campus consult with faculty

governance groups about academic matters. In contrast, most (48%) believe it is not common practice for administrators to consult faculty governance groups on intercollegiate athletics decisions:

- 62% believe it is Moderately to Very Much appropriate to characterize intercollegiate athletics as an auxiliary service that generates its own revenue and is accountable to university administrators, not faculty;
- 61% think it is Moderately to Very Much the case that the work lives of athletic department and academic personnel rarely intersect on their campus; and
- 40% perceive it is Moderately to Very Much the case that faculty roles associated with oversight of intercollegiate athletics are ill defined on their campus,
(See Table 2)

A majority of faculty believe that their athletic departments run “clean programs”. However, half think associations with the entertainment industry may harm their university’s academic mission and 40 percent believe athletics boosters influence their presidents. A third believe athletic department perks create a potential conflict of interest situation for faculty:

- 56% think it is Moderately to Very Much the case that their athletic department runs a “clean program”(e.g., have no major NCAA rule violations);
- 52% say it is Moderately to Very Much characteristic of their athletic department to use its connections with influential politicians, business leaders and alumni to get what it wants on campus;
- 50% say it is Moderately to Very Much the case that decisions about intercollegiate athletics are driven by the priorities of an entertainment industry that is not invested in their university’s academic mission;
- 40% perceive it is Moderately to Very Much the case that athletics boosters who put winning sports records ahead of academic standards have influence with the president; 35% believe such booster influence is Not At All to Slightly characteristic of their campuses; and
- 33% perceive it is Moderately to Very Much the case that athletic department perks to faculty who judge the academic eligibility of student-athletes create a potential conflict of interest situation.

While more than half of the faculty members believe the primary concern of faculty governance of intercollegiate athletics is the quality of student-athletes’ educational experiences, more faculty than not perceive that such faculty oversight committees find it difficult to acquire information from university administrators:

- 54% think it is Moderately to Very Much the case that faculty governance of intercollegiate athletics is primarily concerned with the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences; and
- 35% believe it is Not at All to Slightly characteristic for central administrators and athletics administrators to be forthcoming with information that faculty oversight committees need to ensure the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences.

The largest portion of the faculty (47%) perceive their colleagues are interested in intercollegiate athletics governance issues. Proportionally more are inclined to question if the president and faculty on their campus agree on matters pertaining to intercollegiate athletics. When asked about the relative power of deans and athletic directors with their president, their perceptions were nearly split:

- 47% perceive it is Moderately to Very Much characteristics of faculty on their campus to be interested in governance issues related to intercollegiate athletics;
- 49% believe it is Not At All to Slightly appropriate to say their faculty colleagues and president agree on matters related to intercollegiate athletics; and
- 35% believe it is Not At All to Slightly the case that compared with deans of schools/colleges, their athletic director has more influence with the president of their university; 36% believe it is Moderately to Very Much the case on their campuses.

Although the topic is taken up later in this Report, it is important to note that a substantial number of respondents to the Faculty Survey say they lack information about several aspects of intercollegiate athletics governance. More than a third say they don't know if: administrators use their power to foreclose discussions of intercollegiate athletics (44%); faculty governance committees advise administrators about athletic department budgets (44%); faculty appointed to intercollegiate athletics governance positions are those most likely to accede to athletic department administrators (40%); administrators are forthcoming with information needed by intercollegiate athletics governance committees (37%); and if athletic department perks present a conflict of interest situation (35%).

Table 2. Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics for Total Sample – Frequency Distributions for Governance Items

Index	Individual Index item	Don't Know	Not At All	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much	Not Relevant
BA-G1: Campus Consensus Exists Regarding Intercollegiate Athletics	(1) My president and faculty agree on matters related to intercollegiate athletics	567 27.5%	302 14.7%	498 24.2%	535 26%	151 7.3%	6 .3%
BA-G2: Faculty Interested in Intercollegiate Athletics Issues & Concerned about Student-Athletes' Education	(1) Faculty on my campus are interested in governance issues related to intercollegiate athletics	298 14.5%	127 6.2%	655 31.9%	681 33.2%	291 14.2%	2 .1%
	(2) The primary concern of faculty governance of intercollegiate athletics on my campus is the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences	491 23.9%	106 5.2%	322 15.7%	578 28.1%	535 26%	22 1.1%
BA-G3: Administrators Consult Faculty on Intercollegiate Athletics Decisions	(1) During the budget process for my university's athletic department, faculty governance committees advise administrators	889 43.5%	761 37.3%	228 11.2%	96 4.7%	60 2.9%	8 .4%
	(2) Institution-level decisions about intercollegiate athletics are typically made by administrators who consult with faculty governance groups	648 31.7%	517 25.3%	458 22.4%	265 12.9%	151 7.4%	8 .4%
BA-G4: Intercollegiate Athletics is Auxiliary Enterprise with Weak Faculty Oversight	(1) Organizationally, intercollegiate athletics is an auxiliary service (e.g., campus bookstore) that generates its own revenue and is accountable to university administrators, not faculty	408 20%	202 9.9%	156 7.6%	314 15.4%	955 46.8%	5 .2%
	(2) Central administrators and athletics administrators on my campus are forthcoming with information that faculty oversight committees need to ensure the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences	761 37.3%	384 18.8%	331 16.2%	320 15.7%	227 11.1%	16 .8%
	(3) Faculty roles associated with oversight of intercollegiate athletics are ill defined on my campus	537 26.3%	367 18%	283 13.9%	345 16.9%	493 24.2%	13 .6%
	(4) The work lives of athletic department and academic program personnel rarely intersect on this campus	132 6.4%	227 11%	440 21.3%	403 19.6%	850 41.2%	9 .4%

Note. Survey items are arranged by indices used in ANOVA analyses. Readers may find this information is useful when interpreting the ANOVA results. The survey item reads, "Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus."

Table 2. Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics for Total Sample – Frequency Distributions for Governance Items (Continued)

Index	Individual Index item	Don't Know	Not At All	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much	Not Relevant
BA-G5: Intercollegiate Athletics Power Erodes Faculty Governance & Threatens University Mission	(1) Athletics boosters who put winning sports records ahead of academic standards have influence with my president	512 25%	379 18.5%	344 16.8%	355 17.4%	450 22%	5 .2%
	(2) Decisions about intercollegiate athletics on my campus are driven by the priorities of an entertainment industry that is not invested in my university's academic mission	274 13.4%	346 16.9%	385 18.8%	406 19.9%	624 30.5%	10 .5%
	(3) Compared with deans of schools/colleges, my athletic director has more influence with the president of my university	587 28.7%	464 22.7%	252 12.3%	307 15%	431 21.1%	5 .2%
	(4) Central administrators and athletics administrators use their power to foreclose discussions of intercollegiate athletics that are not consistent with their agendas	904 44.3%	342 16.7%	248 12.1%	225 11%	310 15.2%	13 .6%
	(5) Faculty appointed to athletics governance committees are those most likely to acquiesce to athletics administrators on my campus	812 39.7%	442 21.6%	261 12.8%	234 11.4%	274 13.4%	21 1%
	(6) The athletic department can use its power with influential politicians, business leaders, and alumni to get what it wants on my campus	367 17.9%	203 9.9%	400 19.6%	506 24.7%	563 27.5%	7 .3%
BA-G6: Athletic Department Runs Clean Program	(1) Athletic department perks (e.g., trips to bowl games) to faculty who judge the academic eligibility of student-athletes create a potential conflict of interest situation	720 35.2%	351 17.2%	171 8.4%	187 9.1%	495 24.2%	120 5.9%
	(2) Over the past 5 years, my athletic department has run a "clean" program (e.g., no abuses, no major violations)	395 19.3%	258 12.6%	233 11.4%	351 17.2%	801 39.2%	6 .3%

Note. The survey item reads, "Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus."

Subgroup Analyses

For the purpose of more detailed analyses, the researchers created faculty governance subgroups for individuals with different levels of *current* involvement in non-intercollegiate athletic institutional governance (University Governance Involvement) and in athletics governance *over their careers* (Intercollegiate Athletics Governance Involvement).

Levels of General Governance Involvement are:

- No Current Governance Involvement,
- Involvement at the Department/School/College Level, and
- Involvement at the Institutional Level (e.g., campus-wide committees).

Levels of Intercollegiate Athletics Governance Involvement are:

- Never Involved,
- Served at some time in one of the following capacities: FAR, member of the campus athletics advisory board, or member of the campus NCAA certification team (Intercollegiate Athletics Governance Involvement – One Role), and
- Served at some time in more than one of the following capacities: FAR, member of the campus athletics advisory board, or member of the campus NCAA certification team (Intercollegiate Athletics Governance Involvement – Multiple Roles).

Faculty who have not served in intercollegiate athletics' governance roles tend to be less positive overall compared to those who have served in one or multiple roles. All groups think it is Not At All to Slightly characteristic of faculty governance groups to be involved in decisions about the athletic department's *budget*. However, faculty who have been involved in athletics governance and those active in institutional governance think it is Slightly to Moderately characteristic of their universities to involve faculty governance groups *in other decisions* about intercollegiate athletics. The remaining faculty think this involvement is Not At All to Slightly characteristic. Faculty who have served in one intercollegiate athletics governance role, when compared with their colleagues who have served in multiple capacities, are slightly less positive overall about governance policies and practices.

(See Tables 2A in Appendix B)

Perceptions of Academic Aspects

Total Sample

Faculty characterize student-athletes in general as motivated and prepared academically to keep pace with other students. The majority does not believe their faculty colleagues negatively stereotype student-athletes and most do not perceive that student-athletes lack academic integrity or that academic misconduct among student-athletes is treated differently:

- 61% believe it is Moderately to Very Much accurate to say that student-athletes in their department are motivated to earn their degrees;
- 61% say it is Not at All to Slightly characteristic of student-athletes to not be prepared academically to keep pace with other students in their classes;
- 61% think it is Not at All to Slightly characteristic of individuals to use their status as student-athletes to acquire special treatment from their teaching assistants;
- 59% perceive it is Not at All to Slightly appropriate to say that student-athletes represent a disproportionate number of known cheaters in their classes;
- 73% think it is Not at All to Slightly characteristic of faculty in their department to stereotype student-athletes negatively, dismissing them as serious and capable students; and
- 42% believe that it is Not at All to Slightly accurate to say that sanctions for academic misconduct are less severe for student-athletes than those applied to non-student athletes in their school/college, 14% believe it is Moderately to Very Much the case, and 44% don't know.

(See Table 3)

Faculty are aware of the pressures on student-athletes and the negative consequences that can follow from the demands on their out of class time. Still, faculty are inclined to believe success in football and basketball can be achieved without compromising academic standards:

- 75% believe it is Moderately to Very Much the case that student-athletes are more burdened than other students by demands on their out-of-class time;
- 58% perceive it is Not at All to Slightly appropriate to say that compared to student-athletes, non-student-athletes have worse class attendance records;
- 55% say that it is Not at All to Slightly characteristic of student-athletes to actively participate in student activities (e.g., research opportunities, student government, social events) in their school/college; and
- 50% believe it is Not at All to Slightly the case that compromises in academic standards must be made in order for their university's football and basketball teams to be competitive.

Although faculty seem to have a common perception of how academic advising of student-athletes is handled on their campus, they are unfamiliar with admissions practices and campus-wide monitoring of programs of study that could affect student-athletes' academic performance:

- 60% believe it is Moderately to Very Much the case that academic advising of student-athletes is separate from academic advising for the general undergraduate student body;
- 42% don't know how characteristic it is of their campus for high school athletes who do not meet regular university academic standards to be admitted through a special admissions process that lacks faculty input;
- 56% don't know how typical it is for coaches to be involved in admissions decisions for recruits who do not meet regular university academic standards; and
- 49% don't know if a faculty committee on their campus regularly monitors the educational soundness of student-athletes' programs of study.

Table 3. Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics for Total Sample – Frequency Distributions for Academic Items

Index	Individual Index item	Don't Know	Not At All	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much	Not Relevant
BA-A1: Special Admission of Academically Underprepared Student-Athletes Involves Coaches Not Faculty	(1) High school athletes who do not meet regular university academic standards are admitted through a special admissions process that lacks faculty input	869 42.1%	301 14.6%	227 11%	279 13.5%	364 17.7%	22 1.1%
	(2) Coaches are involved in admissions decisions regarding recruits who do not meet regular university academic standards	1149 55.9%	185 9%	162 7.9%	220 10.7%	308 15%	30 1.5%
	(3) A staff of specialized admissions officers makes decisions about undergraduate admissions with minimal faculty input	427 20.7%	130 6.3%	181 8.8%	307 14.9%	998 48.4%	19 .9%
BA-A2: Academic Advising of Student-Athletes is Separate	(1) Academic advising for student-athletes is separate from academic advising for undergraduates who are not student-athletes	454 22%	159 7.7%	197 9.6%	454 22%	786 38.2%	10 .5%
BA-A3: Student-Athletes' Academic Performance is Weak	(1) Missed class time due to athletic obligations detracts from the quality of student-athletes' learning in my classes	149 7.2%	216 10.5%	663 32.2%	456 22.1%	402 19.5%	175 8.5%
	(2) Student-athletes are not prepared academically to keep pace with other students in my class	221 10.7%	683 33.2%	564 27.4%	296 14.4%	136 6.6%	158 7.7%
	(3) Student-athletes represent a disproportionate number of known cheaters in my classes	539 26.2%	1125 54.8%	87 4.2%	47 2.3%	46 2.2%	210 10.2%
	(4) Individuals try to use their status as student-athletes to acquire special treatment from my teaching assistants (e.g., better grades)	337 16.4%	1073 52.1%	173 8.4%	96 4.7%	62 3%	318 15.4%
BA-A4: Student-Athletes are Burdened and Miss Class	(1) Student-athletes are more burdened than other students on my campus by demands on their out-of-class time	140 6.8%	131 6.3%	224 10.9%	564 27.3%	993 48.1%	11 .5%
	(2) Compared to student-athletes, other students have worse attendance records in my classes	285 13.8%	838 40.7%	363 17.6%	283 13.7%	135 6.6%	157 7.6%
BA-A5: Student-Athletes are Academically Motivated and Engaged	(1) In my experience, student-athletes in my academic department are motivated to earn their degrees	215 10.4%	88 4.3%	392 19%	666 32.3%	592 28.7%	111 5.4%
	(2) Student-athletes actively participate in student activities (e.g., research opportunities, student government, social events) in my school/college	507 24.6%	531 25.8%	610 29.6%	318 15.4%	76 3.7%	19 .9%

Note. The survey item reads, "Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus."

Table 3. Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics for Total Sample – Frequency Distributions for Academic Items (Continued)

Index	Individual Index item	Don't Know	Not At All	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much	Not Relevant
BA-A6: Faculty Hold Negative Stereotypes	(1) Faculty in my academic department stereotype student-athletes negatively, dismissing them as serious and capable students	211 10.2%	914 44.4%	580 28.2%	220 10.7%	70 3.4%	65 3.2%
BA-A7: Intercollegiate Athletics Success Requires Compromises in Academic Standards	(1) In order for my university's football and basketball teams to be competitive, compromises in academic standards must be made	359 17.5%	652 31.7%	368 17.9%	311 15.1%	354 17.2%	13 .6%
	(2) Sanctions for academic misconduct are less severe for student-athletes than those applied to non-student-athletes in my school/college	896 43.6%	694 33.8%	167 8.1%	126 6.1%	154 7.5%	17 .8%
	(3) Tutors hired by the athletic department complete assignments for some student-athletes in my classes	1147 55.7%	460 22.4%	143 6.9%	98 4.8%	88 4.3%	122 5.9%
	(4) A faculty committee on my campus regularly monitors the educational soundness of student-athletes' programs of study	1014 49.2%	226 11.0%	236 11.5%	247 12.0%	305 14.8%	32 1.6%

Note. The survey item reads, "Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus."

Subgroup Analyses

The interviews conducted as part of the questionnaire design phase of this study suggest that faculty perceptions of athletes as students, as well as their opinions about practices that affect student-athletes, might vary in relation to their instructional experiences. Therefore, responses to a question about contact with student-athletes were used to categorize the faculty as either with or without experience teaching student-athletes. Because seniority and disciplinary affiliation also affect beliefs about campus policies and practices (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995), professorial rank was used as a proxy for seniority and disciplinary groups were created. The discipline groups are Natural Sciences (biology and chemistry), Mathematics, Humanities (English, history and Romance languages), Social Sciences (sociology, psychology, and political science), Music, Physical Education/Kinesiology, and Professional (business, education, and engineering).

The item means for the student-athlete teaching experience, disciplinary and faculty rank groups are displayed in Tables 3A through 3C in Appendix B. For the most part, the means are similar. For example, faculty with different disciplinary affiliations hold similar perceptions of student-athletes' engagement in the student activities of their schools/colleges. However, it appears that faculty opinions about the academic performance and motivations of student-athletes may differ by discipline. Faculty in the natural sciences, math and professional fields think it is Not At All to Slightly the case, whereas faculty in the humanities and social sciences think it is Slightly to Moderately the case that student-athletes are not academically prepared to keep pace with other students in their classes. Faculty in natural sciences and professional fields tend to think it is Moderately to Very Much the case that student-athletes in their departments are motivated to earn their degrees. On these same measures, faculty with and without experience teaching student-athletes differ as well. Faculty who teach student-athletes think it is Moderately to Very Much the case that they are motivated to earn their degrees and that it is Slightly to Moderately characteristic of student-athletes to participate in the student activities of their school. Those who lack such teaching experience tend to believe it is Slightly to Moderately accurate to say that student-athletes are motivated to

earn their degrees and that it is Not at All to Slightly characteristic of student-athletes to engage in student activities sponsored by their school/college (See Tables 3A, 3B, & 3C in Appendix B.)

Perceptions of Financial Aspects

Total Sample

In the opinion of faculty, intercollegiate athletics are a mixed financial blessing. On the one hand, they note the high costs associated with intercollegiate athletics. On the other hand, they believe there are financial benefits that can accrue to a campus when the athletic teams are successful:

- 51% believe it is Moderately to Very Much the case that construction of state of the art athletic facilities is given higher priority than capital projects needed by their academic departments;
- 72% say it is Moderately to Very Much the case that salaries paid to head football and basketball coaches are excessive; and
- 50% believe it is Moderately to Very Much the case that the success of intercollegiate athletics fosters alumni/corporate giving to campus initiatives outside of intercollegiate athletics.

(See Table 4)

The largest portion of faculty (39%) don't know if their university subsidizes intercollegiate athletics with general funds, while the remaining faculty believe their campus situations are different - about 32% believe it is Not at All to Slightly characteristic and 29% believe it is Moderately to Very Much characteristic for athletics to be subsidized. In contrast, the largest portion (50%) say that it is Not at All to Slightly characteristic of their athletic departments to contribute funds to support academic resources (e.g., libraries), 34% of professors don't know whether such contributions occur and 16% say that it is Moderately to Very Much typical of their campus.

The largest portion of the faculty believe that athletic scholarships may not be fair compensation: 45 percent perceive that it is Not At All to Slightly the case that athletic scholarships given by their universities to football and basketball players may not fairly compensate them for their service. However, they are almost evenly divided between those who think it is Not At All to Slightly (37%) and Moderately to Very Much (35%)

the case that contracts with clothing and equipment companies (e.g., Nike, adidas) erode the ideals of amateur athletics on their campuses.

Subgroup Analyses

Comparisons of governance group means on the finance items suggest that those experienced in the governance of intercollegiate athletics hold slightly more positive views. For example:

- Faculty with intercollegiate athletics governance experience are *less* inclined than those without such experience to believe athletic department construction projects receive higher priority than capital projects in academic departments or that commercial ventures erode the ideals of amateurism on their campuses. They are *more* inclined than those without experience to perceive that athletic scholarships constitute fair compensation to football and basketball student-athletes.

(See Table 4A in Appendix B.)

Following up the premise that faculty in departments with better funding might be more positive than their colleagues in less well-endowed areas, disciplinary group means on the finance items were compared. The results show that the faculty views are quite similar across fields. However, humanities faculty are more inclined than their colleagues in other disciplines to believe projects in athletics are given higher priority than similar requests from their departments.

(See Table 4B in Appendix B.)

Table 4. Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics for Total Sample – Frequency Distributions for Finance Items

Index	Individual Index Item	Don't Know	Not At All	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much	Not Relevant
BA-F1: Intercollegiate Athletics Subsidized by General Fund	(1) Intercollegiate athletics is subsidized by my university's general fund	789 38.6%	463 22.6%	195 9.5%	238 11.6%	358 17.5%	2 .1%
BA-F2: Intercollegiate Athletics Gives Funds to University	(1) The athletic department on my campus contributes funds to support academic resources (e.g., libraries)	694 33.9%	708 34.6%	311 15.2%	173 8.5%	158 7.7%	2 .1%
BA-F3: Intercollegiate Athletics Gets Higher Funding Priority than Athletics	(1) Construction of state of the art athletic facilities is given higher priority than capital projects needed by my academic department to keep pace with research in my field/discipline	210 10.2%	447 21.8%	330 16.1%	311 15.2%	742 36.2%	10 .5%
	(2) Salaries paid to head football and basketball coaches on my campus are excessive	143 7%	208 10.2%	224 10.9%	338 16.5%	1129 55.1%	6 .3%
BA-F4: Athletics Scholarships Fairly Compensate Football and Basketball Players	(1) Athletic scholarships to football and basketball players fairly compensate them for their service to the university	308 15.1%	499 24.4%	419 20.5%	407 19.9%	380 18.6%	32 1.6%
BA-F5: Athletic Team Success Attracts Donations to Non-Athletic Initiatives	(1) The success of intercollegiate athletics fosters alumni and corporate giving to campus initiatives outside of intercollegiate athletics	248 12.1%	255 12.5%	518 25.3%	518 25.3%	506 24.7%	3 .1%
BA-F6: Intercollegiate Athletics: Commercialization is Eroding Amateurism	(1) Contracts with clothing and equipment companies (e.g., Nike, adidas) have eroded the ideals of amateur athletics on my campus	548 26.7%	408 19.9%	355 17.3%	313 15.3%	406 19.8%	20 1%

Note: The survey item reads, "Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus."

1b. What do faculty find satisfying and dissatisfying about intercollegiate athletics on their campuses and how does this satisfaction differ?

Satisfaction with Governance Aspects

Total Sample

More faculty are satisfied (46%) than are dissatisfied (28%) with presidential oversight and more are satisfied (42%) than are dissatisfied (34%) with institutional control of intercollegiate athletics. A smaller segment of the faculty is satisfied (38%) with the way their campus administrators handle external constituents (e.g., boosters, media, vendors) with vested interests in intercollegiate athletics. (See Table 5)

Proportionally, the group of faculty that is dissatisfied with their roles in the governance of intercollegiate athletics is larger than the group that is satisfied. The largest number are dissatisfied with the degree of consultation between faculty and administrators and the range of faculty opinions considered as decisions are made about intercollegiate athletics:

- 36% are Dissatisfied and 28% are Satisfied with the roles faculty play in the governance of intercollegiate athletics;
- 42% are Dissatisfied with the extent to which faculty input informs administrative decisions related to intercollegiate athletics;
- 44% are Dissatisfied with the range of faculty perspectives considered by central administrators when institutional positions on intercollegiate athletics are formulated; and
- Faculty are almost split regarding their satisfaction with the willingness of faculty who serve on governance groups to take positions at odds with those advocated by athletics administrators, 37% are Satisfied and 34% are Dissatisfied.

(See Table 5)

On several key academic issues, the proportion of those offering no opinion is substantial and, in several instances, exceeds the proportions that are satisfied and dissatisfied. At least a third of the faculty offer no opinion with respect to: the practice of giving perks to faculty and administrators who serve on athletics oversight committees (50%); the level of cooperation between the athletic department and faculty groups responsible for ensuring academic standards are upheld (39%); the willingness of faculty and administrators who serve on governance groups to oppose positions advocated by athletics administrators (39%); the attention given to the quality of student-athletes'

educational experiences (38%); the types of roles faculty play in the governance of intercollegiate athletics (35%); the range of faculty perspectives considered by central administrators when institutional positions on intercollegiate athletics are formulated (34%); and the extent to which faculty input informs administrative decisions related to intercollegiate athletics (33%).

Subgroup Analyses

Comparisons of governance group means indicate that faculty who have served in multiple intercollegiate roles are the most satisfied with governance, followed by those who have served in one intercollegiate athletics governance role. Faculty members who have not served at all are least satisfied.

Faculty who have served in multiple intercollegiate athletics governance capacities are satisfied with the following features:

- Attention given to the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences by faculty governance groups;
- Level of cooperation between the athletic department and faculty groups responsible for ensuring that academic standards are upheld;
- Institutional control over intercollegiate athletics on campus; and
- President's oversight of intercollegiate athletics.

Faculty who have served in one governance role related to intercollegiate athletics and faculty with no intercollegiate athletics governance experience are dissatisfied with all aspects of governance. They are most dissatisfied with the range of faculty perspectives considered by central administrators when institutional positions on intercollegiate athletics are formulated. (See Table 5A in Appendix B.)

Table 5. Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics for Total Sample – Frequency Distribution for Governance Items

Index	Individual Index item	No Opinion	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Not Relevant
SA-G1: Faculty Governance Priorities Emphasize Student-Athletes' Education	(1) Attention given to the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences by faculty governance groups on my campus	762 37.5%	149 7.3%	397 19.5%	564 27.8%	139 6.8%	21 1%
SA-G2: Level of Collaboration and Impact of Faculty Input	(1) Level of cooperation between the athletic department and faculty groups responsible for ensuring that academic standards are upheld on my campus	791 38.9%	203 10%	377 18.5%	521 25.6%	126 6.2%	18 .9%
	(2) Types of roles faculty play in the governance of intercollegiate athletics on my campus	714 35.2%	270 13.3%	462 22.8%	467 23%	101 5%	16 .8%
	(3) Range of faculty perspectives considered by central administrators when institutional positions on intercollegiate athletics are formulated	700 34.4%	424 20.8%	473 23.3%	363 17.8%	58 2.9%	16 .8%
	(4) Practice of giving perks (e.g., trips to bowl games) to faculty and administrators who serve on committees that oversee intercollegiate athletics on my campus	1015 50%	253 2.5%	277 13.6%	292 14.4%	52 2.6%	142 7%
	(5) Willingness of faculty who serve on governance groups to take positions at odds with those advocated by athletics administrators on my campus	778 38.5%	151 7.5%	324 16%	586 29%	162 8%	20 1%
	(6) Extent to which faculty input informs administrative decisions related to intercollegiate athletics	664 32.9%	354 17.5%	496 24.6%	430 21.3%	66 3.3%	9 .4%
SA-G3: Institutional Leaders' Oversight of Intercollegiate Athletics	(1) Institutional control over intercollegiate athletics on my campus	474 23.4%	260 12.8%	431 21.3%	693 34.2%	161 7.9%	7 .3%
	(2) President's oversight of intercollegiate athletics on my campus	528 26.1%	227 11.2%	336 16.6%	742 36.7%	181 8.9%	9 .4%
	(3) The way campus administrators handle external constituencies (e.g., boosters, media, vendors) with vested interests in intercollegiate athletics on my campus	585 28.9%	257 12.7%	404 20%	650 32.1%	118 5.8%	10 .5%

Note: The survey item reads, "Please indicate how personally satisfied you are with each of the following on your campus."

Satisfaction with Academic Aspects

Total Sample

Most faculty are satisfied with the academic integrity and performance of student-athletes in sports other than football and basketball. In addition, most are satisfied with efforts of their departmental colleagues to work with student-athletes and to ensure the quality of their educational experiences:

- 69% are Satisfied and 12% are Dissatisfied with the academic performance of student-athletes in sports other than football and basketball and 19% say they have No Opinion or this issue is Not Relevant, presumably because they do not teach these students;
- 32% are Satisfied and 27% are Dissatisfied with the academic performance of football and basketball student-athletes in their classes, and 41% say they have No Opinion or this issue is Not Relevant, perhaps because they do not teach these students;
- 61% are Satisfied with the level of responsibility student-athletes take to complete assignments and acquire course materials for sessions they miss; and
- 63% are Satisfied with the academic integrity of student-athletes in their classes.

(See Table 6)

Among those who offered an opinion, almost equal segments of the faculty are satisfied (24%) and dissatisfied (20%) with the coaches' role in the undergraduate admissions process. Concerning the professional staff who assume responsibilities for advising and tutoring student-athletes, large segments of faculty again offer no opinion on these issues; however, more faculty are satisfied than dissatisfied:

- 37% are Satisfied and 20% are Dissatisfied with the academic standards of academic advisors who have responsibility for student-athletes; and
- 32% are Satisfied and 15% are Dissatisfied with the academic standards of individuals who tutor student-athletes on their campuses.

Perhaps due in part to their lack of knowledge and or direct experience with student-athletes in their classes, faculty are reluctant to offer an opinion about: the role of coaches in the undergraduate admissions process (53% No Opinion); the academic standards of individuals who tutor student-athletes (53% No Opinion); the academic standards of academic advisors who have responsibility for

student-athletes (42% No Opinion); and the academic standards that guide admissions decisions for high school athletes in football and basketball (40% No Opinion).

Subgroup Analyses

The data indicate that all discipline groups distinguish between the academic performance of student-athletes who are members of football and basketball teams and other student-athletes. Across the discipline groups, satisfaction with the academic performance of football and basketball players is markedly lower than satisfaction with the academic performance of student-athletes in other sports. In addition, faculty who teach student-athletes distinguish between the academic performances of these two groups. They are Moderately to Slightly dissatisfied with student-athletes in basketball and football (mean = 2.46) and are Satisfied with student-athletes in sports other than football and basketball (mean = 3.09) who enroll in their classes. In fact, faculty satisfaction with the latter group is, on average, higher than satisfaction with the academic performance of students who are not student-athletes (mean = 2.86). Overall, faculty in the professional fields tend to be the most satisfied with the academic aspects of intercollegiate athletics covered in the survey. (See Tables 6A, 6B, and 6C in Appendix B.)

Table 6. Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics for Total Sample - Frequency Distribution for Academic Items

Index	Individual Index item	No Opinion	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Not Relevant
SA-A1: Coaches' Admissions-Related Roles and Academic Standards Applied	(1) The role coaches play in the undergraduate admissions process	1090 53.4%	157 7.7%	247 12.1%	403 19.7%	78 3.8%	66 3.2%
	(2) Academic standards on my campus that guide admissions decisions for high school athletes in football and basketball	818 40.1%	214 10.5%	386 18.9%	503 24.7%	92 4.5%	27 1.3%
SA-A2: Standards of Athletic Department Academic Support Staff	(1) Academic standards of academic advisors who have responsibility for student-athletes on my campus	846 41.5%	137 6.7%	273 13.4%	562 27.5%	201 9.8%	22 1.1%
	(2) Academic standards of individuals who tutor student-athletes on my campus	1071 52.6%	93 4.6%	211 10.4%	520 25.5%	126 6.2%	17 .8%
	(3) Efforts of faculty in my academic department who work with student-athletes and ensure the quality of their educational experiences	476 23.4%	32 1.6%	177 8.7%	957 47%	258 12.7%	136 6.7%
SA-A3: Student-Athletes' Academic Performance and Integrity in Class	(1) Academic performance of student-athletes in sports other than football and basketball in my classes	197 9.7%	35 1.7%	206 10.1%	1008 49.4%	397 19.5%	197 9.7%
	(2) Level of responsibility student-athletes take to complete assignments and acquire course materials for sessions they miss in my classes	203 10%	88 4.3%	307 15.1%	953 46.8%	288 14.1%	197 9.7%
	(3) Academic performance of football and basketball student-athletes in my classes	356 17.5%	170 8.4%	378 18.6%	592 29.1%	67 3.3%	471 23.2%
	(4) Academic integrity of student-athletes in my classes	208 10.2%	55 2.7%	297 14.6%	1068 52.4%	217 10.6%	194 9.5%

Note: The survey item reads, "Please indicate how personally satisfied you are with each of the following on your campus."

Satisfaction with Finance Aspects

Total Sample

More faculty are dissatisfied (37%) than are satisfied (21%) with the use of general funds to subsidize intercollegiate athletics (31% offered no opinion). Almost equal proportions are satisfied (41%) and dissatisfied (42%) with the balance struck on their campuses between the commercialization of intercollegiate athletics and the ideals of amateur athletics. (See Table 7)

The majority of faculty are satisfied with the practice of awarding athletic scholarships. They also approve of their campus' compliance with Title IX:

- 53% are Satisfied and 31% are Dissatisfied with the practice of awarding scholarships to individuals based on their athletic abilities and performance; and
- 60% say they are Satisfied and 15% are Dissatisfied with their athletic department's compliance with Title IX (e.g., equitable participation opportunities, financial aid, and treatment of female and male student-athletes).

Subgroup Analyses

As is the case in previous comparisons of governance groups, the faculty who have served in multiple intercollegiate athletics governance roles are slightly more satisfied than other faculty. The largest difference between those with and without intercollegiate governance experience is satisfaction with the use of general fund subsidies. Faculty without these experiences are more Dissatisfied (mean = 1.98) than those with experience in one (mean = 2.50) and those who have served in multiple intercollegiate athletics governance roles (mean = 2.76). (See Table 7A in Appendix B.)

Table 7. Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics for Total Sample - Frequency Distribution for Finance Items

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	No Opinion	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Not Relevant
SA-F1: Intercollegiate Athletics Compliance with Title IX	(1) My athletic department's compliance with Title IX (e.g., equitable participation opportunities, financial aid, and treatment of female and male student-athletes)	512 25.2%	101 5%	197 9.7%	881 43.4%	327 16.1%	11 .5%
SA-F2: Use of General Funds to Subsidize Intercollegiate Athletics	(1) The use of general funds to subsidize intercollegiate athletics on my campus	638 31.4%	420 20.7%	320 15.8%	356 17.5%	74 3.6%	223 11%
SA-F3: Awarding Athletic Scholarships	(1) The practice of awarding scholarships to individuals based on their athletic abilities and performance	313 15.4%	271 13.3%	358 17.6%	929 45.7%	146 7.2%	15 .7%
SA-F4: Balance between Commercialization and Amateurism	(1) The balance struck on campus between the commercialization of intercollegiate athletics and the ideals of amateur athletics	324 15.9%	360 17.7%	494 24.3%	724 35.6%	119 5.8%	15 .7%

Note: The survey item reads, "Please indicate how personally satisfied you are with each of the following on your campus."

1c. What do faculty self-identify as areas where they lack knowledge about intercollegiate athletics on their campuses?

Members of groups that seek greater involvement of faculty in the reform of intercollegiate athletics must attend to how much faculty know about intercollegiate athletics. The data displayed in Table 8 assumes for the purpose of discussion that the “Don’t Know” (Beliefs and Perceptions items) and “No Opinion” (Satisfaction items) answers approximate self-identified areas where faculty lack sufficient information to offer an opinion.

There are 35 items to which more than 25% responded “Don’t Know” or “No Opinion”. One possible explanation is that faculty members’ lack of specific knowledge about intercollegiate athletics issues reflects their lack of general knowledge about campus policies or practices in the selected areas. To test this proposition, the frequency of “Don’t Know” responses were compared in those instances where similar questions are asked about non-athletics and athletics-related policies and practices. In most cases, respondents are reporting a lack of knowledge specific to intercollegiate athletics. For example, faculty are asked if during the budget process for schools/colleges, it is characteristic of faculty governance committees to advise administrators. About 24% of the respondents’ answers are “Don’t Know,” as compared to 45% whose answers are “Don’t Know” to the same question about faculty governance participation in the budget process for athletic departments. Responding to parallel questions about faculty governance participation in institution-level decisions related to academic matters and decisions related to intercollegiate athletics, 12% and 32% of the respondents respectively answer “Don’t Know”. Parallel questions about academic issues produce similar response patterns, again suggesting that the results reflect a lack of information about intercollegiate athletics. For example, 12% of the faculty say they have “No Opinion” about the academic standards of professional staff who have responsibility for undergraduate student advising whereas 42% offer “No Opinion” about the standards of academic advisors who have responsibilities for student-athletes.

A second possibility, closely related to the first, is that larger segments of the sample lack direct experience with the different policies and practices. Given the size of

the sample groups with and without intercollegiate athletics governance experience, this is feasible.

Yet another possibility is that respondents were tired and simply answered “Don’t Know” or “No Opinion” to all items as they approached the end of the survey. Post hoc analyses indicate that this is unlikely.

The final possibility considered is the lack of knowledge reflects a respondent’s level of interest in intercollegiate athletics. More than a third (39%) of the survey respondents say that they attend intercollegiate competitions regularly, indicating some level of interest, at least as casual spectators or sports fans. Almost half the respondents (47%) say they believe it is Moderately to Very Much the case that faculty on their campus are interested in governance issues related to intercollegiate athletics. However, as will be noted later in this Report, respondents rate intercollegiate athletics very low as a faculty governance priority. The survey did not gather information about faculty access to information about intercollegiate athletics on their campus. Consequently, it is not feasible to confirm or disconfirm the possibility that faculty seek but cannot find the information they want.

Table 8. “Don’t Know” and “No Opinion” Responses for Total Sample

Faculty Survey Items	Don't Know and No Opinion Responses
	[25-35%]
Student-athletes actively participate in student activities (e.g., research opportunities, student government, social events)	24.60%
Athletics boosters who put winning sports records ahead of academic standards have influence with my president	25.00%
My athletic department's compliance with Title IX (e.g., equitable participation opportunities, financial aid, and treatment of female and male student-athletes)	25.20%
President's oversight of intercollegiate athletics on my campus	26.10%
Student-athletes represent a disproportionate number of known cheaters in my classes	26.20%
Faculty roles associated with oversight of intercollegiate athletics are ill defined on my campus	26.30%
Contracts with clothing and equipment companies (e.g., Nike, adidas) have eroded the ideals of amateur athletics on my campus	26.70%
My president and faculty agree on matters related to intercollegiate athletics	27.50%
Compared with deans of schools/colleges, my athletic director has more influence with my president	28.70%
The way campus administrators handle external constituents (e.g., boosters, media, vendors) with vested interests in intercollegiate athletics on my campus	28.90%
The use of general funds to subsidize intercollegiate athletics on my campus	31.40%
Institutional-level decisions about intercollegiate athletics are typically made by administrators who consult with faculty governance groups	31.70%
Extent to which faculty input informs administrative decisions related to intercollegiate athletics	32.90%
Range of faculty perspectives considered by central administrators when institutional positions on intercollegiate athletics are formulated	34.40%
	[36-45%]
Types of roles faculty play in the governance of intercollegiate athletics on my campus	35.20%
Athletic perks (e.g., trips to bowl games) to faculty who judge the academic eligibility of student-athletes create a potential conflict of interest situation	35.20%
Faculty use their authority to question courses in my school/college that lack academic integrity, but fulfill undergraduate students' needs to improve their GPAs	36.10%
Central administrators and athletics administrators on my campus are forthcoming with information that faculty oversight committees need to ensure the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences	37.30%
Attention given to the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences by faculty governance groups on my campus	37.50%
Willingness of faculty who serve on governance groups to take positions at odds with those advocated by athletics administrators on my campus	38.50%
Intercollegiate athletics is subsidized by my university's general fund	38.60%
Level of cooperation between the athletic department and faculty groups responsible for ensuring that academic standards are upheld on my campus	38.90%
Faculty appointed to athletics governance committees are those most likely to acquiesce to athletics administrators on my campus	39.70%
Academic standards on my campus that guide admissions decisions for high school athletes in football and basketball	40.10%
Academic standards of academic advisors who have responsibilities for student-athletes on my campus	41.50%

Table 8. “Don’t Know” and “No Opinion” Responses for Total Sample (Continued)

Faculty Survey Items	Don't Know and "No Opinion" Responses
	[36-45% Continued]
High school athletes who do not meet regular academic standards are admitted through a special admissions process that lacks faculty input	42.10%
During the budget process for my university's athletic department, faculty governance committees advise administrators	43.50%
Sanctions for academic misconduct are less severe for student-athletes than those applied to non student-athletes in my school/college	43.60%
Central administrators and athletics administrators use their power to foreclose discussions of intercollegiate athletics that are not consistent with their agendas	44.30%
	[46% and above]
A faculty committee on my campus regularly monitors the educational soundness of student-athletes' programs of study	49%
Practice of giving perks (e.g., trips to bowl games) to faculty and administrators who serve on committees that oversee intercollegiate athletics on my campus	50%
Academic standards of individuals who tutor student-athletes on my campus	52.60%
The role coaches play in the undergraduate admissions process on my campus	53.40%
Tutors hired by the athletic department complete assignments for some student-athletes in my classes	55.70%
Coaches are involved in admissions decisions regarding recruits who do not meet regular university academic standards	55.90%

Note: This table includes items where the “don’t know” or “no opinion” responses constituted at least 25% of all responses. When reading the data displayed in the table, be aware that the majority of Faculty Survey questions deal with policies and practices and facets of faculty and administrator roles, not student-athletes. Hence, the preponderance of the first two sorts of items may simply reflect the emphasis in the Survey instrument.

Section Two: Faculty Governance Priorities and Concerns about Intercollegiate Athletics

2a. Given the myriad issues facing university campuses today, what priority do professors believe faculty governance groups must give to intercollegiate athletics?

To answer this question, the Faculty Survey presents respondents with a list of priority issues derived from higher education publications and the interviews conducted as part of this project. On a scale of 1- 5, where 1 is Very Low and 5 is Very High, faculty indicate how much priority they think faculty governance groups on their campus must give to each issue.

Many issues compete with intercollegiate athletics for faculty attention. The prioritization of issues shows that relative to other topics on the list, with a mean score of 2.52 – indicating Low to Moderate priority, faculty rank intercollegiate athletics next to

last in perceived importance. About 67% of the faculty rank Greek Life Very Low to Low (the least pressing issue in the view of the survey respondents) and 48% rank Intercollegiate Athletics Very Low to Low priority (See Table 9).

A close look at the priority assigned to intercollegiate athletics by different governance, academic rank, and discipline groups reveals:

- Respondents in the Intercollegiate Athletics Governance Involvement – Multiple Role group assign it the highest relative priority (mean = 3.06) followed by those in the Intercollegiate Athletics Governance Involvement – One Role group (mean = 2.99);
- Respondents in the University Governance Institutional Level involvement group on average assign a lower priority to athletics (mean = 2.62) than respondents with intercollegiate athletics governance experiences; and
- Respondents with no intercollegiate athletics governance experience assign the lowest priority to athletics (mean = 2.44) (See Table 9A in Appendix B).

Priorities vary only slightly among discipline and academic rank groups (See Tables 9B & 9C in Appendix B).

Table 9. Priorities for Faculty Governance Groups – Total Sample

Priorities ^a	No Opinion	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	Not Relevant
Undergraduate Majors (e.g., curriculum rigor, resources)	12 .6%	13 .6%	58 2.9%	417 20.5%	862 42.4%	668 32.8%	5 .2%
Graduate Programs (e.g., curriculum rigor, resources)	13 .6%	12 .6%	51 2.5%	303 14.9%	768 37.8%	881 43.3%	5 .2%
Resources for Research (e.g., quality of labs, administrative support, institutional grants)	11 .5%	13 .6%	57 2.8%	276 13.6%	763 37.5%	913 44.9%	1 0%
Undergraduate Educational Policies (e.g., admissions standards, advising, missed class time)	23 1.1%	31 1.5%	194 9.5%	740 36.4%	698 34.3%	341 16.8%	6 .3%
Access to and Affordability of Undergraduate Education (e.g., institutional financial aid, outreach to students and families)	22 1.1%	45 2.2%	198 9.7%	602 29.6%	639 31.4%	521 25.6%	7 .3%
Faculty Personnel Policies (e.g., use of non-tenure track faculty, promotion and tenure)	25 1.2%	38 1.9%	185 9.1%	566 27.3%	698 34.4%	514 25.3%	2 .1%
Faculty Salaries and Benefits (e.g., salary compression, health benefits)	13 .6%	31 1.5%	81 4%	401 19.8%	702 34.6%	799 39.4%	1 0%
Gender Equity (e.g., in employment, admissions)	30 1.5%	144 7.1%	285 14.1%	637 31.4%	515 25.4%	409 20.2%	8 .4%
Racial Equity (e.g., in employment, admissions)	27 1.3%	135 6.7%	232 11.5%	533 26.3%	567 28%	521 25.7%	9 .4%
Financial Health of Institution (e.g., revenue levels, deferred maintenance)	35 1.7%	38 1.9%	161 8%	524 25.9%	728 36%	529 26.2%	5 .2%
Intercollegiate Athletics (e.g., student-athlete well-being, finance)	73 3.6%	383 18.9%	572 28.2%	671 33.1%	249 12.3%	73 3.6%	6 .3%
Greek Life (e.g., initiation activities, Town Gown relationships)	113 5.6%	790 39%	559 27.6%	345 17%	105 5.2%	37 1.8%	79 3.9%
Commercialization of Research (e.g., intellectual property, joint ventures with private business)	75 3.7%	164 8.1%	396 19.6%	656 32.5%	484 24%	236 11.7%	8 .4%

^a Respondents were asked to indicate the priority they believe faculty governance groups on their campus must give to each: 1=Very Low thru 5=Very High

2b. What do faculty say most concerns them about intercollegiate athletics on their campuses?

Total Sample

The survey instrument includes an open-ended question to find out what aspects of intercollegiate athletics on their campuses is of most concern to faculty members. Out of 1,841 individuals who answered the question, 436 (23.7%) say they have no concerns and nine say intercollegiate athletics is not a personal priority. The rest indicate a host of issues ranging from the financing of intercollegiate athletics, to concerns about the well being of student-athletes, to concerns with the culture surrounding intercollegiate athletics events. Responses that refer to related issues were placed in categories representing the different problems and sets of circumstances. For example, different ways faculty think their universities take unfair advantage of student-athletes are grouped together into a category labeled Exploitation of Student- Athletes. (See Figure 5 in Appendix C for the categorization of related concerns.)

The issues mentioned most frequently center on the funding of intercollegiate athletics (19%). The largest group of respondents (9.8%) simply states they are concerned that intercollegiate athletics costs too much and is not self-supporting, while another 8.7% worry that universities subsidize intercollegiate athletics at the expense of academics. For example, one respondent is most concerned about “the monetary resources which are poured into athletics (new indoor football practice field for example) when teaching and research struggle to meet educational goals with old equipment.” Another faculty member alludes to the fiscal challenges facing higher education in many regions of the country. He complains about the “huge expenditures for intercollegiate athletics, including multi-million-dollar contracts for coaches, while the state legislature's support of the academic mission of the university continues to decline.” (See Table 10)

The next largest group of faculty is disturbed by their campus climate and the treatment of student- athletes. Faculty are particularly alarmed by campus cultures that elevate the importance of athletics at a cost to the intellectual atmosphere (Athletics Trump Academics). In the words of one respondent, “athletics dominates academics on this campus, from compensation of coaches vs. faculty to how the students spend their

time to canceling classes in order to accommodate a televised football game.”

Faculty concerns with respect to the treatment of student-athletes are most often references to the Time and Performance Demands on student-athletes (4.7%) and Student-Athletes’ Educational Experiences and Academic Outcomes (3.5%). For example, one professor noted “the time commitments for practices and travel to contests prevents academically-talented student-athletes from choosing very demanding majors (fields of study) and/or requires them to take more years to graduate. Since most student-athletes will not be professional athletes, their college academic experience may not maximally support future careers.”

Table 10. Faculty Concerns about Intercollegiate Athletics

Faculty Concerns ^a	Frequency of Response	Percentage of Respondents
<i>Treatment of Student-Athletes</i>		
Preferential Treatment for Student-Athletes	n=57	3.1%
Lack of Support for Student-Athletes	n=29	1.6%
Time and Performance Demands on Student-Athletes	n=86	4.7%
Exploitation of Student-Athletes	n=36	2%
<i>Student-Athletes’ Educational Experience & Outcomes</i>		
Student-Athletes’ Educational Experiences and Academic Outcomes	n=65	3.5%
<i>Attributes of Student-Athletes</i>		
Student-Athletes’ Weak Academic Preparation and Performance in Class	n=23	1.2%
Student-Athletes’ Poor Academic Attitudes and Dishonesty	n=33	1.8%
Student-Athletes’ Criminal and Bad Behavior	n=21	1.1%
<i>Commercialization and Professionalization</i>		
Intercollegiate Athletics is Professional and Commercialized	n=95	5.2%
<i>Intercollegiate Athletics Finances/Facilities</i>		
Intercollegiate Athletics Costs Too Much and is Not Self-Supporting	n=181	9.8%
Intercollegiate Athletics Is Subsidized at the Expense of Academics	n=161	8.7%
<i>Campus Climate</i>		
Low Interest/Investment by Campus Community	n=20	1.1%
Athletics Is Overemphasized on Campus	n=68	3.7%
Athletics Trumps Academics	n=125	6.8%
<i>Oversight/Governance</i>		
Intercollegiate Athletics Structural Separation and Power on Campus	n=39	2.1%
Faculty Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics is Problematic	n=35	1.9%
Influence of External Groups on Internal Decisions	n=39	2.1%
<i>Athletic Department/Athletics Events</i>		
Athletic Department Culture and Practices	n=49	2.7%
Negative Atmosphere Surrounds Athletic Events	n=17	.9%

Table 10. Faculty Concerns about Intercollegiate Athletics (Continued)

Faculty Concerns ^a	Frequency of Response	Percentage of Respondents
<i>Inequities in Intercollegiate Athletics</i>		
Inequitable Treatment of Athletes and Sports Teams	n=41	2.5%
Impact of Title IX	n=8	.4%
<i>Public View of University</i>		
Public View of University Overemphasizes Importance of Intercollegiate Athletics	n=23	1.2%
<i>Athletic Teams Perform Poorly</i>		
Athletic teams Perform Poorly	n=14	.8%
<i>Football and Men's Basketball</i>		
Football and Men's Basketball are Most Problematic on Campus	n=42	2.3%
<i>Mascot Problems</i>		
Problems Associated with Campus Mascots	n=16	.9%
<i>Intercollegiate Athletics Do Not Belong in Universities</i>		
Intercollegiate Athletics are Inappropriate for Universities	n=26	1.4%
<i>Intercollegiate Athletics Not a Personal Priority</i>		
Intercollegiate Athletics Not a Personal Priority	n=9	.5%
<i>No Concerns to Report</i>		
No Concerns Identified	n=436	23.7%
<i>Other</i>		
Other	n=46	2.5%

^a Respondents were asked to indicate what most concerns them about intercollegiate athletics on their campus

Subgroup Analyses

Faculty are compared to see if individuals with varying levels of involvement in institutional governance generally and in the governance of intercollegiate athletics specifically voice different concerns. Among the findings:

- Within the group whose general governance experience is limited to the school/college level and among those who are currently involved in institutional level governance, the expenses incurred by intercollegiate athletics and the athletics culture on their campuses are top concerns. Faculty currently involved in Institutional Level governance share these concerns and are also apprehensive about the professional nature and commercialization of intercollegiate athletics;
- Faculty with experience in one intercollegiate athletics governance role (e.g., FAR, campus athletics advisory board member, NCAA Certification team member), are concerned about finances and culture. In addition, they often mention the professionalization and commercialization of intercollegiate athletics, time and performance demands on student-athletes, and the influence of external groups on campus decisions;
- Expenses and priorities continue to be top concerns among the faculty who have served in multiple intercollegiate athletics governance roles. However, more faculty in this group are also troubled by the structural separation and power of intercollegiate athletics and problematic aspects of faculty governance of intercollegiate athletics. (See Table 10A in Appendix B.)

An emphasis on financial concerns holds across discipline groups and academic ranks. (See Tables 10B & 10C in Appendix B.)

2c. Are faculty with particular concerns more likely to join campus-based initiatives aimed at ameliorating the underlying problems and to believe that their activities will lead to positive changes on their campuses?

To garner some preliminary answers to these questions, faculty are asked to estimate the chances that (a) they would join a campus-based activity to address their concern and (b) such an initiative will result in meaningful change on their campus. Responses to these two questions are cross-tabulated in Table 11 so that a reader can see how estimates vary among groups with different concerns about intercollegiate athletics. For example, within the group of faculty who say their concern is Time and Performance Demands (n=86), 71 – 90 percent project that the chances they would join are better than

50 percent. Only 15 percent (n=13) think that a campus-based initiative aimed at this set of issues has more than a 50 percent chance of succeeding.

The results displayed in Table 11 suggest there is at least a 50 percent chance that most faculty would join initiatives directed at their concerns. The largest portion of faculty (71-90%) who say the chances of them working to address their concerns are greater than 50 percent are concerned with the Exploitation of Student-Athletes, the Structural Separation of Intercollegiate Athletics from the rest of the university, and Title IX. Faculty groups interested in enhancing the academic integrity of intercollegiate athletics will note that faculty who are concerned about the students' Educational Experiences and Academic Outcomes are among the most optimistic - 23 (35%) believe the chances of success are greater than 50 percent.

Juxtaposing the data in Table 10 (Faculty Concerns About Intercollegiate Athletics) with findings presented in Table 11 (Estimates of Joining Reform Efforts and Perceived Chance of Success) suggests that the areas of concern to the most faculty are also ones where faculty think they might join initiatives. For example, more than 50 percent of those alarmed by the cost of intercollegiate athletics (n=181) and by its subsidization at a cost to academics (n=161) say they would likely engage activities to address these problems. However, only 3 percent of the former group and 8 percent of the latter group project that the chances are greater than 50 percent that initiatives in these areas are likely to succeed.

Table 11. Estimates of Joining Reform Efforts and Perceived Chance of Success

Chances of Joining Reform Efforts	Perceived Chance of Success		
	Don't Know	Under 50%	Over 50%
Majority of Respondents Report Less than 50%			
Student-Athletes' Poor Academic Attitudes and Dishonesty (n=33)	4	28	1
Problems Associated with Campus Mascot (n=16)	0	12	4
51% - 70% of Respondents Report More than 50% Chance of Joining			
Student-Athletes' Criminal and Bad Behavior (n=21)	2	15	4
Athletics Overemphasized on Campus (n=68)	1	67	0
Public View of University Overemphasizes Importance of Athletics (n=23)	1	20	2
Athletes' Weak Academic Preparation and Performance (n=23)	4	15	4
Faculty Governance of Athletics is Problematic (n=35)	1	28	6
Athletics Trumps Academics (n=125)	5	112	8
Preferential Treatment for Student-Athletes (n=57)	4	44	9
Influence of External Groups on Internal Decisions (n=39)	2	34	3
Time and Performance Demands on Student-Athletes (n=86)	5	68	13
Athletics Cost Too Much and are Not Self-Supporting (n=181)	10	165	6
Negative Atmosphere Surrounding Athletics Events (n=17)	0	15	2
Football and Basketball are Most Problematic on Campus (n=42)	0	38	4
Intercollegiate Athletics are Professional and Commercialized (n=95)	3	85	7
Intercollegiate Athletics is Subsidized at the Expense of Academics (n=161)	3	145	12
Athletic Department Culture and Practices (n=49)	0	43	6
Student-Athletes' Educational Experiences and Academic Outcomes (n=65)	2	40	23
Low Interest/Investment by Campus Community (n=20)	0	16	4
71% - 90% of Respondents Report More than 50% Chance of Joining			
Intercollegiate Athletics Structural Separation and Power on Campus (n=38)	4	29	5
Impact of Title IX (n=8)	1	7	0
Exploitation of Student-Athletes (n=36)	2	33	1
Inequitable Treatment – Athletes and Sports Teams (n=41)	2	30	9
Lack of Support for Student-Athletes (n=29)	3	16	10

Note: Missing data are not indicated in the cross tabulations.

Section Three: Campus Context

3a. How do faculty perceptions of their university environments (general campus climate) influence their perceptions of intercollegiate athletics?

In this first set of analyses, general campus climate is used as a proxy for campus context. The proposition that faculty beliefs about intercollegiate athletics reflect their views of policies, practices, norms and behaviors in non-athletic campus domains (general campus climate) is examined within the total sample. For the purpose of these analyses, summative measures – henceforth called *indices* – were created to represent faculty views of several broad features of intercollegiate athletics and general campus climate.

Intercollegiate Athletic Indices

Three sets of *Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics Indices*, derived from separate exploratory factor analyses, represent the governance, academic, and finance aspects of intercollegiate athletics. The survey items that inquire about faculty satisfaction with these same facets of intercollegiate athletics are included in three sets of *Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics Indices*. (Please note: Index labels are italicized to distinguish them from individual Survey items.)

In brief, the indices for *Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Governance Aspects* capture faculty beliefs about the primary concerns of faculty governance committees with oversight responsibilities for intercollegiate athletics and the collaborative decision-making relationships between athletic departments and faculty governance groups. They also depict faculty beliefs about the professional standards of their athletic departments and the power wielded by intercollegiate athletics on their campuses. All but one of the governance indices are comprised of multiple survey items. The indices representing *Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics – Governance Aspects* focus on intercollegiate athletics governance priorities and practices as well as institutional oversight.

The indices for *Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Academic Aspects* represent faculty perceptions of practices and norms related to the admission, advising and tutoring of student-athletes as well as student-athletes' academic

motivations, out-of-class burdens, and in-class academic performance. The indicators also depict faculty views of student-athletes' academic integrity and faculty propensities to negatively stereotype this group. Five indices include multiple-items and two are single items. The *Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics – Academic Aspects Indices* center on admissions, advising and tutoring along with student-athletes' academic performance in their classes.

The *Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Financial Aspects Indices* cover a variety of topics related to faculty beliefs about the funding of intercollegiate athletics on their campuses, the impact of intercollegiate athletics on gifts to the university, and the commercialization of intercollegiate athletics. Five of the six indices are single items. Indicators of faculty *Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics – Financial Aspects* capture faculty views of general fund subsidies to intercollegiate athletics, the commercialization of intercollegiate athletics, the use of athletics scholarships, and Title IX compliance.

The Faculty Survey items that comprise each of these Indices are displayed in Figures 1 and 2 in Appendix C. (Factor analysis results are available from the researchers upon request.)

General Campus Climate Indices

Summative measures representing both *Beliefs and Perceptions of the General Campus Climate* and *Satisfaction with General Campus Climate* are factorial derived general climate indices. These Indices portray faculty perceptions of and satisfaction with non-athletic university policies, practices, norms and behaviors of different groups on and off campus (e.g., administrators, faculty, students, boosters, and residents of the state or local community). The *Beliefs and Perceptions of General Campus Climate* Indices and *Satisfaction with General Campus Climate* Indices are used in analyses where the effects of general campus climate on faculty views of intercollegiate athletics are assessed. (See Figures 3 and 4 in Appendix C for details about the Faculty Survey items that comprise the *Beliefs and Perceptions of General Campus Climate* and *Satisfaction with General Campus Climate Indices*.)

Findings

Overall, the findings show consistencies in faculty views of their general campus climate and intercollegiate athletics. Select results displayed in Table 12 illustrate the various ways faculty perceptions of general campus climate (*General Campus Climate Indices*) predict their beliefs about intercollegiate athletics (*Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics Indices*).

To take into account links between intercollegiate athletics and faculty perceptions of the local and state communities within which universities are situated, a *Town Gown Index* is used in the analysis of variance tests. It assesses the extent to which faculty believe their intercollegiate athletics program fulfills part of their university's service mission to the state and helps the local economy, and if they believe their coaches and student-athletes are good representatives of the university to the public (See Figure 4 in Appendix B for item composition of *Perceptions and Beliefs of General Campus Climate Indices*).

As faculty respondents' scores on the *Town-Gown Index* increase (indicating they believe these characteristics apply to their campus), they tend to also have more positive views of intercollegiate athletics. For example, they believe athletics success fosters donations to initiatives beyond intercollegiate athletics. They are also less inclined to believe athletics construction projects and salaries are prioritized over academic projects, or that their athletic department fails to uphold professional standards. (See Table 12, Items BA-F5, BA-F3 & BA-A7, respectively. Please note: letter/number designations refer to specific Indices in the tables.)

In contrast with the *Town Gown* results, when faculty believe residents of the state are more passionate than faculty and students about the success of their university's athletics teams (*State Residents' Passion for Intercollegiate Athletics*), they are also more likely to believe that athletic department power with external constituents is strong, that the department is accustomed to getting what it wants on campus, and that intercollegiate athletics receives higher priority in funding decisions. Faculty who perceive citizens are avid about their university's athletic teams are less confident that the athletic department complies with NCAA standards or that perks to those charged with oversight conform to

university norms regarding conflicts of interest. (See Table 12, Items BA-G5, BA-F3, & BA-A7, respectively.)

Those who believe that institutional level governance⁵ decisions about academic matters are made in consultation with faculty (*Faculty Governance Committees are Involved in Institutional Decisions about Academic Matters*) also believe that faculty are involved in decisions about intercollegiate athletics. Respondents who are less sure faculty are involved in such institutional decisions tend to perceive that their athletic department gets what it wants on campus and to also believe the athletic department is an auxiliary enterprise with policies and practices that lack transparency. (See Table 12, Items BA-G3, BA-G5, & BA-G4, respectively.)

Perceptions of general academic policies and practices are good predictors of faculty views of the academic aspects of intercollegiate athletics. A few examples make this point. Those who believe it is characteristic for faculty to monitor the quality of courses and undergraduate programs of study (*Faculty & Academic Administrators Hold Same Standards & Monitor Quality of Undergraduate Study*) are less inclined to believe compromises in academic standards must be made in order to be successful in intercollegiate athletics. When they think faculty are generally involved in the *Formal Advising of Undergraduates*, respondents also report it is less typical for the advising of student-athletes to be handled separately. (See Table 12, Items BA-A7 & BA-A2, respectively.)

How faculty characterize the financial aspects of intercollegiate athletics also reflects their views of overall financial conditions on their campus. If they think fiscal conditions on their campus have improved over the last five years (*Fiscal Conditions of Campus & Department Are Good*), they also believe that faculty and the president agree on matters related to intercollegiate athletics, that their athletic department contributes to academic resources on campus, that contributions fostered by success on the field of play go to initiatives outside of intercollegiate athletics, and that coaches' salaries and athletics construction projects do not receive higher priority than similar projects in academic units. In contrast, faculty who think financial conditions have worsened also believe that

⁵ For details on items that comprise the *Beliefs and Perceptions of General Campus Climate* Indices, please refer to Figure 4 in Appendix C.

general fund subsidies to intercollegiate athletics are characteristic of their campuses.
(See Table 12, Items BA-G1, BA-F-2, BA-F5, BA-F3, & BA-F1, respectively.)

Table 12. Beliefs and Perceptions of General Campus Climate Predicting Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Total Sample

	F-Statistic	dF	Significance	Range of Outcome Scores ^d
<i>Town-Gown Relationships (BG-01) with</i>				
BA-G5: Intercollegiate Athletics Power Erodes Faculty Governance & Threatens University Mission	F=81.59	(2, 687)	p<.000 ^a	1.54-2.85
BA-A7: Intercollegiate Athletics Success Requires Compromises in Academic Standards	F=79.56	(2,389)	p<.000 ^a	1.12-2.57
BA-F1: Intercollegiate Athletics Subsidized by General Fund	F=98.49	(2,1112)	p<.000 ^a	1.45-2.58
BA-F3: Intercollegiate Athletics Gets Higher Funding Priority than Academics	F=92.40	(2,1514)	p<.000 ^a	1.98-2.81
BA-F5: Athletic Team Success Attracts Donations to Non-Athletic Initiatives	F=159.89	(2,1514)	p<.000 ^a	1.55-2.50
<i>State Residents' Passion for Intercollegiate Athletics (BG-02) with</i>				
BA-G5: Intercollegiate Athletics Power Erodes Faculty Governance & Threatens University Mission	F=45.39	(2,736)	p<.000 ^a	1.54-2.50
BA-A7: Intercollegiate Athletics Success Requires Compromises in Academic Standards	F=18.33	(2,991)	p<.000 ^{b,c}	1.93-2.42
BA-F3: Intercollegiate Athletics Gets Higher Funding Priority than Academics	F=59.61	(2,1656)	p<.000 ^a	1.99-2.62
<i>General Campus Climate: Shared Governance is Valued (BG-G1) with</i>				
BA-G4: Intercollegiate Athletics is Auxiliary Enterprise with Weak Faculty Oversight	F=37.21	(2,944)	p<.000 ^a	1.92-2.65
BA-G5: Intercollegiate Athletics Power Erodes Faculty Governance & Threatens University Mission	F=36.94	(2,745)	p<.000 ^a	1.50-2.65
<i>Faculty Governance Committees are Involved in Institutional Decisions about Academic Matters (BG-G2) with</i>				
BA-G3: Administrators Consult Faculty on Intercollegiate Athletics Decisions	F=45.11	(2,1011)	p<.000 ^a	1.13-1.91
BA-G4: Intercollegiate Athletics is Auxiliary Enterprise with Weak Faculty Oversight	F=37.21	(2,944)	p<.000 ^a	1.91-2.71
<i>Faculty Involved in Formal Advising of Undergraduates (BG-A2) with</i>				
BA-A2: Academic Advising of Student-Athletes is Separate	F=56.61	(2,1587)	p<.000 ^a	2.17-2.78
<i>Faculty & Academic Administrators Hold Same Standards and Monitor Quality of Undergraduate Study (BG-A3) with</i>				
BA-A7: Intercollegiate Athletics Success Requires Compromises in Academic Standards	F=20.05	(2, 351)	p<.000 ^a	1.23-2.42
<i>Fiscal Conditions of Campus & Department are Good (BG-F1) with</i>				
BA-G1: Campus Consensus Exists Regarding Intercollegiate Athletics	F=80.919	(2,1242)	p<.000 ^a	1.52-2.19
BA-G5: Intercollegiate Athletics Power Erodes Faculty Governance & Threatens University Mission	F=81.591	(2,698)	p<.000 ^a	1.54-2.85
BA-F1: Intercollegiate Athletics Subsidized by General Fund	F=39.061	(2,1079)	p<.000 ^a	1.50-2.30
BA-F2: Intercollegiate Athletics Gives Funds to University	F=101.993	(2,1155)	p<.000 ^a	1.75-2.67
BA-F3: Intercollegiate Athletics Gets Higher Priority than Academics	F=74.065	(2,1410)	p<.000 ^a	2.00-2.77
BA-F5: Athletic Team Success Attracts Donations to Non-Athletic Initiatives	F=287.817	(2,1570)	p<.000 ^a	1.56-2.65

Note: Index labels (e.g., BA-G5) are linked to specific indices. An index with letters "BA" refers to beliefs about athletics. An index with letters "BG" refers to beliefs about general campus climate.

Since virtually all ANOVA results are statistically significant, the results displayed here are only a few selected examples of the full analysis.

^a All groups are significantly different

^b Very Much and Not At All groups are significantly different

^c Very Much and Slightly to Moderately groups are significantly different

^d Scale: 1=Not at all; 2=Slightly/Moderately; 3=Very much

3b. How does faculty satisfaction with general campus climate affect their satisfaction with different aspects of intercollegiate athletics?

Given the interrelatedness of faculty beliefs about intercollegiate athletics and general campus climate, it seems reasonable to ask if satisfaction with general campus climate predicts satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. (See Figure 4 in Appendix C for item composition of *Satisfaction with General Campus Climate Indices*.) No matter which facet of general campus climate or intercollegiate athletics is entered into the regression analysis, satisfaction with climate predicts satisfaction with athletics (See Table 13).

With regard to governance, respondents who are more satisfied with *General Campus Governance Practices* are more satisfied with the extent to which faculty input informs administrative decisions about intercollegiate athletics, with the use of general funds to subsidize intercollegiate athletics, and the balance between commercialization and amateurism on their campus. (See Table 13: Items SA-G2, SA-F2, & SA-F4, respectively.) With respect to academic matters, faculty who are more satisfied with the level of faculty involvement in general undergraduate admissions and with the academic standards of professional staff responsible for undergraduate admissions (*General Admissions Norms & Practices*) are more satisfied with the role coaches play in the undergraduate admissions process and the standards that guide the admissions decisions for high school athletes in football and basketball. Faculty who are more satisfied with undergraduate students (non-athletes) in their classes (*General Student Attributes*) are also satisfied with the academic performance of the student-athletes in their classes. (See Table 13: Items SA-A1& SA-A3, respectively.)

Regarding finances, faculty who are satisfied with resources available for their teaching and research and the priorities that guide allocation of resources on their campus (*General Resources/Allocation Priorities*) are also more satisfied with: the use of general funds to subsidize intercollegiate athletics, institutional leadership and oversight of intercollegiate athletics, and collaborative decision making in the area of intercollegiate athletics. (See Table 7: Items SA-F2, SA-G3, & SA-G2, respectively.)

Table 13. Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics Predicting Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics

	F-Statistic	dF	Significance	Range of Outcome Scores ^{a, b}
<i>Campus Consensus Exists Regarding Intercollegiate Athletics (BA-G1) with</i>				
SA-G3: Institutional Leaders' Oversight of Intercollegiate Athletics	F=237.613	(2,1084)	p<.000	1.03-1.97
<i>Administrators Consult Faculty on Intercollegiate Athletics Decisions (BA-G3) with</i>				
SA-G2: Level of Collaboration and Impact of Faculty Input	F=70.180	(2,461)	p<.000	1.19-2.02
SA-G3: Institutional Leaders' Oversight of Intercollegiate Athletics	F=64.663	(2,841)	p<.000	1.43-1.94
SA-F2: Use of General Funds to Subsidize Intercollegiate Athletics	F=47.155	(2,744)	p<.000	1.20-1.92
<i>Intercollegiate Athletics is Auxiliary Enterprise with Weak Faculty Oversight (BA-G4) with</i>				
SA-G2: Level of Collaboration and Impact of Faculty Input	F=137.582	(2,470)	p<.000	1.09-2.01
SA-G3: Institutional Leaders' Oversight of Intercollegiate Athletics	F=177.88	(2,832)	p<.000	1.20-1.99
SA-A2: Standards of Athletic Department Academic Support Staff	F=65.009	(2,576)	P<.000	1.42-1.94
<i>Intercollegiate Athletics Power Erodes Faculty Governance & Threatens University Mission (BA-G5) with</i>				
SA-G2: Level of Collaboration and Impact of Faculty Input	F=211.209	(2,413)	p<.000	1.05-1.98
SA-A1: Coaches' Admissions-Related Roles and Academic Standards Applied	F=210.441	(2,524)	p<.000	1.13-1.98
<i>Special Admission of Academically Underprepared Student-Athletes Involves Coaches Not Faculty (BA-A1) with</i>				
SA-G1: Faculty Governance Priorities Emphasize Student-Athletes' Education	F=98.602	(2,601)	p<.000	1.23-1.97
SA-A3: Student-Athletes' Academic Performance & Integrity in Class	F=35.027	(2,477)	p<.000	1.47-1.98
<i>Student-Athletes are Academically Motivated and Engaged (BA-A5) with</i>				
SA-A2: Standards of Athletic Department Academic Support Staff	F=29.486	(2,658)	p<.000	1.08-1.84
<i>Intercollegiate Athletics Success Requires Compromises in Academic Standards (BA-A7) with</i>				
SA-A1: Coaches' Admissions-Related Roles and Academic Standards Applied	F=135.015	(2,589)	p<.000	1.08-1.95
<i>Intercollegiate Athletics Gets Higher Funding Priority than Academics (BA-F3) with</i>				
SA-G3: Institutional Leaders' Oversight of Intercollegiate Athletics	F=263.479	(2,1138)	p<.000	1.25-1.99
SA-F4: Balance between Commercialization and Amateurism	F=257.257	(2,1519)	p<.000	1.08-1.94
<i>Athletic Team Success Attracts Donations to Non-Athletic Initiatives (BA-F5) with</i>				
SA-F2: Use of General Funds to Subsidize Intercollegiate Athletics	F=84.353	(2,1073)	p<.000	1.07-1.71
<i>Intercollegiate Athletics: Commercialization is Eroding Amateurism (BA-F6) with</i>				
SA-G3: Institutional Leaders' Oversight of Intercollegiate Athletics	F=189.097	(2,1042)	p<.000	1.18-1.94

Note: Index labels (e.g., SA-G3) are linked to specific indices. An index with letters "SA" refers to satisfaction with athletics. An index with letters "SG" refers to satisfaction with general campus climate.

^a Beliefs and Perceptions Scale: 1=Not at all; 2=Slightly/Moderately; 3=Very much

^b Satisfaction Scale: 1=Dissatisfied; 2=Satisfied

3c. How might variations in the athletic success of an institution's varsity athletics teams and the academic performance of student athletes affect faculty views of intercollegiate athletics?

For this set of analyses, an institutional taxonomy was created to control for specific campus characteristics, and faculty views of intercollegiate athletics within the different campus categories were examined.

Institutional Taxonomy Construction

Guided by the advice of Knight Commission advisors, an institutional taxonomy was created to capture two distinct dimensions: a school's intercollegiate athletics performance and a school's academic performance as it pertains to intercollegiate athletics. Conference membership, a ubiquitous institution-level variable in discussions of intercollegiate athletics, is not used as a contextual variable because only two campuses per conference were selected for the sample and according to faculty interviewed in the first phase of the study and Knight Commission advisors, athletic and academic success are stronger factors in faculty perception than conference membership. In light of distinctions drawn by faculty who were interviewed and by survey respondents, the project advisors and researchers decided to focus on the academic and athletic performance of the football and men's basketball teams.

For the intercollegiate athletics dimension, data were collected from NCAA official records pertaining to the postseason tournament performance of the football and men's basketball teams over a six-year period (academic years 2001-02 through 2006-07). For football, appearances in postseason bowl games were documented, and for men's basketball, appearances in the NCAA tournament were documented. Because each bowl is not considered equivalent in terms of payout as well as "cachet," the bowls were divided into three groups. An institution whose football team competed in a lower-tier bowl, (i.e., those whose payouts were less than \$3 million) were given one point per appearance. Weights were applied to appearances in mid-tier bowls with payouts greater than \$3 million (i.e., Alamo, Capital One, Cotton, Holiday, Peach/Chick-Fil-A, Gator, Outback, and Sun) and higher-tier bowls in the Bowl Championship Series[®] (i.e., Fiesta, Sugar, Rose, Orange, and BCS Championship Game). An institution received 1.25

points per appearance in a mid-tier bowl and 1.50 points per appearance in the higher-tier bowls.

Similarly, for men's basketball, every institution with a team that appeared in the first round of the tournament received one point per appearance. If the team moved on to the Sweet Sixteen[®], the institution was awarded an additional .25 of a point, and if the team appeared in the Final Four[®], the institution was awarded a further .25 of a point. The weighting mirrors that for football such that mid-level success – proxied by a Sweet Sixteen appearance – accords 1.25 points and high-level success – proxied by a Final Four appearance – accords 1.50 points. The total number of points for football and basketball postseason performances as described here was tallied for the same six-year period.

Academic performance as defined in this taxonomy reflects student-athletes' academic performance. Each institution's 4-class average rates for men's basketball and football teams were collected from the 2006 NCAA Graduation Rate report. These rates represent graduation success among scholarship athletes on those teams who entered college in 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, and 1999-2000 and graduated within six years of initial enrollment. Basketball teams have substantially fewer members than football teams, so the basketball graduation rate was weighted less than that for football. While graduation rates represent successful completion of degree programs, the institutional selectivity in terms of students' academic preparation for college is not well captured by these two measures. Since the test scores of incoming student-athletes, specifically football and basketball players, are not publicly available, the incoming overall student ACT Composite 50th percentile for the same six-year period was included to address this limitation. As with the athletic performance score calculation, the values for these three variables were summed to determine each institution's academic performance score.

Because the number of institutions included in the sample is relatively low, the athletic performance and academic performance continua were divided in half, at the median calculated score for the overall sample. The end result is a two-by-two taxonomy, represented below in Figure 6.

FIGURE 6

Institutional Categories

Campus Context: Institutional Taxonomy		Academic Performance		
		Lower Performance	Higher Performance	Total
Athletic Performance	Lower Performance	7 schools (n=463)	4 schools (n=282)	11 schools
	Higher Performance	5 schools (n=482)	7 schools (n=844)	12 schools
	Total	12 schools	11 schools	23 schools

Institutional Taxonomy Findings

The experimental taxonomy of institutional types was created primarily to frame a discussion of how variations in campus environments may shape faculty beliefs about intercollegiate athletics. The placement of institutions is *relative* to the characteristics of sampled campuses, i.e., higher academic performance is defined as above the median for those institutions from which the faculty sample was drawn. The study did not select institutions according to their academic standing and athletics accomplishments.

The discussion of the taxonomy is organized around two questions: how do faculty in the different types of universities perceive the general campus climate and intercollegiate athletics and what is distinctive about their views? Each taxonomy group is discussed as a “case”, organized around the three themes of governance, academics, and finances. A number of institutional characteristics are summarized in Figure 7. Additional details used to create the cases can be found in Appendix B, Tables 14 to 24.

FIGURE 7

Institutional Categories – Select Characteristics

Campus Context: Institutional Taxonomy		Academic Performance	
		Lower Performance	Higher Performance
Athletic Performance	Lower Performance	<p><i>Context</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 private / 6 public - 2 land grants - None offer MD - 3 in Southwest, 2 in Southeast, 1 in Far West, 1 in Rocky Mountains - 2 have pro teams in state <p><i>Academics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Full-time undergraduate enrollment = 10,455* - ACT Composite 50th Percentile = 22* - Undergrad graduation rate = 47%* - Football graduation rate = 44%* - Men's basketball graduation rate = 28%* <p><i>Athletics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of Intercollegiate Teams = 13* - Football Bowl Appearances = 1.70*~ - Men's basketball tournament appearances = 0.71*~ - 2 with NCAA major infractions since 2001 	<p><i>Context</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 0 private / 4 public - No land grants - 1 offers MD - 2 in Great Lakes, 1 in Southeast, 1 in Far West - All have pro teams in state <p><i>Academics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Full-time undergraduate enrollment = 19,170* - ACT Composite 50th Percentile = 23.5* - Undergrad graduation rate = 57%* - Football graduation rate = 65%* - Men's basketball graduation rate = 43%* <p><i>Athletics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of Intercollegiate Teams = 16* - Football Bowl Appearances = 0.75*~ - Men's basketball tournament appearances = 1*~ - 1 with NCAA major infractions since 2001
	Higher Performance	<p><i>Context</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 0 private / 5 public - 1 land grant - 1 offers MD - 2 in Southwest, 3 in Southeast - 4 have pro teams in state <p><i>Academics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Full-time undergraduate enrollment = 22,104* - ACT Composite 50th Percentile = 24.4* - Undergrad graduation rate = 60%* - Football graduation rate = 50%* - Men's basketball graduation rate = 31%* <p><i>Athletics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of Intercollegiate Teams = 15* - Football Bowl Appearances = 4.60*~ - Men's basketball tournament appearances = 1.40*~ - 2 with NCAA major infractions since 2001 	<p><i>Context</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 private / 5 public - 3 land grants - 3 offer MD - 3 in Great Lakes, 1 in Southwest, 1 in Far West, 1 in Mid East, 1 in Plains - 6 have pro teams in state <p><i>Academics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Full-time undergraduate enrollment = 19,405* - ACT Composite 50th Percentile = 27* - Undergrad graduation rate = 75%* - Football graduation rate = 64%* - Men's basketball graduation rate = 52%* <p><i>Athletics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of Intercollegiate Teams = 18* - Football Bowl Appearances = 3.71*~ - Men's basketball tournament appearances = 3.57*~ - 4 with NCAA major infractions since 2001

Note. The variation among institutions within each quadrant are generally small. Please see Tables 14 through 24 in Appendix B for complete means, standard deviations, and frequencies.

* indicates mean calculation for all institutions in the cell

~ football bowl appearances and basketball postseason tournament appearances are the averages for the past six seasons, from 2001-02 through 2006-07.

Higher Athletic/Higher Academic Institutions

The universities, primarily under public control, are geographically dispersed: three are located in the Great Lakes, one in the Southwest, one in the Far West, one in the Mid East, and one in the Plains region. Five are land grant institutions. The majority of campuses are in midsize cities and all but one are located in states with professional football or basketball teams. Faculty in this group tend to believe that intercollegiate athletics at their universities is an irreplaceable source of revenue to their local economies and that residents of the state are more passionate than faculty and students about the success of their athletic teams. Similar to their colleagues at Higher Athletic/Lower Academic campuses, faculty at these public institutions believe that intercollegiate athletics fulfills part of their university's service mission to the state.

The athletic accomplishments of the universities are impressive. According to NCAA records, they have appeared in an average of 3.71 NCAA postseason basketball tournaments over the past six years. The average number of football bowl appearances over the past six years is 3.57. Since 2001, four of the universities have been found to have NCAA infractions but three had none.

Governance

Faculty in Higher Athletic/Higher Academic universities believe shared governance is valued by faculty on their campuses and relative to faculty in the other institutional categories, they are more inclined to think that administrators value shared governance. Furthermore, faculty in this group are comparatively more satisfied with the extent to which faculty input informs intercollegiate athletics decisions.

Judged against their counterparts in other categories, they more often perceive that the faculty and president agree on matters related to intercollegiate athletics; administrators and faculty consult on budget and other athletics-related decisions; intercollegiate athletics governance roles for faculty are better defined; faculty governance representatives do not acquiesce; and the athletics department is free of major rule violations. Rankings of the priority that campus governance groups must give to intercollegiate athletics are virtually identical among faculty at campuses at the higher

academic performance categories. It is lower than the priority ranking by faculty at the lower academic performance categories.

Academic

Full-time undergraduate enrollment on the campuses varies greatly, but the average enrollment is 19,405 full time students. Student selectivity is strong, indicated by the average ACT Composite 50th Percentile score of 27.0 (highest possible score is 36.0). Five of the campuses are members of the Association of American Universities. By definition, the scholarship student-athletes' graduation rates are the highest. As reported to the NCAA, the average graduation rate for football athletes is 64 percent and the average for basketball is 52 percent.

Faculty satisfaction with resources available for their teaching and research is second only to their counterparts at Higher Athletic/Lower Academic campuses. Relative to faculty in the other three institutional categories, faculty in the Higher Athletic/Higher Academic performance category are most satisfied with the performance of student-athletes in sports other than football and basketball. In fact, their satisfaction with the academic performance of the general student body is lower than their satisfaction with these student-athletes. They report the second highest satisfaction with the academic performance of football and basketball players.

Faculty are slightly dissatisfied with the standards that guide admissions decisions for high school athletes in football and basketball and they are slightly dissatisfied with the role of coaches in these admissions decisions. Relative to faculty in other institutional categories, they are the most satisfied with the academic standards of individuals who tutor student-athletes.

Faculty in the Higher Athletic/Higher Academic performance group are particularly aware of the time demands on student-athletes. Although their campuses have achieved comparative academic success and they are satisfied with the academic performance of both students in general and student-athletes, faculty from these campuses most frequently say that what concerns them most about intercollegiate athletics are student and academic-related issues. They worry about the demands that participation in athletics puts on student-athletes (6.39%), the quality of student-athletes'

educational experiences (4.1%), and the exploitation of student-athletes (2%). Further, they are concerned that athletics trumps academics on their campuses (6.8%).

Finance

Universities in this category have the most well-financed academic and athletics programs. With mean core expenses exceeding \$1 billion, the institutions in the Higher Athletic/Higher Academic group spend the most annually on their general operations. Their average annual athletic expenses are \$52 million and faculty in these universities are less inclined to believe that their athletics department is subsidized by the general fund. However, like their counterparts in other categories, they are moderately dissatisfied with such subsidies and after academic issues, subsidization is their biggest concern. Relative to faculty in other categories, this group is most distressed by the professionalization and commercialization of intercollegiate athletics on their campuses.

Distinctive Concern

Although faculty in all categories express apprehension about the demands on student-athletes, the pattern of faculty responses in Higher Athletic/Higher Academic universities suggests this issue is particularly salient to them. Some faculty in this category are most concerned about the high performance standards student-athletes are expected to meet both on the field of competition and in their classes. Other faculty believe intercollegiate athletics on their campuses is being professionalized and commercialized. They characterize varsity athletes as members of professional farm teams who are not given enough time to pursue fields of study that interest them. This distinctive concern with the academic and athletic demands on student-athletes, fueled perhaps by pressures from coaches whose careers depend on team success and public interest in their achievements, seems to characterize faculty in the Higher Athletic/Higher Academic institutions.

Lower Athletic/Lower Academic Institutions

Six of the Lower Athletic/Lower Academic institutions are public and one is private. Two are land grant universities. They are dispersed across the Southwest (3), Southeast (2), Far West (1), and Rocky Mountain (1) regions. Teams from these institutions have appeared in an average of 1.7 football bowl games and less than one (0.71) postseason NCAA men's basketball tournaments over the last six years. None has

appeared in a BCS bowl game during the time period under consideration. Since 2001, two of the seven universities have been cited for an NCAA major infraction. Proportionally, those in the Lower Athletic/Lower Academic group are less likely than the others to be located in states with professional football and basketball teams. Two of these campuses, or 29% of the group, have pro teams while 88% of the institutions in the other three taxonomy groups have pro teams in their states.

Compared to their colleagues in other institutional categories, these faculty believe most strongly that residents of their state are avid about the success of their intercollegiate athletics teams. However, they are less inclined to perceive that intercollegiate athletics fulfills part of their university's service mission to the state or that athletics is an irreplaceable source of revenue to the local community.

Governance

Faculty at both groups of institutions considered "Lower Academic" are less likely to perceive that shared governance between administrators and faculty is valued by campus administrators. However, faculty at Lower Athletic/Lower Academic institutions believe that shared governance is valued by faculty and they are not satisfied with their governance involvement or institutional control of intercollegiate athletics on their campuses. Although governance issues are least often among those of most concern, faculty in this group assign the second highest priority to intercollegiate athletics as a faculty governance issue.

Academic

Institutions with smaller enrollments are clustered in the Lower Athletic/Lower Academic quadrant, where the mean full-time undergraduate enrollment is 10,455. Incoming student selectivity is also on average lowest for these campuses, with an ACT Composite 50th Percentile of 22.0. The overall undergraduate graduation rate is 47%, the football graduation rate is 44% and the men's basketball graduation rate is 28%.

Faculty in this institutional category are comparatively least satisfied with the resources available for their teaching and the resources available for their research. They are also among those who are least satisfied with the academic performance of the general student body. They have the lowest satisfaction of the four taxonomy groups with the academic performance of football and basketball players and they are comparatively

less satisfied with the academic performance of student-athletes in sports other than football and basketball.

Finance

The institutions in the Lower Athletic/Lower Academic quadrant have smaller budgets. Reflecting their comparatively lower enrollments, these campuses have smaller overall core revenues and core expenses – \$275 million on average – than their counterparts in other quadrants. The same pattern holds for athletic spending: the average annual athletic expenses are \$20 million for the Lower Athletic/Lower Academic group.

Among faculty at these campuses, concerns about the subsidization and the overall cost of athletics are especially noteworthy. The belief that construction of state of the art athletic facilities is given higher priority than academic capital projects is especially strong at these institutions. Faculty at the campuses with less on-field athletics success clearly believe that intercollegiate athletics is subsidized by their universities' general funds. Faculty at these campuses are most likely to say their biggest concerns related to intercollegiate athletics are escalating costs and the fact athletics fails to generate enough revenue to support itself.

Distinctive Concern

The pattern of responses among faculty in the Lower Athletic/Lower Academic category suggest their distress over the funding of intercollegiate athletics may be entangled with concerns about shared governance. The largest segment of faculty in this group say that they are most concerned with the cost of intercollegiate athletics and the subsidization of athletics at the expense of academics. Like their counterparts in other categories, faculty in the Lower Athletic/Lower Academic universities are distressed by the nature of the roles faculty play and the impact their input has on institutional decisions about intercollegiate athletics. However, their perceptions that administrators and faculty do not agree on matters related to intercollegiate athletics, their greater dissatisfaction with the power of athletic directors on their campuses and with the ways administrators foreclose discussions that do not fit with their athletics' agendas distinguish them from faculty in the other institutional categories. Their dissatisfaction with governance and perceived erosion of general funds for academic purposes, combined with the relatively higher priority they assign to intercollegiate athletics as a faculty governance issue, seems to distinguish this group from the others.

Lower Athletic/Higher Academic Institutions

The four institutions in this group are all public universities, although none is a land grant campus. Two are located in the Great Lakes region, one in the Southeast, and one in the Far West. All have professional football and basketball teams located in their states. Over the past six years, their football teams have competed in less than one bowl (0.75) on average. None has appeared in a BCS bowl game over the past six years. Two of the institutions' men's basketball teams have appeared in two NCAA post-season tournaments apiece over the last six years, while the other two institutions have not appeared in any NCAA post-season tournaments. One of the four institutions has incurred an NCAA major infraction since 2001.

Compared to their colleagues at institutions in other quadrants, faculty at these institutions are least likely to perceive that interest in their intercollegiate athletics teams runs higher among the residents of their state than among faculty and students. They are also least likely to perceive that intercollegiate athletics fulfills part of their university's service mission to the state or that intercollegiate athletics is an irreplaceable source of revenue to the local community.

Governance

Relative to their counterparts in other categories, faculty at Lower Athletic/Higher Academic campuses believe most strongly that shared governance is valued by faculty and campus administrators. However, they tend to not believe that faculty and administrators agree on intercollegiate athletics issues. The priority that faculty in this category assign to intercollegiate athletics as a governance issue is virtually the same as that given by faculty in the Higher Athletic/Higher Academic category and lower than that assigned by faculty in the lower academic categories.

Academic

The average full-time undergraduate enrollment is 19,170, which is midrange among the taxonomy groups. The ACT Composite 50th Percentile is 23.5 and the overall undergraduate graduation rate is 57%. For the athletic teams, the football graduation rate is on average 65% and the average men's basketball graduation rate is 43%. Faculty at Lower Athletic/Higher Academic campuses are more satisfied with the resources available for their teaching and for their research than faculty in the lower academic universities. However, their satisfaction with the academic performance of the general

student body is second lowest of the four taxonomy groups and their satisfaction with student-athletes in sports other than football and basketball is lowest. In contrast, they report the highest satisfaction with the academic performance of football and basketball student-athletes. When asked about their biggest single concern related to intercollegiate athletics, faculty at these campuses less often cite an academic-related issue. However, like their colleagues in the Higher Athletic/Higher Academic universities, they are distressed by the demands on student-athletes and the quality of their educational experiences.

Finance

Within this institutional category, the mean institutional core expenses is \$443 million and the athletics program expenses are similarly smaller in scale than their counterpart universities in other categories. The annual athletic expenditures average \$22.7 million. Faculty at the Lower Athletic/Higher Academic universities clearly believe that athletics are subsidized by university general funds and the highest percentage say their biggest concerns are that athletics cost too much, athletics are not self-supporting, or that athletics are subsidized at the expense of academics.

Distinctive Concern

Faculty at universities in this category share several concerns with their counterparts in Higher Athletic/Higher Academic institutions. They are worried about the time and performance demands on student-athletes as well as the quality of their academic experiences. Along with faculty in the Lower Athletic/Lower Academic universities, their strongest concerns center on financial issues, the structural separation of athletics from the rest of the university, and the power intercollegiate athletics exerts over campus decisions (athletics trumps academics). However, this group does not share the dissatisfaction with the professionalization or with governance of athletics expressed by the other two groups. A rather unambiguous focus on the prioritization of athletics in financial decisions appears to be a distinguishing feature of the concerns of faculty in Lower Athletic/Higher Academic universities.

Higher Athletic/Lower Academic Institutions

All five of the campuses in the Higher Athletic/Lower Academic group are public institutions; one is a land grant university. Two are located in the Southwest and three in

the Southeast. Four of the five have professional football and basketball teams in their states. Over the last six years, the Higher Athletic/Lower Academic institutions have appeared on average in the most football bowls (4.60) of the four taxonomy groups. Their men's basketball teams have appeared in an average of 1.40 NCAA postseason tournaments over the past six years. Two of the five institutions have received NCAA major violations since 2001.

Faculty at the Higher Athletic/Lower Academic campuses perceive that residents of their states are more passionate than faculty and students about the success of their intercollegiate athletics teams. Compared to their peers at campuses in different taxonomy categories, they most strongly believe that intercollegiate athletics fulfills part of their university's service mission to their state and that intercollegiate athletics is an irreplaceable source of revenue to the local community.

Governance

Like their counterparts at the Lower Athletic/Lower Academic institutions, these faculty members believe strongly that shared governance is valued by faculty, but they are less likely to perceive that shared governance is valued by campus administrators. Although they are slightly dissatisfied, relative to faculty in other institutional categories, faculty at Higher Athletic/Lower Academic campuses are more satisfied with institutional control over athletics. However, they are most concerned about the influence of external groups on intercollegiate athletics decisions, the structural separation of athletics and academics, and the power of the athletics department. Faculty in this institutional category assign the highest ranking to intercollegiate athletics as a campus faculty governance priority.

Academic

On average, these universities have the highest full-time undergraduate enrollment (mean = 22,104). Student selectivity, as measured by the ACT Composite 50th Percentile, is second highest with an average of 24.4. The undergraduate graduation rate at these campuses is 60%, the football team graduation rate is 50%, and the men's basketball team graduation rate is 31%. Faculty at Higher Athletic/Lower Academic campuses are comparatively most satisfied with the resources available for their teaching and for their research. They are satisfied with the academic performance of the general student body and they are relatively more satisfied with the academic performance of

student-athletes in sports other than football and basketball. However, they are comparatively less satisfied with the academic performance of football and basketball players. Relative to faculty in other institutional categories, they expressed less concern about the time and performance demands on students, the exploitation of student-athletes, and the quality of student-athletes' academic experiences.

Finance

The average core expenses for those in the Higher Athletic/Lower Academic group are \$524 million, an average second to only the Higher Athletic/Higher Academic institutions. For athletics, the average annual expenses are approximately \$41.2 million. Compared to their colleagues in the other taxonomy groups, faculty at Higher Athletic/Lower Academic campuses are less concerned about financial issues, are less inclined to believe that their athletics department is subsidized by the general fund, and are less inclined to worry that athletics on their campus is being subsidized at the expense of academics.

Distinctive Concerns

Like faculty at the Higher Athletic/Higher Academic institutions, these faculty members express more concern about the professionalization and commercialization of intercollegiate athletics. However, they seem to be relatively less concerned about the burden this trend places on student-athletes or about the exploitation of student-athletes. Instead, they tend to emphasize concerns about the structural separateness and power of the athletic department and the over-emphasis of intercollegiate athletics in the campus culture. Along with faculty in the Lower Athletic/Lower Academic group, they tend to believe boosters and other external groups influence decisions about intercollegiate athletics and they give higher priority to intercollegiate athletics as a governance issue. This combination of beliefs about the structural separateness and power of athletics departments and concern with the emphasis of athletics in their campus cultures appears to distinguish this group's concerns about intercollegiate athletics.

Although researchers have compared the views of faculty in different NCAA divisions, few previous studies have attempted to look within divisions and identify institutional differences that might contribute to variations in faculty opinions about intercollegiate athletics. The experimental taxonomy offers a way to categorize

universities that may help ground sensitive discussions about contextual variations without directly comparing individual campuses. The distinctive patterns of concerns that are abstracted in this Report provide a foundation for researchers, faculty and administrators who choose to further develop this line of thinking.

In contrast with the ANOVA results discussed in the previous section that show causal relationships between individual faculty members' perceptions of non-athletic and athletic-related features of their campuses, the taxonomy findings simply describe what faculty employed by universities in each of the four institutional categories seem to believe about intercollegiate athletics and what appears to be of most concern to them. Together, the ANOVA and taxonomy results present a starting point for deciding how to draw faculty into national efforts aimed at reforming intercollegiate athletics.

Study Summary and Implications

Overview of Study

Background

In its 1991 and 2001 reports, the Knight Commission called on faculty to join other members of the academic community to act together and restore the balance of athletics and academics on campus. In 2006, members of faculty reform groups approached the Knight Commission to propose a summit on the role of faculty in maintaining a healthy relationship between academics and athletics on campus. To lay the groundwork for discussions at the faculty summit, the Knight Commission authorized a national survey of faculty members at NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision universities.

The Faculty Survey was undertaken primarily to find out:

- how faculty characterize intercollegiate athletics on their campuses;
- how satisfied they are with its governance, academic and financial aspects;
- what most concerns them about intercollegiate athletics; and
- what priority they think their campus faculty governance groups must give to intercollegiate athletics.

Consideration was also given to:

- how faculty perceptions, satisfaction, priorities and concerns about intercollegiate athletics may be affected by variations in their career experiences and campus context; and

- what faculty estimate are the chances that (a) they will engage in campus activities aimed at ameliorating their personal concerns about intercollegiate athletics and (b) such an activity will lead to meaningful change on their campus.

Method

The Faculty Survey sample is drawn from universities included in the NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision. It is a purposive sample, designed to optimize participation of tenure track faculty who are involved in faculty governance and those with experience teaching student-athletes. Adjusted for those who did not fully complete the survey, faculty on sabbatical, emeritus faculty, non-tenure track faculty, and administrators inadvertently included, the final sample is 2,071.

Distributed in April 2007, the survey includes both scaled items and open-ended questions asking respondents for their opinions about and satisfaction with three interrelated aspects of intercollegiate athletics *on their campuses*: governance, academic and financial. Faculty are also asked to (1) indicate the priority they believe faculty governance committees on their campus must give to several areas, including intercollegiate athletics, (2) explain what most concerns them about intercollegiate athletics at their university, and (3) estimate the chances they would join a campus initiative directed at resolving their concern and the chances that such an activity would lead to meaningful change at their university. To understand how faculty perceive intercollegiate athletics and general campus climate, they responded to a series of statements describing different conditions, indicating on a six point scale the extent to which each one applies to their campus: Don't Know, Not Relevant, Not At All, Slightly, Moderately, and Very Much. For the purpose of discussion, the responses are grouped to indicate where there is little to no perceived fit between the statement and conditions on campus (Not At All and Slightly) and where the fit is reasonably good (Moderately to Very Much).

Additionally, the survey asks about general campus climate – faculty perceptions of the norms, individual behaviors, policies, and practices in domains other than intercollegiate athletics – and faculty satisfaction with this climate. Information about professors' experience with the governance of intercollegiate athletics and with teaching student-athletes was gathered along with other demographic data.

The Faculty Survey is a comprehensive multi-institutional inquiry into faculty opinions about a wide range of issues related to intercollegiate athletics. Although the survey focuses on the perceptions of faculty at institutions sponsoring big-time athletics programs, many issues cut across all divisions and thus may be useful to many groups. In this initial analysis of the survey data, the goals were first, to develop a general portrait of faculty beliefs about intercollegiate athletics and second, to explore differences in campus contexts and how they might shape faculty opinions.

Summary of Study Findings

Beliefs, Perceptions and Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics

Governance Aspects of Intercollegiate Athletics

Faculty believe intercollegiate athletics is an auxiliary enterprise and that faculty oversight is weak. While most think that administrators on their campus consult with faculty governance groups about academic matters (54%), the largest portion of respondents also believe it is not common practice for administrators to consult faculty governance groups on intercollegiate athletics decisions (48%). They are inclined to believe that faculty governance roles in this domain are ill defined and tend to be dissatisfied with the nature and impact of their involvement:

- 62% believe it is Moderately to Very Much and 18% believe it is Not At All to Slightly the case that intercollegiate athletics is an auxiliary enterprise that generates its own revenue and is accountable to university administrators, not faculty;
- 40% perceive it is Moderately to Very Much and 32% believe it is Not At All to Slightly appropriate to characterize intercollegiate athletics roles on their campus as ill defined;
- 49% believe that during the budget process for their university's athletic department, it is Not At All to Slightly characteristic for faculty governance committees to advise administrators, but a few (7%) believe it is Moderately to Very Much characteristic for this to happen;
- 44% and 21% respectively are Dissatisfied and Satisfied with the range of faculty perspectives considered by central administrators when institutional positions on intercollegiate athletics are formulated; and
- 42% and 25% respectively are Dissatisfied and Satisfied with the extent to which faculty input informs campus decisions about intercollegiate athletics.

A substantial portion of the respondents (47%) think faculty on their campus are interested in intercollegiate athletics governance issues. However, faculty acknowledge they are unfamiliar with many governance policies and practices related to intercollegiate athletics. Compared to other faculty governance issues, 47 percent believe intercollegiate athletics is a very low priority faculty governance issue. Faculty dissatisfaction with their involvement in intercollegiate athletic decisions, the lower priority they assign to intercollegiate athletics as a governance issue, and their lack of knowledge may all signal that they are interested in athletics but it is not foremost in their minds. The findings also suggest faculty may feel disconnected from this area of institutional decision-making:

- 56% don't know how typical it is on their campus for coaches to be involved in admissions decisions for recruits who do not meet regular university academic standards;
- 49% don't know if a faculty committee on campus regularly monitors the educational soundness of student-athletes' programs of study;
- 42% don't know how characteristic it is for high school student-athletes who do not meet regular university academic standards to be admitted through a special admissions process that lacks faculty input; and
- 37% don't know if intercollegiate athletics is subsidized by their university's general fund.

Faculty believe external groups that influence campus decisions about intercollegiate athletics have minimal regard for their universities' academic missions. Furthermore, their satisfaction with the way campus administrators manage external constituents is nearly split:

- Half of the faculty perceive that it is Moderately to Very Much the case that decisions about intercollegiate athletics on their campus are driven by the priorities of an entertainment industry with minimal investment in their university's academic mission; and
- 38% are Satisfied and 33% are Dissatisfied with the way campus administrators handle external constituencies (e.g., boosters, media, vendors) with vested interests in intercollegiate athletics on their campus.

While more than half (54%) of faculty members believe campus intercollegiate governance groups attend to the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences, more than a third (38%) have no opinion about whether the consideration is adequate. Of those who express an opinion, slightly more faculty are satisfied than are dissatisfied with the attention:

- 54% believe it is Moderately to Very Much and 21% think it is Not At All to Slightly appropriate to say that the primary concern of intercollegiate governance groups is the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences; and
- 35% are Satisfied and 27% are Dissatisfied with the attention given by faculty governance groups to the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences.

Faculty who identify the oversight and governance of intercollegiate athletics as matters about which they are most concerned cite specific problems with faculty oversight, the structural separation of intercollegiate athletics and the influence of external groups. A faculty member with intercollegiate athletics governance experience says, "faculty input is 'superficial' - the Faculty Athletic Committee is 'controlled' by athletic administration. I know - I sat on it - I am greatly dissatisfied with their unwillingness to listen - their unilateral dissolution of a 'gender equity' sub-committee - their setting of priorities (reviewing athletic annual awards - doing their gathering of statistics on issues - rather than providing us with information for policy analysis)." Another individual highlights concern about the "inbred group of faculty involved in athletic policy roles. I served on the Athletic Policy (Senate) committee for 2 years-- basically a body with no power AT ALL."

Regarding structural separation, a respondent notes, "athletics is no longer an integral part of the university. It is a stand-alone profit center. TV contracts are set up to maximize revenues, not to minimize the impact on the athletes' academic experience."

Another faculty member notes that he/she is most concerned about "the opportunity it [athletics] creates for outside forces (boosters, sports writers, donors) to impose their values on university discussions, subverting and submerging the university's academic mission."

Faculty who are concerned about the structural separation of athletics from the rest of the university and about problematic aspects of governance are among the most optimistic regarding the potential success of change activities (i.e., those whose estimates of the likely success of a campus initiative to ameliorate their concern were greater than chance).

Academic Aspects of Intercollegiate Athletics

Faculty characterize student-athletes in general as motivated and academically prepared to keep pace with other students. However, faculty are less complimentary about student-athletes in football and basketball and say they are unfamiliar with admissions practices that could affect the academic performance of student-athletes:

- 61% believe it is Moderately to Very Much and 23% believe it is Not At All to Slightly appropriate to say that student-athletes in their department are motivated to earn their degrees;
- 61% perceive it is Not at All to Slightly and 21% perceive it is Moderately to Very Much the case that student-athletes are not prepared academically to keep pace with other students in their classes;
- 69% are Satisfied and 12% are Dissatisfied with the academic performance of student-athletes in sports other than football and basketball;
- Within the total sample, 32% are Satisfied and 27% are Dissatisfied with the academic performance of student-athletes in football and basketball. Faculty who currently or have in the past taught student athletes also distinguish between the academic performance of student-athletes in football and basketball and in other sports. Their satisfaction with football and basketball players is lower;
- 42% of the faculty say they don't know how typical it is for high school student-athletes who do not meet regular university academic standards to be admitted through a special admissions process; and
- 56% don't know if their coaches are typically involved in special admissions decisions for their recruits. Perhaps as a result, more than half (53%) have no opinion about their satisfaction with coaches' roles in undergraduate admissions and 40% have no opinion about the standards that guide admissions decisions for high school athletes in football and basketball.

Faculty are aware of the pressures on student-athletes and the negative consequences that can follow from the demands on their out of class time. Still, faculty are inclined to believe a university can be successful in football and basketball without compromising its academic standards:

- 53% are Satisfied and 31% are Dissatisfied with the practice of awarding scholarships to individuals based on their athletic abilities and performance;
- 75% believe it is Moderately to Very Much and 17% believe it is Not At All to Slightly appropriate to characterize student-athletes as more burdened than other students on their campus by demands on their out-of-class time;
- 58% perceive it is Not At All to Slightly and 20% think it is Moderately to Very Much the case that compared to student-athletes, other students have worse attendance records in their classes;
- 55% believe it is Not at All to Slightly and 19% believe it is Moderately to Very Much characteristic of student-athletes to actively participate in student

activities (e.g., research opportunities, student government, social events) in their school/college; and

- 50% think it is Not At All to Slightly and 32% think it is Moderately to Very Much the case that compromises in academic standards must be made at their university in order for their football and basketball teams to be competitive.

Faculty are positive about their colleagues' attitudes toward and department endeavors with student-athletes, but many are unsure about the monitoring of student-athletes' programs of study:

- Only a small segment (14%) believe it is Moderately to Very Much the case that their colleagues negatively stereotype and dismiss student-athletes as serious students, while 73% believe it is Not at All to Slightly characteristic of their colleagues;
- The majority (60%) are Satisfied and 10% are Dissatisfied with their departments' efforts to work with student-athletes to ensure the quality of their educational experiences; and
- Almost three-quarters (74%) say that it is Moderately to Very Much the case that a faculty committee monitors the educational soundness of undergraduate majors' programs of study. However, when asked specifically about student-athletes, almost half (49%) say they don't know whether or not a faculty committee on their campus regularly monitors the educational soundness of student-athletes' programs of study.

Among those faculty whose personal concerns about intercollegiate athletics focus on student-athletes and academic issues, such as campus climates that overemphasize athletics and diminish attention to academics, the time and performance demands on student-athletes are particularly troubling. So, too, are the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences and the financial cost to academics when capital projects in athletics are prioritized over academic improvements.

One respondent complains, "I teach at a university that has to be in the top three in the country in terms of complete and fanatical uniform devotion to our sports program among practically ALL the current students AND alumni. The cult that surrounds our sports team means that our university tends to attract college applicants who are more interested in the university for its sports than for the quality of their intellectual experience we have to offer. The high profile of our sports teams, and the intensity of devotion they inspire negatively impact the cultivation of an intellectual environment, despite the outstanding academic credentials of our student body."

Faculty members voice dismay over the exploitation of student-athletes and the quality of their educational experiences. One says, “I think athletes (football and basketball) get short-changed. They are used. They miss classes for practice and games; they don't receive a full education.” Another laments, “Students miss classes for which there is no substitute for being there. Required hours at tutoring tables do not ensure quality experiences, just punching the clock, quantity.”

Frustration over the perceived prioritization of intercollegiate athletics in budgets is evident in the following statement of a faculty member's concerns. “Our athletic program consistently loses over 2 million bucks per year and that money is taken from the educational budget. We can't hire additional faculty to meet student demand for courses, we can't build adequate classroom buildings, but we can hire more assistant coaches, add athletic programs, replace the football field every 4 years, and give athletes other luxuries.”

Faculty who are personally most concerned about the academic aspects of intercollegiate athletics are likely to join campus activities directed at problems they identify. Among those who think the chances are greater than 50/50 that their efforts will result in meaningful change, the largest number said academic issues are of most concern to them. In particular, faculty who are concerned about the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences and their academic outcomes are the most optimistic: 35 percent of those who say they would join an initiative to address their concerns thought the chances of success are better than chance.

Finance Aspects of Intercollegiate Athletics

Faculty think intercollegiate athletics are a mixed financial blessing. On the one hand, they note the high costs associated with intercollegiate athletics. On the other hand, they acknowledge the financial benefits they believe can accrue to a campus if athletic teams are successful:

- 72% believe it is Moderately to Very Much and 21% believe it is Not At All to Slightly characteristic that the salaries paid to head football and basketball coaches on their campus are excessive;
- 51% believe it is Moderately to Very Much and 38% think it is Not At All to Slightly characteristic of their campus to prioritize construction of state of the art athletic facilities ahead of capital projects for academic departments; and

- 50% perceive it is Moderately to Very Much the case while 38% perceive it is Not At All to Slightly appropriate to say that on their campus, the success of intercollegiate athletics fosters alumni and corporate giving to campus initiatives outside of intercollegiate athletics.

Faculty are about equally divided between those who do and those who do not think commercialization of intercollegiate athletics negatively affects amateur athletics. They are also about equally divided in terms of their satisfaction with commercial ventures on their campuses:

- Almost identical portions of the faculty, 37% and 36% respectively, think it is Not at All to Slightly and Moderately to Very Much the case that the ideals of amateur athletics are being eroded by contracts with equipment and clothing companies; and
- About equal portions are Dissatisfied (42%) and Satisfied (41%) with the balance struck on their campuses between the commercialization of intercollegiate athletics and the ideals of amateur competition.

More faculty are Satisfied (53%) than are Dissatisfied (31%) with the practice of awarding scholarships to individuals based on their athletic abilities and performance and more of them think athletic scholarships may not fairly compensate football and basketball players. Forty-five percent of the respondents believe it is Not At All to Slightly appropriate to characterize athletics scholarships as adequate compensation for student-athletes in football and basketball; 39 percent believe the characterization is Moderately to Very Much appropriate.

About 39 percent of the faculty are unsure if their university subsidizes intercollegiate athletics with general funds. This finding may reflect the complexity of university budgets as almost a third (31.4%) offer no opinion regarding their satisfaction with subsidization:

- 32% believe it is Not At All to Slightly and 29% believe it is Moderately to Very Much characteristic of their university to allocate general funds to intercollegiate athletics; and
- 37% are Dissatisfied and 21% are Satisfied with general fund subsidization of intercollegiate athletics.

Financial issues are the most frequent personal concerns faculty cite for intercollegiate athletics on their campuses. In particular, they highlight the high costs of

intercollegiate athletics and the subsidization of intercollegiate athletics with general funds. Faculty specify the following apprehensions about finances on their campuses:

- “The use of the ‘general’ fund to subsidize athletics. This continues to manifest itself as, not rising tuition, but rising fee structures for students.”
“Money came from the general fund to support athletic facilities. That money could have been used for scholarships, purchase of research equipment, etc, but instead it was spent on sports.”
- “We're a small school, with no chance of fielding a winning team, yet millions go down that rat hole. Football and basketball are a huge waste of taxpayer dollars.”
- “Athletics has become an ‘Arms Race’ for facilities, salaries, perks. Excessive money is spent and athletics is valued way beyond academics, particularly by the alumni, businesses, state legislators, administrators, and citizens. It has very little to do with faculty or students. It's a separate monster, run by an AD who answers to no one, has more power than even the University Chancellor.”

Faculty concerned about financial matters also estimate that the chances of their joining campus-based initiatives are greater than 50 percent. However, they are not optimistic about the potential impact of their efforts. Faculty disturbed by the subsidization of intercollegiate athletics at the expense of academic activities are most optimistic; 8 percent say the chances are better than 50/50 that their efforts would lead to meaningful campus changes.

Potential Influence of Campus Context on Faculty Views of Intercollegiate Athletics

How faculty perceptions of general, non-athletic, conditions on their campuses affect their beliefs about intercollegiate athletics is assessed with a series of one-way ANOVA. The overarching finding is that faculty views of non-university fans, administrators’ and faculty values as well as university policies and practices regulating campus governance, and campus resources for teaching and research affect their opinions about intercollegiate athletics. For example:

- Faculty perceptions of state residents' fervor vis a vis their athletic teams predicts their beliefs about the prioritization of intercollegiate athletics in budget decisions;
- Faculty perceptions of the extent to which faculty governance on their campus is involved in institutional decisions about academic matters predicts their beliefs about intercollegiate athletics as an auxiliary enterprise; and
- Faculty perceptions of the overall financial conditions on their campus predict their views about whether intercollegiate athletics is subsidized with general funds and whether athletic team success attracts donations to non-athletic initiatives.

A second exploratory effort to understand how campus context shapes faculty perspectives involved the development of an institutional taxonomy that places the universities from which the survey sample is drawn into one of four categories, based on: (a) the athletic success of their intercollegiate teams and (b) the academic success of their student athletes and a student selectivity indicator for the general student population. The four categories are: Higher Athletic/Higher Academic, Lower Athletic/Higher Academic, Higher Athletic/Lower Academic, and Lower Athletic/Lower Academic performance groups.

Comparisons of faculty perceptions within each of the institutional categories suggest campus context may affect how faculty frame intercollegiate athletic issues on their campuses. To illustrate, the following distinctive concerns are abstracted from faculty responses to the survey items:

Higher Athletic/Higher Academic Performance Group - Although faculty in all categories express apprehension about the demands on student-athletes, the pattern of faculty responses in Higher Athletic/Higher Academic universities suggests this issue is particularly salient to them. Some faculty in this category are most concerned about the high performance standards student-athletes are expected to meet, both on the field of competition and in their classes. Other faculty believe intercollegiate athletics on their campuses is being professionalized and commercialized. They characterize varsity athletes as members of professional farm teams that do not allow enough time for student-athletes to pursue fields of study that interest them. This distinctive concern with the demands on student-athletes, fueled perhaps by pressures from coaches whose careers depend on team success and public interest in their achievements, seems to characterize faculty in the Higher Athletic/Higher Academic institutions.

Lower Athletic/Lower Academic Performance Group - The pattern of responses among faculty in the Lower Athletic/Lower Academic category suggests their distress over the funding of intercollegiate athletics may be entangled with concerns about shared governance. The largest segment of faculty in this group say that they are most concerned with the cost of intercollegiate athletics and the subsidization of athletics at the expense of academics. Like their counterparts in other categories, faculty in the Lower Athletic/Lower Academic universities are worried about the nature of the roles faculty play and the impact their input has on institutional decisions about intercollegiate athletics. However, their perceptions that administrators and faculty do not agree on matters related to intercollegiate athletics, their greater dissatisfaction with the power of athletic directors on their campuses and with the ways administrators foreclose discussions that do not fit with their agendas distinguish them from faculty in the other institutional categories. This combination of dissatisfaction with governance and perceived erosion of general funds for academic purposes, combined with the relatively higher priority they assign to intercollegiate athletics as a faculty governance issue, seems to distinguish this group from the others.

Lower Athletic/Higher Academic Performance Group - Faculty at universities in this category share several concerns with their counterparts in Higher Athletic/Higher Academic institutions. They are worried about the time and performance demands on student-athletes as well as the quality of their academic experiences. Along with faculty in the Lower Athletics/Lower Academic universities, their strongest concerns center on financial issues and the structural separation of athletics from the rest of the university and its power over campus decisions (athletics trumps academics). However, these faculty do not share the dissatisfaction with professionalization of athletics or with governance expressed by the other two groups. A rather unambiguous focus on the prioritization of athletics in financial decisions appears to be a distinctive feature of the Lower Athletic/Higher Academic faculty concerns.

Higher Athletic/Lower Academic Performance Group - Like faculty at the Higher Athletic/Higher Academic institutions, these faculty express relatively more concern about the professionalization and commercialization of intercollegiate athletics. However, they seem to be relatively less concerned about the burden this trend places on student-

athletes or about the exploitation of student-athletes. Instead, they tend to emphasize concerns about the structural separateness and power of the athletic department and the overemphasis of intercollegiate athletics in the campus climate. Along with faculty in the Lower Athletics/Lower Academics group, they believe boosters and other external groups greatly influence decisions about intercollegiate athletics. They likewise give higher priority to intercollegiate athletics as a governance issue. This combination of beliefs about the structural separateness and power of athletic departments and concern with how campus culture emphasizes athletics appears to be a distinctive feature of this group's concerns about intercollegiate athletics.

Implications of Survey Findings for Enhancing Intercollegiate Athletics

Issues embedded in the Survey results are relevant to multiple constituents and change will require coordinated efforts among them. However, to facilitate discussions at the Knight Commission's Faculty Summit, as well as debate in other venues, several issues are abstracted and questions are directed to facilitate discussions around different topics.

Despite several national efforts currently underway to promote faculty involvement in the oversight of intercollegiate athletics, there is a dearth of research in this area. This Report aims to address that gap by providing a significant description of current faculty perceptions, satisfaction, priorities, and concerns related to intercollegiate athletics at NCAA Football Bowl Subdivision institutions. Yet an important acknowledgement is that many relevant areas are omitted from the study due to scope constraints. For example, in a few cases, the survey administered here differentiates between the national "high-profile" sports of football and men's basketball and other intercollegiate teams, but for the most part intercollegiate athletics writ large is the focus. Faculty do differentiate among the sports and have different perceptions of athletes according to the sport that they play; further research is needed to understand these differences. For the most part, the survey focuses on faculty views of intercollegiate athletics on their own campus. Whether their beliefs about intercollegiate athletics at a national level are similar is unclear, but further study of this question would be valuable

to the current faculty reform efforts. In addition, more research is needed to understand faculty views of the intersection of race, gender, class and intercollegiate athletics and whether they perceive that institutional and national policies in these areas are appropriately administered. As mentioned, further research is needed to confirm the significance of the variables considered here using more sophisticated statistical techniques, and to identify other important environmental influences. It is also important that further analyses are completed to identify the factors that explain why faculty are uninformed about key areas of concern to reform groups. Such research would be instrumental in guiding national, conference, and institutional-level policy initiatives aimed at faculty. Despite the need for further research, the results described here are relevant to multiple constituents, including faculty, presidents, student-athletes, athletics administrators, and higher education researchers.

Faculty Governance Issues

Capturing Faculty Attention

Survey findings reveal that intercollegiate athletics reform groups seeking greater faculty involvement face a steep challenge. Although faculty members are dissatisfied with many facets of intercollegiate athletics, their dissatisfaction may not be as strong as expected by observers of intercollegiate athletics and faculty reform groups. Faculty generally are satisfied with academic practices and policies, as well as the academic performance and integrity of student-athletes.

Many of the areas where faculty express a lack of knowledge or no opinion are, in fact, at the center of national reform efforts, such as the coaches' roles in the admission of athletes they recruit and the standards that guide the special admissions process. These findings may reflect a conservative tendency on the part of academics, cautiousness about over-generalizing from a limited information base. However, the response patterns suggest a lack of knowledge specifically about campus practices surrounding intercollegiate athletics. National reform efforts must consider the implications of such findings for garnering widespread faculty support and involvement.

Initiatives (e.g., legislative recommendations, materials and proposals prepared by faculty athletics reform groups) are often led by faculty with extensive experience in the

governance of intercollegiate athletics who may assume others are as knowledgeable and concerned as they are about campus policies, practices and trends. Often the call for reform involves comprehensive changes across a range of issues. Given the study results, reform groups may want to consider an alternative strategy, by prioritizing one issue and educating faculty about its root causes and its general campus impact. Although intercollegiate athletics problems are interrelated, wide-ranging calls for reform that encompass multiple issues may overwhelm faculty and diminish their willingness to take on the challenge. Attracting faculty attention and educating them about one area may sustain interest and lead eventually to faculty involvement in other areas.

Question for Consideration: How might reformists capture the attention of faculty who appear to lack knowledge and for whom intercollegiate athletics is a relatively low priority faculty governance issue?

Shared Governance

While calls for the reform of intercollegiate athletics highlight the importance of faculty involvement on campus, the data from this study tend to show that faculty believe campus governance roles for faculty are ill defined and not particularly meaningful. They do not believe administrators and faculty collaborate on intercollegiate athletics decisions.

In addition, faculty perceive that athletic departments use their influence with powerful off-campus constituents, such as the media and wealthy boosters, to steer campus decisions. There is nothing particularly unique about this use of off-campus groups. However, in the case of intercollegiate athletics, faculty also believe that the vested interests of the external groups are not consistent with the academic mission of universities and threaten their academic integrity.

Questions for Consideration: What elements of the existing administrator/faculty shared governance of intercollegiate athletics are most in need of attention? What types of roles should faculty play in the oversight of intercollegiate athletics and why?

Today, as more areas of higher education practice become professionalized - such as admissions and student advising - the ideal of shared campus governance often requires joint efforts of campus administrators, faculty, and staff. Findings from the present study demonstrate that faculty believe it is common at their universities for specialized staff to make undergraduate admissions decisions with minimal faculty input. At the same time, faculty lack information about whether faculty input is involved in the process for special admissions for high school athletes who may not meet regular admissions standards.

The success of reform efforts aimed at involving faculty in change may improve if faculty join with professional staff who are responsible for specialized areas such as the admissions and advising of student-athletes. This strategy might signal to faculty that the administration is willing to improve the transparency of select practices and that the burden of change will be shared with others. The exchange of information could result in a better understanding of why current practices exist, how they are supposed to operate, and how they impact student-athletes and faculty. Since many professional staff belong to national professional associations, such alliances may also be advantageous to national intercollegiate athletics reform groups.

Questions for Consideration: What types of roles should campus professional staff play in the formulation, administration and oversight of intercollegiate athletics policies and practices? Would the flow of information to faculty governance committees improve if such coalitions are formed? Are the chances of implementing proposed changes greater when faculty and professional staff join together?

Faculty Priorities

In light of the priorities faculty assign to different governance issues, intercollegiate athletics reformers would benefit from identifying where, in practice, faculty have clearly designated decision-making authority and where their agendas intersect with those of established campus committees. The survey respondents who are involved in intercollegiate athletics and in general institutional governance give high priority to problems with undergraduate majors, college access policies and practices, and the retention of undergraduate students. Perhaps more can be accomplished by

introducing intercollegiate athletics issues as specific examples of these higher priority concerns, rather than by making intercollegiate athletics the focal concern of a separate committee. For example, a faculty committee on undergraduate studies could examine the soundness of student-athletes' programs of study as a special instance of problematic undergraduate majors. On most campuses, the responsibility for matters pertaining to instruction traditionally falls to faculty. Because the quality of educational experiences is identified by faculty as a strong personal concern and because faculty estimates of likely success in this area are greatest, academic-related athletic issues should, perhaps, be a strong focus for reformers who want to engage faculty.

Question for Consideration: How might issues of intercollegiate athletics be introduced into standing committee decisions about program quality, at both the school and institution levels?

Academic Issues

Academic Support

Faculty understand that student-athletes carry heavy out-of-class demands. They are generally pleased with student-athletes' academic performance and motivation to earn degrees. However, faculty do acknowledge that they are not knowledgeable about the standards of academic support staff (typically employed by the athletic department), who are designated responsibility for assisting student-athletes and optimizing the quality of their educational experience.

Questions for Consideration: Should faculty play a direct role in the oversight of athletic department staff who advise athletes? How could faculty and student academic support staff collaborate effectively?

Athletic Demands and the Athletes' Educational Experiences

Faculty think athletes are motivated to complete their degrees, but they are concerned about burdens on athletes' out of class time. Faculty generally are pleased with the academic performance of student-athletes, although they are relatively more satisfied with student-athletes in sports other than football and basketball. They do believe that

competitive football and basketball teams may be fielded without compromising academic standards.

Question for Consideration: How might faculty and athletic department support staff work together to enhance the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences, generally and the academic performance of student-athletes in football and basketball, specifically?

Financial Issues

Contemporary writers describe today's heightened pressures for accountability within higher education. Universities are pushed to document their success. University administrators require schools and colleges to be educationally innovative and financially responsible. Academic departments are challenged to fund new initiatives as well as comply with campus norms and policies regarding conflict of interest. In part, these felt pressures might explain why concerns about the financing of intercollegiate athletics are a pervasive theme in the findings.

Question for Consideration: How might faculty participate more fully in the budgeting process for intercollegiate athletics, and how can the budgeting process be made more transparent?

Contextual Considerations

As this study and others not specific to intercollegiate athletics indicate, faculty beliefs vary according to their work environments. The study results clearly demonstrate that faculty perceptions of their general campus context influence their perceptions of and satisfaction with their intercollegiate athletics program. Little existing research addresses the contextual variables that shape faculty beliefs specific to intercollegiate athletics. The results here suggest that the academic context related to intercollegiate athletics as well as athletic teams on-field performance may mediate faculty perceptions, satisfaction, and concerns. For example, while financial concerns are prevalent among all survey respondents, subsidization of athletics at the cost of academic activities is more salient to faculty at campuses with less successful football and men's basketball teams. In contrast,

faculty whose football and men's basketball teams are more successful have more concerns about commercialization and the high overall cost of their intercollegiate programs.

Questions for Consideration: In the interview phase of this study, discussion often turned to whether divisional and conference membership are meaningful categorizations where faculty views of intercollegiate athletics are concerned, or if other classification schema might be more useful for such analyses. Clearly division and conference are important for organizing athletics competitions and NCAA governance purposes, but are they “the” critical organizational level variables when faculty involvement in the reform of intercollegiate athletics is the issue of concern? Do division and conference perhaps mask institutional characteristics that are in fact more important (e.g., size of undergraduate enrollment, overall institutional revenues/expenses/endowment, athletics culture), at least in relation to faculty involvement in the oversight of intercollegiate athletics?

References

- Baucom, C. & Lantz, C. (2001). Faculty attitudes toward male Division II student-athletes. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 24(3), 265-276.
- Bernard, P. (2003). The athletics equation: The president's bad dream. *Change*, 32-33.
- Blackburn, R. & Lawrence, J. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, satisfaction*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Briody, J. (1996). *Perceptions of the impact of intercollegiate athletics on academic reputation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: University of Connecticut.
- Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (2004). *Campus athletics governance, the faculty role: Principles, proposed rules and guidelines*. Retrieved March 3, 2007 from <http://www.neuro.uoregon.edu/~tublitz/COIA/Governance.html>
- Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (2005). *Academic integrity in intercollegiate athletics: Principles, rules and best practices*. Retrieved March 3, 2007 from <http://www.neuro.uoregon.edu/~tublitz/COIA/AID.pdf>
- Cockley, W. & Roswal, G. (1994). A comparison study of faculty members' perceived knowledge and satisfaction regarding NCAA athletic programs. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 17(4), 217-223.
- Duderstadt, J. (2003). *Intercollegiate athletics and the American university: A university president's perspective*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Engstrand, G. (1995). *Faculty control of athletics: A case study of the University of Minnesota*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Minnesota.
- Engstrom, C., Sedlacek, W., & McEwen, M. (1995). Faculty attitudes toward male revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes. *Journal of College Student Development*, 36(3), 217-227.
- Friesen, R. (1992). *A comparison of NCAA Division I-A coaches and administrators' attitudes toward issues in intercollegiate athletics*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Kansas.
- Grimes, P. & Chressanthi, G. (1994). Alumni contributions to academics: The role of intercollegiate sports and NCAA sanctions. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 53(1), 27-40.

Gumprecht, B. (2003). Stadium culture: College athletics and the making of place in the American college town. *Southeastern Geographer*, XXXXIII(1), 28-53.

Harrison, T. (2004). *Internal stakeholder perceptions of intercollegiate athletic reform: A focus group examination*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University.

Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics (2001). *A Call To Action: Reconnecting college sports and higher education*. Retrieved November 6, 2006 from http://knightfdn.org/publications/knightcommission/KCfinal_06-2001.pdf

Kuga, D. (1996). Governance of intercollegiate athletics: Perceptions of faculty members. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10, 149-168.

Lovaglia, M. & Lucas, J. (2005). High-visibility athletic programs and the prestige of public universities. *The Sport Journal*, 8(1). Retrieved March 15, 2007 from http://www.thesportjournal.org/2005Journal/Vol8-No1/michael_lovaglia.asp

NCAA Presidential Task Force on the Future of Division I Intercollegiate Athletics (2006). *The Second-Century Imperatives: Presidential Leadership – Institutional Accountability*.

Noble, J. (2004). *Faculty attitudes toward NCAA Division III athletic programs*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: University of Northern Colorado.

Norman, G. (1995). *Faculty attitudes toward intercollegiate athletics at colleges and universities belonging to Division I of the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas.

Putler, D. & Wolfe, R. (1999). Perceptions of intercollegiate athletic programs: Priorities and tradeoffs. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 16(4), 301-325.

Rhoads, T. & Gerking, S. (2000). Educational contributions, academic quality, and athletic success. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 18(2), 248-258.

Shulman, J. & Bowen, W. (2001). *The Game of Life: College Sports and Educational Values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Solow, R. (1998). *Faculty athletic committees as a source of intercollegiate athletic authority*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Georgia.

Splitt, F. (2004). *Reclaiming Academic Primacy in Higher Education: A Brief*. Retrieved September 6, 2006 from <http://www.westga.edu/~drake/home.html>

Thelin, J. (1996). *Games colleges play: Scandal and reform in intercollegiate athletics*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Toma, D. (1999). The collegiate ideal and the tools of external relations: The uses of high-profile intercollegiate athletics. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 105, 81-90.

Trail, G. & Chelladurai, P. (2000). Perceptions of goals and processes of intercollegiate athletics: A case study. *Journal of Sport Management*, 14, 154-178.

Weber, L, Sherman, T., & Tegano, C. (1990). Faculty perceptions of the sources and types of pressure to assist college athletes. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 7(4), 389-393.

Wolfe, R. & Putler, D. (2002). How tight are the ties that bind stakeholder groups? *Organization Science*, 13(1), 64-80.

Appendix A: Survey Instrument

Please Do Not Duplicate or Distribute Publicly
Without Permission of the study's Primary Investigator, Janet H. Lawrence

Contact Information:

University of Michigan
School Of Education
2117 SEB
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

Phone: 734 647 1977
Email: janlaw@umich.edu

Screen 1 of 22

INFORMED CONSENT FOR STUDY:

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS ON THEIR CAMPUSES

The goals of this study are to better understand faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletics on their campuses; what aspects of intercollegiate athletics require attention at their universities; and their interest in assisting with efforts to address these problems. Study findings will be shared with members of the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics, with participants in the Knight Commission Faculty Summit on Intercollegiate Athletics scheduled for October 15, 2007, and in journal articles. Results will always be reported in aggregate form such that no individual or institution can be identified.

It should take you 20-25 minutes to complete the survey. It would be most helpful to us if you complete all survey items. However, if you wish to skip questions, you may do so, and if at any time you wish to terminate participation in the online survey, you may do so by simply closing the window. Should you wish to complete the survey in multiple sessions, you may do so. Directions for doing this are on Screen 2. If you finish the survey and choose to enter a drawing, you will be eligible to win one of four Barnes & Nobles bookstore gift certificates each valued at \$100 – provided by the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation.

Any information you provide is completely confidential. The study team, comprised of three University of Michigan investigators, will be the only individuals with access to the study data. Your email address will be deleted from the dataset once the data collection is completed.

If you have questions regarding the study, survey instrument, or results, please contact the primary investigator, Dr. Janet H. Lawrence, University of Michigan, at 734-647-1977 or janlaw@umich.edu. Should you have questions regarding your rights as a participant in this research, please contact the University of Michigan's Behavioral Sciences Institutional Review Board (irbhsbs@umich.edu). The mailing address is 540 East Liberty Street, Suite 202, Ann Arbor, MI 48104, and telephone number is 734-936-0933.

1. Please click YES, to indicate that your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that you are agreeing to it with an understanding of how the information will be used. You will then go to the first survey question.

- Yes, I provide my consent.
- No, I do not provide my consent. (This will end your participation in the study.)

Screen 2 of 22

Survey Outline:

Screens 3-10: Perceptions of Your Campus and Intercollegiate Athletics (i.e., environment, academics, governance, finance);

Screens 11-15: Satisfaction with Your Campus and Intercollegiate Athletics;

Screens 16-18: Campus and National Priorities; and

Screens 19-22: Demographic Information.

Returning to the Survey:

As you work through the survey, responses on each page are recorded and saved in Zoomerang when the “Submit” button for that page is clicked. If you exit the survey before clicking “Submit” on the final page, you may return to the survey by clicking on the link from the original email invitation.

You should not preview screens unless you intend to complete them in that session. The back button on your browser can only be used to revisit the screens viewed during the current session. This means if you choose to complete the survey in multiple sessions, you will always be taken to the screens you did not view in your previous session, regardless of whether all your questions had been completed.

In this Survey:

References to student-athletes are to students who participate on **varsity intercollegiate athletics teams**.

Unless otherwise indicated, references to intercollegiate athletics are on **your campus**.

A response of **not relevant** means that to the best of your knowledge, a particular policy, practice, behavior or norm does not apply to your campus at this time.

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics on their Campuses

Screen 3 of 22

2. PERCEPTIONS OF YOUR CAMPUS: ENVIRONMENT

The following statements describe policies, practices and norms as well as individual behaviors that may or may not fit with your perceptions of your university at this time.

Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus:

	Don't Know	Not at All	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much	Not Relevant
Residents of the state are more passionate than faculty and students about the success of our intercollegiate athletics teams						
Intercollegiate athletics fulfills part of my university's service mission to the state						
Intercollegiate athletics at my university is an irreplaceable source of revenue to the local community						
Student-athletes are good representatives of my university in their public behavior and statements to the press						
Coaches are good representatives of my university in their public behavior and statements to the press						
The local media tend to emphasize the negative aspects of intercollegiate athletics on my campus						
Faculty in my department often attend and talk about intercollegiate athletics events						
Student-athletes actively participate in student activities (e.g., research opportunities, student government, social events) in my school/college						
The work lives of athletic department and academic program personnel rarely intersect on this campus						

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics on their Campuses

Screen 4 of 22

3. PERCEPTIONS OF YOUR CAMPUS: ACADEMICS

Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus:

	Don't Know	Not at All	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much	Not Relevant
The number of undergraduate applicants to my university has increased steadily over the last five years						
University visibility achieved through intercollegiate athletics increases applications for undergraduate admission to my university						
University visibility achieved through intercollegiate athletics increases the <u>quality</u> of applicants for undergraduate admission to my university						
A specialized admissions staff makes decisions about undergraduate admissions with minimal faculty input						
Academic standards for undergraduate admissions to my university have been lowered to make up for enrollment shortfalls over the last five years						
High school athletes who do not meet regular university academic standards are admitted through a special admissions process that lacks faculty input						
Coaches are involved in admissions decisions regarding recruits who do <u>not</u> meet regular university academic standards						
Faculty are involved in formal advising of undergraduate students						
Academic advising for student-athletes is separate from academic advising for undergraduates who are not student-athletes						

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics on their Campuses

Screen 5 of 22

4. PERCEPTIONS OF YOUR CAMPUS: ACADEMICS

Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus:

	Don't Know	Not at All	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much	Not Relevant
In my experience, student-athletes in my academic department are motivated to earn their degrees						
Student-athletes are more burdened than other students on my campus by demands of their out-of-class time						
Compared to student-athletes, other students have worse attendance records in my classes						
Missed class time due to athletic obligations detracts from the quality of student-athletes' learning in my classes						
Student-athletes are <u>not</u> prepared academically to keep pace with other students in my classes						
Student-athletes represent a disproportionate number of known cheaters in my classes						
Individuals try to use their status as student-athletes to acquire special treatment from my teaching assistants (e.g., better grades)						
Faculty in my academic department stereotype student-athletes negatively, dismissing them as serious and capable students						

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics on their Campuses

Screen 6 of 22

5. PERCEPTIONS OF YOUR CAMPUS: ACADEMICS

Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus:

	Don't Know	Not at All	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much	Not Relevant
A faculty committee in my school/college regularly monitors the educational soundness of our undergraduate majors' programs of study						
A faculty committee on my campus regularly monitors the educational soundness of student-athletes' programs of study						
Academic administrators, faculty and professional staff (e.g., admissions officers) share a common understanding of my university's academic standards						
In order for my university's football and basketball teams to be competitive, compromises in academic standards must be made						
Sanctions for academic misconduct are less severe for student-athletes than those applied to non student-athletes in my school/college						
Faculty use their authority to question courses in my school/college that lack academic integrity, but fulfill <u>undergraduate students'</u> needs to improve their GPAs						
Tutors hired by the athletic department complete assignments for some student-athletes in my classes						

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics on their Campuses

Screen 7 of 22

6. PERCEPTIONS OF YOUR CAMPUS: GOVERNANCE

Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus:

	Don't Know	Not at All	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much	Not Relevant
Shared governance between administrators and faculty is highly valued by <u>administrators</u> on this campus						
Shared governance between administrators and faculty is highly valued by <u>faculty</u> on this campus						
Service to this institution is rewarded in faculty personnel decisions (e.g., salary, promotion)						
My president and faculty agree on matters related to intercollegiate athletics						
Faculty on my campus are interested in governance issues related to intercollegiate athletics						
The primary concern of faculty governance of intercollegiate athletics on my campus is the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences						

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics on their Campuses

Screen 8 of 22

7. PERCEPTIONS OF YOUR CAMPUS: GOVERNANCE

Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus:

	Don't Know	Not at All	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much	Not Relevant
Institution-level decisions about <u>academic matters</u> are typically made by administrators who consult with faculty governance groups						
Institution-level decisions about <u>intercollegiate athletics</u> are typically made by administrators who consult with faculty governance groups						
During the budget process for <u>schools/colleges</u> , faculty governance committees advise administrators						
During the budget process for my university's <u>athletic department</u> , faculty governance committees advise administrators						
Over the past five years, my athletic department has run a "clean" program (e.g., no abuses, no major violations)						
Organizationally, intercollegiate athletics is an auxiliary service (e.g., campus bookstore) that generates its own revenue and is accountable to university administrators, not faculty						
Central administrators and athletics administrators on my campus are forthcoming with information that faculty oversight committees need to ensure the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences						
Faculty roles associated with oversight of intercollegiate athletics are ill defined on my campus						
Athletic department perks (e.g., trips to bowl games) to faculty who judge the academic eligibility of student-athletes create a potential conflict of interest situation						

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics on their Campuses

Screen 9 of 22

8. PERCEPTIONS OF YOUR CAMPUS: GOVERNANCE

Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus:

	Don't Know	Not at All	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much	Not Relevant
The athletic department can use its power with influential politicians, business leaders and alumni to get what it wants on my campus						
Athletics boosters who put winning sports records ahead of academic standards have influence with my president						
Decisions about intercollegiate athletics on my campus are driven by the priorities of an entertainment industry that is <u>not</u> invested in my university's academic mission						
Compared with deans of schools/colleges, my athletic director has more influence with the president of my university						
Central administrators and athletics administrators use their power to foreclose discussions of intercollegiate athletics that are not consistent with their agendas						
Faculty appointed to athletics governance committees are those most likely to acquiesce to athletics administrators on my campus						

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics on their Campuses

Screen 10 of 22

9. PERCEPTIONS OF YOUR CAMPUS: FINANCE

Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus:

	Don't Know	Not at All	Slightly	Moderately	Very Much	Not Relevant
Fiscal conditions on my campus have improved continuously over the last five years						
The budget of my academic department has declined over the last five years						
Intercollegiate athletics is subsidized by my university's general fund						
The athletic department on my campus contributes funds to support academic resources (e.g., libraries)						
Construction of state of the art athletic facilities is given higher priority than capital projects needed by my academic department to keep pace with research in my discipline/field						
Salaries paid to head football and/or basketball coaches on my campus are excessive						
Athletic scholarships to football and basketball players fairly compensate them for their service to the university						
The success of intercollegiate athletics fosters alumni and corporate giving to campus initiatives outside of intercollegiate athletics						
Contracts with clothing and equipment companies (e.g., Nike, adidas) have eroded the ideals of amateur athletics on my campus						

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics on their Campuses

Screen 11 of 22

10. SATISFACTION WITH YOUR CAMPUS AND INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS: ACADEMICS

Faculty members vary in their satisfaction with different aspects of their university. Please indicate **how personally satisfied you are with each of the following on your campus**:

	No Opinion	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Not Relevant
Level of faculty involvement in undergraduate admissions process in my school/college						
Academic standards of professional staff in my school/college who have responsibilities for undergraduate admissions						
The role coaches play in the undergraduate admissions process on my campus						
Academic standards on my campus that guide admissions decisions for high school athletes in football and basketball						
Level of faculty involvement in undergraduate advising in my school/college						
Academic standards of professional staff who have responsibilities for undergraduate student advising						
Academic standards of academic advisors who have responsibilities for student-athletes on my campus						
Academic standards of individuals who tutor student-athletes on my campus						

Screen 12 of 22

11. SATISFACTION WITH YOUR CAMPUS AND INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS: ACADEMICS

Please indicate **how personally satisfied you are with each of the following on your campus**:

	No Opinion	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Not Relevant
Academic integrity of <u>undergraduate students</u> who are not student-athletes						
Academic integrity of <u>student-athletes</u> in my classes						
Adjudication of academic misconduct among <u>undergraduate students</u> '						
Academic performance of <u>undergraduate students</u> who are not student-athletes in my classes						
Academic performance of <u>football and basketball</u> student-athletes in my classes						
Academic performance of <u>student-athletes in sports, other than football and basketball</u> , in my classes						
Level of responsibility student-athletes take to complete assignments and acquire course materials for sessions they miss in my classes						
Efforts of faculty in my academic department to work with student-athletes and ensure the quality of their educational experiences						

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics on their Campuses

Screen 13 of 22

12. SATISFACTION WITH YOUR CAMPUS AND INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS: GOVERNANCE

Please indicate **how personally satisfied you are with each of the following on your campus**:

	No Opinion	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Not Relevant
Level of cooperation between the athletic department and faculty groups responsible for ensuring that academic standards are upheld on my campus						
Attention given to the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences by faculty governance groups on my campus						
Types of roles faculty play in the governance of intercollegiate athletics on my campus						
Range of faculty perspectives considered by central administrators when institutional positions on intercollegiate athletics are formulated						
Practice of giving perks (e.g., trips to bowl games) to faculty and administrators who serve on committees that oversee intercollegiate athletics on my campus						

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics on their Campuses

Screen 14 of 22

13. SATISFACTION WITH YOUR CAMPUS AND INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS: GOVERNANCE

Please indicate **how personally satisfied you are with each of the following on your campus**:

	No Opinion	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Not Relevant
Extent to which faculty input informs administrative decisions that affect my <u>entire campus</u> (e.g., academic personnel policies, budget priorities)						
Institutional control over intercollegiate athletics on my campus						
President's oversight of intercollegiate athletics on my campus						
The way campus administrators handle external constituencies (e.g., boosters, media, vendors) with vested interests in intercollegiate athletics on my campus						
Willingness of faculty who serve on governance groups to take positions at odds with those advocated by athletics administrators on my campus						
Extent to which faculty input informs administrative decisions related to <u>intercollegiate athletics</u>						

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics on their Campuses

Screen 15 of 22

14. SATISFACTION WITH YOUR CAMPUS AND INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS: FINANCE

Please indicate **how personally satisfied you are with each of the following on your campus**:

	No Opinion	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Not Relevant
The resources available for my teaching						
The resources available for my research						
Priorities that guide the allocation of resources on my campus						
The use of general funds to subsidize intercollegiate athletics on my campus						
The practice of awarding scholarships to individuals based on their athletic abilities and performance						
My athletic department's compliance with Title IX (e.g., equitable participation opportunities, financial aid, and treatment of female and male student-athletes)						
The balance struck on my campus between the commercialization of intercollegiate athletics and the ideals of amateur athletics						

Screen 16 of 22

CAMPUS PRIORITIES

15. What most concerns you about intercollegiate athletics on your campus? Please use this space to answer, or type "Nothing" if that is the case.

16.

	Don't Know	0%	Less than 50%	51-79%	80-100%	Not Applicable
If asked to join a campus initiative to address the concern you raised in the preceding question, what are the chances you would agree?						

17.

	Don't Know	0%	Less than 50%	51-79%	80-100%	Not Applicable
What do you think are the chances that a faculty initiative to address the concern you raised in the preceding question will result in meaningful change on your campus?						

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics on their Campuses

Screen 17 of 22

18. CAMPUS PRIORITIES

Please indicate the priority you believe faculty governance groups on your campus must give to each of the following over the next five years:

	No Opinion	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	Not Relevant
Undergraduate Majors (e.g., curriculum rigor, resources)							
Graduate Programs (e.g., curriculum rigor, resources)							
Resources for Research (e.g., quality of labs, administrative support, institutional grants)							
Undergraduate Educational Policies (e.g., admissions standards, advising, missed class time)							
Access to and Affordability of Undergraduate Education (e.g., institutional financial aid, outreach to students and families)							
Faculty Personnel Policies (e.g., use of non-tenure track faculty, promotion and tenure)							
Faculty Salaries and Benefits (e.g., salary compression, health benefits)							
Gender Equity (e.g., in employment, admissions)							
Racial Equity (e.g., in employment, admissions)							
Financial Health of Institution (e.g., revenue levels, deferred maintenance)							
Intercollegiate Athletics (e.g., student-athlete well-being, finance)							
Greek Life (e.g., initiation activities, Town Gown relationships)							
Commercialization of Research (e.g., intellectual property, joint ventures with private business)							

Screen 18 of 22

NATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS ISSUES

The questions so far have focused on how you perceive your own campus. We ask that you now shift your focus and answer the following questions about intercollegiate athletics in general.

19. Do you feel that there is too much, too little or about the right amount of emphasis given to the importance of intercollegiate athletics at:				
	Too much	Too little	About right	Not Sure
Most colleges and universities				
Colleges and universities with big time football and basketball programs				
My own college or university				

20. Which of the following statements comes closest to your opinion about college athletics? (Select one)

- The athletic programs at most universities with big time sports are out of control
- Only relatively few universities, the so-called bad apples, make it seem that all college athletics are out of control
- Not sure

21. If you had to choose, which one of the following would you say is the primary goal of most big-time athletic programs?

- Making alumni happy
- Getting university favorable attention
- Underwriting non-revenue athletic programs
- Making sure student-athletes get an education
- Not sure

22. If you had to choose, which one of the following would you say should be the primary consideration of most big-time athletic program?

- Making alumni happy
- Getting university favorable attention
- Underwriting non-revenue athletic programs
- Making sure student-athletes get an education
- Not sure

23. Please use the space provided here to briefly explain what, in the context of intercollegiate athletics, academic integrity means to you.

Screen 19 of 22

24. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

25. What is your highest degree earned?

- Doctorate
- All But Dissertation
- Masters
- Other, please specify _____

26. Year in which you earned your highest degree: _____

27. What is your current academic rank?

- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Instructor or Lecturer
- Other, please specify _____

28. What is your tenure track status?

- Tenured
- Not Yet Tenured
- Not in Tenure Track

29. In what year were you tenured? (Please enter NA if this question is not applicable to you.) _____

30. Years in all paid non-student positions at your current institution: _____

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics on their Campuses

Screen 20 of 22

31. Primary Area of Teaching (Please select one):

- Biology
- Business
- Chemistry
- Education
- Engineering
- English
- History
- Kinesiology
- Mathematics
- Music
- Performing Arts (e.g., Dance, Theater)
- Physical Education
- Political Science
- Psychology
- Romance Languages
- Sociology
- Other

32. Do you hold an administrative position?

- No
- Department/Program Head
- Assistant Dean
- Associate Dean
- Other, please specify _____

33. What percentage of your time is spent on administration? (Please enter NA if this question is not applicable to you.) _____

34. Please indicate the level(s) of institutional governance in which you are currently involved (Check all that apply):

- None
- Academic Department
- School/College
- Institution

35. Please indicate the level(s) of institutional governance in which you have ever been involved (Check all that apply):

- None
- Academic Department
- School/College
- Institution

36. Have you ever served in an institutional governance role with responsibilities for intercollegiate athletics? (Check all that apply)

- No
- Yes, Faculty Athletics Representative
- Yes, Campus Advisory Board
- Yes, My Institution's NCAA Certification Team
- Other, please specify _____

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics on their Campuses

Screen 20 of 22

37. In a typical academic year, how many courses do you teach?

Number of undergraduate courses _____

Number of graduate courses _____

**38. How would you characterize your contact with student-athletes on your campus?
(Check all that apply)**

- Little to no contact in or out of class
- Student-athletes currently take my classes
- Student-athletes have taken my classes in the past
- I supervise teaching assistants who work with student-athletes
- I supervise tutors who work with student-athletes
- I attend athletic competitions
- Other, please specify _____ -

39. In the current academic year and to the best of your knowledge, what percentage of the students in your undergraduate courses are student-athletes?

- 0%
- 1-10%
- 11-20%
- 21-30%
- 31-40%
- 41%-50%
- 51-60%
- 61-70%
- 71-80%
- 81-90%
- 91-100%
- Not Relevant

40. What are your sources of information about intercollegiate athletics? (Check all that apply)

- Campus news
- Local news
- National news
- Internet
- Sports-specific media (e.g., ESPN or Sports Illustrated)
- Education media (e.g., Chronicle of Higher Education, insidehighered.com)
- Friends outside of the university
- Faculty colleagues
- Official campus publications
- Other, please name _____

Screen 22 of 22

41. Were you a varsity student-athlete in college?

- Yes
- No

42. Are any of your children currently engaged in: (Check all that apply)

- Youth Sports
- High School Varsity Athletics
- Intercollegiate Athletics
- Not Relevant

43. What is your race/ethnicity? (Check all that apply)

- Hispanic or Latino
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White

44. Is there anything else that you would like to say about your perceptions of intercollegiate athletics on your campus?

Appendix B: Tables

Table 1A. Governance Involvement of the Sample by Academic Rank, Experience Teaching Student-Athletes, Race, and Gender

		Academic Rank				Experience Teaching Student-Athletes ^c		Race		Gender	
		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Other	Yes	No	White	Non-White	Male	Female
University Governance	No Current Governance Involvement	181 8.9%	101 5%	135 6.7%	24 1.2%	335 16.5%	107 5.3%	385 19.5%	43 2.2%	315 15.6%	122 6.1%
	Academic Department, School or College Governance Involvement	434 21.4%	276 13.6%	215 10.6%	18 .9%	726 35.7%	219 10.8%	833 42.1%	89 4.5%	657 32.6%	281 14%
	Institution-Level Governance Involvement	355 17.5%	222 11%	55 2.7%	9 .4%	510 25.1%	135 6.6%	582 29.4%	46 2.3%	447 22.2%	192 9.5%
Athletics Governance	No Athletics Governance Involvement	800 39.4%	525 25.8%	391 19.2%	39 1.9%	1348 66.1%	413 20.3%	1550 78.1%	157 7.9%	1228 60.8%	517 25.6%
	One Athletics Governance Role ^a	129 6.3%	56 2.8%	14 .7%	7 .3%	165 8.1%	41 2%	190 9.6%	15 .8%	145 7.2%	58 2.9%
	Multiple Athletics Governance Roles ^b	42 2.1%	23 1.1%	1 0%	5 .2%	63 3.1%	9 .4%	64 3.2%	8 .4%	47 2.3%	25 1.2%

Note: The percentages listed within cells are the percentage of respondents within each demographic category (i.e., rank, experience teaching student athletes, race, gender) for each governance category (i.e., university governance and athletics governance). Totals may not add up to 100% due to missing data.

^aThe respondents currently serve or have served in one governance role for intercollegiate athletics (e.g., faculty athletics representative)

^bThe respondents currently serve or have served in multiple governance roles for intercollegiate athletics (i.e., faculty athletics representative, campus athletics board, NCAA certification team)

^cExperience teaching student-athletes includes either current or previous experience

Table 1B. Governance Involvement of the Sample by Discipline

		Disciplines							
		Humanities	Kinesiology & Physical Education	Mathematics	Music	Natural Sciences	Professional Fields ^c	Social Sciences	Other
University Governance	No Current Governance Involvement	64 3.1%	10 .5%	28 1.4%	15 .7%	65 3.2%	161 7.9%	63 3.1%	36 1.8%
	Academic Department, School or College Governance Involvement	149 7.3%	18 .9%	51 2.5%	40 2%	117 5.8%	312 15.3%	171 8.4%	88 4.3%
	Institution-Level Governance Involvement	93 4.6%	18 .9%	19 .9%	22 1.1%	93 4.6%	212 10.4%	90 4.4%	98 4.8%
Athletics Governance	No Athletics Governance Involvement	261 12.8%	34 1.7%	94 4.6%	74 3.6%	248 12.2%	584 28.6%	288 14.1%	179 8.8%
	One Athletics Governance Role ^a	30 1.5%	10 .5%	4 .2%	4 .2%	22 1.1%	76 3.7%	30 1.5%	30 1.5%
	Multiple Athletics Governance Roles ^b	19 .9%	2 .1%	1 0%	0 0%	7 .3%	24 1.2%	7 .3%	12 .6%

Note: The percentages listed within cells are the percentage of respondents within each governance category (i.e., university governance and athletics governance) for each discipline category (e.g., humanities). Totals may not add up to 100% due to missing data.

^a The respondents currently serve or have served in one governance role for intercollegiate athletics (e.g., faculty athletics representative)

^b The respondents currently serve or have served in multiple governance roles for intercollegiate athletics (i.e., faculty athletics representative, campus athletics board, NCAA certification team)

^c The professional fields include business, education, and engineering.

Table 1C. Experience of the Sample Teaching Student-Athletes by Governance Involvement, Race, Gender

		University Governance			Athletics Governance			Race		Gender	
		None	Academic Department, School or College	Institution -Level	None	One Role ^a	Multiple Roles ^b	White	Non-White	Male	Female
Experience Teaching	Yes (Current or Previous)	335 16.5%	726 35.7%	510 25.1%	1348 66.1%	165 8.1%	63 3.1%	1405 70.5%	140 7%	1117 55%	450 22.2%
Student- Athletes	No	107 5.3%	219 10.8%	135 6.6%	413 20.3%	41 2%	9 .4%	407 20.4%	41 2.1%	311 15.3%	153 7.5%

Note: The percentages listed within cells are for the percentage of respondents within an entire category (i.e., university governance, athletics governance, race, gender).

^a The respondents currently serve or have served in one governance role for intercollegiate athletics (e.g., faculty athletics representative)

^b The respondents currently serve or have served in multiple governance roles for intercollegiate athletics (i.e., faculty athletics representative, campus athletics board, NCAA certification team)

Table 1D. Experience of the Sample Teaching Student-Athletes by Discipline

		Disciplines							
		Humanities	Kinesiology & Physical Education	Mathematics	Music	Natural Sciences	Professional Fields ^a	Social Sciences	Other
Experience Teaching Student-Athletes	Yes (Current or Previous)	261 12.7%	43 2.1%	75 3.7%	38 1.9%	220 10.7%	522 25.5%	264 12.9%	159 7.8%
	No	50 2.4%	3 .1%	25 1.2%	40 2%	58 2.8%	165 8%	63 3.1%	64 3.1%

^a The professional fields include business, education, and engineering.

Table 2A. Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores on Governance Items by Governance Involvement

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	University Governance Involvement			Intercollegiate Athletics Governance Involvement		
		None	Department, School, College	Institution Level	None	One Governance Role ^b	Multiple Roles ^c
BA-G1: Campus Consensus Exists Regarding Intercollegiate Athletics	(1) My president and faculty agree on matters related to intercollegiate athletics	M=2.26	M=2.33	M=2.47	M=2.32	M=2.56	M=2.77
BA-G2: Faculty Interested in Intercollegiate Athletics Issues & Concerned about Student-Athletes' Education	(1) Faculty on my campus are interested in governance issues related to intercollegiate athletics	M=2.54	M=2.60	M=2.78	M=2.63	M=2.70	M=2.79
	(2) The primary concern of faculty governance of intercollegiate athletics on my campus is the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences	M=2.90	M=3.00	M=3.07	M=2.99	M=2.99	M=3.13
BA-G3: Administrators Consult Faculty on Intercollegiate Athletics Decisions	(1) During the budget process for my university's athletic department, faculty governance committees advise administrators	M=1.40	M=1.44	M=1.66	M=1.48	M=1.65	M=1.79
	(2) Institution-level decisions about intercollegiate athletics are typically made by administrators who consult with faculty governance groups	M=1.87	M=1.97	M=2.19	M=1.96	M=2.32	M=2.52
BA-G4: Intercollegiate Athletics is Auxiliary Enterprise with Weak Faculty Oversight	(1) Organizationally, intercollegiate athletics is an auxiliary service (e.g., campus bookstore) that generates its own revenue and is accountable to university administrators, not faculty	M=3.27	M=3.27	M=3.20	M=3.26	M=3.19	M=3.03
	(2) Central administrators and athletics administrators on my campus are not forthcoming with information that faculty oversight committees need to ensure the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences ^d	M=2.71	M=2.90	M=2.45	M=2.83	M=2.22	M=1.84
	(3) Faculty roles associated with oversight of intercollegiate athletics are ill defined on my campus	M=2.71	M=2.81	M=2.42	M=2.75	M=2.25	M=1.96
	(4) The work lives of athletic department and academic program personnel rarely intersect on this campus	M=2.90	M=3.06	M=2.92	M=3.04	M=2.67	M=2.43

Note: Index refers to the variable used in ANOVA. The survey item reads, "Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus."

Means do not include respondents who answered "don't know" or "not relevant".

^a Scale: 1 = Not At All thru 4 = Very Much

^b The respondents currently serve or have served in one governance role for intercollegiate athletics (e.g., faculty athletics representative)

^c The respondents currently serve or have served in multiple governance roles for intercollegiate athletics (i.e., faculty athletics representative, campus athletics board, NCAA certification team)

^d Item is reverse coded for directional consistency with the others in this scale. Table means reflect the reverse coding. Original item read "Central administrators and athletics administrators on my campus are forthcoming with information that faculty oversight committees need to ensure the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences"

Table 2A. Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores on Governance Items by Governance Involvement (Continued)

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	University Governance Involvement			Intercollegiate Athletics Governance Involvement		
		None	Department, School, College	Institution Level	None	One Governance Role ^b	Multiple Roles ^c
BA-G5: Intercollegiate Athletics Power Erodes Faculty Governance & Threatens University Mission	(1) Athletics boosters who put winning records ahead of academic standards have influence with my president	M=2.60	M=2.67	M=2.43	M=2.64	M=2.25	M=2.10
	(2) Decisions about intercollegiate athletics on my campus are driven by the priorities of an entertainment industry that is not invested in my university's academic mission	M=2.70	M=2.86	M=2.60	M=2.81	M=2.35	M=2.24
	(3) Compared with deans of schools/colleges, my athletic director has more influence with the president of my university	M=2.51	M=2.56	M=2.38	M=2.51	M=2.39	M=2.22
	(4) Central administrators and athletics administrators use their power to foreclose discussions of intercollegiate athletics that are not consistent with their agendas	M=2.41	M=2.56	M=2.33	M=2.52	M=2.16	M=1.90
	(5) Faculty appointed to athletics governance committees are those most likely to acquiesce to athletics administrators on my campus	M=2.29	M=2.44	M=2.09	M=2.38	M=1.91	M=1.83
	(6) The athletic department can use its power with influential politicians, business leaders, and alumni to get what it wants on my campus	M=2.86	M=2.96	M=2.71	M=2.92	M=2.53	M=2.37
BA-G6: Athletic Department Runs Clean Program	(1) Athletic department perks (e.g., trips to bowl games) to faculty who judge the academic eligibility of student-athletes do not create a potential conflict of interest situation ^d	M=2.31	M=2.12	M=2.55	M=2.20	M=2.77	M=3.02
	(2) Over the past 5 years, my athletic department has run a "clean" program (e.g., no abuses, no major violations)	M=2.99	M=2.97	M=3.14	M=2.97	M=3.34	M=3.44

Note: The survey item reads, "Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus."

Means do not include respondents who answered "don't know" or "not relevant".

Scale: 1 = Not At All thru 4 = Very Much

^b The respondents currently serve or have served in one governance role for intercollegiate athletics (e.g., faculty athletics representative)

^c The respondents currently serve or have served in multiple governance roles for intercollegiate athletics (i.e., faculty athletics representative, campus athletics board, NCAA certification team)

^d Item is reverse coded for directional consistency with the others in this scale. Table means reflect the reverse coding. Original item read "Athletic department perks (e.g., trips to bowl games) to faculty who judge the academic eligibility of student-athletes create a potential conflict of interest situation."

Table 3A. Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Experience Teaching Student-Athletes for Academic Items

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	Experience Teaching Student-Athletes	
		Yes	No
BA-A1: Special Admission of Academically Underprepared Student-Athletes Involves Coaches Not Faculty	(1) High school athletes who do not meet regular university academic standards are admitted through a special admissions process that lacks faculty input	M=2.58	M=2.71
	(2) Coaches are involved in admissions decisions regarding recruits who do not meet regular university academic standards	M=2.70	M=2.91
	(3) A staff of specialized admissions officers makes decisions about undergraduate admissions with minimal faculty input	M=3.38	M=3.18
BA-A2: Academic Advising of Student-Athletes is Separate	(1) Academic advising for student-athletes is separate from academic advising for undergraduates who are not student-athletes	M=3.13	M=3.34
BA-A3: Student-Athletes' Academic Performance is Weak	(1) Missed class time due to athletic obligations detracts from the quality of student-athletes' learning in my classes	M=2.59	M=2.70
	(2) Student-athletes are not prepared academically to keep pace with other students in my class	M=1.91	M=2.08
	(3) Student-athletes represent a disproportionate number of known cheaters in my classes	M=1.24	M=1.30
	(4) Individuals try to use their status as student-athletes to acquire special treatment from my teaching assistants (e.g., better grades)	M=1.38	M=1.49
BA-A4: Student-Athletes are Burdened and Miss Class	(1) Student-athletes are more burdened than other students on my campus by demands on their out-of-class time	M=3.51	M=3.46
	(2) Compared to student-athletes, other students do not have worse attendance records in my classes ^o	M=3.16	M=3.29
BA-A5: Student-Athletes are Academically Motivated and Engaged	(1) In my experience, student-athletes in my academic department are motivated to earn their degrees	M=3.05	M=2.78
	(2) Student-athletes actively participate in student activities (e.g., research opportunities, student government, social events) in my school/college	M=2.01	M=1.75
BA-A6: Faculty Hold Negative Stereotypes	(1) Faculty in my academic department stereotype student-athletes negatively, dismissing them as serious and capable students	M=1.69	M=1.71
BA-A7: Intercollegiate Athletics Success Requires Compromises in Academic Standards	(1) In order for my university's football and basketball teams to be competitive, compromises in academic standards must be made	M=2.20	M=2.29
	(2) Sanctions for academic misconduct are less severe for student-athletes than those applied to non-student-athletes in my school/college	M=1.74	M=1.94
	(3) Tutors hired by the athletic department complete assignments for some student-athletes in my classes	M=1.74	M=1.95
	(4) A faculty committee on my campus does not regularly monitor the educational soundness of student-athletes' programs of study ^p	M=2.40	M=2.29

Note: Means do not include respondents who answered "don't know" and "not relevant"

The survey item reads, "Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus."

^a Scale: 1 = Not At All thru 4 = Very Much

^b Item is reverse coded for directional consistency with the others in this scale. Table means reflect the reverse coding. Original items read "Compared to student-athletes, other students have worse attendance records in my classes" and "A faculty committee on my campus regularly monitors the educational soundness of student-athletes' programs of study"

Table 3B. Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Discipline for Academic Items

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	Disciplines							
		Humanities	Kinesiology & Physical Education	Mathematics	Music	Natural Sciences	Professional Fields ^b	Social Sciences	Other
BA-A1: Special Admission of Academically Underprepared Student-Athletes Involves Coaches Not Faculty	(1) High school athletes who do not meet regular university academic standards are admitted through a special admissions process that lacks faculty input	M=2.81	M=2.93	M=2.83	M=2.73	M=2.66	M=2.33	M=2.77	M=2.59
	(2) Coaches are involved in admissions decisions regarding recruits who do not meet regular university academic standards	M=3.03	M=2.96	M=3.03	M=2.88	M=2.80	M=2.52	M=2.66	M=2.77
	(3) A staff of specialized admissions officers makes decisions about undergraduate admissions with minimal faculty input	M=3.55	M=3.15	M=3.51	M=2.16	M=3.44	M=3.29	M=3.48	M=3.35
BA-A2: Academic Advising of Student-Athletes is Separate	(1) Academic advising for student-athletes is separate from academic advising for undergraduates who are not student-athletes	M=3.37	M=3.02	M=3.43	M=3.41	M=3.17	M=2.98	M=3.32	M=3.07
BA-A3: Student-Athletes' Academic Performance is Weak	(1) Missed class time due to athletic obligations detracts from the quality of student-athletes' learning in my classes	M=2.77	M=2.86	M=2.64	M=2.70	M=2.65	M=2.38	M=2.65	M=2.76
	(2) Student-athletes are not prepared academically to keep pace with other students in my class	M=2.13	M=2.00	M=1.96	M=2.37	M=1.89	M=1.67	M=2.15	M=2.01
	(3) Student-athletes represent a disproportionate number of known cheaters in my classes	M=1.37	M=1.42	M=1.26	M=1.68	M=1.17	M=1.11	M=1.34	M=1.28
	(4) Individuals try to use their status as student-athletes to acquire special treatment from my teaching assistants (e.g., better grades)	M=1.54	M=1.66	M=1.43	M=1.76	M=1.35	M=1.26	M=1.36	M=1.57
BA-A4: Student-Athletes are Burdened and Miss Class	(1) Student-athletes are more burdened than other students on my campus by demands on their out-of-class time	M=3.49	M=3.63	M=3.48	M=3.13	M=3.56	M=3.55	M=3.48	M=3.41
	(2) Compared to student-athletes, other students do not have worse attendance records in my classes ^c	M=3.17	M=3.28	M=3.22	M=3.44	M=3.22	M=3.17	M=3.11	M=3.11

Note: Means do not include respondents who answered "don't know" and "not relevant"

The survey item reads, "Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus."

^a Scale: 1 = Not At All thru 4 = Very Much

^b The professional fields include business, education, and engineering.

^c Item is reverse coded for directional consistency with the others in this scale. Table means reflect the reverse coding. Original item read "Compared to student-athletes, other students have worse attendance records in my classes"

Table 3B. Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Discipline for Academic Items (Continued)

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	Disciplines							
		Humanities	Kinesiology & Physical Education	Mathematics	Music	Natural Sciences	Professional Fields ^b	Social Sciences	Other
BA-A5: Student-Athletes are Academically Motivated and Engaged	(1) In my experience, student-athletes in my academic department are motivated to earn their degrees	M=2.90	M=2.82	M=2.81	M=2.61	M=3.03	M=3.27	M=2.78	M=2.94
	(2) Student-athletes actively participate in student activities (e.g., research opportunities, student government, social events) in my school/college	M=1.72	M=2.00	M=1.78	M=1.87	M=1.95	M=2.13	M=1.94	M=1.89
BA-A6: Faculty Hold Negative Stereotypes	(1) Faculty in my academic department stereotype student-athletes negatively, dismissing them as serious and capable students	M=1.92	M=1.60	M=1.77	M=2.05	M=1.69	M=1.47	M=1.78	M=1.82
BA-A7: Intercollegiate Athletics Success Compromises Academic Standards	(1) In order for my university's football and basketball teams to be competitive, compromises in academic standards must be made	M=2.48	M=2.38	M=2.32	M=2.26	M=2.32	M=2.04	M=2.18	M=2.18
	(2) Sanctions for academic misconduct are less severe for student-athletes than those applied to non-student-athletes in my school/college	M=2.13	M=1.59	M=1.77	M=1.89	M=1.72	M=1.58	M=1.74	M=1.94
	(3) Tutors hired by the athletic department complete assignments for some student-athletes in my classes	M=2.15	M=1.82	M=2.32	M=2.00	M=1.68	M=1.47	M=1.80	M=1.83
	(4) A faculty committee on my campus does not regularly monitor the educational soundness of student-athletes' programs of study ^c	M=2.66	M=2.17	M=2.60	M=2.13	M=2.43	M=2.23	M=2.37	M=2.41

Note: Means do not include respondents who answered "don't know" and "not relevant"

The survey item reads, "Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus."

^a Scale: 1 = Not At All thru 4 = Very Much

^b The professional fields include business, education, and engineering.

^c Item is reverse coded for directional consistency with the others in this scale. Table means reflect the reverse coding. Original item read, "A faculty committee on my campus regularly monitors the educational soundness of student-athletes' programs of study"

Table 3C. Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Academic Rank for Academic Items

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	Academic Rank			
		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Other
BA-A1: Special Admission of Academically Underprepared Student-Athletes Involves Coaches Not Faculty	(1) High school athletes who do not meet regular university academic standards are admitted through a special admissions process that lacks faculty input	M=2.59	M=2.56	M=2.77	M=2.46
	(2) Coaches are involved in admissions decisions regarding recruits who do not meet regular university academic standards	M=2.69	M=2.78	M=2.87	M=2.78
	(3) A staff of specialized admissions officers makes decisions about undergraduate admissions with minimal faculty input	M=3.31	M=3.42	M=3.39	M=3.14
BA-A2: Academic Advising of Student-Athletes is Separate	(1) Academic advising for student-athletes is separate from academic advising for undergraduates who are not student-athletes	M=3.22	M=3.20	M=2.96	M=3.10
BA-A3: Student-Athletes' Academic Performance is Weak	(1) Missed class time due to athletic obligations detracts from the quality of student-athletes' learning in my classes	M=2.61	M=2.58	M=2.62	M=2.33
	(2) Student-athletes are not prepared academically to keep pace with other students in my class	M=1.96	M=1.90	M=1.88	M=2.03
	(3) Student-athletes represent a disproportionate number of known cheaters in my classes	M=1.25	M=1.24	M=1.23	M=1.20
	(4) Individuals try to use their status as student-athletes to acquire special treatment from my teaching assistants (e.g., better grades)	M=1.42	M=1.38	M=1.37	M=1.22
BA-A4: Student-Athletes are Burdened and Miss Class	(1) Student-athletes are more burdened than other students on my campus by demands on their out-of-class time	M=3.55	M=3.48	M=3.43	M=3.43
	(2) Compared to student-athletes, other students have worse attendance records in my classes ^b	M=3.17	M=3.19	M=3.19	M=2.85
BA-A5: Student-Athletes are Academically Motivated and Engaged	(1) In my experience, student-athletes in my academic department are motivated to earn their degrees	M=3.03	M=3.06	M=2.90	M=3.10
	(2) Student-athletes actively participate in student activities (e.g., research opportunities, student government, social events) in my school/college	M=1.96	M=1.94	M=1.95	M=2.28
BA-A6: Faculty Hold Negative Stereotypes	(1) Faculty in my academic department stereotype student-athletes negatively, dismissing them as serious and capable students	M=1.69	M=1.72	M=1.64	M=1.86
BA-A7: Intercollegiate Athletics Success Requires Compromises in Academic Standards	(1) In order for my university's football and basketball teams to be competitive, compromises in academic standards must be made	M=2.31	M=2.14	M=2.07	M=2.10
	(2) Sanctions for academic misconduct are less severe for student-athletes than those applied to non-student-athletes in my school/college	M=1.75	M=1.78	M=1.82	M=1.63
	(3) Tutors hired by the athletic department complete assignments for some student-athletes in my classes	M=1.79	M=1.79	M=1.66	M=1.80
	(4) A faculty committee on my campus does not regularly monitor the educational soundness of student-athletes' programs of study ^b	M=2.42	M=2.34	M=2.28	M=2.29

Note: Means do not include respondents who answered "don't know" and "not relevant"

The survey item reads, "Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus."

^a Scale: 1 = Not At All thru 4 = Very Much

^b Item is reverse coded for directional consistency with the others in this scale. Table means reflect the reverse coding.

Table 4A. Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Governance Involvement for Finance Items

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	University Governance Involvement			Intercollegiate Athletics Governance Involvement		
		None	Department, School, College	Institution Level	None	One Governance Role ^b	Multiple Roles ^c
BA-F1: Intercollegiate Athletics Subsidized by General Fund	(1) Intercollegiate athletics is subsidized by my university's general fund	M=2.31	M=2.41	M=2.41	M=2.42	M=2.31	M=2.16
BA-F2: Intercollegiate Athletics Gives Funds to University	(1) The athletic department on my campus contributes funds to support academic resources (e.g., libraries)	M=1.95	M=1.79	M=1.84	M=1.79	M=2.05	M=2.13
BA-F3: Intercollegiate Athletics Gets Higher Funding Priority than Academics	(1) Construction of state of the art athletic facilities is given higher priority than capital projects needed by my academic department to keep pace with research in my field/discipline	M=2.73	M=2.85	M=2.58	M=2.79	M=2.45	M=2.28
	(2) Salaries paid to head football and basketball coaches on my campus are excessive	M=3.20	M=3.30	M=3.23	M=3.30	M=2.98	M=3.07
BA-F4: Athletic Scholarships Fairly Compensate Football and Basketball Players	(1) Athletic scholarships to football and basketball players fairly compensate them for their service to the university	M=2.34	M=2.37	M=2.44	M=2.34	M=2.62	M=2.74
BA-F5: Athletic Team Success Attracts Donations to Non-Athletic Initiatives	(1) The success of intercollegiate athletics fosters alumni and corporate giving to campus initiatives outside of intercollegiate athletics	M=2.67	M=2.69	M=2.77	M=2.68	M=2.91	M=2.79
BA-F6: Intercollegiate Athletics: Commercialization is Eroding Amateurism	(1) Contracts with clothing and equipment companies (e.g., Nike, adidas) have eroded the ideals of amateur athletics on my campus	M=2.39	M=2.56	M=2.42	M=2.53	M=2.26	M=2.11

Note: Means do not include respondents who answered "don't know" and "not relevant"

The survey item reads, "Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus."

^a Scale: 1 = Not At All thru 4 = Very Much

^b The respondents currently serve or have served in one governance role for intercollegiate athletics (e.g., faculty athletics representative)

^c The respondents currently serve or have served in multiple governance roles for intercollegiate athletics (i.e., faculty athletics representative, campus athletics board, NCAA certification team)

Table 4B. Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Discipline for Finance Items

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	Disciplines							
		Humanities	Kinesiology & Physical Education	Mathematics	Music	Natural Sciences	Professional Fields ^b	Social Sciences	Other
BA-F1: Intercollegiate Athletics Subsidized by General Fund	(1) Intercollegiate athletics is subsidized by my university's general fund	M=2.61	M=2.94	M=2.61	M=2.34	M=2.55	M=2.16	M=2.25	M=2.58
BA-F2: Intercollegiate Athletics Gives Funds to University	(1) The athletic department on my campus contributes funds to support academic resources (e.g., libraries)	M=1.72	M=1.55	M=1.45	M=2.08	M=1.78	M=1.97	M=1.94	M=1.67
BA-F3: Intercollegiate Athletics Gets Higher Funding Priority than Academics	(1) Construction of state of the art athletic facilities is given higher priority than capital projects needed by my academic department to keep pace with research in my field/discipline	M=3.09	M=2.71	M=2.79	M=2.97	M=2.92	M=2.44	M=2.68	M=2.86
	(2) Salaries paid to head football and basketball coaches on my campus are excessive	M=3.53	M=3.33	M=3.42	M=3.56	M=3.40	M=2.99	M=3.26	M=3.31
BA-F4: Athletics Scholarships Fairly Compensate Football and Basketball Players	(1) Athletic scholarships to football and basketball players fairly compensate them for their service to the university	M=2.27	M=2.59	M=2.29	M=2.56	M=2.38	M=2.45	M=2.31	M=2.43
BA-F5: Athletic Team Success Attracts donations to Non-Athletic Initiatives	(1) The success of intercollegiate athletics fosters alumni and corporate giving to campus initiatives outside of intercollegiate athletics	M=2.44	M=2.69	M=2.34	M=2.91	M=2.59	M=2.92	M=2.81	M=2.57
BA-F6: Intercollegiate Athletics: Commercialization is Eroding Amateurism	(1) Contracts with clothing and equipment companies (e.g., Nike, adidas) have eroded the ideals of amateur athletics on my campus	M=2.72	M=2.53	M=2.95	M=2.81	M=2.54	M=2.30	M=2.41	M=2.48

Note: Means do not include respondents who answered "don't know" and "not relevant"

The survey item reads, "Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus."

^a Scale: 1 = Not At All thru 4 = Very Much

^b The professional fields include business, education, and engineering.

Table 5A. Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Governance Involvement for Governance Items

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	University Governance Involvement			Intercollegiate Athletics Governance Involvement		
		None	Department, School, College	Institution Level	None	One Governance Role ^b	Multiple Roles ^c
SA-G1: Faculty Governance Priorities Emphasize Student-Athletes' Education	(1) Attention given to the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences by faculty governance groups on my campus	M=2.50	M=2.46	M=2.68	M=2.47	M=2.84	M=3.04
SA-G2: Level of Collaboration and Impact of Faculty Input	(1) Level of cooperation between the athletic department and faculty groups responsible for ensuring that academic standards are upheld on my campus	M=2.45	M=2.36	M=2.58	M=2.37	M=2.76	M=3.10
	(2) Types of roles faculty play in the governance of intercollegiate athletics on my campus	M=2.22	M=2.22	M=2.44	M=2.22	M=2.57	M=2.94
	(3) Range of faculty perspectives considered by central administrators when institutional positions on intercollegiate athletics are formulated	M=2.02	M=1.95	M=2.14	M=1.95	M=2.37	M=2.64
	(4) Practice of giving perks (e.g., trips to bowl games) to faculty and administrators who serve on committees that oversee intercollegiate athletics on my campus	M=2.12	M=2.06	M=2.32	M=2.04	M=2.50	M=2.91
	(5) Willingness of faculty who serve on governance groups to take positions at odds with those advocated by athletics administrators on my campus	M=2.50	M=2.56	M=2.74	M=2.55	M=2.89	M=2.92
	(6) Extent to which faculty input informs administrative decisions related to intercollegiate athletics	M=2.08	M=2.07	M=2.28	M=2.08	M=2.43	M=2.57
SA-G3: Institutional Leaders' Oversight of Intercollegiate Athletics	(1) Institutional control over intercollegiate athletics on my campus	M=2.47	M=2.39	M=2.61	M=2.41	M=2.76	M=3.10
	(2) President's oversight of intercollegiate athletics on my campus	M=2.51	M=2.52	M=2.71	M=2.52	M=2.85	M=3.09
	(3) The way campus administrators handle external constituencies (e.g., boosters, media, vendors) with vested interests in intercollegiate athletics on my campus	M=2.37	M=2.37	M=2.56	M=2.38	M=2.69	M=2.94

Note: Means do not include respondents who answered "no opinion".

The survey item reads, "Please indicate how personally satisfied you are with each of the following on your campus."

^a Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied thru 4 = Very Satisfied

^b The respondents currently serve or have served in one governance role for intercollegiate athletics (e.g., faculty athletics representative)

^c The respondents currently serve or have served in multiple governance roles for intercollegiate athletics (i.e., faculty athletics representative, campus athletics board, NCAA certification team)

Table 6A. Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Discipline for Academic Items

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	Disciplines							
		Humanities	Kinesiology & Physical Education	Mathematics	Music	Natural Sciences	Professional Fields ^b	Social Sciences	Other
SA-A1: Coaches' Admissions-Related Roles and Academic Standards Applied	(1) Role coaches play in the undergraduate admissions process	M=2.08	M=2.48	M=2.24	M=2.69	M=2.44	M=2.70	M=2.34	M=2.49
	(2) Academic standards on my campus that guide admissions decisions for high school athletes in football and basketball	M=2.14	M=2.31	M=2.13	M=2.38	M=2.38	M=2.65	M=2.26	M=2.34
SA-A2: Standards of Athletic Department Academic Support Staff	(1) Academic standards of advisors who have responsibility for student-athletes on my campus	M=2.37	M=2.51	M=2.49	M=2.85	M=2.63	M=2.93	M=2.69	M=2.72
	(2) Academic standards of individuals who tutor student-athletes on my campus	M=2.41	M=2.78	M=2.46	M=2.77	M=2.68	M=2.93	M=2.70	M=2.67
	(3) Efforts of faculty in my academic department to work with student-athletes and ensure the quality of their educational experiences	M=2.89	M=2.78	M=2.85	M=3.07	M=3.04	M=3.10	M=2.92	M=3.09
SA-A3: Student-Athletes' Academic Performance and Integrity in Class	(1) Academic performance of student-athletes in sports other than football and basketball in my classes	M=3.03	M=3.19	M=2.96	M=3.02	M=3.04	M=3.20	M=2.96	M=3.00
	(2) Level of responsibility student-athletes take to complete assignments and acquire course materials for sessions they miss in my classes	M=2.76	M=2.67	M=2.77	M=2.68	M=2.94	M=3.08	M=2.72	M=2.76
	(3) Academic performance of football and basketball student-athletes in my classes	M=2.25	M=2.33	M=2.44	M=2.29	M=2.40	M=2.76	M=2.30	M=2.28
	(4) Academic integrity of student-athletes in my classes	M=2.80	M=2.80	M=2.82	M=2.71	M=2.94	M=3.03	M=2.79	M=2.72

Note: Means do not include respondents who answered "no opinion".
The survey item reads, "Please indicate how personally satisfied you are with each of the following on your campus."

^a Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied thru 4 = Very Satisfied

^b The professional fields include business, education, and engineering.

Table 6B. Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Academic Rank for Academic Items

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	Academic Rank			
		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Other
SA-A1: Coaches' Admissions-Related Roles and Academic Standards Applied	(1) Role coaches play in the undergraduate admissions process	M=2.47	M=2.46	M=2.30	M=2.79
	(2) Academic standards on my campus that guide admissions decisions for high school athletes in football and basketball	M=2.42	M=2.41	M=2.21	M=2.68
SA-A2: Standards of Athletic Department Academic Support Staff	(1) Academic standards of advisors who have responsibility for student-athletes on my campus	M=2.74	M=2.71	M=2.57	M=2.59
	(2) Academic standards of individuals who tutor student-athletes on my campus	M=2.78	M=2.67	M=2.55	M=2.77
	(3) Efforts of faculty in my academic department to work with student-athletes and ensure the quality of their educational experiences	M=3.02	M=3.04	M=2.96	M=2.97
SA-A3: Student-Athletes' Academic Performance and Integrity in Class	(1) Academic performance of student-athletes in sports other than football and basketball in my classes	M=3.12	M=3.06	M=2.97	M=3.22
	(2) Level of responsibility student-athletes take to complete assignments and acquire course materials for sessions they miss in my classes	M=2.85	M=2.94	M=2.85	M=3.00
	(3) Academic performance of football and basketball student-athletes in my classes	M=2.49	M=2.48	M=2.34	M=2.60
	(4) Academic integrity of student-athletes in my classes	M=2.89	M=2.89	M=2.85	M=2.94

Note: Means do not include respondents who answered "no opinion".
 The survey item reads, "Please indicate how personally satisfied you are with each of the following on your campus."
^a Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied thru 4 = Very Satisfied

Table 6C. Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Experience Teaching Student-Athletes for Academic Items

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	Experience Teaching Student-Athletes ^b	
		Yes	No
SA-A1: Coaches' Admissions-Related Roles and Academic Standards Applied	(1) Role coaches play in the undergraduate admissions process	M=2.46	M=2.43
	(2) Academic standards on my campus that guide admissions decisions for high school athletes in football and basketball	M=2.39	M=2.42
SA-A2: Standards of Athletic Department Academic Support Staff	(1) Academic standards of advisors who have responsibility for student-athletes on my campus	M=2.70	M=2.74
	(2) Academic standards of individuals who tutor student-athletes on my campus	M=2.72	M=2.70
	(3) Efforts of faculty in my academic department to work with student-athletes and ensure the quality of their educational experiences	M=3.01	M=3.01
SA-A3: Student-Athletes' Academic Performance and Integrity in Class	(1) Academic performance of student-athletes in sports other than football and basketball in my classes	M=3.09	M=2.96
	(2) Level of responsibility student-athletes take to complete assignments and acquire course materials for sessions they miss in my classes	M=2.90	M=2.72
	(3) Academic performance of football and basketball student-athletes in my classes	M=2.46	M=2.45
	(4) Academic integrity of student-athletes in my classes	M=2.90	M=2.75

Note: Means do not include respondents who answered "no opinion".

The survey item reads, "Please indicate how personally satisfied you are with each of the following on your campus."

^a Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied thru 4 = Very Satisfied

^b Faculty were asked to indicate whether student-athletes currently or have in the past taken their classes. Those who answered affirmatively to one or both of these items are in the "Yes" category.

Table 7A. Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores by Governance Involvement for Finance Items

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	University Governance Involvement			Intercollegiate Athletics Governance Involvement		
		None	Department, School, College	Institution Level	None	One Governance Role ^b	Multiple Roles ^c
SA-F1: Intercollegiate Athletics Compliance with Title IX	(1) My athletic department's compliance with Title IX (e.g., equitable participation opportunities, financial aid, and treatment of female and male student-athletes)	M=3.00	M=2.92	M=2.98	M=2.92	M=3.05	M=3.31
SA-F2: Use of General Funds to Subsidize Intercollegiate Athletics	(1) The use of general funds to subsidize intercollegiate athletics on my campus	M=2.12	M=1.98	M=2.17	M=1.98	M=2.50	M=2.76
SA-F3: Awarding Athletic Scholarships	(1) The practice of awarding scholarships to individuals based on their athletic abilities and performance	M=2.55	M=2.52	M=2.61	M=2.50	M=2.83	M=2.97
SA-F4: Balance between Commercialization and Amateurism	(1) The balance struck on campus between the commercialization of intercollegiate athletics and the ideals of amateur athletics	M=2.36	M=2.28	M=2.46	M=2.30	M=2.56	M=2.80

Note: Means do not include respondents who answered "no opinion".

The survey item reads, "Please indicate how personally satisfied you are with each of the following on your campus."

^a Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied thru 4 = Very Satisfied

^b The respondents currently serve or have served in one governance role for intercollegiate athletics (e.g., faculty athletics representative)

^c The respondents currently serve or have served in multiple governance roles for intercollegiate athletics (i.e., faculty athletics representative, campus athletics board, NCAA certification team)

Table 9A. Priorities for Faculty Governance Groups by Governance Involvement

Priorities ^a	University Governance Involvement			Intercollegiate Athletics Governance Involvement		
	None	Department, School, College	Institution Level	None	One Governance Role ^b	Multiple Roles ^c
Undergraduate Majors (e.g., curriculum rigor, resources)	M=4.02	M=4.07	M=4.04	M=4.05	M=4.08	M=3.94
Graduate Programs (e.g., curriculum rigor, resources)	M=4.17	M=4.28	M=4.16	M=4.23	M=4.20	M=4.01
Resources for Research (e.g., quality of labs, administrative support, institutional grants)	M=4.18	M=4.29	M=4.20	M=4.24	M=4.26	M=4.10
Undergraduate Educational Policies (e.g., admissions standards, advising, missed class time)	M=3.57	M=3.58	M=3.53	M=3.56	M=3.64	M=3.38
Access to and Affordability of Undergraduate Education (e.g., institutional financial aid, outreach to students and families)	M=3.64	M=3.71	M=3.70	M=3.69	M=3.77	M=3.44
Faculty Personnel Policies (e.g., use of non-tenure track faculty, promotion and tenure)	M=3.68	M=3.71	M=3.79	M=3.72	M=3.85	M=3.64
Faculty Salaries and Benefits (e.g., salary compression, health benefits)	M=3.99	M=4.08	M=4.10	M=4.08	M=4.05	M=3.84
Gender Equity (e.g., in employment, admissions)	M=3.29	M=3.37	M=3.45	M=3.38	M=3.45	M=3.14
Racial Equity (e.g., in employment, admissions)	M=3.43	M=3.54	M=3.65	M=3.55	M=3.66	M=3.34
Financial Health of Institution (e.g., revenue levels, deferred maintenance)	M=3.62	M=3.78	M=3.88	M=3.78	M=3.77	M=3.74
Intercollegiate Athletics (e.g., student-athlete well-being, finance)	M=2.53	M=2.44	M=2.62	M=2.44	M=2.99	M=3.06
Greek Life (e.g., initiation activities, Town Gown relationships)	M=1.89	M=1.86	M=2.06	M=1.88	M=2.27	M=2.34
Commercialization of Research (e.g., intellectual property, joint ventures with private business)	M=3.05	M=3.08	M=3.23	M=3.10	M=3.23	M=3.18

Note: Means do not include respondents who answered “no opinion” or “not relevant”

^a Respondents were asked to indicate the priority they believe faculty governance groups on their campus must give to each: 1=Very Low thru 5=Very High

^b The respondents currently serve or have served in one governance role for intercollegiate athletics (e.g., faculty athletics representative)

^c The respondents currently serve or have served in multiple governance roles for intercollegiate athletics (i.e., faculty athletics representative, campus athletics board, NCAA certification team)

Table 9B. Priorities for Faculty Governance Groups by Discipline

Priorities ^a	Discipline							
	Humanities	Kinesiology & Physical Education	Mathematics	Music	Natural Sciences	Professional Fields ^b	Social Sciences	Other
Undergraduate Majors (e.g., curriculum rigor, resources)	M=4.20	M=4.13	M=4.10	M=4.21	M=4.06	M=4.02	M=3.92	M=4.01
Graduate Programs (e.g., curriculum rigor, resources)	M=4.28	M=4.13	M=4.21	M=4.42	M=4.28	M=4.13	M=4.24	M=4.24
Resources for Research (e.g., quality of labs, administrative support, institutional grants)	M=4.34	M=3.96	M=4.11	M=4.24	M=4.32	M=4.17	M=4.33	M=4.23
Undergraduate Educational Policies (e.g., admissions standards, advising, missed class time)	M=3.61	M=3.57	M=3.52	M=3.72	M=3.48	M=3.50	M=3.59	M=3.68
Access to and Affordability of Undergraduate Education (e.g., institutional financial aid, outreach to students and families)	M=4.01	M=3.72	M=3.71	M=3.79	M=3.50	M=3.56	M=3.75	M=3.78
Faculty Personnel Policies (e.g., use of non-tenure track faculty, promotion and tenure)	M=4.06	M=3.54	M=3.73	M=3.81	M=3.58	M=3.66	M=3.67	M=3.80
Faculty Salaries and Benefits (e.g., salary compression, health benefits)	M=4.26	M=3.67	M=3.99	M=4.23	M=3.97	M=3.97	M=4.16	M=4.17
Gender Equity (e.g., in employment, admissions)	M=3.69	M=3.18	M=3.28	M=3.48	M=3.38	M=3.18	M=3.58	M=3.34
Racial Equity (e.g., in employment, admissions)	M=4.00	M=3.42	M=3.36	M=3.45	M=3.44	M=3.35	M=3.81	M=3.50
Financial Health of Institution (e.g., revenue levels, deferred maintenance)	M=3.91	M=3.78	M=3.75	M=3.97	M=3.74	M=3.71	M=3.76	M=3.83
Intercollegiate Athletics (e.g., student-athlete well-being, finance)	M=2.33	M=2.85	M=2.32	M=2.45	M=2.44	M=2.65	M=2.48	M=2.53
Greek Life (e.g., initiation activities, Town Gown relationships)	M=1.85	M=2.07	M=1.88	M=2.03	M=1.82	M=1.97	M=1.91	M=2.06
Commercialization of Research (e.g., intellectual property, joint ventures with private business)	M=2.98	M=3.30	M=2.80	M=2.99	M=3.12	M=3.28	M=2.97	M=3.17

Note: Means do not include respondents who answered “no opinion” or “not relevant”

^a Respondents were asked to indicate the priority they believe faculty governance groups on their campus must give to each: 1=Very Low thru 5=Very High

^b The professional fields include business, education, and engineering.

Table 9C. Priorities for Faculty Governance Groups by Academic Rank

Priorities ^a	Academic Rank			
	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Other
Undergraduate Majors (e.g., curriculum rigor, resources)	M=4.06	M=4.09	M=3.94	M=4.31
Graduate Programs (e.g., curriculum rigor, resources)	M=4.27	M=4.17	M=4.18	M=4.23
Resources for Research (e.g., quality of labs, administrative support, institutional grants)	M=4.25	M=4.21	M=4.25	M=4.32
Undergraduate Educational Policies (e.g., admissions standards, advising, missed class time)	M=3.58	M=3.55	M=3.46	M=3.92
Access to and Affordability of Undergraduate Education (e.g., institutional financial aid, outreach to students and families)	M=3.69	M=3.71	M=3.66	M=3.88
Faculty Personnel Policies (e.g., use of non-tenure track faculty, promotion and tenure)	M=3.73	M=3.79	M=3.63	M=3.80
Faculty Salaries and Benefits (e.g., salary compression, health benefits)	M=4.09	M=4.13	M=3.92	M=4.15
Gender Equity (e.g., in employment, admissions)	M=3.34	M=3.43	M=3.37	M=3.62
Racial Equity (e.g., in employment, admissions)	M=3.52	M=3.58	M=3.58	M=3.65
Financial Health of Institution (e.g., revenue levels, deferred maintenance)	M=3.87	M=3.72	M=3.66	M=3.92
Intercollegiate Athletics (e.g., student-athlete well-being, finance)	M=2.58	M=2.42	M=2.43	M=3.12
Greek Life (e.g., initiation activities, Town Gown relationships)	M=1.98	M=1.90	M=1.82	M=2.41
Commercialization of Research (e.g., intellectual property, joint ventures with private business)	M=3.20	M=3.02	M=3.00	M=3.67

Note: Means do not include respondents who answered “no opinion” or “not relevant”

^a Respondents were asked to indicate the priority they believe faculty governance groups on their campus must give to each: 1=Very Low thru 5=Very High

Table 10A. Frequency of Faculty Concerns about Intercollegiate Athletics by Governance Involvement

Concerns ^a	University Governance Involvement			Intercollegiate Athletics Governance Involvement		
	None	Department, School, College	Institution Level	None	One Governance Role ^b	Multiple Roles ^c
Preferential Treatment for Student-Athletes	14 3.5%	28 3.3%	15 2.6%	51 3.2%	3 1.6%	2 3.1%
Lack of Support for Student-Athletes	1 .3%	17 2%	12 2.1%	23 1.5%	5 2.6%	2 3.1%
Time and Performance Demands on Student-Athletes	12 3%	36 4.3%	36 6.2%	73 4.6%	10 5.3%	3 4.6%
Exploitation of Student-Athletes	7 1.8%	17 2%	12 2.1%	29 1.8%	7 3.7%	
Student-Athletes' Educational Experiences and Academic Outcomes	12 3%	29 3.4%	22 3.8%	55 3.5%	7 3.7%	2 3.1%
Student-Athletes' Weak Academic Preparation and Performance in Class	7 1.8%	11 1.3%	5 .9%	20 1.3%	1 .5%	2 3.1%
Student-Athletes Poor Academic Attitudes and Dishonesty	5 1.3%	19 2.2%	8 1.4%	33 2.1%		
Student-Athletes' Criminal and Bad Behavior	5 1.3%	11 1.3%	5 .9%	20 1.3%	1 .5%	
Intercollegiate Athletics is Professional and Commercialized	18 4.5%	50 5.9%	27 4.7%	78 5%	14 7.4%	3 4.6%
Intercollegiate Athletics Costs Too Much and is Not Self-Supporting	41 10.3%	68 8%	72 12.4%	147 9.3%	25 13.2%	9 13.8%
Intercollegiate Athletics Subsidized at the Expense of Academics	34 8.5%	82 9.7%	42 7.3%	144 9.1%	12 6.3%	4 6.2%
Low Interest/Investment by Campus Community	6 1.5%	4 .5%	10 1.7%	15 1%	3 1.6%	2 3.1%
Athletics Overemphasized on Campus	16 4%	30 3.6%	21 3.6%	61 3.9%	5 2.6%	
Athletics Trumps Academics	30 7.5%	57 6.7%	37 6.4%	108 6.9%	12 6.3%	4 6.2%
Intercollegiate Athletics Structural Separation and Power on Campus	8 2%	20 2.4%	11 1.9%	29 1.8%	5 2.6%	5 7.7%
Faculty Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics is Problematic	2 .5%	16 1.9%	17 2.9%	24 1.5%	6 3.2%	5 7.7%

Table 10A. Frequency of Faculty Concerns about Intercollegiate Athletics by Governance Involvement (Continued)

Concerns ^a	University Governance Involvement			Intercollegiate Athletics Governance Involvement		
	None	Department, School, College	Institution Level	None	One Governance Role ^b	Multiple Roles ^c
Influence of External Groups on Internal Decisions	7 1.8%	11 1.3%	21 3.6%	29 1.8%	10 5.3%	
Athletic Department Culture and Practices	8 2%	19 2.2%	21 3.6%	44 2.8%	3 1.6%	2 3.1%
Negative Atmosphere Surrounds Athletic Events	3 .8%	7 .8%	7 1.2%	17 1.1%		
Inequitable Treatment of Athletes and Sports Teams	6 1.5%	15 1.8%	19 3.3%	31 2%	9 4.8%	
Impact of Title IX	2 .5%	5 .6%	1 .2%	8 .5%		
Public View of University Overemphasizes Importance of Intercollegiate Athletics	7 1.8%	9 1.1%	6 1%	19 1.2%	2 1.1%	2 3.1%
Athletic teams Perform Poorly	4 1%	6 .7%	4 .7%	13 .8%	1 .5%	
Football and Men's Basketball are Most Problematic on Campus	10 2.5%	22 2.6%	10 1.7%	40 2.5%	2 1.1%	
Problems Associated with Campus Mascots	3 .8%	10 1.2%	3 .5%	12 .8%	4 2.1%	
Intercollegiate Athletics are Inappropriate for Universities	7 1.8%	15 1.8%	3 .5%	24 1.5%		1 1.5%
Intercollegiate Athletics Not a Personal Priority		6 .7%	3 .5%	9 .6%		
No Concerns Identified	116 29.1%	202 23.9%	113 19.5%	385 24.4%	33 17.5%	14 21.5%
Other	7 1.8%	23 2.7%	16 2.8%	34 2.2%	9 4.8%	3 4.6%

Note: Percentages represent the proportion of university governance or intercollegiate athletic governance groups that had each concern.

^a Respondents were asked to indicate what most concerns them about intercollegiate athletics on their campuses. Concerns are response categories derived from open coding of faculty answers to an open-ended question.

^b The respondents currently serve or have served in one governance role for intercollegiate athletics (e.g., faculty athletics representative)

^c The respondents currently serve or have served in multiple governance roles for intercollegiate athletics (i.e., faculty athletics representative, campus athletics board, NCAA certification team)

Table 10B. Frequency of Faculty Concerns about Intercollegiate Athletics by Discipline

Concerns ^a	Discipline							
	Humanities	Kinesiology & Physical Education	Mathematics	Music	Natural Sciences	Professional Fields ^b	Social Sciences	Other
Preferential Treatment for Student-Athletes	9 3.2%	1 2.4%	1 1.2%	3 4.4%	6 2.4%	24 3.8%	7 2.5%	7 3.4%
Lack of Support for Student-Athletes	2 .7%			1 1.5%	1 .4%	13 2.1%	9 3.2%	3 1.4%
Time and Performance Demands on Student-Athletes	11 4%	1 2.4%	5 6%	1 1.5%	14 5.6%	27 4.3%	17 6%	10 4.8%
Exploitation of Student-Athletes	3 1.1%	1 2.4%			7 2.8%	12 1.9%	6 2.1%	7 3.4%
Student-Athletes' Educational Experiences and Academic Outcomes	9 3.2%	1 2.4%	1 1.2%	1 1.5%	7 2.8%	26 4.2%	14 4.9%	5 2.4%
Student-Athletes' Weak Academic Preparation and Performance in Class	6 2.2%	1 2.4%		1 1.5%	3 1.2%	4 .6%	5 1.8%	3 1.4%
Student-Athletes Poor Academic Attitudes and Dishonesty	3 1.1%	1 2.4%	3 3.6%	3 4.4%	5 2%	5 .8%	8 2.8%	5 2.4%
Student-Athletes' Criminal and Bad Behavior	5 1.8%				1 .4%	8 1.3%	5 1.8%	2 1%
Intercollegiate Athletics is Professional and Commercialized	17 6.1%	2 4.9%	6 7.1%	4 5.9%	8 3.2%	32 5.1%	13 4.6%	13 6.3%
Intercollegiate Athletics Costs Too Much and is Not Self-Supporting	25 9%	2 4.9%	8 9.5%	11 16.2%	27 10.8%	64 10.3%	20 7%	24 11.6%
Intercollegiate Athletics Subsidized at the Expense of Academics	36 13%	2 4.9%	8 9.5%	5 7.4%	36 14.4%	44 7.1%	14 4.9%	15 7.2%
Low Interest/Investment by Campus Community	3 1.1%	2 4.9%				15 2.4%		
Athletics Over-Emphasized on Campus	9 3.2%	2 4.9%	6 7.1%	3 4.4%	12 4.8%	24 3.8%	7 2.5%	5 2.4%
Athletics Trumps Academics	22 7.9%	1 2.4%	8 9.5%	5 7.4%	24 9.6%	31 5%	18 6.3%	15 7.2%
Intercollegiate Athletics Structural Separation and Power on Campus	7 2.5%	3 7.3%		2 2.9%	5 2%	7 1.1%	7 2.5%	8 3.9%
Faculty Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics is Problematic	7 2.5%			3 4.4%	1 .4%	17 2.7%	5 1.8%	2 1%

Table 10B. Frequency of Faculty Concerns about Intercollegiate Athletics by Discipline (Continued)

Concerns ^a	Discipline							
	Humanities	Kinesiology & Physical Education	Mathematics	Music	Natural Sciences	Professional Fields ^b	Social Sciences	Other
Influence of External Groups on Internal Decisions	4 1.4%	3 7.3%	1 1.2%	1 1.5%	7 2.8%	12 1.9%	8 2.8%	3 1.4%
Athletic Department Culture and Practices	12 4.3%	1 2.4%	2 2.4%	3 4.4%	6 2.4%	13 2.1%	7 2.5%	5 2.4%
Negative Atmosphere Surrounds Athletic Events			2 2.4%	1 1.5%	4 1.6%	6 1%	2 .7%	2 1%
Inequitable Treatment of Athletes and Sports Teams	7 2.5%	1 2.4%	2 2.4%		5 2%	8 1.3%	8 2.8%	9 4.3%
Impact of Title IX	1 .4%		1 1.2%		1 .4%	5 .8%		
Public View of University Overemphasizes Importance of Intercollegiate Athletics	4 1.4%		3 3.6%	1 1.5%	3 1.2%	7 1.1%	3 1.1%	2 1%
Athletic teams Perform Poorly					2 .8%	7 1.1%	3 1.1%	2 1%
Football and Men's Basketball are Most Problematic on Campus	8 2.9%	3 7.3%		2 2.9%	8 3.2%	10 1.6%	9 3.2%	2 1%
Problems Associated with Campus Mascots	6 2.2%	1 2.4%				5 .8%	1 .4%	3 1.4%
Intercollegiate Athletics are Inappropriate for Universities	7 2.5%	1 2.4%	6 7.1%		5 2%	2 .3%	1 .4%	3 1.4%
Intercollegiate Athletics Not a Personal Priority	1 .4%					5 .8%	1 .4%	2 1%
No Concerns Identified	46 16.6%	8 19.5%	19 22.6%	14 20.6%	51 20.4%	173 27.7%	82 28.9%	42 20.3%
Other	7 2.5%	3 7.3%	2 2.4%	3 4.4%	1 .4%	18 2.9%	4 1.4%	8 3.9%

Note: Percentages represent the proportion of university governance or intercollegiate athletic governance groups that had each concern.

^a Respondents were asked to indicate what most concerns them about intercollegiate athletics on their campuses

^b The professional fields include business, education, and engineering.

Table 10C. Frequency of Faculty Concerns about Intercollegiate Athletics by Academic Rank

Concerns ^a	Academic Rank			
	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Other
Preferential Treatment for Student-Athletes	30 3.4%	13 2.4	12 3.2%	1 2.1%
Lack of Support for Student-Athletes	12 1.4%	8 1.5%	8 2.1%	2 4.2%
Time and Performance Demands on Student-Athletes	43 4.9%	24 4.5%	17 4.6%	2 4.2%
Exploitation of Student-Athletes	17 2%	15 2.8%	3 .8%	
Student-Athletes' Educational Experiences and Academic Outcomes	33 3.8%	19 3.5%	11 2.9%	1 2.1%
Student-Athletes' Weak Academic Preparation and Performance in Class	10 1.1%	4 .7%	9 2.4%	
Student-Athletes' Poor Academic Attitudes and Dishonesty	13 1.5%	10 1.9%	10 2.7%	
Student-Athletes' Criminal and Bad Behavior	8 .9%	8 1.5%	4 1.1%	1 2.1%
Intercollegiate Athletics is Professional and Commercialized	50 5.7%	27 5%	17 4.6%	1 2.1%
Intercollegiate Athletics Costs Too Much and is Not Self-Supporting	105 12.1%	48 8.9%	25 6.7%	3 6.3%
Intercollegiate Athletics Subsidized at the Expense of Academics	77 8.9%	54 10%	27 7.2%	2 4.2%
Low Interest/Investment by Campus Community	10 1.1%	7 1.3%	2 .5%	1 2.1%
Athletics Overemphasized on Campus	29 3.3%	25 4.6%	11 2.9%	2 4.2%
Athletics Trumps Academics	61 7%	33 6.1%	26 7%	4 8.3%
Intercollegiate Athletics Structural Separation and Power on Campus	25 2.9%	10 1.9%	2 .5%	2 4.2%

^a Respondents were asked to indicate what most concerns them about intercollegiate athletics on their campuses

Table 10C. Frequency of Faculty Concerns about Intercollegiate Athletics by Academic Rank (Continued)

Concerns ^a	Academic Rank			
	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Other
Faculty Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics is Problematic	18 2.1%	10 1.9%	5 1.3%	1 2.1%
Influence of External Groups on Internal Decisions	22 2.5%	7 1.3%	7 1.9%	3 6.3%
Athletic Department Culture and Practices	21 2.4%	21 3.9%	7 1.9%	
Negative Atmosphere Surrounds Athletic Events	11 1.3%	1 .2%	3 .8%	2 4.2%
Inequitable Treatment of Athletes and Sports Teams	17 2%	12 2.2%	10 2.7%	2 4.2%
Impact of Title IX	2 .2%	4 .7%	1 .3%	1 2.1%
Public View of University Overemphasizes Importance of Intercollegiate Athletics	11 1.3%	8 1.5%	3 .8%	1 2.1%
Athletic teams Perform Poorly	5 .6%	5 .9%	4 1.1%	
Football and Men's Basketball are Most Problematic on Campus	20 2.3%	11 2%	11 2.9%	
Problems Associated with Campus Mascots	5 .6%	3 .6%	7 1.9%	1 2.1%
Intercollegiate Athletics are Inappropriate for Universities	11 1.3%	10 1.9%	2 .5%	2 4.2%
Intercollegiate Athletics Not a Personal Priority	4 .5%	2 .4%	3 .8%	
No Concerns Identified	179 20.6%	124 23%	118 31.6%	12 25%
Other	21 2.4%	16 3%	8 2.1%	1 2.1%

^a Respondents were asked to indicate what most concerns them about intercollegiate athletics on their campuses

Table 14. Lower Athletic/Lower Academic Institutional Characteristics.

	LL-1	LL-2	LL-3	LL-4	LL-5	LL-6	LL-7
Governance							
Institutional Control	Public	Public	Public	Public	Private	Public	Public
Land Grant Status	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Institution grants MD	no	No	No	No	No	No	No
Percent Faculty who are <u>not</u> on Tenure Track	67%	54%	45%	41%	41%	28%	44%
Academics							
AAUP status	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
ACT Composite 50th Percentile	21.0	19.0	23.0	20.0	26.5	21.5	23.0
Graduation Rate, bachelor degree within 6 years	39%	43%	46%	42%	61%	40%	58%
Full Time Undergraduate Enrollment	Less than 10,000	15,000-20,000	10,000-15,000	Less than 10,000	Less than 10,000	15,000-20,000	Less than 10,000
Ratio of Students to Faculty	19:1	21:1	19:1	19:1	11:1	21:1	15:1
Finance							
Institutional Core Expenses	Less than \$500 mil	\$500 mil-\$1 bil	Less than \$500 mil				
Athletics Expenses	Less than \$25 mil	Less than \$25 mil	\$25 to \$50 mil	Less than \$25 mil	Less than \$25 mil	\$25 to \$50 mil	Less than \$25 mil
Athletics							
Total Number of Intercollegiate Teams	12	15	14	14	14	12	13
Percent Undergraduates who are Student Athletes	6%	4%	4%	4%	15%	3%	6%
Football Graduation Rate	41%	44%	49%	48%	39%	42%	42%
Basketball Graduation Rate	25%	25%	45%	44%	23%	10%	27%
Total NCAA Team Championships	Less than 10	Greater than 10	Less than 10				
Total Men's Basketball Tournament Appearances	Less than 10	Less than 10	Less than 10	10 to 20	10 to 20	10 to 20	10 to 20
Total Football Bowl Appearances	Less than 10	11 to 20	Greater than 30	Less than 10	11 to 20	11 to 20	11 to 20
NCAA Major Infractions (2001-present)	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No
External Environment							
Professional Football or Basketball Team in State	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
Region of Country	Southeast	Far West	Southeast	Southwest	Southwest	Southwest	Rocky Mountains
Urbanicity	City: Small	City: Large	Town: Remote	City: Small	City: Large	City: Large	Town: Remote

Note. This table presents descriptive data collected from IPEDS, EADA, and the NCAA for each of the institutions included in the Lower Athletic/Lower Academic taxonomy group. Each column represents one institution in the group. The statistics are summarized to protect the identity of the individual institutions.

Table 15. Lower Athletic/Higher Academic Institutional Characteristics.

	LH-1	LH-2	LH-3	LH-4
Governance				
Institutional Control	Public	Public	Public	Public
Land Grant Status	No	No	No	No
Institution grants MD	No	Yes	No	No
Percent Faculty who are <u>not</u> on Tenure Track	53%	48%	45%	31%
Academics				
AAUP status	No	No	No	No
ACT Composite 50th Percentile	22.5	24.0	21.0	26.5
Graduation Rate, bachelor degree within 6 years	53%	48%	46%	80%
Full Time Undergraduate Enrollment	20,000-25,000	20,000-25,000	15,000-20,000	10,000-15,000
Ratio of Students to Faculty	19:1	19:1	18:1	18:1
Finance				
Institutional Core Expenses	Less than \$500 mil	\$500 mil-\$1 bil	Less than \$500 mil	Less than \$500 mil
Athletics Expenses	\$25 to \$50 million	Less than \$25 million	Less than \$25 million	Less than \$25 million
Athletics				
Total Number of Intercollegiate Teams	16	18	14	16
Percent Undergraduates who are Student Athletes	2%	2%	3%	4%
Football Graduation Rate	67%	61%	76%	57%
Basketball Graduation Rate	29%	38%	50%	53%
Total NCAA Team Championships	Less than 10	Less than 10	Less than 10	Less than 10
Total Men's Basketball Tournament Appearances	Less than 10	Less than 10	Less than 10	10 to 20
Total Football Bowl Appearances	Less than 10	Less than 10	Less than 10	Less than 10
NCAA Major Infractions (2001-present)	Yes	No	No	No
External Environment				
Professional Football or Basketball Team in State	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region of Country	Far West	Southeast	Great Lakes	Great Lakes
Urbanicity	City: Large	City: Large	Suburb: Large	Town: Fringe

Note. This table presents descriptive data collected from IPEDS, EADA, and the NCAA for each of the institutions included in the Lower Athletic/Higher Academic taxonomy group. Each column represents one institution in the group. The statistics are summarized to protect the identity of the individual institutions.

Table 16. Higher Athletic/Lower Academic Institutional Characteristics.

	HL-1	HL-2	HL-3	HL-4	HL-5
Governance					
Institutional Control	Public	Public	Public	Public	Public
Land Grant Status	No	No	No	Yes	No
Institution grants MD	No	No	Yes	No	No
Percent Faculty who are <u>not</u> on Tenure Track	32%	36%	53%	37%	47%
Academics					
AAUP status	No	No	No	No	No
ACT Composite 50th Percentile	24.0	23.0	25.0	26.5	23.5
Graduation Rate, bachelor degree within 6 years	63%	55%	66%	75%	43%
Full Time Undergraduate Enrollment	15,000-20,000	Greater than 25,000	Greater than 25,000	10,000-15,000	20,000-25,000
Ratio of Students to Faculty	19:1	23:1	21:1	15:1	19:1
Finance					
Institutional Core Expenses	Less than \$500 mil	\$500 mil-\$1 bil	\$500 mil-\$1 bil	Less than \$500 mil	Less than \$500 mil
Athletics Expenses	Greater than \$50 mil	\$25 to \$50 million	\$25 to \$50 million	\$25 to \$50 million	Less than \$25 mil
Athletics					
Total Number of Intercollegiate Teams	16	18	15	15	12
Percent Undergraduates who are Student Athletes	3%	2%	2%	5%	2%
Football Graduation Rate	46%	53%	42%	59%	49%
Basketball Graduation Rate	53%	22%	40%	15%	25%
Total NCAA Team Championships	Less than 10	Greater than 10	Less than 10	Less than 10	Less than 10
Total Men's Basketball Tournament Appearances	10 to 20	10 to 20	10 to 20	Less than 10	Less than 10
Total Football Bowl Appearances	Greater than 30	21 to 30	Greater than 30	21 to 30	Less than 10
NCAA Major Infractions (2001-present)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
External Environment					
Professional Football or Basketball Team in State	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region of Country	Southeast	Southwest	Southeast	Southeast	Southwest
Urbanicity	City: Midsize	City: Large	City: Midsize	Town: Fringe	City: Small

Note. This table presents descriptive data collected from IPEDS, EADA, and the NCAA for each of the institutions included in the Higher Athletic/Lower Academic taxonomy group. Each column represents one institution in the group. The statistics are summarized to protect the identity of the individual institutions.

Table 17. Higher Athletic/Higher Academic Institutional Characteristics.

	HH-1	HH-2	HH-3	HH-4	HH-5	HH-6	HH-7
Governance							
Institutional Control	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Public	Public
Land Grant Status	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Institution grants MD	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Percent Faculty who are not on Tenure Track	37%	36%	46%	45%	28%	62%	48%
Academics							
AAUP status	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ACT Composite 50th Percentile	28.5	32.0	25.0	26.5	23.5	25.5	28.0
Graduation Rate, bachelor degree within 6 years	83%	95%	63%	79%	55%	74%	77%
Full Time Undergraduate Enrollment	Greater than 25,000	Less than 10,000	15,000-20,000	10,000-15,000	20,000-25,000	20,000-25,000	Greater than 25,000
Ratio of Students to Faculty	11:1	13:1	19:1	11:1	20:1	11:1	15:1
Finance							
Institutional Core Expenses	Greater than \$1 bil	Less than \$500 mil	\$500 mil-\$1 bil	Less than \$500 mil	Less than \$500 mil	Greater than \$1 bil	Greater than \$1 bil
Athletics Expenses	\$25 to \$50 mil	Greater than \$50 mil	Greater than \$50 mil	\$25 to \$50 mil	Greater than \$50 mil	Greater than \$50 mil	Greater than \$50 mil
Athletics							
Total Number of Intercollegiate Teams	17	22	19	17	13	19	20
Percent Undergraduates who are Student Athletes	2%	14%	4%	5%	2%	3%	4%
Football Graduation Rate	53%	84%	75%	65%	63%	59%	51%
Basketball Graduation Rate	64%	53%	30%	53%	38%	63%	60%
Total NCAA Team Championships	Greater than 10	Greater than 10	Greater than 10	Greater than 10	Less than 10	Less than 10	Greater than 10
Total Men's Basketball Tournament Appearances	Greater than 20	Greater than 20	Less than 10	Greater than 20	10 to 20	10 to 20	10 to 20
Total Football Bowl Appearances	10 to 20	21 to 30	Greater than 30	21 to 30	21 to 30	21 to 30	10 to 20
NCAA Major Infractions (2001-present)	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
External Environment							
Professional Football or Basketball Team in State	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region of Country	Great Lakes	Great Lakes	Plains	Mid East	Southwest	Far West	Great Lakes
Urbanicity	City: Small	City: Midsize	City: Midsize	City: Midsize	City: Midsize	City: Large	City: Midsize

Note. This table presents descriptive data collected from IPEDS, EADA, and the NCAA for each of the institutions included in the Higher Athletic/Higher Academic taxonomy group. Each column represents one institution in the group. The statistics are summarized to protect the identity of the individual institutions.

Table 18. Faculty Concerns about Intercollegiate Athletics by Taxonomy Group

Faculty Concerns ^a	Higher Athletic -- Higher Academic	Lower Athletic -- Higher Academic	Higher Athletic -- Lower Academic	Lower Athletic -- Lower Academic
<i>Treatment of Student-Athletes</i>				
Preferential Treatment for Student-Athletes	3.5%	2.5%	3.2%	2.7%
Lack of Support for Student-Athletes	0.9%	1.6%	2.3%	2.2%
Time and Performance Demands on Student-Athletes	6.4%	4.5%	2.3%	4.1%
Exploitation of Student-Athletes	1.7%	3.0%	0.4%	2.0%
<i>Student-Athletes' Educational Experience & Outcomes</i>				
Student-Athletes' Educational Experiences and Academic Outcomes	4.1%	4.2%	1.6%	3.5%
<i>Attributes of Student-Athletes</i>				
Student-Athletes' Weak Academic Preparation and Performance in Class	1.0%	1.6%	1.2%	1.2%
Student-Athletes Poor Academic Attitudes and Dishonesty	3.6%	1.6%	1.6%	0.9%
Student-Athletes' Criminal and Bad Behavior	1.9%	0.4%	1.2%	0.2%
<i>Commercialization and Professionalization</i>				
Intercollegiate Athletics is Professional and Commercialized	7.7%	2.0%	4.8%	2.7%
<i>Intercollegiate Athletics Finances/Facilities</i>				
Intercollegiate Athletics Costs Too Much and is Not Self-Supporting	7.3%	13.1%	6.9%	15.5%
Intercollegiate Athletics Subsidized at the Expense of Academics	7.2%	12.3%	5.3%	13.1%
<i>Campus Climate</i>				
Low Interest/Investment by Campus Community	0%	5.3%	0.5%	1.2%
Athletics Overemphasized on Campus	3.5%	2.0%	6.2%	2.4%
Athletics Trumps Academics	6.8%	7.6%	3.7%	7.3%
<i>Oversight/Governance</i>				
Intercollegiate Athletics Structural Separation and Power on Campus	2.3%	2.0%	2.8%	1.2%
Faculty Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics is Problematic	2.1%	2.5%	1.4%	1.7%
Influence of External Groups on Internal Decisions	1.9%	3.7%	1.2%	1.6%

^a Respondents were asked in an open-ended item to indicate what most concerns them about intercollegiate athletics on their campus

Table 18. Faculty Concerns about Intercollegiate Athletics by Taxonomy Group (Continued)

Faculty Concerns ^a	Higher Athletic -- Higher Academic	Lower Athletic -- Higher Academic	Higher Athletic - - Lower Academic	Lower Athletic -- Lower Academic
<i>Athletic Department/Athletics Events</i>				
Athletic Department Culture and Practices	2.5%	2.0%	1.8%	4.1%
Negative Atmosphere Surrounds Athletic Events	1.2%	0%	1.2%	0.7%
<i>Inequities in Intercollegiate Athletics</i>				
Inequitable Treatment of Athletes and Sports Teams	2.3%	2.0%	2.1%	2.4%
Impact of Title IX	0.4%	1.2%	0.5%	0%
<i>Public View of University</i>				
Public View of University Overemphasizes Importance of Intercollegiate Athletics	2.1%	0%	1.4%	0.2%
<i>Athletic Teams Perform Poorly</i>				
Athletic teams Perform Poorly	0.4%	2.9%	0.5%	0.5%
<i>Football and Men's Basketball</i>				
Football and Men's Basketball are Most Problematic on Campus	2.8%	1.2%	2.1%	2.2%
<i>Mascot Problems</i>				
Problems Associated with Campus Mascots	1.5%	0%	0%	1.2%
<i>Intercollegiate Athletics Do Not Belong in Universities</i>				
Intercollegiate Athletics are Inappropriate for Universities	1.5%	1.2%	1.8%	1.0%
<i>Intercollegiate Athletics Not a Personal Priority</i>				
Intercollegiate Athletics Not a Personal Priority	0.5%	0.2%	0%	0.8%
<i>No Concerns to Report</i>				
No Concerns Identified	24.0%	27.9%	26.1%	18.2%
<i>Other</i>				
Other	1.3%	3.3%	3.7%	2.9%

^a Respondents were asked in an open-ended item to indicate what most concerns them about intercollegiate athletics on their campus

Table 19. Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores within the Taxonomy for Governance Items

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	Higher Athletic -- Higher Academic	Lower Athletic -- Higher Academic	Higher Athletic -- Lower Academic	Lower Athletic -- Lower Academic
BA-G1: Campus Consensus Exists Regarding Intercollegiate Athletics	(1) My president and faculty agree on matters related to intercollegiate athletics	M=2.54	M=2.25	M=2.39	M=2.10
BA-G2: Faculty Interested in Intercollegiate Athletics Issues & Concerned about Student-Athletes' Education	(1) Faculty on my campus are interested in governance issues related to intercollegiate athletics	M=2.65	M=2.58	M=2.61	M=2.72
	(2) The primary concern of faculty governance of intercollegiate athletics on my campus is the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences	M=3.02	M=2.98	M=3.05	M=2.94
BA-G3: Administrators Consult Faculty on Intercollegiate Athletics Decisions	(1) During the budget process for my university's athletic department, faculty governance committees advise administrators	M=1.67	M=1.69	M=1.36	M=1.36
	(2) Institution-level decisions about intercollegiate athletics are typically made by administrators who consult with faculty governance groups	M=2.20	M=2.07	M=1.94	M=1.84
BA-G4: Intercollegiate Athletics is Auxiliary Enterprise with Weak Faculty Oversight	(1) Organizationally, intercollegiate athletics is an auxiliary service (e.g., campus bookstore) that generates its own revenue and is accountable to university administrators, not faculty	M=3.25	M=2.98	M=3.36	M=3.23
	(2) Central administrators and athletics administrators on my campus are not forthcoming with information that faculty oversight committees need to ensure the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences ^b	M=2.55	M=2.57	M=2.70	M=2.96
	(3) Faculty roles associated with oversight of intercollegiate athletics are ill defined on my campus	M=2.45	M=2.74	M=2.63	M=2.94
	(4) The work lives of athletic department and academic program personnel rarely intersect on this campus	M=3.01	M=2.81	M=3.01	M=2.97

Note: The survey item reads, "Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus.

Means do not include respondents who answered "don't know" or "not relevant".

^a Scale: 1 = Not At All thru 4 = Very Much

^b Item is reverse coded for directional consistency with the others in this scale. Table means reflect the reverse coding. Original item read "Central administrators and athletics administrators on my campus are forthcoming with information that faculty oversight committees need to ensure the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences"

Table 19. Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores within the Taxonomy for Governance Items (Continued)

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	Higher Athletic -- Higher Academic	Lower Athletic -- Higher Academic	Higher Athletic -- Lower Academic	Lower Athletic -- Lower Academic
BA-G5: Intercollegiate Athletics Power Erodes Faculty Governance & Threatens University Mission	(1) Athletics boosters who put winning records ahead of academic standards have influence with my president	M=2.46	M=2.33	M=2.69	M=2.75
	(2) Decisions about intercollegiate athletics on my campus are driven by the priorities of an entertainment industry that is not invested in my university's academic mission	M=2.74	M=2.41	M=2.82	M=2.85
	(3) Compared with deans of schools/colleges, my athletic director has more influence with the president of my university	M=2.37	M=2.19	M=2.58	M=2.74
	(4) Central administrators and athletics administrators use their power to foreclose discussions of intercollegiate athletics that are not consistent with their agendas	M=2.30	M=2.23	M=2.46	M=2.77
	(5) Faculty appointed to athletics governance committees are those most likely to acquiesce to athletics administrators on my campus	M=2.23	M=2.17	M=2.14	M=2.56
	(6) The athletic department can use its power with influential politicians, business leaders, and alumni to get what it wants on my campus	M=2.87	M=2.45	M=2.99	M=2.91
BA-G6: Athletic Department Runs Clean Program	(1) Athletic department perks (e.g., trips to bowl games) to faculty who judge the academic eligibility of student-athletes do not create a potential conflict of interest situation ^b	M=2.24	M=2.56	M=2.31	M=2.32
	(2) Over the past 5 years, my athletic department has run a "clean" program (e.g., no abuses, no major violations)	M=3.00	M=3.30	M=2.99	M=2.98

Note: The survey item reads, "Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus.

Means do not include respondents who answered "don't know" or "not relevant".

^a Scale: 1 = Not At All thru 4 = Very Much

^b Item is reverse coded for directional consistency with the others in this scale. Table means reflect the reverse coding. Original item read "Athletic department perks (e.g., trips to bowl games) to faculty who judge the academic eligibility of student-athletes create a potential conflict of interest situation"

Table 20. Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores within the Taxonomy for Academic Items

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	Higher Athletic -- Higher Academic	Lower Athletic -- Higher Academic	Higher Athletic -- Lower Academic	Lower Athletic -- Lower Academic
BA-A1: Special Admission of Academically Underprepared Student-Athletes Involves Coaches Not Faculty	(1) High school athletes who do not meet regular university academic standards are admitted through a special admissions process that lacks faculty input	M=2.58	M=2.79	M=2.45	M=2.70
	(2) Coaches are involved in admissions decisions regarding recruits who do not meet regular university academic standards	M=2.67	M=2.83	M=2.72	M=2.85
	(3) A staff of specialized admissions officers makes decisions about undergraduate admissions with minimal faculty input	M=3.37	M=3.43	M=3.27	M=3.32
BA-A2: Academic Advising of Student-Athletes is Separate	(1) Academic advising for student-athletes is separate from academic advising for undergraduates who are not student-athletes	M=3.22	M=3.17	M=3.25	M=3.01
BA-A3: Student-Athletes' Academic Performance is Weak	(1) Missed class time due to athletic obligations detracts from the quality of student-athletes' learning in my classes	M=2.54	M=2.50	M=2.55	M=2.81
	(2) Student-athletes are not prepared academically to keep pace with other students in my class	M=1.83	M=1.77	M=1.99	M=2.13
	(3) Student-athletes represent a disproportionate number of known cheaters in my classes	M=1.24	M=1.23	M=1.14	M=1.37
	(4) Individuals try to use their status as student-athletes to acquire special treatment from my teaching assistants (e.g., better grades)	M=1.32	M=1.39	M=1.42	M=1.50
BA-A4: Student-Athletes are Burdened and Miss Class	(1) Student-athletes are more burdened than other students on my campus by demands on their out-of-class time	M=3.57	M=3.38	M=3.51	M=3.43
	(2) Compared to student-athletes, other students do not have worse attendance records in my classes ^b	M=3.24	M=3.17	M=3.09	M=3.17

Note: The survey item reads, "Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus.

Means do not include respondents who answered "don't know" or "not relevant".

^a Scale: 1 = Not At All thru 4 = Very Much

^b Item is reverse coded for directional consistency with the others in this scale. Table means reflect the reverse coding. Original item read, "Compared to student-athletes, other students have worse attendance records in my classes"

Table 20. Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores within the Taxonomy for Academic Items (Continued)

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	Higher Athletic -- Higher Academic	Lower Athletic -- Higher Academic	Higher Athletic -- Lower Academic	Lower Athletic -- Lower Academic
BA-A5: Student-Athletes are Academically Motivated and Engaged	(1) In my experience, student-athletes in my academic department are motivated to earn their degrees	M=3.14	M=3.15	M=2.88	M=2.86
	(2) Student-athletes actively participate in student activities (e.g., research opportunities, student government, social events) in my school/college	M=2.00	M=2.12	M=1.88	M=1.90
BA-A6: Faculty Hold Negative Stereotypes	(1) Faculty in my academic department stereotype student-athletes negatively, dismissing them as serious and capable students	M=1.60	M=1.58	M=1.76	M=1.83
BA-A7: Intercollegiate Athletics Success Requires Compromises in Academic Standards	(1) In order for my university's football and basketball teams to be competitive, compromises in academic standards must be made	M=2.22	M=2.14	M=2.26	M=2.23
	(2) Sanctions for academic misconduct are less severe for student-athletes than those applied to non-student-athletes in my school/college	M=1.74	M=1.65	M=1.74	M=1.94
	(3) Tutors hired by the athletic department complete assignments for some student-athletes in my classes	M=1.60	M=1.77	M=1.74	M=2.05
	(4) A faculty committee on my campus does not regularly monitor the educational soundness of student-athletes' programs of study ^b	M=2.26	M=2.52	M=2.24	M=2.61

Note: The survey item reads, "Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus.

Means do not include respondents who answered "don't know" or "not relevant".

^a Scale: 1 = Not At All thru 4 = Very Much

^b Item is reverse coded for directional consistency with the others in this scale. Table means reflect the reverse coding. Original item read "A faculty committee on my campus regularly monitors the educational soundness of student-athletes' programs of study"

Table 21. Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores within the Taxonomy for Finance Items

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	Higher Athletic -- Higher Academic	Lower Athletic -- Higher Academic	Higher Athletic -- Lower Academic	Lower Athletic -- Lower Academic
BA-F1: Intercollegiate Athletics Subsidized by General Fund	(1) Intercollegiate athletics is subsidized by my university's general fund.	M=1.88	M=3.23	M=1.94	M=3.19
BA-F2: Intercollegiate Athletics Gives Funds to University	(1) The athletic department on my campus contributes funds to support academic resources (e.g., libraries).	M=2.08	M=1.25	M=2.22	M=1.24
BA-F3: Intercollegiate Athletics Gets Higher Funding Priority than Athletics	(1) Construction of state of the art athletic facilities is given higher priority than capital projects needed by my academic department to keep pace with research in my field/discipline.	M=2.86	M=2.37	M=2.57	M=2.88
	(2) Salaries paid to head football and basketball coaches on my campus are excessive.	M=3.30	M=2.80	M=3.35	M=3.33
BA-F4: Athletics Scholarships Fairly Compensate Football and Basketball Players	(1) Athletic scholarships to football and basketball players fairly compensate them for their service to the university.	M=2.35	M=2.51	M=2.35	M=2.45
BA-F5: Athletic Team Success Attracts Donations to Non-Athletic Initiatives	(1) The success of intercollegiate athletics fosters alumni and corporate giving to campus initiatives outside of intercollegiate athletics.	M=2.77	M=2.51	M=2.88	M=2.53
BA-F6: Intercollegiate Athletics: Commercialization is Eroding Amateurism	(1) Contracts with clothing and equipment companies (e.g., Nike, adidas) have eroded the ideals of amateur athletics on my campus	M=2.63	M=2.11	M=2.48	M=2.40

Note: The survey item reads, "Please indicate the extent to which you think the statement applies to your campus. Means do not include respondents who answered "don't know" or "not relevant".

^a Scale: 1 = Not At All thru 4 = Very Much

Table 22. Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores within the Taxonomy for Governance Items

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	Higher Athletic -- Higher Academic	Lower Athletic -- Higher Academic	Higher Athletic -- Lower Academic	Lower Athletic -- Lower Academic
SA-G1: Faculty Governance Priorities Emphasize Student-Athletes' Education	(1) Attention given to the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences by faculty governance groups on my campus	M=2.67	M=2.54	M=2.55	M=2.38
SA-G2: Level of Collaboration and Impact of Faculty Input	(1) Level of cooperation between the athletic department and faculty groups responsible for ensuring that academic standards are upheld on my campus	M=2.56	M=2.50	M=2.52	M=2.25
	(2) Types of roles faculty play in the governance of intercollegiate athletics on my campus	M=2.43	M=2.40	M=2.33	M=2.04
	(3) Range of faculty perspectives considered by central administrators when institutional positions on intercollegiate athletics are formulated	M=2.18	M=1.97	M=2.06	M=1.82
	(4) Practice of giving perks (e.g., trips to bowl games) to faculty and administrators who serve on committees that oversee intercollegiate athletics on my campus	M=2.16	M=2.29	M=2.21	M=2.06
	(5) Willingness of faculty who serve on governance groups to take positions at odds with those advocated by athletics administrators on my campus	M=2.69	M=2.70	M=2.60	M=2.48
	(6) Extent to which faculty input informs administrative decisions related to intercollegiate athletics	M=2.25	M=2.16	M=2.20	M=1.95
SA-G3: Institutional Leaders' Oversight of intercollegiate Athletics	(1) Institutional control over intercollegiate athletics on my campus	M=2.54	M=2.55	M=2.57	M=2.29
	(2) President's oversight of intercollegiate athletics on my campus	M=2.66	M=2.56	M=2.72	M=2.38
	(3) The way campus administrators handle external constituencies (e.g., boosters, media, vendors) with vested interests in intercollegiate athletics on my campus	M=2.46	M=2.55	M=2.43	M=2.36

Note: The survey item reads, "Please indicate how personally satisfied you are with each of the following on your campus."

Means do not include respondents who answered "no opinion" or "not relevant"

^a Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied thru 4 = Very Satisfied

Table 23. Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores within the Taxonomy for Academic Items

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	Higher Athletic -- Higher Academic	Lower Athletic -- Higher Academic	Higher Athletic -- Lower Academic	Lower Athletic -- Lower Academic
SA-A1: Coaches' Admissions- Related Roles and Academic Standards Applied	(1) Role coaches play in the undergraduate admissions process	M=2.53	M=2.35	M=2.48	M=2.35
	(2) Academic standards on my campus that guide admissions decisions for high school athletes in football and basketball	M=2.44	M=2.53	M=2.44	M=2.20
SA-A2: Standards of Athletic Department Academic Support Staff	(1) Academic standards of advisors who have responsibility for student-athletes on my campus	M=2.81	M=2.69	M=2.71	M=2.54
	(2) Academic standards of individuals who tutor student-athletes on my campus	M=2.87	M=2.75	M=2.72	M=2.43
	(3) Efforts of faculty in my academic department to work with student-athletes and ensure the quality of their educational experiences	M=3.04	M=2.96	M=2.98	M=3.02
SA-A3: Student-Athletes' Academic Performance and Integrity in Class	(1) Academic performance of student-athletes in sports other than football and basketball in my classes	M=3.11	M=3.00	M=3.07	M=3.06
	(2) Level of responsibility student-athletes take to complete assignments and acquire course materials for sessions they miss in my classes	M=2.95	M=2.89	M=2.86	M=2.77
	(3) Academic performance of football and basketball student-athletes in my classes	M=2.55	M=2.60	M=2.40	M=2.32
	(4) Academic integrity of student-athletes in my classes	M=2.94	M=2.86	M=2.88	M=2.80

Note: The survey item reads, "Please indicate how personally satisfied you are with each of the following on your campus."

Means do not include respondents who answered "no opinion" or "not relevant"

^a Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied thru 4 = Very Satisfied

Table 24. Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics – Mean Scores within the Taxonomy for Finance Items

Index	Individual Index Item ^a	Higher Athletic -- Higher Academic	Lower Athletic -- Higher Academic	Higher Athletic -- Lower Academic	Lower Athletic -- Lower Academic
SA-F1: Intercollegiate Athletics Compliance with Title IX	(1) My athletic department's compliance with Title IX (e.g., equitable participation opportunities, financial aid, and treatment of female and male student-athletes)	M=3.07	M=2.91	M=2.96	M=2.78
SA-F2: Use of General Funds to Subsidize Intercollegiate Athletics	(1) The use of general funds to subsidize intercollegiate athletics on my campus	M=2.19	M=2.02	M=2.29	M=1.79
SA-F3: Awarding Athletic Scholarships	(1) The practice of awarding scholarships to individuals based on their athletic abilities and performance	M=2.58	M=2.59	M=2.67	M=2.38
SA-F4: Balance between Commercialization and Amateurism	(1) The balance struck on campus between the commercialization of intercollegiate athletics and the ideals of amateur athletics	M=2.32	M=2.64	M=2.29	M=2.34

Note: The survey item reads, "Please indicate how personally satisfied you are with each of the following on your campus."
Means do not include respondents who answered "no opinion" or "not relevant"

^a Scale: 1 = Very Dissatisfied thru 4 = Very Satisfied

Table 25. Frequency of Responses for Total Sample to Follow-up Question from 1992 Harris Poll Survey: Emphasis Given to Importance of Intercollegiate Athletics

	Too Much	Too Little	About Right	Not Sure
Do you feel that there is too much, too little or about the right amount of emphasis given to the importance of intercollegiate athletics <u>at most colleges and universities</u>	1214 (58.6%)	13 (.6%)	729 (35.2%)	89 (4.3%)
Do you feel that there is too much, too little or about the right amount of emphasis given to the importance of intercollegiate athletics <u>at institutions with big time programs</u>	1690 (81.6%)	15 (.7%)	291 (14.1%)	46 (2.2%)
Do you feel that there is too much, too little or about the right amount of emphasis given to the importance of intercollegiate athletics <u>at your own institution</u>	1118 (54.0%)	48 (2.3%)	802 (38.7%)	67 (3.2%)

Table 26. Frequency of Responses for Total Sample to Follow-up Question from 1992 Harris Poll Survey: Opinion of Intercollegiate Athletics

Which of the following statements comes closest to your opinion about college athletics?	Frequency
The athletic programs at most universities with big time sports are out of control	1105 (53.4%)
Only relatively few universities, the so-called bad apples, make it seem that all college athletics are out of control	694 (33.5%)
Not Sure	234 (11.3%)

Table 27. Frequency of Responses for Total Sample to Follow-up Question from 1992 Harris Poll Survey: Primary Goal of Intercollegiate Athletics

	Making Alumni Happy	Getting University Favorable Attention	Underwriting Non-Revenue Athletic Programs	Making Sure Student-Athletes Get an Education	Not Sure
If you had to choose, which one of the following would you say <u>is</u> the primary goal of most big-time athletic programs?	672 (32.4%)	1047 (50.6%)	107 (5.2%)	34 (1.6%)	172 (8.3%)
If you had to choose, which one of the following would you say <u>should be</u> the primary consideration of most big-time athletic program?	35 (1.7%)	323 (15.6%)	181 (8.7%)	1273 (61.5%)	207 (10.0%)

Appendix C: Figures

Figure 1. Individual Items Comprising the Beliefs and Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics Indices

Beliefs & Perceptions – Governance Aspects

BA-G1 Campus Consensus Exists Regarding

Intercollegiate Athletics

- My president and faculty agree on matters related to intercollegiate athletics (Q6d)

BA-G2 Faculty Interested in Intercollegiate Athletics Issues & Concerned About Student-Athletes' Education

- Faculty on my campus are interested in governance issues related to intercollegiate athletics (Q6e)

- The primary concern of faculty governance of intercollegiate athletics on my campus is the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences (Q6f)

BA-G3 Administrators Consult Faculty on Intercollegiate Athletics Decisions

- During the budget process for my university's athletic department, faculty governance committees advise administrators (Q7d)

- Institution-level decisions about intercollegiate athletics are typically made by administrators who consult with faculty governance groups (Q7b)

BA-G4 Intercollegiate Athletics is Auxiliary Enterprise with Weak Faculty Oversight

- Organizationally, intercollegiate campus bookstore) that generates its own revenue and is accountable to university administrators, not faculty (Q7f)

- Central administrators and athletics administrators on my campus are forthcoming with information that faculty oversight committees need to ensure the quality of student-athletes' educational experiences (Q7g)

- Faculty roles associated with oversight of intercollegiate athletics are ill defined on my campus (Q7h)

- The work lives of athletic department and academic personnel rarely intersect on this campus (Q2i)

BA-G5 Intercollegiate Athletics Power Erode

Faculty Governance & Threatens University Mission

- Athletics boosters who put winning sports records ahead of academic standards have influence with my president (Q8b)

- Decisions about intercollegiate athletics on my campus are driven by the priorities of an entertainment industry that is not invested in my university's academic mission (Q8c)

- Compared with deans of schools/colleges, my athletic director has more influence with the president of my university (8d)

- Faculty appointed to athletics governance committees are those most likely to acquiesce to athletics administrators on my campus (Q8f)

- The athletic department can use its power with influential politicians, business leaders and alumni to get what it wants on campus (Q8a)

- Central administrators and athletics administrators use their power to foreclose discussions of intercollegiate athletics that are not consistent with their agendas (Q8e)

BA-G6 Athletic Department Runs Clean Program

- Athletic department perks (e.g., trips to bowl games) to faculty who judge the academic eligibility of student-athletes create a potential conflict of interest situation (Q7i)

- Over the past 5 years, my athletic department has run a "clean" program (e.g., no abuses, no major violations) (Q7e)

Figure 1 (cont.)

Beliefs & Perceptions – Academic Aspects

BA-A1 Special Admissions of Academically Under-prepared Student-Athletes Involves Coaches Not Faculty

- High school athletes who do not meet regular university academic standards are admitted through a special admissions process that lacks faculty input (Q3f)
- Coaches are involved in admissions decisions regarding recruits who do not meet regular university academic standards (Q3g)
- A specialized admissions staff makes decisions about undergraduate admissions with minimal faculty input (Q3d)

BA-A2 Academic Advising of Student Athletes Is Separate

- Academic advising for student-athletes is separate from academic advising for undergraduates who are not student-athletes (Q3i)

BA-A3 Student-Athletes' Academic Performance is Weak

- Missed class time due to athletic obligations detracts from the quality of student-athletes' learning in my classes (Q4d)
- Student-athletes are not prepared academically to keep pace with other students in my classes (Q4e)
- Student-athletes represent a disproportionate number of known cheaters in my classes (Q4f)
- Individuals try to use their status as student-athletes to acquire special treatment from my teaching assistants (e.g., better grades) (Q4g)

BA-A4 Student-Athletes Are Burdened and Miss Class

- Student-athletes are more burdened than other students on my campus by demands on their out-of-class time (Q4b)
- Compared to student-athletes, other students have worse attendance records in my classes (Q4c)

BA-A5 Student-Athletes Are Motivated and Engaged

- In my experience, student-athletes in my academic department are motivated to earn their degrees (Q4a)
- Student-athletes actively participate in student activities (e.g., research opportunities, student government, social events) in my school/college (Q2h)

BA-A6 Faculty Hold Negative Stereotypes

- Faculty in my academic department stereotype student-athletes negatively, dismissing them as serious and capable students (Q4h)

BA-A7 Intercollegiate Athletics Success Requires Compromises in Academic Standards

- In order for my university's football and basketball teams to be competitive, compromises in academic standards must be made (Q5d)
- Sanctions for academic misconduct are less severe for student-athletes than those applied to non-student-athletes in my school/college (Q5e)
- Tutors hired by the athletic department complete assignments for some student-athletes in my classes (Q5g)
- A faculty committee on my campus regularly monitors the educational soundness of student-athletes' programs of study (Q5b)

Figure 1 (cont.)

Beliefs & Perceptions – Financial Aspects

BA-F1 Intercollegiate Athletics Subsidized by General Fund

•Intercollegiate athletics is subsidized by my university's general fund (Q9c)

BA-F2 Intercollegiate Athletics Gives Funds To University

•The athletic department on my campus contributes funds to support academic resources (e.g., libraries) (Q9d)

BA-F3 Intercollegiate Athletics Gets Higher Funding Priority Than Academics

•Construction of state of the art athletic facilities is given higher priority than capital projects needed by my academic department to keep pace with research in my field/ discipline (Q9e)

•Salaries paid to head football and basketball coaches on my campus are excessive (Q9f)

BA-F4 Athletics Scholarships Fairly Compensate Football and Basketball Players

•Athletic scholarships to football and basketball players fairly compensate them for their service to the university (Q9g)

BA-F5 Athletic Team Success Attracts Donations to Non-Athletic Initiatives University Mission

•The success of intercollegiate athletics fosters alumni and corporate giving to campus initiatives outside of intercollegiate athletics (Q9h)

BA-F6 Intercollegiate Athletics: Commercialization is Eroding Amateurism

•Contracts with clothing and equipment companies (e.g., Nike, adidas) have eroded the ideals of amateur athletics on my campus (Q9i)

Figure 2. Individual Items Comprising the Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics Indices

Satisfaction with Governance Aspects

***SA-G1 Intercollegiate Athletics:
Governance Policies Emphasize
Student-Athletes' Educational Experiences***

- Attention to quality of student-athletes' educational experiences by faculty governance groups (Q12b)

***SA-G2 Intercollegiate Athletics:
Collaborative Decision-Making***

- Level of cooperation between the athletic department and faculty groups responsible for ensuring that academic standards are upheld (Q12a)

- Types of roles faculty play in the governance of intercollegiate athletics on my campus (Q12c)

- Range of faculty perspectives considered by campus administrators when institutional positions on intercollegiate athletics are formulated (Q12d)

- Practice of giving perks to faculty and administrators who serve on committees that oversee athletics (Q12e)

- Willingness of faculty who serve on governance groups to take positions at odds with those advocated by athletics administration on my campus (Q13c)

- Extent to which faculty input informs administrative decisions related to intercollegiate athletics (Q13f)

***SA-G3 Intercollegiate Athletics:
Institutional Leaders' Oversight***

- Institutional control over intercollegiate athletics on my campus (Q13b)

- President's oversight of intercollegiate athletics on my campus (Q13c)

- The way campus administrators handle external constituencies (e.g., boosters, media, vendors) with vested interests in intercollegiate athletics on my campus (Q13d)

Figure 2 (cont.)

Satisfaction with Academic Aspects

SA-A1 Admissions Role of Coaches and Academic Standards Applied

- Role coaches play in the undergraduate admissions process (Q10c)

- Academic standards on my campus that guide admissions decisions for high school athletes in football and basketball (Q10d)

SA-A2 Standards of Athletic Department Academic Support Staff

- Academic standards of advisors who have responsibility for student-athletes on my campus (Q10g)

- Academic standards of individuals who tutor student-athletes on my campus (Q10h)

- Efforts of faculty in my academic department to work with student-athletes and ensure the quality of their educational experiences (Q11h)

SA-A3 Student-Athletes' Academic Performance and Integrity in Class

- Academic performance of student-athletes in sports other than football and basketball in my classes (Q11f)

- Level of responsibility of student-athletes take to complete assignments and acquire course materials for sessions they miss in my classes (Q11g)

- Academic performance of football and basketball student-athletes in my classes (Q11e)

- Academic performance of student-athletes in sports, other than football and basketball, in my classes (Q11c)

- Academic integrity of student-athletes in my classes (Q11b)

Satisfaction with Financial Aspects

SA-F1 Intercollegiate Athletics Compliance with Title IX

- My athletic department's compliance with Title IX (e.g., equitable participation opportunities, financial aid, and treatment of female and male student-athletes) (Q14f)

SA-F2 General Fund Subsidies to Intercollegiate Athletics

- The use of general funds to subsidize intercollegiate athletics on my campus (Q14d)

SA-F3 Awarding Athletic Scholarships

- The practice of awarding scholarships to individuals based on their athletic abilities and performance (Q14e)

SA-F4 Balance Between Commercialization and Amateurism

- The balance struck on my campus between the commercialization of intercollegiate athletics and the ideals of amateur athletics (Q14g)

Figure 3. Individual Items Comprising the Beliefs and Perceptions of General Campus Climate Indices

Beliefs and Perceptions - Governance Aspects

General Campus Climate:

Shared Governance Is Valued

- Shared governance between administrators and faculty is highly valued by administrators on this campus (Q6a)
- Shared governance between administrators and faculty is highly valued by faculty on this campus (Q6b)
- Service to this institution is rewarded in faculty personnel decisions (e.g., salary, promotion) (Q6c)

Faculty Governance Committees

Are Involved In Institutional Decisions About Academic Matters

- Institution-level decisions about academic matters are typically made by administrators who consult with faculty governance groups (Q7a)
- During the budget process for schools/colleges, faculty governance committees advise administrators (Q7c)

Beliefs and Perceptions - Academic Aspects

Undergraduate Applications Increased - Helped by Intercollegiate Athletics Visibility

- The number of undergraduate applicants to my university has increased steadily over the last five years (Q3a)
- University visibility achieved through intercollegiate athletics increases applications for undergraduate admissions to my university (Q3b)
- University visibility achieved through intercollegiate athletics increases the quality of applicants for undergraduate admissions to my university (Q3c)

Faculty & Academic Administrators Hold Same Standards & Monitor Quality of Undergraduate Study

- A faculty committee in my school/college regularly monitors the educational soundness of our undergraduate majors (Q5a)

Faculty Involved in Formal Advising Of Undergraduates

- Faculty are involved in formal advising of undergraduate students (Q3h)

General Campus Context: Academic Integrity

- Academic administrators, faculty and professional staff (e.g., admissions officers) share a common understanding of my university's academic standards (Q5c)
- Faculty use their authority to question courses in my school/college that lack academic integrity, but fulfill undergraduate students' needs to improve their GPAs (Q5f)

Beliefs and Perceptions - Financial Aspects

Fiscal Conditions of Campus & Department Are Good

- Fiscal conditions on my campus have improved continuously over the last five years (Q9a)
- The budget of my academic department has declined over the last five years (Q9b)
- The success of intercollegiate athletics fosters alumni and corporate giving to campus initiatives outside of intercollegiate athletics (Q9h)

Figure 3 (cont.)

Beliefs and Perceptions - Internal-External Relationships

Town-Gown Relationships

•Intercollegiate athletics fulfills part of my university's service mission to the state (Q2b)

•Intercollegiate athletics at my university is an irreplaceable source of revenue to the local community (Q2c)

•Coaches are good representatives of my university in their public behavior and statements to the press (Q2e)

•Student-athletes are good representatives of my university in their public behavior and statements to the press (Q2d)

State Residents' Passion for Intercollegiate Athletics

•Residents of the state are more passionate than faculty and students about the success of our intercollegiate athletics teams (Q2a)

Beliefs and Perceptions - Department Context

Department Colleagues'

Interest in Intercollegiate Athletics

•Faculty in my department often attend and talk about intercollegiate athletics events (Q2g)

Figure 4. Individual Items Comprising the Satisfaction with the General Campus Climate Indices

Satisfaction with Governance Aspects

Governance Practices

- Extent to which faculty input informs administrative decisions that affect my entire campus (e.g., academic personnel policies, budget priorities) (Q13a)

Satisfaction with Academic Aspects

Admissions Norms & Practices

- Level of faculty involvement in undergraduate admissions process in my school/college (Q10a)
- Academic standards of professional staff in my school/college who have responsibilities for undergraduate admissions (Q10b)

Advising Norms & Practices

- Level of faculty involvement in undergraduate advising in my school/college (Q10e)
- Academic standards of professional staff who have responsibilities for undergraduate student advising (Q10f)

General Student Attributes

- Academic integrity of undergraduate students who are not student-athletes (Q11a)
- Academic performance of undergraduate students who are not student-athletes in my classes (Q11d)

Satisfaction with Financial Aspects

General Resources/Allocation Priorities

- The resources available for my teaching (Q14a)
- The resources available for my research (Q14b)
- Priorities that guide the allocation of resources on my campus (Q14c)

Figure 5. Descriptions of Concern Categories

Note. Listed in bold print are the open-coded categories for faculty responses to what most concerns them about intercollegiate athletics on their campuses, as well as the number of respondents who identified each concern (N= 1,841). Bulleted below each concern category are general themes that emerged within each code.

Preferential Treatment for Student-Athletes (n=57)

- Lowered academic standards applied to admissions
- Academic standards are lowered
- Preferential treatment: academic
- Preferential treatment: non-academic

Lack of Support for Student-Athletes (n=30)

- Negative faculty attitudes and behaviors
- Athletes abandoned after eligibility
- Inadequate and misdirected advising
- Inadequate academic and social support

Time and Performance Demands on Student- Athletes (n=85)

- Competing demands on student-athletes' time
- Pressure for high level academic and athletic performance

Exploitation of Student Athletes (n=36)

- Exploitation of student-athletes
- Under-compensation of student athletes
- Students with extra economic needs

Student Athletes Educational Experiences and Academic Outcomes (n=65)

- Low graduation rates
- Quality of educational experience
- Separation from general student body

Student -Athletes' Weak Academic Preparation and Performance in Class (n=23)

- Student-athletes under-prepared academically
- Poor academic performance

Student-Athletes Poor Academic Attitudes and Dishonesty (n=32)

- Student-athletes not serious students
- Student-athletes are academically dishonest

Student-Athletes' Criminal and Bad Behavior (n=21)

- Student athletes' criminal behavior
- Student-athletes engage in inappropriate behavior - non-criminal

Intercollegiate Athletics is Professional and Commercialized (n=96)

- University intercollegiate athletics are semi-pro and farm teams
- Intercollegiate athletics are commercialized
- Accessibility of athletics events

Intercollegiate Athletics Costs Too Much and Is Not Self-Supporting (n=181)

- Intercollegiate athletics costs too much/runs a deficit
- Intercollegiate athletics and facilities arms race
- Cost of football
- Intercollegiate athletics dependence on revenue sports
- Professional sports affect intercollegiate athletics' revenue

Intercollegiate Athletics Subsidized at the Expense of Academics (n=160)

- Intercollegiate athletics subsidized at expense of academics
- Intercollegiate athletics does not contribute funds to the campus' academic community
- Intercollegiate athletics competes with academics for donor dollars
- Gifts designated for academics are misdirected or diverted to intercollegiate athletics

Low Interest/Investment by Community (n=20)

Athletics Overemphasized on Campus (n=68)

- Overemphasis of intercollegiate athletics
- Missions of academics and intercollegiate athletics differ

Athletics Trumps Academics (n=125)

- High institutional priority on intercollegiate athletics undermines/detracts from academic/intellectual focus on campus
- Intercollegiate athletics events disrupt access to campus for faculty and students
- Expansion in intercollegiate athletics will compromise academics in the future

Intercollegiate Athletics Structural Separation and Power on Campus (n=39)

- Campus control of intercollegiate athletics lacking
- Power/autonomy of athletics department
- Intercollegiate athletics is structurally separate (auxiliary enterprise)

Faculty Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics is Problematic (n=35)

- Institutional policies and practices not transparent
- Faculty governance ineffective due to those involved and campus climate
- Faculty not involved in admissions decisions

Influence of External Groups on Internal Decisions (n=39)

- Alumni pressure for intercollegiate athletics success
- Booster/outsider influence is strong and anti-intellectual
- Local and state residents desire university recognition for intercollegiate athletics
- Legislative support tied to athletics success
- NCAA governance

Athletic Department Culture and Practices (n=32)

- Athletics department culture devalues academics
- Unethical practices of athletics department
- Coaches' and administrators' behavior is inappropriate/tarnishes university

Negative Atmosphere Surrounds Athletic Events (n=17)

- Negative culture surrounding competitive events

Inequitable Treatment of Athletes and Sports Teams (n=41)

- Gender inequities in athletics
- Inequitable attention and distribution of resources across sports teams

Impact of Title IX (n=8)

- Title IX: negative impact
- Title IX: misplaced blame

Public View of University Overemphasizes Importance of Intercollegiate Athletics (n=23)

- Public view of university amplifies importance of athletics
- Media tends to overemphasize athletics and to be negative

Athletic Teams Perform Poorly (n=14)

Football and Men's Basketball Are Most Problematic On Campus (n=42)

Problems Associated with Campus Mascots (n=16)

Intercollegiate Athletics are Inappropriate for Universities (n=25)

Intercollegiate Athletics Not a Personal Priority (n=9)

No Concerns identified (n=436)

- There are no problems - all is good on campus
- "None" or "Nothing"
- No basis for judgment - don't know enough about intercollegiate athletics to comment

Other (n=46)

Figure 8. Institutional Response Rates

Note. Overall survey response rate = 23%

Institutional Category	Response Rate
Private	25.5%
Public	22.8%
Land Grant	26.2%
PAC 10	19.3%
Sun Belt	14.9%
WAC	23.4%
ACC	23.2%
MAC	21.3%
Mt West	29.0%
Big East	22.7%
Big 12	24.9%
SEC	27.2%
C-USA	24.2%
Big 10	25.9%
Independent	21.0%