

Position Paper on the Supervision and Financing of the Sook Center for Athletic Academic Advising

*Presented by The Ohio University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors
(AAUP) to:*

President Dr. Duane Nellis

Interim Provost Dr. David Descutner

Director of Athletics, Mr. Jim Schaus

Faculty Athletic Representatives:

Dr. Ann Gabriel

Dr. Bob Colvin

Dr. Heather Lawrence, Chair, Intercollegiate Athletics Committee

October 17, 2018

Primary Authors

The Ohio University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors--Executive Committee and Athletic Issues Sub-Committee (Drs. Loren Lybarger, President, OU-AAUP, Nicholas Kiersey, Daniel Moak, Robin Muhammad, Smoki Musaraj, B. David Ridpath, Miriam Shadis, Patty Stokes)

Contributing author: Dr. Gerald Gurney, University of Oklahoma and past president of the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics (N4A)

The authors of this paper wish to thank Dr. Donna Lopiano of Sport Management Resources and Dr. Allen Sack, Professor Emeritus at the University of New Haven for their assistance.

Executive Summary

Ohio University (OU) will soon complete construction of the Sook Center, an academic support unit for university athletes. The building of this center raises an urgent concern pertaining to the integrity of the academic mission at Ohio University. The bulk of academic advising, tutoring, and other academic support activities for the athletes currently comes under the direct control of the athletic department. Academic offices have no supervisory role. This arrangement is a mistake. If it persists in the new Sook Center, we predict a number of negative consequences. Such consequences include limiting the freedom of student-athletes to explore the full range of curriculum at Ohio University and undermining the integrity of the academic experience of the student-athlete and of the student body as a whole.

To prevent these negative outcomes, and thereby to ensure the excellence of Ohio University's teaching mission for all of its students, the Ohio University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors formally requests of President Nellis and Interim Provost Descutner *that the supervision, financing, management, and control of the soon-to-be finished Sook Center cease to remain under the control of the athletic department in any way*. Instead, we recommend structuring the center as an auxiliary service under the direct supervision of an academic office. Other units such as housing, dining, and the Ohio University Foundation, for example, function independently. Athletics has access to the services of these units but does not retain any financial and supervisory control over them. The Sook Center should operate in the same way to prevent any possible conflict of interest and corresponding violations of academic integrity.

This report details the negative consequences that flow from allowing athletic departments to supervise the academic experience of athletes. It also suggests a number of practical steps in line with NCAA principles and best practices for separating athletics from the supervision of the core academic mission. Our main findings and suggestions are the following:

- Academic support entities that come under the control of athletic departments tend to prioritize eligibility maintenance rather than the educational needs of the student-athlete;
- Athletic control over an academic function further isolates athletes from the greater campus community;
- The risk to the university is greater when the athletic department finances and supervises an academic entity because such arrangements can lead to violations of NCAA rules and academic integrity policies;
- The model we propose will insulate athletic advisors, support staff, the athletes, and the university from those who may want to circumvent academic integrity for athletic gain;
- The model we propose provides a clear line of supervisory demarcation, facilitates the athlete's access to the broad range of academic majors, and keeps the focus on the athlete's academic career first and foremost;
- The model we propose will integrate athletes into the wider university community;
- Several prominent groups, including the American Council on Education and the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics, strongly suggest placing athletic academic support and advising under an academic entity;
- Many universities already have similar models in place that have preserved or enhanced the quality of academic support services for athletes without affecting competitiveness.

Introduction

This paper will not resurrect arguments critical of the decision to build the Sook Center. The facility is being built. The question that confronts the university now concerns the the day-to-day operations, supervision, and control of the facility. This matter is not an Ohio University Department of Intercollegiate Athletics issue alone. It is a matter for the entire university community, and it is an important one.

The Ohio University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) believes that the Sook Center should be a facility for all students, athletes and non-athletes alike, and that the financing and supervision of the center's advising services should come under the auspices of an academic office and not under the purview of the Athletic Department. Our recommendation is in line with the NCAA's best practices and with its concept of institutional control. Several colleges and universities, nationally, have already moved to a model of academic and financial control of athletic advising to better ensure academic integrity and to counter a the prevailing money-centric system in intercollegiate athletics that prioritizes eligibility rather than education.¹ At Ohio University we must forefront the vision and goals of supporting the next 50-60 years of an athlete's life, rather than being more concerned with eligibility and our immediate entertainment. We must protect our institutional integrity.

The NCAA's Principles of Academic Sound Standards in Bylaw 2.5 states: *Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be maintained as a vital component of the educational program, and student-athletes shall be an integral part of the student body. The admission, academic standing and academic progress of student-athletes shall be consistent with the policies and standards adopted by the institution for the student body in general.* **Maintaining athletic eligibility as a primary goal must be distinguished from education.** The purpose of the university is to offer athletes the opportunity to explore majors and earn a meaningful education. The purpose is decidedly not to maintain athletic eligibility at minimal academic levels.

Numerous academic scandals related to the intercollegiate athletics programs at a number of the nation's most prestigious institutions of higher education reveal the absence of policy and practice that would ensure the primacy of academic study and the maintenance of academic standards.² Ohio University and its department of athletics has so far avoided an academic scandal in athletics; but we must not rest on our laurels. Protecting academic integrity requires constant vigilance; the willingness to make needed adjustments; and the involvement of all relevant stakeholders at an institution.

Current emphasis on winning in big-time college sports has wrought an epidemic level of well-publicized academic fraud cases. In 2015, for example, the NCAA investigated 20 cases compared to just one in 2014.³ The dramatic effects on the reputation of the nearly two-decade long University of North Carolina academic fraud scandal should be a clarion call to action for every Division 1 institution to prevent any lapses in academic integrity.⁴ We propose a better system of academic support management that protects everyone involved in the educational

¹ See Appendix 1.

² Ibid.

³ Gurney, G., Lopiano, D., & Zimbalist, A. (2017). *Unwinding Madness: What Went Wrong with College Sports—and How to Fix It*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press. P. 75.

⁴ <http://www.newsobserver.com/news/local/education/unc-scandal/>.

experience of the athlete, from the athletes themselves to the coaches, major advisors, athletic academic support staff, administrators, and faculty.

This proposal begins with the recommendation to establish a clear demarcation between the control of academic advising and the athletic department. Establishing this demarcation is in the obvious interest of the university and is consistent with several models nationwide that Ohio University can emulate.⁵ Separating athletics and academic advising will guard against any potential academic improprieties. This is not an unprecedented change proposal. Rather, it is one that many peer institutions and other participants in NCAA Division I athletics are enacting or have already instituted. Several academic management templates within the NCAA are available for implementation at the Sook Center. These programs can result in better management and institutional control; and they can ensure that Ohio University becomes a national leader in truly “changing the game” of college sports by redirecting resources to an education first policy for student-athletes.

Historical Background

Since 2003, following the establishment of the Academic Performance Program, the NCAA has levied penalties for failure to maintain minimal academic performance standards (academic eligibility) for athletes. These penalties have included suspending team participation in bowl games and championships. As a consequence, academic advising for athletes has evolved beyond class scheduling and tutoring. A cottage industry of learning specialists and athletic academic advisers has emerged. The primary responsibility of these professionals is to remediate athletes and maintain their eligibility. Advisers for college student-athletes at many institutions continue to focus only on maintaining academic eligibility and graduation rates rather than enhancing the academic, personal, and athletic development of the student-athlete.⁶ A wealth of empirical research demonstrates that this focus on eligibility does not sufficiently meet the needs of student athletes and can often be in conflict with academic goals.⁷

The Athletic Academic Advisor

National Association for Academic Advisors for Athletics (N4A) members are primarily responsible for the counseling and advising of student-athletes. As a group, N4A professionals possess specialized knowledge, skills, and perspectives relevant to the student athlete’s experience. They acquire their expertise through graduate study at a university in an appropriate academic discipline. Additionally, they acquire skills through experience, in-service training, and personal development after the completion of their formal degrees.⁸

Arguments against separating athletic academic support from the athletic department include the loss of control over advising (and thus loss of the ability to ensure eligibility) and the potential of not having advisors specifically trained in the nuances of intercollegiate athletics and NCAA

⁵ See Appendix 2.

⁶ http://etd.fcla.edu/UF/UFE0012640/sloan_s.pdf.

⁷ Broughton, E., & Neyer, M. (2001). “Advising and counseling student athletes. New directions for student services,” 2001(93), 47-53 and Ridpath, B (2010). “Perceptions of NCAA Division I athletes on motivations concerning the use of specialized academic support services in the era of the Academic Progress Rate.” *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 3, 253-271.

⁸ <http://nfoura.org/about/codeof-ethics.php>.

rules. The latter worry is ill-founded. Advisors can easily learn NCAA eligibility rules through targeted training sessions. This training can occur in various ways, including through NCAA Regional Seminars or through programs at institutions that already have the academic supervisory model.

The prior worry--concern about loss of control of advising--is also wrongheaded because it focuses on eligibility maintenance and not on the educational needs of the student-athlete. There is a strong tendency for many coaches to feel ownership of athletic academic advisors. This feeling creates a tendency to place unfair responsibility on the advisor when an athlete has academic problems. In extreme cases, when athletic departments retain supervisory and funding control of advising, the athletic academic support staff can lose their employment if the athletes they advise experience eligibility problems. In response, advisors may seek the path of least resistance to keep the athlete academically eligible rather than to support a full educational experience. Having supervisory and financial control outside of athletics, by contrast, can give the academic advising staff the security and authority it needs to do the right thing, namely to return the educational responsibility back to the athlete, where it belongs. This model of control maintains the level of service, competence, ability, and task completion of athletic academic advisors and support staff while substantially reducing if not entirely eliminating conflict of interest, risk of NCAA violations, and academic improprieties.

As stated above, this proposed model is not a new phenomenon. Despite strong evidence that it works to protect athletic programs from academic scandal, many athletic departments still resist this type of change, fearing a loss of control or even a direct assault on the integrity and competitiveness of their programs. These fears are misplaced. The proposed model is a way to protect everyone at the university, strengthen academic advising for athletes, and still maintain program competitiveness.

Dr. Gerald Gurney of the University of Oklahoma, former Director of four Division I athletic academic support programs, and a past president of the N4A and Drake Group, pulls no punches when he speaks of the need for athletic academic support to be closely aligned with an academic entity. Gurney states, *“In order to make good on the University’s promise of a meaningful education, colleges must provide their athletes with the freedom to participate in the undergraduate academic experience. Any athletic program that insists on a model of academic, budgetary and supervisory control housed in athletics fails to ensure the wellbeing of the athlete, jeopardizes the academic reputation of the institution, and potentially devalues the diploma.”*⁹

Purpose and Proposal

The Ohio University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors formally requests of President Nellis and Interim Provost Descutner *that the supervision, financing, management, and control of the soon-to-be finished Sook Center cease to remain under the control of the athletic department in any way.* Instead, we recommend structuring the center as an auxiliary service under the direct supervision of an academic office. Other units such as housing, dining, and the OU Foundation, for example, function independently. Athletics has access to the services of these units but does not retain any financial and supervisory control over

⁹ Dr. Gerald Gurney, personal communication.

them. The Sook Center should operate in the same way to prevent any possible conflict of interest and corresponding violations of academic integrity. The center should have advisors who are not in any way reporting to athletics for supervision, control, employee evaluations, or compensation. These are all human resource issues and potential conflicts of interest. The Ohio University Chapter of the AAUP will seek additional internal and external endorsements, including a Faculty Senate resolution, to support this change.

Academic advising and support are functions of faculty and of trained academic support staff organized within specifically academic units in American colleges and universities. Athletic academic support and advising should also be a function of academic units. Athletic departments should have no financial or supervisory role, since they will likely privilege eligibility maintenance over academic exploration and success. A separate problem is the overenthusiastic athletic supporter--which could also be a faculty member--who is inclined to advocate for the relaxation of academic standards for student-athletes. Finally, in some cases, an absence of academic control over athletic academic support can encourage an atmosphere of 'academic clustering' where athletes are steered into majors and classes ("gut courses") more beneficial to athletic eligibility than to pursuit of educational goals.¹⁰ Although the primary measure of success of athletic academic support advisers nationwide remains eligibility management, we at Ohio University can and must choose another way.

To be clear, we are not suggesting any wrongdoing or lack of integrity on the part of the Department of Athletics, current athletic academic advisors, or anyone else on this campus. On the contrary, we are advocating policies that can prevent any abuse that might occur in the future if we do not act to change matters. We have an opportunity to continue to lead the way in academic integrity within the Mid-American Conference and within the NCAA by adopting a best practice measure consistently stressed by academic reform groups, faculties, and the NCAA itself.

External Endorsements

Since athletes have such heavy burdens on their time, schools typically provide them with enhanced support. That is appropriate in principle; athletic departments, however, should not control these services. Advising programs supervised through the athletic departments are a common source of academic violations.¹¹ Thus many respected outside academic and educational organizations, listed below, recommend that institutions adopt these changes with regard to academic advising for athletes:

The *Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA)*, of which Ohio University is a member, has issued recommendations similar to the ones this paper proposes. COIA recommends that athletic department advisors be appointed in the regular campus advising system, report through the academic advising structure, and at the very least be assessed by an academic-side review.¹² As

¹⁰ Salzwedel, M. R.; Ericson, J. (2003). "Cleaning up Buckley: How the family educational rights and privacy act shields academic corruption in college athletics." *Wisconsin Law Review* 2003(6), 1053-1114.

¹¹ See Appendix 1.

¹² <http://www.thecoia.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Academic-Integrity-in-Intercollegiate-Athletics-2005.pdf>.

members of COIA, Ohio University must implement the standards suggested by this respected faculty group if it wishes to remain a member of this organization.

The Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics similarly supports the integration of support services for athletes into academic processes for students, including admissions, academic support services, choice of major, and progress-toward-degree requirements.¹³

The Drake Group, a nationwide group of college faculty, staff, coaches, and others who advocate for ensuring quality education for college athletes, argues that athletes are students first and foremost and should be assimilated into the general student body. To achieve this end, they recommend that an academic entity administer and control academic advising for athletics. The Drake Group position is *academic support study and computer centers, housing, dining, game room, and other non-athletics locker room facilities should be prohibited because they isolate the college athlete from normal student experiences and in many cases bestow superior treatment and facilities on college athletes, a double standard that should not be supported by higher education.*¹⁴ Having the Sook Center under academic control would allow for the integration of the building and of the athletes into the wider university culture. *The Sook Center will also likely, in whole or in part, receive significant support from student fees for daily operations and maintenance. The entire student body, consequently, should have opportunities to participate in Sook Center services.* The general student body does not have a comparable facility on campus as the Sook Center. Denying general student access to the Sook Center will only further isolate the athletes from the larger student body. The Walter Field House is a good template for how to achieve better integration with the university even with athletics as a primary beneficiary.

The American Council on Education (ACE), in its excellent 2016 report entitled *The Student-Athlete, Academic Integrity and Intercollegiate Athletics*, made four significant points:¹⁵

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

This particular report, endorsed and signed by current Mid-American Conference Commissioner Dr. Jon Steinbrecher, also discusses the importance of integration of college athletes into the greater campus community along with strategies to manage risk and threats to the academic

¹³ NCAA Presidential Task Force on the Future of Division I Intercollegiate Athletics: Student-Athlete Well-Being Subcommittee, "Academic Enhancements-Academic Advising, June 2005.

¹⁴ www.thedrakegroup.org.

¹⁵ <http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/ACE-Academic-Integrity-Athletics.pdf>.

mission. The report states that since athletics are framed as an integral part of the fabric of a college or university, athletics should not be *siloed and managed in a way that ignores its integration in and support of the academic mission of the institution*.¹⁶ It also mentions that high profile college sports is a high-reward area for institutions but with those rewards also come potential risks.

The ACE report presents many solutions and best practices to better manage risk and integrate college athletics into the greater campus community. One of our primary recommendations aligns directly with the proposed changes the ACE paper supports. With regard to academic support services for college athletes, ACE recommends:

1. Academic advising and support operations for student-athletes should report to (and have regular access to) senior academic executives, such as chief academic officers, ensuring that there is regular access, communication, and oversight.
2. In many cases, chief academic officers, other senior academic leaders, or vice presidents of student affairs are well-positioned to supervise or regularly review the policies and procedures for such operations, although care should be taken to ensure that academic support reporting and budgeting are aligned.
3. Athletic directors, athletic staff, and coaches should not have supervisory responsibility over, or influence the selection of, academic support staff for specific teams.
4. Advising should provide student-athletes with academic support and counseling that is adequate and appropriate for their progress toward a degree and graduation and facilitate their ability to fully pursue their individual academic interests.¹⁷

Clear and unambiguous recommendations from prestigious groups and the findings of research notwithstanding, neither the NCAA nor any other athletic conference institutionalizes athletic academic advising oversight structures. The NCAA does, however, strongly encourage such institutionalization at individual colleges and universities as part of the best practices that it advocates. The Ohio University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors believes Ohio University must implement reforms in line with these NCAA recommendations. Ohio University must ensure a quality education for students who participate in intercollegiate athletics. It must make academic advising for athletes an integral part of an academic-centered approach. Thus all academic counseling and academic support services must reside under the direct supervision and budgetary control of the institution's academic authority. This supervisory structure must remain separate from the athletic department. The services this structure provides must be consistent with counseling and support services available to all students. Athletic department employees should have no control over academic advising of any kind, since all too individuals in these positions can exert undue pressures to keep an athlete eligible. These pressures can include implicit or explicit threats to an individual advisor's job security. We are

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid., 4.

fortunate that we do not have any current or recent problems with academic advising of athletes at Ohio University; but we also must recognize that leaving advising of athletes under the department of athletics has the potential to cause future problems and at the very least suggests a conflict of interest. Making these organizational changes protects all parties, preserves academic integrity, and serves the best interests of the athlete at Ohio University.

Institutionally separating athletics academic advising from the athletic department clarifies lines of communication and responsibility. To achieve such clarification, Ohio University must immediately implement a policy prohibiting communication between coaches, athletic administrative personnel, and faculty regarding the individual athlete and questions of her or his eligibility. Any communication with faculty regarding an athlete's academic situation must pass through the Faculty Athletic Representatives (FAR) and no one else, under any circumstances. This includes boosters, deans, executive staff and even the president's office. This policy aims not to limit faculty contact and friendships with coaches but rather to preserve academic integrity and student privacy. The FAR should be the sole source of communication and inquiry with faculty concerning any academic issues lest faculty feel pressure from advisors, administrators or coaches ostensibly looking for an eligibility favor. This new management scenario will clarify the acceptable boundaries and responsibilities, dramatically lower the risk of improprieties, and bring Ohio University into conformity with the NCAA standards for institutional control.

Institutional Templates

Many prominent intercollegiate athletic programs already have systems such as the one we are recommending. Sadly, many of these institutions made the switch to academic supervisory and budgetary control only after major NCAA academic scandals that tainted their institutions and forced their administrations to bring academic advising under academic control. Many other colleges and universities have responded proactively in light of these scandals to enhance institutional control and academic oversight.

According to the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletes, there are approximately 50 to 60 NCAA Division I schools that have athletic academic support supervision and/or financing under an academic entity, or at least a dual reporting line to academics and athletics.¹⁸ This equates to nearly 50% of all Division I FBS playing schools and 30% of all Division I schools that play basketball. Many of these centers are separate entities typically funded and/or built with private donations, like the Sook Center. The financial support for these facilities runs the gamut from student fees to athletic and development dollars, academic and institutional subsidies, or a combination of all of these funding sources. We feel that a direct and unambiguous commitment to academic funding of the Sook Center's operations will ensure its integrity and protect the national academic reputation of Ohio University.

Conclusion

The authors and endorsers of this white paper opposed the building of the Sook Center as a separate, athletics-specific academic advising entity. Nevertheless, the center is being built and we accept the *fait accompli*. Several legitimate concerns nevertheless remain, and we must address them as a university. Faculty, as guardians of the curriculum and academic primacy,

¹⁸ See Appendix 2.

should take a hard look at the management of this new center. We have presented many good ideas on how to operate and supervise the Sook Center in accordance with best practices, empirical research, and the recommendations of experts. Athletic Department control of the Sook Center's advising services creates the conditions for potentially undermining academic integrity. We must act to prevent this risk. Placing academic advising for athletes under academic and faculty control is one of the best protective measures we can take to assure academic integrity, compliance with NCAA rules, and institutional control. Moreover, allowing the entire student body to have access to the Sook Center's services will prevent the further isolation of athletes from the wider university community. We urge President Nellis, interim Provost Descutner, and Athletic Director Jim Schaus to make the changes we recommend immediately with input from the FARs, Faculty Senate, and the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee. The authors offer their assistance and expertise in managing any needed transitional aspects and structure.

It is of vital importance that our athletes have access to the same educational opportunities enjoyed by all Ohio University students. If that means that an individual athlete must miss a game, multiple games, or even a season for academic remediation or pursuit of their program of study, then that is the best thing for that individual and for the university. Any potential short-term eligibility pain will be long-term gain for the entire university community and most importantly for the future of the athlete. Ensuring that academics remain under the purview of an academic office will demonstrate firmly that we stand by our mantra that the student comes before the athlete. The proposed changes will not cause any loss of athletic competitiveness and can only have a positive impact, as demonstrated by so many other schools that manage athletic academic support, completely or in part, in the manner we recommend. The reforms we suggest will make athletic academic advising better and provide a system of academic primacy that protects us all. Let us embrace these changes and in so doing lead the nation in academic and athletic excellence.

Appendix 1-Relevant Examples of Need for Academic Control of Athletic Academic Advisement

The Ohio State University

The Ohio State University has instituted an exemplary structure for athletic academic advising governance. The current director of SASSO (Student-Athlete Support Services Office), Dr. David Graham, is an Assistant Provost and reports directly to the Vice Provost. While his position does have a dotted line on the organizational chart to the Athletic Director for communication purposes, the chain of accountability for SASSO services passes through an academic entity and in many cases through the Provost's or Dean's office. Ohio State University is a self-sustaining athletic department; and the financing of SASSO comes primarily from athletic department funds. While that arrangement can produce a conflict of interest, the university has established clear lines of responsibility that exclude any role in advising for the coaches, other athletics personnel, and individual boosters. This direct academic oversight enables advisers to deflect and prevent undue influence on the part of athletics personnel and supporters to maintain athlete eligibility.

The University of North Carolina

The worst scandal in NCAA history involving athletics and academic fraud has embroiled and embarrassed the University of North Carolina for more than six years. Astoundingly, the NCAA has recently determined that it is unable to conclude there were actual NCAA bylaws violated. Nevertheless, the UNC case is a sobering example of why academic oversight and control over athletic academic advising and support is so important. At the center of the UNC controversy was the direct control that the athletic department had held over its academic support entity despite the nominal housing of advisors in the College of Arts and Sciences. The athletic department retained financial control and authority and many advisors took their orders from athletic staff and coaches in an eligibility driven atmosphere.

The scandal at UNC is complicated as the NCAA decision last week demonstrated. The fundamental fact, however, is that the entire institution is responsible for allowing the undermining of the academic mission on that campus. An eligibility driven culture along with soft spots in the former African American Studies (AFAM) curriculum, primarily, led to hundreds of athletes being clustered in that department's major. The situation also fostered no-show courses, grade changes, and enrollment in other courses that required little if any academic work. A comparison with Ohio State is instructive in this instance: At both OSU and UNC academic units formally governed academic advising for athletes; and at both institutions athletics funded advising. But, unlike at OSU, at UNC the athletic department retained a role, to which they felt entitled because of the funding they provided, in the advising process. As a result, eligibility priorities trumped education.

UNC has since dramatically changed the relationship of advising to academics by adopting a model similar to the one we are proposing. The university finally has recognized the need for an academic entity to control both the administration and financing of advising but it should not have taken a major academic fraud scandal for it to happen.

Weber State University

At Weber State University, athletic academic advising was disjointed, centralized neither in academics nor in athletics. This situation led to much confusion about supervision. Also, because athletics provided partial salary financing, athletics leadership became inappropriately involved in the academic process and in the advising of athletes: coaches presumed they had the right to oversee the academic career of athletes. This muddled situation led to an eligibility scandal in the men's basketball program involving use of impermissible correspondence courses from another institution. The NCAA cited the university's disjointed approach to academic advising to athletes along with overzealous involvement of coaches and administrators to keep athletes eligible as the major causes of the scandal .

As one of the primary corrective actions, the university moved athletic academic advising to the control of the university academic advising center. Moreover, they shifted advisor salaries to the general academic budget and to NCAA academic enhancement funds. The advisors continued in their professional capacity as academic support staff for athletes but there was a new layer of protection that prevented pressure from coaches, parents, and even boosters to maintain eligibility, switch majors, and even break NCAA rules. Academic advising at Weber State has maintained its quality while drastically reducing the risk from the inherent conflicts that exist when athletic departments control the advising process.

Appendix 2-Data Showing Trends of Athletic Academic Advisement Under Academic/Faculty Control. *Source: N4A Academic Survey, 2016. Original survey contained proprietary information thus actual institution is not identified, only conference affiliation*

Institutional Conference	Supervisory Authority
Big East	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
A-SUN	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
ACC	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
USA	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
Colonial Athletic Association	Athletic Department
Southland	Athletic Department
American Athletic Conference	Athletic Department
Mid-American Conference	Dual Report to Academics and Athletics
WAC	Athletic Department
C-USA	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
WAC	Athletic Department
CUSA	Dual Report to Academics and Athletics
Southern	Athletic Department
Atlantic Sun	Dual Report to Academics and Athletics
SEC	Athletic Department
AAC	Athletic Department
Big Ten	Other than athletics/academics i.e. Student Affairs
The American	Dual Report to Academics and Athletics
ACC	Dual Report to Academics and Athletics
SSC	Athletic Department
Colonial Athletic Association	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
American	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
WCC	Athletic Department
SEC	Dual Report to Academics and Athletics
Big Sky	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
America East	Athletic Department
Mid-American Conference	Athletic Department
Big Sky	Athletic Department
SEC	Athletic Department
Mountain West	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
Big Ten	Other (please explain)
America East	Athletic Department
MVC	Athletic Department
BIG 12	Athletic Department

Institutional Conference	Supervisory Authority
Mid American Conference	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
Big East	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
Southern Conference	Dual Report to Academics and Athletics
Patriot League	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
Mid American Conference	Athletic Department
MEAC	Athletic Department
Mid-American Intercollegiate Athletics Association	Athletic Department
BIG 12	Athletic Department
SEC	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
SWAC	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
MEAC	Athletic Department
ACC	Dual Report to Academics and Athletics
A10	Athletic Department
Pac-12	Dual Report to Academics and Athletics
Big East	Dual Report to Academics and Athletics
Big Sky	Athletic Department
Mountain Valley Conference	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
MAAC	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
Ohio Valley Conference	Athletic Department
PAC 12	Athletic Department
Big 12	Athletic Department
SEC	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
ACC	Athletic Department
SEC	Athletic Department
Big Ten	Athletic Department
Summit League/Missouri Valley-football Only	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
Mid-American Conference	Athletic Department
UAA	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
American Athletics Conference	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
America East	Athletic Department
Southern Conference	Academic Affairs/Academic Division or Department
Colonial Athletic Association	Athletic Department
CAA	Athletic Department
MAAC	Athletic Department