Athletics Certification Committee Analysis Report  
California State University, Bakersfield  
September 21, 2009

NCAA Issue:
1.1 Institutional Control, Presidential Authority and Shared Responsibilities.
1 NCAA Operating Principle 1.1 requires that the chancellor or president is assigned ultimate responsibility and authority for the operation and personnel of the athletics program. Acceptable plans for improvement must include specified timetables. After reviewing Page No. 21 of your institution’s self-study report, the NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification (hereinafter referred to as “committee”) noted your institution did not include a specific timetable in your plan for improvement for full participation of academic senate and faculty in governance of athletics. Therefore, your institution must revise its current governance and rules compliance plan to include a specific timetable. Please note, plans for improvement must contain all required elements.

CSUB Response:
A revised improvement plan for Operating Principle 1.1 has been submitted. This revised plan was developed with broad-based participation, review and approval by the academic integrity self-study subcommittee, IAAC, Academic Senate, SAAC, and President’s Cabinet. The plan was also reviewed and approved by President Horace Mitchell.

NCAA Issue:
2.1 Academic Standards
1 Operating Principle 2.1 requires that academic standards and policies applicable to student-athletes are consistent with those adopted by the institution for the student-body in general or conference or Association standards, whichever are higher. After reviewing Page No. 38 of your institution’s self-study report, the committee noted there was no analysis or explanation in regard to the differences between the percentage of first year student-athletes receiving athletics aid who were admitted through the processes described in self-study Item No. 5 and the percentage of first-year students in general who were so admitted.

Therefore, your institution must explain, and if necessary, address through a plan for improvement, the differences between the percentage of first-year student-athletes receiving athletics aid who were admitted through the processes described in self-study Item No. 5 and the percentage of first-year students in general who were so admitted.

CSUB Response:
In 2006 and 2007, the campus accepted a much higher number of special admit first-year freshman student-athletes on athletics aid (12 percent and 8 percent respectively). The move to Division I, coupled with a new recruitment policy instituted in fall 2008 that restricts coaches from recruiting special admits, has significantly improved the quality of our student-athletes.

For example, the number of specially admitted first-year student-athletes in 2008 was only 3.5 percent, which was lower than the number of special admits of all students. In fall 2008, CSUB had 925 first-time freshmen enrolled; 1825 (19.7 percent) of which were special admits. With the enforcement of the new recruitment policy - where coaches are recruiting students with adequate test scores, grade point averages above 3.00, and clearly demonstrated capability of graduating - the campus is unlikely to accept any special admit student-athletes in the future.
Although the number of special admit student-athletes may well be zero or very small, the FAR has developed and implemented a monitoring system for special-admit student-athletes that is focused on academic progress and academic support. This monitoring system is noted in the revised improvement plan.

**NCAA Issue:**
2 Operating Principle 2.1 stipulates that if the academic profile of entering student-athletes, as a whole or for any student-athlete subgroup, is lower than that of other student-athlete or comparable student-body groups or subgroups, the contrast shall be analyzed and explained by appropriate institutional authorities. In order to demonstrate conformity with this operating principle, an institution must analyze and explain any differences between the academic profile of entering student-athletes, as a whole or for any student-athlete subgroup (i.e., sport, gender, ethnicity, transfers) and the academic profile of other student-athletes and comparable student-body groups or subgroups. After reviewing Page Nos. 38 and 39 of your institution's self-study report, the committee noted when addressing the chart for first-year students compared to first-year student-athletes on athletics aid in regards to average standardized test scores by gender, your institution did not provide an analysis of the differences between male students generally and male student-athletes on athletics aid or female students generally and female student-athletes on athletics aid. Further, your institution did not provide an analysis in regard to the different average standardized test scores by ethnicity between first-year students generally and first-year student-athletes on athletics aid. Finally, your institution did not provide any explanation why the average core course grade-point average for men's basketball was not provided for the 2005-06 and 2008-09 academic years, the average standardized test score for men's basketball was not provided for the 2005-06 and 2007-08 academic years and the average standardized test score for men's cross country and track was not provided for the 2006-07 academic year, as well as analyze any core-course grade-point average differences between the sport groups. Therefore, your institution must analyze, explain, and if necessary, develop a plan for improvement addressing the differences between the academic profile of male students generally and male student-athletes on athletics aid and female students generally and female student-athletes on athletics aid; and the differences in regard to the average standardized test score by ethnicity between first-year students generally and first-year student-athletes on athletics aid.

Further, you institution must provide data in the following areas and analyze and explain any differences in the core-course grade-point average between sport groups, as well as the:

a. Core-course grade-point average for men's basketball for the 2005-06 and 2008-09 academic years;
b. Average standardized test score for men's basketball for the 2005-06 and 2007-08 academic years; and
c. Average standardized test score for men's cross country and track for the 2006-07 academic year.

**CSUB Response:**
Because of the complexity of this item, the university’s response appears below in sections. Each section directly addresses a particular area of the item that is listed.

--------

**NCAA Issue:**
After reviewing Page Nos. 38 and 39 of your institution's self-study report, the committee noted when addressing the chart for first-year students compared to first-year student-athletes on
athletics aid in regards to average standardized test scores by gender, your institution did not provide an analysis of the differences between male students generally and male student-athletes on athletics aid or female students generally and female student-athletes on athletics aid. Further, your institution did not provide an analysis in regard to the different average standardized test scores by ethnicity between first-year students generally and first-year student-athletes on athletics aid.

**CSUB Response:**

Female students and student-athletes: The average standardized test scores for all female first-year students is 912 in 2005-06, 906 in 2006-07, and 899 in 2007-08. In 2005-06, the scores of first-year female student-athletes in all sport categories exceeded the average score for all first-year female students. In 2006-07, the scores of first-year female student-athletes in all sport categories fell below the average score for all first-year female students. In 2007-08, only women’s track/cross country was below the score for all female students (775 for student-athletes in this sport compared to 899 for all female first-year students). However, in 2008-09, the scores of female student-athletes in basketball and track/cross country were significantly above all previous year average scores in those sports, as well as significantly above all historic scores for all female first-year students. The average score for “women’s other sports” in 2008-09 was 947, also well above the historic scores for all female first-year students. The self-study subcommittee believes this reflects changes in recruiting practices resulting from the move to Division I, and thus no improvement plans are necessary.

Male students and student-athletes: The average standardized test scores for all male first-year students are 1020 in 2005-06, 1030 in 2006-07, and 1021 in 2007-08. In 2005-06 and 2006-07, the scores of first-year male student-athletes men’s track/cross country exceeded the score for all first-year male students. In 2007-08, however, the team score fell to 953, which was lower than the score for all students. However, the team score for 2008-09 was significantly higher (1285). The self-study subcommittee believes this reflects changes in recruiting practices resulting from the move to Division I, and thus no improvement plans are necessary.

In contrast, the average standardized test scores for men’s basketball and “men’s other sports” were below the average scores for all first-time male students, in all years compared. An improvement strategy is included in the Improvement Plan for Operating Principle 2.1 Academic Integrity section.

This revised strategy is included in the revised plan. The plan was developed with broad-based participation, review and approval by the academic integrity self-study subcommittee, IAAC, Academic Senate, SAAC, and President’s Cabinet. The plan was also reviewed and approved by President Horace Mitchell.

-----------------------------

**NCAA Issue:**

Finally, your institution did not provide any explanation why the average core course grade-point average for men's basketball was not provided for the 2005-06 and 2008-09 academic years, the average standardized test score for men's basketball was not provided for the 2005-06 and 2007-08 academic years and the average standardized test score for men's cross country and track was not provided for the 2006-07 academic year, as well as analyze any core-course grade-point average differences between the sport groups. Therefore, your institution must analyze, explain, and if necessary, develop a plan for improvement addressing the differences between the
academic profile of male students generally and male student-athletes on athletics aid and female students generally and female student-athletes on athletics aid; and the differences in regard to the average standardized test score by ethnicity between first-year students generally and first-year student-athletes on athletics aid.

**CSUB Response:**
In general, the comparison of average standardized test scores by racial/ethnic group between first-year student athletes on aid and all first-year students shows, with few exceptions, that student-athletes in nearly all racial/ethnic categories have higher average scores compared to all students in the corresponding categories. The only major exception to this trend is for white student-athletes, who have lower average scores in 2004-05, 2005-06, and 2006-07. In 2007-08, however, the average score for first-year white student-athletes exceeded the score for all first-year students. The self-study subcommittee believes this reflects changes in recruiting practices resulting from the move to Division I, and thus no improvement plans are necessary.

**NCAA Issue:**
Further, your institution must provide data in the following areas and analyze and explain any differences in the core-course grade-point average between sport groups, as well as the:

a. Core-course grade point average for men's basketball for the 2005-06 and 2008-09 academic years;
b. Average standardized test score for men's basketball for the 2005-06 and 2007-08 academic years; and
c. Average standardized test score for men's cross country and track for the 2006-07 academic year.

**CSUB Response:**
The missing data have been added to the table “Test Scores and GPA by Sport”:

a) GPA for men’s basketball: 2005-06: correct value is blank; there were no student-athletes in this category; 2008-09: correct value is 3.12 (one student athlete)

b) Test scores for men’s basketball: 2005-2006: correct value is blank; there were no student-athletes in this category; 2007-08: correct value is 840 (one student athlete)

c) Test scores for men’s track/cross country, 2006-07: correct value is 1100 (one student-athlete)

There were several other corrections to this table:
1) In 2008-09, the correct number of female student-athletes in track/cross country in is 14, and the number in “women’s other sports” is 22. In the original table, eight student athletes had been reported in “women’s other sports” that should have been reported in women’s track/cross country. All remaining values for number of students are correct.

2) Several “Core-Course GPA” averages are corrected. These corrections brought the course pattern that should be included in the GPA calculation in line with NCAA rules.

3) Several “Standardized Test Score” averages were corrected. The original request for data specified SAT scores only. The correction updates the averages as a result of including ACT scores (converted to SAT scores for these calculations using the standard
conversion developed by the University of Illinois for this purpose: SAT=40*ACT+110) for those student-athletes who did not take the SAT.

4) It should be noted that in 2007-08 there is one student athlete who is excluded from the GPA table in the category “women’s other sports.” The excluded student-athlete is a foreign student who completed high school in Australia and there is no GPA on record.

These corrections to the “Test Scores and GPA by Sport chart” (page 85 on the original report submission) are shown on new charts submitted to the NCAA and to be made available to the review committee. The revised charts will also be available for review by the Peer-Review Team.

**NCAA Issue:**

3 Operating Principle 2.1 requires that an institution must assess, evaluate and, if necessary, develop plans for improvement to ensure acclimation, retention and academic success for student-athletes with special academic needs and student-athletes who are admitted through the institution’s special admissions process. After reviewing Page Nos. 39 and 40 of your institution’s self-study report and supplemental material submitted July 9, 2009, the committee is unclear whether specific academic support programs are in place to ensure acclimation of those student-athletes who were specially admitted.

Therefore, your institution must explain, and if necessary, address through a plan for improvement, that there are specific academic support programs to ensure acclimation for those student-athletes who were specially admitted.

**CSUB Response:**

As previously indicated, in fall 2008 a new recruitment policy was instituted that restricts coaches from recruiting special admits. The policy has significantly improved the quality of our student-athletes. However, specific academic support programs are in place to ensure acclimation and retention of student-athletes who are specially admitted. The following are examples of such programs:

- Each specially admitted student-athlete is advised and counseled quarterly.
- Faculty members assist all specially admitted student-athletes in creating the required four-year roadmap for graduation.
- Each student-athlete is required to complete CSUB 101, an orientation course that provides crucial information.
- Student-athletes are required to utilize study tables a minimum of four hours each week.
- At-risk specially admitted student-athletes receive assistance through workshops offered by Resources for Academic Change (REACH).
- Grades are checked twice per quarter for student-athletes subject to or on academic probation.

All academic support program activities are assessed, evaluated and monitored by the IAAC, SAAC, FAR, AAAC, and senior associate athletic director/SWA for effectiveness.

**NCAA Issue:**

4 Operating Principle 2.1 requires that an institution must assess, evaluate and, if necessary, develop plans for improvement to ensure acclimation, retention and academic success for student-
athletes with special academic needs and student-athletes who are admitted through the institution’s special admissions process. After reviewing Page Nos. 40 and 41 of your institution’s self-study report and supplemental material submitted July 9, 2009, the committee noted your institution stated that beginning fall 2009, the faculty athletics representative will collect data for those student-athletes specially admitted.

Therefore, your institution must develop a plan for improvement addressing how the faculty athletic representative will collect the data for those student-athletes specially admitted. Please note, plans for improvement must contain all required elements.

**CSUB Response:**
The academic improvement plan for Operating Principle 2.1 has been updated and now includes an item under “academic standards” that pertains to a tracking system for special admit students. This monitoring system has been instituted by the FAR and is now in place.

For fall 2009 there are 12 special admit student-athletes who will be monitored. It is important to note that some of these student-athletes have special admit status because of missing course requirements and not because of grade point average (GPA). Four of these special admits have incoming GPAs above 3.00 and three are above 2.50.

The monitoring plan will follow student-athlete progress each quarter, and verify participation in the online writing course. The course evaluates and provides students with feedback on their writing. This group of student-athletes will also participate in study hall, tutoring sessions and in the university’s Resources for Academic Change (REACH) program.

If student-athletes are placed in any remedial courses, their progress is carefully monitored to ensure they are progressing successfully in these courses. These student-athletes are required to attend additional hours of study hall and to take part in all special support programs for which they are eligible. They also are carefully advised. Data is also collected on their SAT and ACT scores as well as their incoming and ongoing GPAs.

**NCAA Issue:**
5 Operating Principle 2.1 stipulates that if the measures of academic performance of student-athletes, as a whole or for any student-athlete subgroup are lower than that of other student-athletes or comparable student-body groups or subgroups, this disparity shall be analyzed, explained and, if necessary, addressed (through specific plans for improvement) by appropriate institutional authorities. In order to demonstrate conformity with this operating principle an institution must analyze, explain and address any differences between the most recent four-class average Federal Graduation Rate for all student-athlete subgroups (i.e., team, gender, ethnicity, ethnicity within team) and the most recent four-class average Federal Graduation Rate for all students, including comparable student-body subgroups (i.e., gender, ethnicity). If the most recent four-class average Federal Graduation Rate of a student-athlete subgroup is lower than the most recent four-class average Federal Graduation Rate for all students or comparable student-body subgroup, the institution must develop a plan for improvement to address the issue. After reviewing Page Nos. 43 through 45 of your institution’s self-study report, the committee noted your institution identified differences within its analysis for the Federal Graduation Rates by racial and ethnic groups, as well as for the Federal Graduation Rates by sport. However, the committee noted that your institution did not explain these differences or provide a plan for improvement for any deficiencies.
Therefore, your institution must analyze and explain the differences cited and, if necessary, address any deficiencies through a formal plan for improvement. Please note, plans for improvement must include all required elements.

CSUB Response:
Although the academic performance of student-athletes as a whole is generally comparable or exceeds that of all students, the campus acknowledges the disparity in the Federal Graduation Rates of African-American basketball players and has taken steps to address this issue.

At the macro and micro level, the African-American student and student-athlete is an issue of retention. High school grade point average continues to be a strong predictor of subsequent academic achievement in college for student-athletes and all students. Because some African-American students matriculate from high schools and environments with inferior academic resources, they tend to be less academically prepared than their white peers. Therefore, campuses must provide intervention programs that help student-athletes develop confidence in the classroom, just as they are confident about their athletic skills.

CSUB recognizes the importance of introducing student-athletes to the academic culture of the university, including all expectations that will be required for success and the academic support and assistance necessary to ensure the success. In collaboration with student-athletes, FAR, AAAC, SAAC, and other campus departments, the university will work closely with African-American student-athletes in identifying factors that may impede and/or facilitate their academic talent development and success. Based on these findings, intervention strategies will be developed and incorporated into a comprehensive improvement plan. The ability to transfer skills from the athletic to the academic domain can make a significant difference in how African-American student-athletes approach academics and will lead to improved graduation rates.

In addition to the traditional academic support, tutoring, study hall and advising services available to student-athletes described in section 2.2, self-study item #6, specific intervention strategies will be implemented to improve the graduation success rates of African-American student-athletes. These strategies include fostering stronger mentoring interactions between student-athletes and faculty members who can serve as socializing agents to African-American student-athletes. The importance of student-faculty relationships is well documented as a valuable aspect of the college experience. This “connect with the intellect” strategy will provide a panel of faculty to engage student-athletes in a dialogue about the ways in which to form meaningful relationships with other professors on campus - conceivably leading to academic success. Because increased retention presents the greatest short-term opportunity to significantly increase the graduation rate of the African-American student-athlete, the athletics department's objective in developing the mentoring program is to identify additional strategies to retain African-American student-athletes.

CSUB has also adopted the Challenging Athletes' Minds for Personal Success (CHAMPS) Life Skills Program. The CHAMPS/Life Skills Program provides students with development in five areas: academics, athletics, personal development, career development, and community service. Students may participate in a lecture series featuring topics relevant to everyday life issues. The program provides an opportunity to better integrate student-athletes and all students into campus life and gives them necessary life skills they can use after graduation.

Finally, as previously stated, by enforcing the new recruitment policy, CSUB will only recruit student-athletes with the potential to succeed in their studies and graduate from the university.
**NCAA Issue:**

Operating Principle 2.1 stipulates that if the retention rate of student-athletes, as a whole or for any student-athlete subgroup, is lower than that of other student-athletes, this disparity shall be analyzed, explained and, if necessary, addressed through specific plans for improvement by appropriate institutional authorities. To demonstrate conformity with this operating principle an institution must analyze, explain and address any differences between the most recent four-class retention rate for student-athlete subgroups (i.e., sport, gender, ethnicity, ethnicity within teams) and the most recent four class retention rate for all student-athletes. If the most recent four-class retention rate for any student-athlete subgroup is lower than the retention rate for all student-athletes, the institution must develop a plan for improvement to address the issue. After reviewing Page No. 46 of your institution's self-study report, the committee noted your institution stated men's indoor track and field, men's basketball, men's soccer, men's golf, women's swimming, women's basketball, women's soccer and water polo, as the teams whose most recent four-class retention rate was lower than the retention rate for all student-athletes.

Your institution also indicated that the retention rate for all male student-athletes was slightly lower than the retention rate for all student-athletes. The committee noted that your institution stated that plans for improvement for men's indoor track and field, men's basketball, men's soccer, men's golf, women's swimming, women's basketball, women's soccer and water polo would be provided, yet those plans were not included.

Therefore, your institution must analyze, explain and address through plans for improvement the deficiencies in retention rates for all male student-athletes, men's indoor track and field, men's basketball, men's soccer, men's golf, women's swimming, women's basketball, women's soccer and water polo in relation to all student-athletes.

**CSUB Response:**

The committee's previous response was based on APR team single-year scores not retention rate data.

According to the most recent-four year class rates (NCAA Div. I 2007-08 APR/Retention Rate Institutional Report), men's indoor track, men's soccer, men's golf, women's swimming, women's basketball, women's soccer and women's waterpolo were higher than the retention rates of all students. Men's basketball was the only team whose retention rate was lower than the retention rate for all students. The retention rate for all male student-athletes was slightly lower than for all female student-athletes, but higher than the retention rates for all students.

The athletics department did a poor job recruiting academically in 2004-05 and 2005-06. The men's recruits averaged a 2.20 grade point, with 90 percent of special admits being male recruits. In 2008-09, men's teams are averaging a 2.90 GPA for all recruits. Men’s and women’s team do not specially admit any recruit with low GPA and/or test scores.

The overall men's and women's APR/retention rates have improved every year since 2007-08 when the university instituted the academic improvement plans. Men's basketball has shown significant improvement in retention and graduation rates, with a graduation rate of 1,000 in 2007-08 and 2008-09. The improvements plans have been submitted for the men's and women's teams below a 925 APR: men’s basketball, men's golf, men's soccer, men's wrestling, women's basketball, women's soccer, and women's waterpolo.

Please note all men's and women's APR/retention rates improved in 2007-08, as will be the case
The NCAA Div. I 2007-08 APR/Retention Rate Institutional Report is available for review of the Peer Review Team.

NCAA Issue:
7 Operating Principle 2.1 requires that if the measure of academic performance of student-athletes, as a whole or for any student-athlete subgroup, is lower than that of other student-athletes or comparable student-body groups or subgroups, the disparity shall be analyzed, explained and if necessary, addressed through specific plans for improvement. Acceptable plans for improvement must provide specific timetables for completing the work. After reviewing Page Nos. 54 and 55 of your institution's self-study report, the committee noted your institution did not include specific timetables in its plans for improvement for each of the following areas:
   a. Academic progress report;
   b. Academic standards;
   c. Compliance;
   d. Practicing and scheduling policy; and
   e. Academic support.

Therefore, your institution must revise its current academic standards plan to include specific timetables or each of the aforementioned areas. In addition, your institution must demonstrate that its revised academic standards plan was developed with broad-based participation and has received formal institutional approval.

CSUB Response:
In response to the initial findings of the Committee on Athletics Certification, the campus has revised and updated its academic standards improvement plan to include specific timetables for the following areas:
   a. Academic progress report;
   b. Academic standards;
   c. Compliance;
   d. Practicing and scheduling policy; and
   e. Academic support.

The revised plan was developed with broad-based participation, review and approval by the academic integrity self-study subcommittee, IAAC, Academic Senate, SAAC, and President’s Cabinet. The plan was also reviewed and approved by President Horace Mitchell.

NCAA Issue:
8 Operating Principle 2.1 requires that if the measure of academic performance of student-athletes, as a whole or for any student-athlete subgroup, is lower than that of other student-athletes or comparable student-body groups or subgroups, the disparity shall be analyzed, explained and if necessary, addressed through specific plans for improvement. Acceptable plans for improvement must provide specific steps to achieve the measurable goals for completing the work. After reviewing Page Nos. 54 and 55 of your institution’s self-study report, the committee noted your institution did not include specific steps in its plans for improvement to achieve the measurable goals stated in the following areas:
   a. Graduation Success Rate;
   b. Scheduling policy; and
c. Practice.

Therefore, your institution must revise its current academic standards plan to include specific steps to achieve the measurable goals in the aforementioned areas. In addition, your institution must demonstrate that its revised academic standards plan was developed with broad-based participation and has received formal institutional approval.

CSUB Response:
A revised improvement plan for Operating Principle 2.1 has been submitted. This revised plan was developed with broad-based participation, review and approval by the academic integrity self-study subcommittee, IAAC, Academic Senate, SAAC, and President’s Cabinet. The plan was also reviewed and approved by President Horace Mitchell.

NCAA Issue:
2.2 Academic Support
1 Operating Principle 2.2 requires an institution to demonstrate that there is a commitment to the fair and equitable treatment of student-athletes, in support of their academic endeavors. Acceptable plans for improvement must include specific measurable goals for completing the work. After reviewing Page Nos. 79 and 80 of your institution's self-study report, the committee noted your institution created a plan for improvement, however, the plan for improvement did not include specific measurable goals within the areas of programming development and academic support.

Therefore, your institution must revise its current academic support plan to include specific measurable goals in the aforementioned areas. In addition, your institution must demonstrate that its revised academic support plan was developed with broad-based participation and has received formal institutional approval.

CSUB Response:
In response to the initial findings of the Committee on Athletics Certification, the campus has revised and updated its academic support plan to include specific measurable goals in the areas of programming development and academic support.

This revised plan was developed with broad-based participation, review and approval by the academic support self-study subcommittee, IAAC, Academic Senate, SAAC, and President’s Cabinet. The plan was also reviewed and approved by President Horace Mitchell.

NCAA Issue:
2 Operating Principle 2.2 requires an institution to demonstrate that there is a commitment to the fair and equitable treatment of student-athletes, in support of their academic endeavors. In order to demonstrate conformity with this operating principle, an institution may develop and implement an institutional plan to address academic support issues in the intercollegiate athletics program. Acceptable plans for improvement must provide specific steps to achieve the measurable goals for completing the work. After reviewing Page Nos. 79 and 80 of your institution's self-study report, the committee noted your institution did not include specific steps in its plans for improvement to achieve the measurable goals stated in the following program areas:

a. Departmental liaisons;
b. Staffing; and
c. Program development.

Therefore, your institution must revise its current academic support plan to include specific steps
to achieve the measurable goals stated in the aforementioned areas. In addition, your institution must demonstrate that its revised academic support plan was developed with broad-based participation and has received formal institutional approval.

CSUB Response:
A revised improvement plan for Operating Principle 2.2 has been submitted. This revised plan was developed with broad-based participation, review and approval by the academic integrity self-study subcommittee, IAAC, Academic Senate, SAAC, and President’s Cabinet. The plan was also reviewed and approved by President Horace Mitchell.

NCAA Issue:
3 Operating Principle 2.2 requires an institution to demonstrate that there is a commitment to the fair and equitable treatment of student-athletes, in support of their academic endeavors. In order to demonstrate conformity with this operating principle, an institution may develop and implement an institutional plan to address academic support issues in the intercollegiate athletics program. Acceptable plans for improvement must provide specific timetables for completing the work. After reviewing Page Nos. 79 and 80 of your institution's self-study report, the committee noted your institution did not include specific timetables in its plans for improvement for each of the following program areas:

a. Academic advising;
b. Departmental liaisons;
c. Staffing;
d. Program development; and
e. Academic support.

Therefore, your institution must revise its current academic support plan to include specific timetables for each of the aforementioned areas. In addition, your institution must demonstrate that its revised academic support plan was developed with broad-based participation and has received formal institutional approval.

CSUB Response:
In response to the initial findings of the Committee on Athletics Certification, the campus has revised and updated its academic support improvement plan to include specific timetables for the following areas:

a. Academic advising;
b. Departmental liaisons;
c. Staffing;
d. Program development; and
e. Academic support.

This revised plan was developed with broad-based participation, review and approval by the academic support self-study subcommittee, IAAC, Academic Senate, SAAC, and President’s Cabinet. The plan was also reviewed and approved by President Horace Mitchell.

NCAA Issue:
3.1 Gender Issues
1 Operating Principle 3.1 stipulates that an institution must conduct a thorough and written review of each of the 17 program areas for gender issues. In order to demonstrate conformity with this operating principle, the review must:

a. Describe how the institution has ensured a complete study of the 17 program areas;
b. Provide data demonstrating the institution's commitment, including resource allocation, across each of the 17 areas;
c. Using data provided in letter b above, analyze and explain how the institution is meeting the needs of the underrepresented gender within the athletics program; and
d. Explain how the institution's written, stand-alone plan for gender issues addresses each of the 17 areas.

After reviewing Page Nos. 121 and 122 of your institution's self-study report and supplemental material submitted July 9, 2009, the committee noted your institution stated beginning in September 2009, both the CHOICES program and the CHAMPS workshops will include gender equity as a specific program.

Therefore, your institution must revise its current gender-issues plans for improvement in the program area of programs and activities (student-athletes), to include gender-equity programs that will be offered by the CHOICES program and CHAMPS workshops beginning September 2009.

CSUB Response:
The following is new information to be added to Operating Principal 3.1, item #16 d (found on page 121 of the original report):

As a corollary of the CHOICES program, the Counseling Center will offer gender-related programs in October 2009 and April 2010. CHAMPS will offer a gender-focused program in November 2009.

NCAA Issue:
2 Operating Principle 3.1 requires an institution to formally adopt a written plan for the future for the intercollegiate athletics program that ensures the institution maintains, or continues progress toward, a program that is equitable for both genders. The plan must include measurable goals an institution intends to achieve, steps the institution will take to achieve those goals, persons responsible and timetables. An institution's plan must extend at least five years into the future and be active at all times. After reviewing Page No. 123 of your institution's self-study report and supplemental material submitted July 9, 2009 the committee is unclear as to the specific length (e.g., five years) of this plan, including the specific years this plan will be active. Therefore, your institution must demonstrate its revised gender-issues plan was developed using broad-based participation, has received formal institutional approval, extends at least five years into the future and is active at all times.

CSUB Response:
The following is an update of Operating Principal 3.1, item #11, paragraph 1 (found on page 123 of the original report):

To create alignment with the most current plan for gender issues, the committee’s plan will utilize dates that overlap with the most current five-year plan, 2007-12. The plan created through the self-study is valid for the five-year period of 2009-14.

NCAA Issue:
3 Operating Principle 3.1 requires an institution to formally adopt a written plan for the future for the intercollegiate athletics program that ensures the institution maintains, or continues progress toward, a program that is equitable for both genders. The plan must include measurable goals an institution intends to achieve, steps the institution will take to achieve those goals, persons
responsible and timetables.

After reviewing Page Nos. 98 through 106 of your institution's self-study report, the committee noted your institution did not include specific steps to achieve the measurable goals stated in the program area of programs and activities for student-athletes. Therefore, your institution must revise its current gender issues plan to include specific steps to achieve the measurable goals in the aforementioned program area.

In addition, your institution must demonstrate that its revised gender-issues plan was developed with broad-based participation and has received formal institutional approval.

CSUB Response:
A revised improvement plan for Operating Principle 3.1 has been submitted and addresses specific steps to achieve program goals in the area of programs and activities. This revised plan was developed with broad-based participation, review and approval by the gender equity subcommittee, IAAC, Academic Senate, SAAC, and President’s Cabinet. The plan was also reviewed and approved by President Horace Mitchell.

NCAA Issue:
4 Operating Principle 3.1 requires an institution to formally adopt a written plan for the future for the intercollegiate athletics program that ensures the institution maintains, or continues progress toward, a program that is equitable for both genders. The plan must include measurable goals an institution intends to achieve, steps the institution will take to achieve those goals, persons responsible and timetables.

After reviewing Page Nos. 124 through 127 of your institution's self-study report, the committee noted your institution did not include specific timetables for completing the work in each of the following program areas:
- Accommodation of interests and abilities;
- Athletics scholarships;
- Scheduling of contests and practice time;
- Travel allowance;
- Academic support services;
- Coaches;
- Locker rooms, practice and competitive facilities;
- Medical and training room facilities and services;
- Housing, dining facilities and services;
- Publicity and awards;
- Support services;
- Retention (staff and coaches);
- Retention (student-athletes);
- Programs and activities (staff and coaches);
- Programs and activities (student-athletes); and
- Participation in governance and decision making.

Therefore, your institution must revise its current gender-issues plan to include specific timetables for completing the work in each of the aforementioned program areas. In addition, your institution must demonstrate that its revised gender-issues plan was developed with broad-based participation and has received formal institutional approval.
**CSUB Response:**
A revised improvement plan for Operating Principle 3.1 has been submitted and includes specific timetables for completing the work in noted program areas. This revised plan was developed with broad-based participation, review and approval by the gender equity subcommittee, IAAC, Academic Senate, SAAC, and President’s Cabinet. The plan was also reviewed and approved by President Horace Mitchell.

**NCAA Issue:**

**3.2 Diversity Issues**

1 Operating Principle 3.2 requires an institution to demonstrate that it is committed to, and has progressed toward, fair and equitable treatment of all student-athletes and athletics department personnel with diverse racial, ethnic and other backgrounds. Self-study Item No. 6 asks institutions to analyze and explain the data regarding the racial or ethnic composition for the following for the three most recent academic years:

- a. Full-time senior administrative athletics department staff members (i.e., assistant athletics directors up through the athletics director level);
- b. Other full- and part-time professional (i.e., nonclerical) athletics department staff members (such as trainers, ticket managers, academic support staff, and facility managers, even if the position is not funded by or does not report to the athletics department);
- c. Full- and part-time head coaches;
- d. Full- and part-time assistant coaches (including graduate assistant and volunteer coaches);
- e. Faculty-based athletics board or committee (e.g., faculty senate subcommittee on athletics, faculty athletics committee); and
- f. Other advisory or policy-making group (e.g., governing board subcommittee for athletics, student-athlete advisory committee) members (if any).

After reviewing Page Nos. 130 and 131 of your institution's self-study report, the committee noted that your institution indicated that increasing the diversity of the following groups would be a target goal in the diversity-issues plan:

- a. Full- and part-time head coaches;
- b. Faculty-based athletics board or committee members; and
- c. Other advisory or policy-making group.

However, your institution did not provide the plan for improvement to attain the target goals.

Therefore, your institution must revise its diversity-issues plan for improvement to include its plan for how it will attain target goals in the aforementioned areas. In addition, your institution must provide must demonstrate that its revised diversity-issues plan was developed with broad-based participation and has received formal institutional approval.

**CSUB Response:**
A substantially revised and enlarged improvement plan has been submitted. Among the areas most elaborated on in detail are Institutional Commitment and Retention. In all areas, the previous plan was reviewed and clarification was added to area of issues and the differences between measurable goals and steps to achieve goals. In most areas, the issue is the need to reaffirm the initiatives and progress already under way.

With regard to (a) full- and part-time coaches, this is directly addressed under hiring practices. With regard to (b) faculty-based athletics board or committee members, please refer to the improvement plan’s section on partnerships. Finally, (c) other advisory or policy-making groups, has been clarified in the issues, measurable goals, and steps to achieve the goals under
Programs (coaches and staff), Programs (student-athletes), and Participation in Governance and Decision-Making.

In the original submission, the diverse and broad participation in our subcommittee’s analysis and plan formulation was summarized, and we re-affirm that at this time. The revised improvement plan was developed through a diverse and broadly-based self-study subcommittee on diversity, and reviewed and critiqued by the IAAC, Compliance and Commitment to Rules Committee, Academic Senate, SAAC, and President’s Cabinet. The plan was reviewed and approved by President Horace Mitchell.

NCAA Issue:
2 Operating Principle 3.2 requires an institution to demonstrate that it is committed to, and has progressed toward, fair and equitable treatment of all student-athletes and athletics department personnel with diverse racial, ethnic and other backgrounds. Self-Study Item No. 7 asks institutions to analyze and explain the data regarding the racial or ethnic composition for student-athletes who received athletics aid and for all students for the three most recent academic years. After reviewing Page No. 131 of your institution's self-study report, the committee noted your institution provided the racial/ethnic composition of students on aid compared to student-athletes on athletics aid. However, your institution did not provide the racial/ethnic composition of all students compared to the racial/ethnic composition of all student-athletes on athletics aid.

Therefore, your institution must provide the applicable data and explain the racial/ethnic composition of all students compared to the racial/ethnic composition of all student-athletes on athletics aid.

CSUB Response:
The data on student-athletes on financial aid compared to all students generally has been updated. However, we retained in the table on page 177 the data showing racial and ethnic composition of all students on financial aid. The diversity self-study subcommittee has created a second table that shows percentages in addition to the raw numbers in the first table. These two tables will be available to the Peer-Review Team. The committee has commented previously on the differences and salient facts with regard to student-athletes on financial aid compared to all students on financial aid.

The expanded tables show that among the student-athletes on financial aid, there is relative stability except in the categories for non-resident aliens and other, which have undergone definitional change.

For all undergraduate students at the university, again there is relative stability for the three years under study: American Indians and Native Americans – 59, 55, and 69; Asian and Pacific Islander – 291, 299, and 320; Black – 343, 343, and 382; Hispanic 1695, 1820, and 1876; and White 1658, 1575, and 1477. The losses in all students identified as White are mirrored by the increases in Hispanic.

This trend can also be seen in the race and ethnic composition of all students for the three year period calculated by percentage. In percentages, CSUB has had American Indian and Native American – 1.3, 1.2, and 1.5; Asian and Pacific Islander – 6.4, 6.4, and 6.8; Black – 7.5, 7.3, and 8.1; Hispanic 37.1, 38.6, and 39.9; and White 36.3, 33.4, and 31.4. The non-resident aliens and others among all students at the university are 2.0, 1.8, and 1.7 and 9.5, 11.3, and 10.6 respectively.
These three distributions (all students on financial aid, student-athletes on financial aid, and all undergraduate students generally) demonstrate that the most salient difference is that Hispanics are underrepresented in CSUB’s intercollegiate athletics programs. The diversity self-study subcommittee and others who were consulted agree that there are several reasons for this fact: (a) the family and work commitments of many Hispanic students, especially those from small towns in our service area, (b) the older age of some of these students, especially the returning women students, and (c) the lack of social resources that provides for their participation in sports programs at young ages.

The coaches and the advisory groups will be studying ways to overcome these factors, including collaboration with area and regional feeder schools and participation in other programs that are increasing Hispanic participation in sports, such as golf, where they are traditionally underrepresented. The newest example of such a program is the Aquatics Club open to the community and sponsored by the intercollegiate swim program.

**NCAA Issue:**

3 Operating Principle 3.2 requires an institution to demonstrate that it is committed to, and has progressed toward, fair and equal treatment of all student-athletes and athletics department personnel with diverse racial, ethnic and other backgrounds in each of the nine program areas for diversity issues. In order to demonstrate conformity with this operating principle an institution must conduct a thorough and written review of each of the nine program areas for diversity issues. This review must:

- a. Describe how the institution has ensured a complete study of the nine program areas;
- b. Provide data demonstrating the institution's commitment, including resource allocation, across each of the nine areas;
- c. Using data provided in letter b above, analyze and explain how the institution is meeting the needs of its student-athletes and staff with diverse racial, ethnic and other backgrounds; and
- d. Explain how the institution's written, stand-alone plan for diversity issues addresses each of the nine areas.

After reviewing Page Nos. 132 through 141 of your institution's self-study report, the committee is unclear as to whether your institution conducted a comprehensive analysis using points listed in letters a through d above in order to determine whether deficiencies exist within the program areas. The committee believes this comprehensive review is crucial to the development of a reasonable diversity issues plan for your institution.

Therefore, your institution must conduct a formal and comprehensive review of its commitment to diversity in the intercollegiate athletics program by evaluating all nine program areas using points listed in letters a through d outlined previously. Further, if any deficiencies are revealed, they will need to be addressed and your institution must submit a revised diversity-issues plan that is developed with broad-based participation and has received formal institutional approval.

**CSUB Response:**
The self-study, both at the subcommittee level and in conjunction with other subcommittees and university faculty, staff, and students, examined all nine program areas for diversity identifying issues, measurable goals, steps to achieve goals, responsible personnel, and time lines. The diversity self-study subcommittee has had available the same data on budgets, academic...
progress, gender composition, and programs to secure and enhance student-athlete well being. The following are brief statements of our comprehensive evaluation for each of the nine areas:

9.1 Institutional Commitment: The university will continue the procedures under way, as well as communicate the commitments more explicitly and in various public ways. The procedures will be updated and reviewed on no less than annually. The diversity self-study subcommittee also endorses the use of the surveys and exit interviews to identify diversity issues that need to be addressed.

9.2 Assessment: The “issue” is to build into the plan continuous assessment of the diversity issues. The university is promising, with our subcommittee’s support, to work with the FAR and the diversity subcommittee of the IAAC to continue assessment throughout the plan years.

9.3 Recruitment: The diversity self-study subcommittee study shows that “networking” for diversity student-athletes occurs in many ways during their years of study. The diversity self-study subcommittee’s recommendation is designed to insure that this networking begins even while the potential student-athlete is yet a recruit.

9.4 Hiring Practices: An investment in advertising and incremental budget increases has been identified as the primary commitment needed to continue to diversify hiring pools and enrich diversity among the coaches and staff.

9.5 Retention: The diversity self-study subcommittee concluded that retention, for both diversity staff and student-athletes, should become more explicit. The intentions are in place, but should be more programmatic. For coaches and staff, there is need for a programmatic plan to be developed this academic year. For student-athletes, steps that have already been identified should be implemented.

9.6 Partnerships: CSUB strives to continue improvements and initiatives already in progress. The stand-alone plan includes a series of steps for the athletics department and its university partners to continue or initiate these steps to achieve the goals with time lines for each.

9.7 Programs and Activities: Staff and Coaches: As part of educating coaches and athletics department staff on all issues affecting gender equity, diversity and well-being, the self-study subcommittee has stipulated an effort to include all coaches and staff in university programs and governance outside the department.

9.8 Programs and Activities: Student-Athletes: While recognizing the time limits and academic priorities for student-athletes, the self-study subcommittee found that diversity student-athletes seem to participate less. (There is no comprehensive data about this, and it is an area for further study.) The students on our subcommittee, and especially other student leaders, are advocates for initiating contacts with diversity student-athletes to increase their participation in campus life.

9.9 Participation in Governance and Decision-Making: The senior associate athletic director/SWA is the point person for continuing efforts to recruit diverse student-athletes
and other racial and ethnic minorities into all the governing and advisory bodies, most especially SAAC and IAAC.

NCAA Issue:
4 Operating Principle 3.2 requires that an institution formally adopt a written plan for the future for the intercollegiate athletics program that ensures the institution maintains, or continues progress toward, a program that expands equitable treatment of all student-athletes and athletics personnel with diverse racial, ethnic and other backgrounds. Self-study Item No. 11 requires that the institution's plan be active at all times and include a mechanism to ensure the plan is reviewed on an annual basis, including a comparison of its assessment. After reviewing Page No. 141 of your institution's self-study report and supplemental material submitted July 9, 2009, the committee is unclear how your institution will compare your diversity plan with its assessment.

Therefore, your institution must explain how your diversity plan will be compared to its assessment.

CSUB Response:
The improvement plan for Operating Principle 3.2 will be continuously evaluated against the goals and actions (Steps to Achieve Goals) that are built into the plan at this time and/or that will come into being as a part of studies and initiatives that constitutes the process. There is no place in the plan where there is anything less than an annual review, and in several place assessment will occur more frequently.

Just as importantly, student surveys, exit interviews, Academic Progress Reports, budgetary deliberations, and other required governance actions will be points for assessment of the plan and progress of the component areas. All of these are in addition to the very open culture the self-study subcommittee has previously identified as one means to ensure that issues troubling students, faculty, staff, and community members are identified. Prominent among these open channels of communication is the University Council, a completely open forum, and the President’s website on excellence.

NCAA Issue:
5 Operating Principle 3.2 stipulates that institutions must formally adopt a written plan for the future for the intercollegiate athletics program that ensures the institution maintains a program, or continues progress toward a program, which expands opportunities and support for minority student-athletes and athletics personnel. In order to demonstrate conformity with this operating principle, an institution must develop a five-year written, stand-alone plan addressing diversity issues that maintains an institution's conformity or moves an institution into conformity with the operating principle. Acceptable diversity issues plans must address all nine program areas and contain the eight required elements for institutional plans for improvement. The committee noted your institution did not adequately complete a plan for improvement addressing diversity issues.

Therefore, your institution must provide a written, stand-alone institutional plan for addressing diversity issues for the future in the intercollegiate athletics program.

Further, your institution must demonstrate that its diversity-issues plan was developed with broad-based participation, has received formal institutional approval and extends at least five years into the future.
CSUB Response:
The diversity self-study subcommittee submits that the revised improvement plan meets the criteria - stand-alone, study and assessment of all required areas and elements, and comprehensiveness. The plan has been formulated and approved by a diverse, representative committee, and extensively subjected to critique by other equally diverse committees and governing bodies, such as SAAC, IAAC, Academic Senate, and President’s Cabinet. The plan was also reviewed and approved by President Horace Mitchell.

NCAA Issue:
3.3 Student-Athlete Well-Being
1 Operating Principle 3.3 requires an institution to provide evidence that the well-being of student-athletes and the fairness of their treatment is monitored, evaluated and addressed on a continuing basis. In order to demonstrate conformity with this operating principle, an institution must demonstrate that it conducts exit interviews via in-person meetings and/or teleconferences in each sport with a sample of student-athletes whose eligibility has expired in accordance with NCAA Constitution 6.3.2. After reviewing Page Nos. 147 and 158 of your institution's self-study report, the committee noted that your institution stated that exit interviews will be added to the current student-athlete well-being plan. However, the committee also noted your institution's current exit interviews are not in person. Further, your institution stated that it conducted a pilot exit interview that was conducted by the professor of sociology and assistant vice president for institutional research, planning and assessment, and the associate professor of nursing. The committee is unclear whether these individuals designated representatives to conduct the exit interview per NCAA legislation. Therefore, your institution must provide evidence demonstrating that the exits interviews were conducted in accordance with Constitution 6.3.2 and revise its plan for improvement to ensure that future exit interviews are conducted in accordance with Constitution 6.3.2. Please note, plans for improvement must contain all required elements.

CSUB Response:
In accordance with the NCAA Constitution 6.3.2 the director of athletics designated Dr. Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley, faculty athletics representative, as the person to conduct student-athlete interviews. Dr. Kegley administers all the student-athlete annual surveys given to each team at the end of their season.

With regard to the exit interviews, Dr. Kegley designated Dr. Laura Hecht, professor of sociology and vice president for institutional research, planning, and assessment, and Dr. Gail Davidson, associate professor of nursing, to conduct a pilot procedure for person-to-person exit interviews with student-athletes who had exhausted their eligibility. They were selected because of their specific training in person-to-person interviews. Dr. Davidson will be designated as the person to develop an annual exit interview process for the future years. She will establish a specific time line and set of procedures for the interviews.

The creation and implementation of the exit interviews was added to the revised well-being improvement plan.

NCAA Issue:
2 Operating Principle 3.3 requires an institution to have in place programs that protect the health of and provide a safe environment for each of its student-athletes in each of the seven program areas for student-athlete well-being. In order to demonstrate conformity with this operating principle an institution must conduct a thorough and written review of each of the seven program areas for student-athlete well-being. This review must:
a. Describe how the institution has ensured a complete study of the seven program areas for student-athlete well-being;
b. Provide data demonstrating the institution's commitment and current efforts across each of the seven areas for all student-athletes;
c. Using data provided in letter b above, analyze and explain how the institution is meeting the needs of its student-athletes; and
d. If the institution identifies any deficiency(ies) related to a student-athlete well-being program area, explain how the institution's written, stand-alone plan for student-athlete well-being addresses the deficiency(ies).

After reviewing Page Nos. 154 through 173 of your institution's self-study report, the committee noted your institution identified many recommendations within each program area that were not included in its student-athlete well-being plan for improvement.

Therefore, your institution must revise its student-athlete well-being plan for improvement to include recommendations that were provided within each program area. Please note, plans for improvement must contain all required elements.

CSUB Response:
The various recommendations made in the self-study report have been added to the 2006 Student-Athlete Welfare Plan that was created as part of the original self-certification report. The revised improvement plan has been submitted and includes the following additions:

a. General information for student-athletes
b. Grievance procedures for student-athletes
c. Policies on prohibition of discrimination because of sexual orientation
d. Consistency in written policies
e. Travel policy
f. Travel policy in regard to academic import
g. Information on medical policies
h. Catastrophic incident plan for intercollegiate athletics
i. Appropriate medical coverage for intercollegiate athletics
j. Strength and conditioning training
k. Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
l. In-person exit interview

This revised plan was developed with broad-based participation, review and approval by the student-athlete well-being self-study subcommittee, IAAC, Academic Senate, SAAC, and President’s Cabinet. The plan was also reviewed and approved by President Horace Mitchell.

NCAA Issue:
3 Operating Principle 3.3 requires an institution to provide evidence that the well-being of student-athletes and the fairness of their treatment is monitored, evaluated and addressed on a continuing basis.

Acceptable plans for improvement must include specific measurable goals for completing the work.

After reviewing Page Nos. 174 and 175 of your institution's self-study report, the committee noted your institution created a student-athlete well-being plan for improvement. However, your institution's plan for improvement did not include specific measurable goals in the following
areas:
  a. Training facility;
  b. Sports medicine team model;
  c. Financial needs;
  d. Job opportunities;
  e. Social integration;
  f. Educational needs; and
  g. CHAMPS/Life Skills.

Therefore, your institution must revise its current student-athlete well-being plan to include specific measurable goals in the aforementioned program areas. In addition, your institution must demonstrate that its revised student-athlete well-being plan was developed with broad-based participation and has received formal institutional approval.

CSUB Response:
The improvement plan for student-athlete welfare has been updated to include specific measurable goals for the following items:

  a. Training facility
  b. Sports medicine team model
  c. Financial needs
  d. Job opportunities
  e. Social integration
  f. Educational needs
  g. CHAMPS

This revised plan was developed with broad-based participation, review and approval by the student-athlete well-being self-study subcommittee, IAAC, Academic Senate, SAAC, and President’s Cabinet. The plan was also reviewed and approved by President Horace Mitchell.

NCAA Issue:
4 Operating Principle 3.3 requires an institution to provide evidence that the well-being of student-athletes and the fairness of their treatment is monitored, evaluated and addressed on a continuing basis.

Acceptable plans for improvement must include specific steps for completing the work. After reviewing Page Nos. 174 and 175 of your institution's self-study report, the committee noted your institution created a student-athlete well-being plan for improvement. However, your institution's plan for improvement did not include specific steps to achieve the measurable goals stated in the following areas:
  a. Training facility;
  b. Sports medicine team model;
  c. Financial needs; and
  d. Scheduling.

Therefore, your institution must revise its current student-athlete well-being plan to include specific steps to achieve the measurable goals in the aforementioned program areas. In addition, your institution must demonstrate that its revised student-athlete well-being plan was developed with broad-based participation and has received formal institutional approval.
CSUB Response:
The improvement plan for student-athlete welfare has been updated to include specific steps for achieving the goals for the following areas:

a. Training facility
b. Sports medicine model
c. Financial needs
d. Scheduling

This revised plan was developed with broad-based participation, review and approval by the student-athlete well-being self-study subcommittee, IAAC, Academic Senate, SAAC, and President’s Cabinet. The plan was also reviewed and approved by President Horace Mitchell.

NCAA Issue:
5 Operating Principle 3.3 requires an institution to provide evidence that the well-being of student-athletes and the fairness of their treatment is monitored, evaluated and addressed on a continuing basis.

Acceptable plans for improvement must include specific timetables for completing the work. After reviewing Page Nos. 174 and 175 of your institution's self-study report, the committee noted your institution created a student-athlete well-being plan for improvement. However, your institution's plan for improvement did not include specific timetables for each of the following program areas:

a. Sports medicine training model;
b. Financial needs;
c. Information;
d. Job opportunities;
e. Scheduling;
f. Student-athlete responsibility;
g. Academic collegiate;
h. Social integration;
i. Leadership;
j. Citizenship;
k. Sportsmanship;
l. Educational needs; and
m. CHAMPS/Life Skills.

Therefore, your institution must revise its current student-athlete well-being plan to include specific timetables for each of the aforementioned program areas. In addition, your institution must demonstrate that its revised student-athlete well-being plan was developed with broad-based participation and has received formal institutional approval.

CSUB Response:
The improvement plan for student-athlete welfare has been updated to include additional information and timelines for the following:

a. Sports medicine
b. Training mode
c. Financial needs
d. Job opportunities
e. Scheduling
f. Student-athlete responsibility
  g. Academic collegiate
  h. Social integration
  i. Leadership
  j. Citizenship
  k. Sportsmanship
  l. Educational needs
  m. CHAMPS

This revised plan was developed with broad-based participation, review and approval by the student-athlete well-being self-study subcommittee, IAAC, Academic Senate, SAAC, and President’s Cabinet. The plan was also reviewed and approved by President Horace Mitchell.