

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

5-14-2002

A descriptive analysis of NCAA Divisions I, II, and III compliance programs

Michele McGowan
Rowan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

McGowan, Michele, "A descriptive analysis of NCAA Divisions I, II, and III compliance programs" (2002).
Theses and Dissertations. 1478.
<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/1478>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact graduateresearch@rowan.edu.

A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF NCAA DIVISIONS I, II, AND III
COMPLIANCE PROGRAMS

By
Michele McGowan

A Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Master of Arts Degree
of
The Graduate School
at
Rowan University
May 14, 2002

Approved by _____
Professor

Date Approved May 14, 2002

© 2002 Michele McGowan

ABSTRACT

MICHELE MCGOWAN
A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF NCAA DIVISIONS I, II, AND III
COMPLIANCE PROGRAMS

2001/02

Dr. Thomas Monahan
Master of Arts in Higher Education

The purpose of this research was to explore a number of aspects and components of athletic compliance programs in Division I, II, and III institutions. I gathered my information for this study via surveys. The subjects surveyed were both male and female athletic administrators at Division I, II, and III colleges and universities. A systematic random sample stratified by division such that it would provide a 90% confidence level with a $\pm 5\%$ margin of error was designed. To achieve the desired confidence level, I sent 213 surveys as follows: 70 surveys were sent to Division I institutions, 58 were sent to Division II, and 85 surveys were sent to Division III institutions. The following number of surveys were returned from each division: Division I 58 (83% response rate), Division II 53 (91% response rate), and Division III 65 (76% response rate.) The overall total response from all three divisions was 83%. This investigation shows the significant differences among compliance programs in Division I, II, and III institutions. The research concludes that compliance programs in Division I institutions have more support programs and are more beneficial in helping student athletes.

MINI-ABSTRACT

MICHELE MCGOWAN
A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF NCAA DIVISION I, II, AND III
COMPLIANCE PROGRAMS
2001/02
Dr. Thomas Monahan
Masters of Arts in Higher Education

In the university setting, student athletes have always been under academic scrutiny. In many ways, they are under a microscope in terms of their academic success and failure, and they have more pressures and stress to deal with than the regular student population. This research study explores a number of aspects and components of athletic compliance programs in Division I, II, and III institutions. The research outlined the extent of involvement of compliance officers in selected areas of all divisions. The data shows a statistically significant difference Between Division I and Division III compliance programs. The data also presents a significant difference between divisions regarding the extent of support services provided to student athletes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would to thank all the people who have helped me in the process of completing my thesis. Dr. Monahan for being a true and honest mentor. Scott Leacott for letting me use his computer everyday. Thank you Dad, Scott, Annette Grassia, and Michelle Andre for coping with me throughout this process. I would also like to thank all the institutions that participated in the survey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE	
INTRODUCTION.....	1-4
CHAPTER TWO	
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	5-26
CHAPTER THREE	
METHODOLOGY.....	27-29
CHAPTER FOUR	
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION.....	30-52
CHAPTER FIVE	
CONCLUSIONS.....	53

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In the university setting, student athletes have always been under academic scrutiny. In many ways, they are under a microscope in terms of their academic success and failure, and they have more pressures and stress to deal with than the regular student population. Compliance officers are those university officials whose job it is to keep track of student athletes to ensure that they remain in compliance with the rules and regulations of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). This research study explores a number of aspects and components of athletic compliance programs in Division I, II, and III institutions.

One reason for conducting this research project was to identify the problems athletic compliance officers experience in helping student athletes adapt to the academic rigors in college environments. “It is the responsibility of each member institution to control its intercollegiate athletic programs in compliance with the rules and regulations of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA)” (NCAA Seminar Notebook, 2001, p.3).

The NCAA was founded in 1905 and is made up of 972 schools classified into three divisions. Division I has 318 schools; Division II has 261; and Division III has 393. The primary purpose of the Association is to maintain intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the educational program and the athlete as an integral part of the student body (NCAA Guide for College, 2001-2002). Member institutions agree to abide by Association rules governing intercollegiate athletics, which are enforced through the

Association's Executive Committee. This research explores specific compliance problems among the three classifications of divisions.

This research investigates compliance programs in institutions of Divisions I, II, and III. This study also ascertains the job responsibilities of compliance officers and essential characteristics of compliance programs. It is necessary to enforce rules and regulations at the national level. Every intercollegiate athletic employee and representative should be held accountable for fully complying with all NCAA rules and regulations. Each passing year, NCAA compliance becomes more complex. There are several compliance concepts that need to be kept in perspective. These concepts are institutional control, key elements in compliance, shared responsibility, and monitoring procedures. This research explored these concepts and compared the specific problems each classification of institution confronts.

An institution demonstrates institutional control when formal institutional policies and procedures for compliance are in place (McKelvey, 1977). Control is also demonstrated when policies and procedures are monitored and enforced and are established in such a way as to deter violations before they occur. Finally, control is demonstrated when steps are taken to alter a compliance system when there are indications the system is not working (Regional Seminar Notebook Divisions I, II, and III, 2001).

The key elements in a compliance program can enhance an institution's ability to prevent or detect violations. Compliance programs need to be coordinated centrally through a system that ensures *communication, organization, documentation*, and the *evaluation* of student athletes. The institution's commitment to rules and compliance is

demonstrated through oral and written communications with various campus entities. Key compliance tasks and responsibilities are communicated clearly to individuals with compliance responsibilities. In each department that plays a role in completing a compliance task, an individual is designated to communicate with other departments.

Organization is enforced through senior level institutional administrators assuming leadership roles in establishing the institution's commitment to compliance initiatives (Leith, 1983). Institutions centrally coordinate their rules and compliance program. Key tasks and responsibilities are identified and assigned to appropriate individuals in each area of compliance the institution considers critical and sensitive. The formal process for conducting investigations of alleged rules violations and reporting confirmed rules violations to the NCAA and conference office has been established through organization.

Compliance is an important factor in the campus community through the documentation of policies and procedures. Policies and procedures relating to compliance systems are clearly documented and are available. Each key compliance area maintains the supporting documentation necessary to substantiate institutional policies and procedures relating to compliance systems. Responsibilities of key participants in compliance areas are reflected in job descriptions, letters of appointment, and contracts.

Institutions often use evaluations to ensure continuing and regular administrative oversight in key compliance areas. Compliance officers approve policies and procedures in critical and sensitive compliance areas. Institutional staff members inside the athletics department are evaluated periodically on their rules-compliance responsibilities. All

aspects of the rules-compliance program are subject to periodic review by some institutional authority outside the athletics department.

Shared responsibility is used to describe the active involvement of various campus constituencies in the administration of an effective compliance program. Shared responsibility includes established relationships on campus, an established compliance committee, and review of the compliance program. Institutions use compliance committees to facilitate the application of the concept of shared responsibility. Committee members work together to complete monitoring tasks, educate, and ensure compliance with NCAA regulations through a system of checks and balances that involves both athletics and non-athletics staff. This research compares responsibilities of compliance officers among institutions on various levels.

The following research questions have guided this study. What are the job responsibilities and essential characteristics of compliance officers? What are the problems athletic compliance officers' experience? Are compliance programs beneficial to NCAA members? How do compliance programs and concepts differ between Division I, II, and III institutions? What are the key compliance areas that are monitored by the officers? What is the underlying process of compliance programs? How do compliance programs enhance the educational experience of student athletes?

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Background

The NCAA has faced many challenges as its members have increased in number and diversity during a century of growth. In 1905, problems with football spurred the formation of the NCAA. The game's rugged nature resulted in numerous injuries and deaths and prompted many institutions to discontinue the sport. Many institutional leaders urged that football be reformed or abolished from intercollegiate athletics. President Theodore Roosevelt summoned college athletics leaders to two White House conferences to encourage reform. In early December 1905, Chancellor Henry M. MacCracken of New York University convened a meeting of thirteen institutions to initiate changes in football playing rules. At a meeting on December 28, 1905 in New York City, the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States (IAAUS) was founded by 62 members (NCAA News, 2000).

The IAAUS was officially constituted March 31, 1906 and took its present name, The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) in 1910. For several years, the NCAA was a discussion group and rule-making body. In 1921, the first NCAA national championship was the National Collegiate Track and Field Championship (NCAA News, 2000). Gradually, more rules and committees were formed, and more championships were held.

Several problems brought the NCAA to a crossroads after World War II. The "Sanity Code", initially designed to establish guidelines for recruiting and financial aid,

has failed to completely curb abuses involving student athletes. The “Sanity Code” holds student athletes to the same sound academic standards as the general student body, awarding financial aid without consideration for athletics ability. It further provides a policy for recruiting that basically prohibits a coach or anyone representing a member school from recruiting any prospective student-athlete with the offer of illegal financial aid (NCAA News, 2001). In addition, postseason football games were multiplying rapidly, and member institutions were increasingly concerned about the effects of unrestricted television on football attendance.

The complexity and scope of these problems and growth in members and championships demonstrated the increasing need for full-time professional leadership. In 1951, Walter Byers was named executive director of the NCAA, and a national headquarters was established in Kansas City, Missouri in 1952. A program to control live television of football games was approved, the annual convention delegated enforcement powers to the Executive Committee, and legislation was adopted governing postseason bowl games.

The NCAA’s membership was divided into three legislative and competitive divisions in 1973 at the first special convention ever held. Five years later, Division I members voted to create subdivisions I-A and I-AA in the sport of football. The only difference between I-AA and I-A is that I-AA schools do not need to meet attendance requirements (NCAA News, 2001). The NCAA began administering women’s athletics programs in 1980 when Divisions II and III established ten championships for 1981-1982. A year later, the historic 75th Convention adopted an extensive governance plan to

include women's athletics programs, services and representation. The delegates expanded the women's championships program with the addition of 19 events.

Walter Byers retired on October 1, 1987, after 36 years as the Association's executive director. Richard D. Schultz, who resigned in 1993, replaced him. Today, President Cedric W. Dempsey leads the national office staff of more than 320 employees based in Indianapolis (NCAA News, 2000).

The mission of the NCAA is "to maintain intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the educational program and the athlete as an integral part of the student body" (NCAA Guide for College, 2001-2002, p.2). The NCAA's purposes are to initiate, stimulate and improve intercollegiate athletics programs for student athletes and to promote and develop educational leadership, physical fitness, and athletics excellence (Summary of NCAA Regulation, Divisions I, II, and III, 2001-2002). The NCAA prepares student athletes for leadership in a dynamic and diverse society (Parkhouse, 1980). A priority of the organization is to maintain the fundamental connection between classroom performance and athletics participation through standards for initial and continuing eligibility that ensure equitable access to higher education and encourages academic success.

Over the last twenty years, the role of the NCAA intercollegiate compliance program for men and women has undergone many changes. This is due in part to the combining of athletic programs for women and men. In addition, skyrocketing budgets, negative publicity because of rules violations, poor graduation rates, recurrent disciplinary problems with student athletes, lawsuits involving sex discrimination, and gender equity issues have contributed to greater visibility and accountability than in the

past. Recognizing that the compliance program has undergone changes, there is a need to identify and update current competencies, skills, and knowledge deemed important in athletic administration (Judd, 1995). In the past, athletic administrator positions were described as performing skills related to those in other organizations (Spradel, 1974). However, the new knowledge and levels of expertise in budget, finance, use of computers, collective bargaining, public relations, NCAA rules and regulations, and federal school laws (Title IX) now require preparation in a number of competencies in order to be a successful compliance officer.

Divisional Differences

Division I member institutions have to sponsor at least seven sports for men and seven for women (or six for men and eight for women) with two team sports for each gender. Each playing season has to be represented by each gender as well. There are contest and participant minimums for each sport, as well as scheduling criteria. For sports other than football and basketball, Division I schools must play 100% of the minimum number of contests against Division I opponents. Division I men's and women's basketball teams who play more than the minimum number of games have to play all but two games against Division I teams. Schools that have football are classified as Division I-A or I-AA. Division I-A teams have to meet certain attendance requirements for competition. At least one of the following must apply: (a) 17,000 people in attendance per home game, (b) 20,000 average of all football games in the last four years, (c) 30,000 permanent seats in their stadium and an average attendance of

17,000 per home game, or (d) inclusion in a member conference in which at least six conference members sponsor football or more than half of football schools meet attendance criteria. Division I-AA teams are not required to meet minimum attendance requirements. Division I-A and I-AA school must meet minimum financial aid awards for their athletics program, and there are maximum financial aid awards for each sport that a Division I school cannot exceed (NCAA News, 2000).

Division II institutions have to sponsor at least four sports for men and four for women, with two team sports for each gender, and each playing season represented by each gender. There are contest and participant minimums for each sport, as well as scheduling criteria. Football and men's and women's basketball teams must play 50% of their games against Division II or I-A or I-AA opponents. For sports other than football and basketball, there are no scheduling requirements. There are no attendance requirements for football, or arena game requirements for basketball. There are maximum financial aid awards for each sport that a Division II institution must not exceed. Division II teams usually feature a number of local or in-state student athletes. Many Division II student athletes pay for school through a combination of scholarship money, grants, student loans, and employment earnings. Division II athletic programs are financed in the institution's budget like other academic departments on campus. Traditional rivalries with regional institutions dominate the schedules of many Division II athletics programs (NCAA News, 2000).

Division III institutions have to sponsor at least five sports for men and five for women, with two team sports for each gender, and each playing season represented by each gender. Division III athletics features student athletes who receive no financial aid

related to their athletic ability, and athletic departments are staffed and funded like any other department in the university. Division III athletics departments place special importance on the impact of athletics on the participants rather than on the spectators. The student athlete's experience is of paramount concern. Division III athletics encourages participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletics opportunities available to students, placing primary emphasis on regional in-season and conference competition (NCAA News, 2000).

Different Programs and Concepts among Division I, II, III

Division I

Compliance programs in Division I organizations must abide by the NCAA regulations regarding eligibility. Ethical conduct plays a major role in maintaining eligibility for competition. The NCAA manual clearly states that "you must compete with honesty and sportsmanship at all times so that you represent the honor and dignity of fair play"(NCAA Bylaw 10.01.1, 2001-2002, p.6). Division I athletes are not eligible to compete if they knowingly: (a) provide information to individuals involved in organized gambling activities concerning intercollegiate athletic competition, (b) solicit a bet on any intercollegiate team, (c) accept a bet on any team representing the institution, or (d) participate in any gambling activity that involves intercollegiate athletics through a bookmaker (NCAA Bylaw 10.3).

Division I athletes are not eligible to compete if they have shown dishonesty in evading or violating NCAA regulations (NCAA Bylaw 14.01.3.3). Compliance programs must make sure that athletes are amateurs in all sports. Division I athletes are not eligible for participation in a sport if they have taken pay, or the promise of pay, for

competing in that sport. They are also not eligible if they have agreed orally or in writing to compete in professional athletics in that sport. Athletes are also not eligible in a sport if they have ever accepted money, transportation, or other benefits from an agent or agreed to have an agent market their athletic ability or reputation in that sport (NCAA Bylaw 12.3). Division I athletes are not eligible in any sport if, after they become student athletes, they accept any pay for promoting a commercial product or service or allow their names or pictures to be used for promoting a commercial product or service. Finally, they are not eligible in any sport if, because of their athletic ability, they were paid for work they did not perform, paid at a rate higher than the going rate, or were paid for the value an employer placed on their reputation, fame, or personal following.

Financial aid is a common issue compliance programs handle on a regular basis. In order for athletes to be eligible, they may not receive financial aid other than the aid that their institution distributes. However, it is permissible to receive financial aid that has been awarded to a student on a basis other than athletic ability or financial aid from an entity outside the institution that meets the requirements specified in the Division I Manual (NCAA Bylaw 12.4). Athletes must report to their institution any financial aid that they receive from a source other than their institution (Summary of NCAA Regulations, Division I, II, III, 2001-2002). Direct and Federal Family Education Loans are a major form of self-help aid that student athletes must report to their institution.

With the start of each new year, questions such as “Who is eligible?” or “What can the fund be used for?” are asked regarding the special assistance fund for student athletes. The fund was initially established in 1991 to meet Division I student athletes’ needs of an emergency or essential nature for which financial assistance is not otherwise

available (NCAA News, 2000). The responsibility for the oversight and administration of the fund, including interpretations, rests solely with the conference offices.

Conferences annually report to the NCAA national office the number of special assistance funds recipients, purposes for which the funds were used, and the specific amount for each purpose.

The special assistance fund also imposes special responsibilities upon Division I financial aid officers and athletics compliance officers. Athletics compliance officers review and approve all special assistance fund awards to be certain they comply with institutional, conference, and NCAA rules. The coordination between the two areas alleviates confusion regarding the application of regulations and the administration of the fund (Williams, 1982).

There are also several Division I academic eligibility requirements. If an athlete first enters a Division I college or university on or after August 1, 1996, in order to be classified a “qualifier”, a checklist of eligibility criteria must be completed. An athlete must graduate from high school and successfully complete a core curriculum of at least 13 academic course units. A qualifier must complete the following: English (4 years), math above Algebra I (2 years), natural or physical lab science (2 years), additional courses in math, English, or science (1 year), social science (2 years), and foreign language or computer science (2 years). The athlete must demonstrate an appropriate grade point average and a combined score on the SAT verbal and math based on the qualifier index scale (NCAA Guide for College-Bound Student-Athlete, 2001-2002). A qualifier is academically eligible and can compete immediately upon entering a Division I institution.

A “partial qualifier” is eligible to practice with the team at its home facility and receive an athletics scholarship during his or her first year at a Division I school. Thereafter, he or she has three seasons of competition remaining. A partial qualifier may earn a fourth year of competition, provided that, at the beginning of the fifth academic year following the student athlete’s initial, full-time collegiate enrollment, he or she has not received a baccalaureate degree (NCAA College Bound Student Athlete, 2001-2002).

In order to be classified a partial qualifier, a student will not have met the requirements for a qualifier but is required to have completed three requirements. The first requirement is the need to be a high school graduate. The student also would have successfully completed a core curriculum of at least 13 academic course units in the appropriate core areas. Finally, the athlete needs to present an appropriate core course grade point average and a combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections based on the qualifier index scale (College Bound Student Athlete, 2001-2002).

A “non-qualifier” is a student who has not graduated from high school or who has presented neither the core curriculum grade point average nor SAT scores required for a qualifier. A non-qualifier shall not be eligible for regular season competition or practice during the first academic year in residence and then has three seasons of competition remaining. A non-qualifier during the first academic year in residence shall be eligible for non-athletics institutional financial aid that is not from an athletics source and is based on financial need only (College Bound Student Athlete, 2001-2002).

Institutions shall not permit a student athlete to represent it in intercollegiate athletics competition unless he/she meets all applicable academic eligibility requirements. To be eligible to represent an institution in intercollegiate athletics competition, a student

athlete shall be enrolled in at least a minimum full-time program of studies (12 credits), be in good academic standing and maintain satisfactory progress toward a baccalaureate or equivalent degree. Athletes who are enrolled in less than a full-time program are eligible to compete only if they are enrolled in the last term of their degree program and are carrying credits necessary to finish their degree (Bylaw 14.1.6.2.1.3).

The NCAA constantly reinforces the values of fairness and integrity of intercollegiate athletics (Ulrich, 1982). Compliance programs promote sportsmanship and ethical behavior through an aggressive educational program and collaboration with leaders in athletics. Compliance officers in Division I institutions seek federal legislation to prohibit wagering on amateur athletics. They also work with the higher education community to increase academic support (Parkhouse, 1980). The compliance programs evaluate the effectiveness of current continuing eligibility standards and recommend modifications as deemed appropriate.

Division II

Division II compliance requirements are slightly different when compared to Division I in that Division II has a few more rules and regulations. The ethical conduct section is the same as for both divisions. Athletes must compete with honesty and sportsmanship at all times so they can represent the honor and dignity of fair play. Although ethical conduct eligibility is the same among the different classifications of divisions, the amateurism of all sports differs.

While Division I has rules and regulations for amateurism, Division II has more rules to abide by. The major difference between the two divisions is that prospective student athletes do not automatically lose college eligibility if they participate in activities

before initial collegiate enrollment. The following rules are applicable to all Division II student athletes upon entering a collegiate institution. An individual utilizes a season of competition if he or she participates in activities that meet certain criteria. If the athlete participates in any competition or training in which compensation is provided to any of the participants, he or she is not eligible to compete at the intercollegiate level. Any competition following the signing of the contract is not acceptable for intercollegiate competition. Eligibility is also lost if the athlete is involved in a professional draft or any competition funded by a professional sports organization.

Financial aid in Division II athletics is similar to Division I. Athletes are not eligible if they received financial aid other than the aid distributed by the institution. However, it is permissible to receive money from anyone on whom the athlete is naturally or legally dependent. It is also permissible to receive financial aid that has been awarded on a basis other than athletic ability. Athletes must report to their institution any financial aid that they received from a source other than from their institution. Loans such as the Federal Perkins and the Federal Family Education Loan are examples of such aid. However, it is not mandatory to report financial aid received from one on whom the athlete is naturally or legally dependent (Summary of NCAA Regulations Divisions I, II, III, 2001-2002).

Academic eligibility requirements vary among institutions. If a student first enters a Division II college or university on or after August 1, 1996, in order to be classified a “qualifier,” several requirements must be fulfilled. Student athletes participating in Division II athletics must have completed and graduated from high school. A GPA of 2.0 in the core curriculum is required for competition. The athletes

must have successfully completed 13 academic course units, including: English (3 years), math (2 years), lab science (2 years), additional courses in English, math, science (2 years), social science (2 years), and additional academic courses (2 years). The student athlete must also have a combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections of 820 (if taken on or after April 1, 1995) or a 68 sum score on the ACT (NCAA Guide for College Bound Student Athlete, 2001-2002).

A “partial qualifier” is eligible to practice with a team at its home facility and may receive an athletics scholarship during his or her first year at a Division II school, and then has four seasons of competition remaining. In order to be classified a partial qualifier, the athlete need not have met the requirements for a qualifier, but is required to have graduated from high school. The athlete must also meet one of the following requirements: specified minimum SAT or ACT scores and have completed a required core curriculum consisting of 13 core course units and a 2.0 grade-point average in the core curriculum.

A “non-qualifier” is a student who has not graduated from high school or who has presented neither the core curriculum grade point average nor the SAT/ACT score required for a qualifier. A non-qualifier is not eligible for regular season competition and practice during the first academic year in residence and then has four seasons of competition remaining. A non-qualifier may not receive athletics-related aid as a freshman, but may receive regular need-based financial aid if the school certifies that aid was granted without regard to athletics ability (NCAA Guide for College Bound Student Athlete, 2001-2002).

Once the student athlete is enrolled in a Division II institution, he or she must maintain the academic standards of the institution to remain eligible for competition. To be eligible for competition the athlete: (a) must have been admitted as a regular student seeking an appropriate degree (either associate or baccalaureate) according to the published entrance requirements, (b) must remain in good academic standing according to the standards of the institution, and (c) must be enrolled in at least a minimum full-time program (not less than 12 semester or quarter hours) and maintain satisfactory progress toward a degree. If the student athlete is enrolled in less than a full-time program, he or she is eligible to compete only if he or she is enrolled in the last term of his/her degree program carrying credits necessary to finish the degree (Regional Seminar Notebook Division I, II, III, 2001).

Division III

Division III eligibility requirements are similar but less complex than Division I or II requirements. The ethical conduct code is exactly the same as Divisions I and II, and student athletes are not eligible to compete if they are involved in organized gambling activities concerning intercollegiate athletics competition. The student athletes are not eligible if they knowingly participate in any gambling activity that involves intercollegiate or professional athletics, through a bookmaker, parlay, or any other type of organized gambling (Regional Seminar Notebook Division I, II, III, 2001).

Division III athletics is strict on amateurism in all sports. In this division, the athlete is not eligible for participation in a sport if one of the rules have been violated. The athlete cannot take pay, or the promise to pay, for competing in a sport. The athlete cannot agree (orally or in writing) to compete in professional athletics in that sport. If the

athlete played on any professional athletics team as defined by the NCAA, he or she is not eligible (Regional Seminar Notebook Division I, II, III, 2001). If the athlete has ever accepted money, transportation or other benefits from an agent or agreed to have an agent market his/her athletic ability or reputation, then that student athlete is not eligible. Also, if the athlete accepts any pay for promoting a commercial product or service or allows his or her name or picture to be used, then that athlete is not eligible.

In Division III athletics, no financial aid based on athletic ability is given to the student athletes. An athlete is not eligible to compete if he or she has received financial aid other than the aid permissible. The athletes are allowed to receive aid from their parents or other legal guardians. They may also receive financial aid that has been awarded on a basis other than athletic ability, for example, athletes may receive federal Pell grants. If an athlete receives aid from another source other than his or her institution, it must be reported to their institution.

The academic requirements for Division III athletics are markedly different from Divisions I and II. Unlike the other divisions, these requirements currently do not apply to Division III colleges where institutional, conference, and other NCAA regulations govern eligibility for financial aid, practice, and competition. The Division III academic standards for eligibility to compete are: (a) entrance requirements by the institution, (b) the athlete must to be in good academic standing, and (c) enrollment in at least a minimum full-time program (12 credits). If the athlete is enrolled in less than a full-time program, he or she is eligible to compete only if he or she is enrolled in the last term of the degree program and is carrying credits necessary to finish the degree (Summary of NCAA Regulations Division I, II, III, 2001-2002).

Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse

The Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse certifies athletic eligibility for Division I and II. If an athlete intends to participate in Division I or II athletics as a freshman, he or she must register and be certified by the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse. The previous standards mentioned regarding eligibility apply to the clearinghouse as well. The initial-eligibility certification pertains only to whether the athletes meet the NCAA requirements for participation as freshmen in Division I and II athletics and has no bearing on their admission to a particular Division I or II institution (NCAA Guide to College Bound Student Athlete, 2001-2002).

Athletes must apply for certification after their junior year in high school if they are sure they wish to participate in intercollegiate athletics as freshmen at a Division I or II institution. If the athlete fails to submit all required documents, the file will be discarded after three years. There is no deadline to register with the clearinghouse; however, an athlete must be certified before receiving an athletics scholarship for practicing and competing at a Division I or II institution. The clearinghouse will send the athlete's eligibility status to any Division I or II institution that requests it. The clearinghouse will not send an athlete's eligibility information at the athlete's request; rather, the college must make the request for that information. Additionally, if no member institution requests an athlete's eligibility status, a final certification decision may not be processed (NCAA Guide to College Bound Student Athlete, 2001-2002).

Responsibilities and Characteristics of Compliance Officers

Over the years, the field of athletics has experienced rapid growth and change, underscoring the need for updating knowledge about effective administration of

compliance programs. One purpose of this study was to identify and document the job responsibilities and essential characteristics of intercollegiate athletic compliance officers. There is a need for well-prepared administrators for expanding and complex athletic programs. The process of athletic administration refers to *planning, organizing, leading, and controlling* that take place to accomplish objectives (Robbins, 1980).

Planning encompasses setting objectives, as well as making day-to-day decisions on how these objectives can best be achieved. Planning involves the determination of both ends and means. It also forces the administrator to look ahead and anticipate future deviations based on data from the past and present, to consider the impact of changes on the organization, and to develop appropriate responses. The process of planning as a compliance officer should consist of two major steps: objective setting and evaluation. The first step in the planning process is to identify the organization's objectives. All functional organizational activity should be directed toward objectives, and the organization's performance should be determined by the degree to which it achieves these objectives. The second step in the planning process involves the element of evaluation. Compliance officers establish directly measurable objectives such as evaluation criteria and determine if specific standards have been accomplished.

Organizing is the establishment of relationships among the activities to be performed, the personnel to perform them, and the physical factors that are needed. To coordinate the available resources, the compliance officers must design a formal structure of relationships that will foster the effective and efficient attainment of goals.

In the leading function, the compliance officer guides and supervises the student athletes. This function carries out the objectives established in planning with the

personnel established in the organizing process. Compliance officers' leadership includes supervision, communication, monitoring, managing, and bringing about change.

Control is the final link in the functional chain of athletic administration. It involves checking on activities to ensure that they are going as planned and, in those instances where there are significant deviations, taking the necessary action to correct the problems. Control in the athletic environment can be defined as the process of monitoring activities to determine whether individual units and the organization itself are obtaining and utilizing their resources effectively and efficiently to accomplish their objectives (Robbins, 1980).

The NCAA National Office offers a compliance review program to member institutions to offer advice in helping adhere to all the rules and regulations. At an institution's request, a membership services staff member will visit an institution to assist in reviewing all or any specific aspect of its compliance program (Leith, 1983). The review helps identify key areas where compliance systems are engaged and functioning. A compliance review concentrates on systems that are in place to monitor key compliance areas. The compliance areas this study focused on are: eligibility, ethical conduct, amateurism, financial aid, academic eligibility, and recruitment.

Recruitment is another major issue that compliance officers must address. The rules and regulations for recruitment differ among the three divisions. In addition to general recruiting regulations, no alumni, boosters or representatives of a college's athletics interests can be involved in recruiting in Division I. There can be no phone calls or letters from boosters. The restriction doesn't apply to recruiting by alumni or representatives as part of a college's regular admissions program for all prospective

students, including non-athletes. The athlete (or his/her family) may not receive any benefit, inducement or arrangement such as cash, clothing, cars, improper expenses, transportation, gifts or loans to encourage the athlete to sign a National Letter of Intent or attend a NCAA college. Letters from coaches, faculty members and students (but not boosters) aren't permitted until September 1 at the beginning of the athlete's junior year (Summary of NCAA Regulations Division I, II, III, 2001-200).

In all sports other than football and basketball, phone calls from faculty members and coaches are not permitted until July 1 after completion of a student's junior year in high school. After this, in sports other than football, a college coach or faculty member is limited to one telephone call per week.

In Division I-A and I-AA football, an institution's coaches may telephone the athlete once during the month of May of his/her junior year in high school and then not again until September 1 of his/her senior year in high school. Also, an institution's football coaches can telephone a prospective athlete as often as they wish during the period 48 hours before and 48 hours after 7 a.m. on the initial signing date for the National Letter of Intent and during the contact period. Outside of the contact period, a football coach may only telephone a prospective athlete once per week (Summary of NCAA Regulations Division I, II, III, 2001-2002).

In Division I basketball, an institution's coaches may telephone a prospect on or after June 21 of the prospect's junior year in high school. In addition, only three telephone calls may be made to a prospect during the month of July after the prospect's junior year, with no more than one telephone call per week.

Student athletes already enrolled in a college or university may not make recruiting telephone calls to prospective athletes. Enrolled students (non-athletes) may telephone prospective students as part of a college's regular admissions program directed at all prospective students. However, enrolled students (including student athletes) may receive telephone calls from prospective students at their expense on or after July 1 after completion of their junior year.

A college coach may contact a prospective athlete in person off the college campus only on or after July 1 after completion of his or her junior year in high school. Any face-to-face meeting between a college coach and the athlete, during which more than "hello" is stated, is considered a contact. Also, any face-to-face meeting that is prearranged or that occurs at their high school or competition or practice site is contact, regardless of the conversation. Currently, in all sports other than football and basketball, coaches have seven recruiting opportunities (contacts and evaluations) during the academic year and not more than three of the seven opportunities may be in-person, off-campus contacts. However, a college coach may visit a prospective student athlete's high school with the approval of the principal.

Division II recruiting rules and regulations differ from Division I and III. In Division II recruiting, no alumni or representatives of a college's athletics interests (boosters or representatives) can be involved in off-campus recruiting. However, prospective athletes may receive letters from boosters, faculty members, students, and coaches on or after September 1 of their junior year. In all sports, telephone calls from coaches and faculty members are permissible on or after June 15 before their senior year.

After this, a college coach or faculty member is limited to one telephone call per week to the prospective athlete (NCAA News, 2001).

In Division II football, however, unlimited phone calls to the athlete can be made during a contact period and once a week outside the contact period. Coaches may accept collect calls and use toll free numbers to receive telephone calls from the prospective student or his/her parents at any time. Enrolled students (including student athletes) may not make recruiting telephone calls unless the calls are made as a part of an institution's regular admissions program that coaches may direct to all prospective students. Enrolled students may receive telephone calls at the institution's expense on or after June 15 before the athlete's senior year.

The athlete may not receive any benefit, inducement or arrangement such as cash, clothing, cars, improper expenses, transportation, gifts or loans to encourage him or her to sign an institutional or conference letter of intent or to attend an NCAA school. A college coach may contact the athlete in person off the college campus but only on or after June 15 before the athlete's senior year. The same rule for contact in Division I institutions applies to Division II institutions (Summary of NCAA Regulation Division I, II, III, 2001-2002).

Division III recruitment regulations are straightforward. In addition to general recruiting regulations, athletes may not receive any benefit, inducement or arrangement such as cash, clothing, cars, improper expenses, transportation, gifts or loans to encourage their attendance at any NCAA institution. An athletics department staff member, alumni or representative of a college's athletics interests may contact the athlete in person off the college campus after the athlete's junior year of high school. There is

no limit on the number of contacts or the period when they may occur. Recruits may not try out for a Division III college's athletics team. A tryout is any physical activity conducted by or arranged on behalf of a college, at which they display any athletic ability.

Recruits can visit a college campus any time at the college's expense. On such a visit, the athlete may receive three complimentary admissions to a game on that campus; a tour of off-campus practice and competition sites; a meal in the college's on-campus student dining facilities; and housing, if it is available to all visiting prospective students.

Educational Enhancement through Compliance Programs

The heart of academic reform seeks to ensure that student athletes who complete their eligibility at a NCAA member school are in an enhanced position to earn their degrees. In fact, more student athletes are graduating from college today than ever before (NCAA News, 2001). On average, Division I student athletes graduate at a higher rate than the rest of the student body. The graduation rate is 58 percent for athletes, compared to 56 percent for the overall student body (NCAA News, 2001). To ensure higher graduation rates, intercollegiate athletics must be vigilant to student athlete academic success. It is vital that individuals entering college be prepared to do college level work. The NCAA initial-eligibility clearinghouse was established to facilitate those efforts.

Over the 90-year life of the NCAA, great strides have been made in intercollegiate athletics. Yet, the NCAA is not complacent. There are ongoing issues with which the NCAA continually struggles. The NCAA must remain true to its mission and high ideals: the value of education and sound academic standards, the value of sportsmanship that builds character and promotes leadership, and the principle of fairness

(NCAA News, 2001). The NCAA is committed to the success of the student athlete, both in the classroom and on the field of play. The thrust of the NCAA programs and the investment of the association's revenues benefit over 323,000 young people directly and indirectly. Enriching the student athlete's collegiate experience is the goal of the NCAA (NCAA News, 2001).

The challenge to the compliance programs is how to determine if these rules and regulations are fulfilling the student athlete's needs. If the athlete's needs are not being fulfilled, what can be done to improve or expand the compliance program? Does the underlying process of compliance programs enhance the educational experience of the student athletes? Only when institutional responsibility is taken for this population of students can the moral concerns so evident today be addressed in a meaningful way.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Compliance officers in NCAA Divisions I, II, and III play a key role in the overall success of athletic programs. Most research on compliance programs has been done in Division I and II institutions. An institution demonstrates institutional control when formal institutional policies and procedures for compliance are in place. Institutions in all three divisions make clear that violations of NCAA rules will result in disciplinary action against the violator, including possible dismissal from the institution. My research for this case study focuses on compliance officers from Division I, II, and III institutions.

I gathered my information via surveys. The subjects surveyed were both male and female athletic administrators at Division I, II, and III colleges and universities. A systematic random sample stratified by division such that it would provide a 90% confidence level with a $\pm 5\%$ margin of error was designed. The NCAA is made up of 972 institutions classified into three divisions. Division I has 318 institutions; Division II has 261; and Division III has 393. To achieve the desired confidence level, I sent 213 surveys as follows: 70 surveys were sent to Division I institutions, 58 were sent to Division II, and 85 surveys were sent to Division III institutions. The following number of surveys were returned from each division: Division I 58 (83% response rate), Division II 53 (91% response rate), and Division III 65 (76% response rate) (see Appendix A). The overall total response from all three divisions was 83%.

The letter of introduction requested each compliance officer to respond to the survey in hope that the final results of the research will contribute to the growing body of knowledge about the effective methods for keeping student athletes in compliance with

rules and regulations. The survey asked the administrators to identify the extent of their involvement in selected areas. They were also asked to indicate the importance of selected areas. Subject level of involvement and importance were measured on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1= *very involved* or *very great* (essential for performance) to 4= *not involved* or *not at all* (not essential for performance). Demographic information included gender, length of employment as a compliance officer, length of time worked in collegiate athletics, and formal training requirements.

The surveys allowed me to obtain a first hand understanding of their perceptions on compliance programs and issues. I took the results from the surveys and offered recommendations to help strengthen compliance programs and resolve problems that programs experience. In order to ensure the validity of my surveys, I field tested it with the compliance officer at Rowan University. During that meeting, I tested the survey to check for accuracy on the subject matter. The field test gave me the opportunity to eliminate and add questions that needed alterations.

Data collection for this research was conducted from February to May 2002. The survey elicited data about the perceived effectiveness of compliance programs and pinpointed the strengths and weaknesses of compliance programs. Division I, II, and III institutions were given different surveys to complete. The surveys were colored coded to distinguish the different divisions. Every survey in each division was given a numerical code for follow up purposes. The data received from the surveys were analyzed using SPSS.

The study sought to determine the opinions of NCAA athletic administrators regarding a number of issues about compliance. In addition, the analysis explored

differences and similarities among the divisions regarding those issues. Institutions in all three divisions place highest priority on the overall quality of the educational and athletic experience of the student athlete's. In doing so, they seek to strengthen the integration of objectives and programs in athletics with academic and developmental objectives and to assure the integration of athletes with other students.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

In this sub-section, I present the results of the data analysis. In the following sub-section, the meaning of these data analyses are explored and discussed.

Descriptive Statistics

The compliance coordinator position covers a diverse subject area requiring a wide variety of skills and competencies. The compliance coordinator role within the athletics department has continued to expand and has gained the well-deserved respect of coaches, administrators and student athletes, becoming the cornerstone of maintaining institutional control within an athletics program.

I analyzed the data from the surveys and was able to measure the extent of involvement of compliance officers in selected areas of all divisions. Descriptive statistics for the most important competencies by compliance officers are provided in tables which follow. Table 1 demonstrates the extent of involvement of job responsibilities of compliance officers in Divisions I, II, and III. The table was constructed from surveys with n=176. The table displays the involvement of compliance officers in percentages in four categories: very involved, involved, marginally involved, and not involved.

Communication, continuing eligibility, reinstatement of students, and playing and practice requirements are the top four areas of involvement in compliance officers' job responsibilities. All four areas scored in the 90% range of involvement. These four areas are essential in maintaining institutional control within intercollegiate athletics. It is

mandatory that compliance officers communicate with the athletes, coaches, and administration to adhere to NCAA rules and regulations.

In addition, compliance officers indicated that initial eligibility, ethical conduct, and transfer students play a major role in their job responsibilities. The results from Table 1 indicate that 80% of compliance officers are *involved* in these areas. Table 1 also shows that compliance officers are less involved in recruitment and monitoring student athletes. These two areas only scored in the 70% range.

Table 2 demonstrates compliance officers involvement with selected problem areas at their institutions in all three divisions. The top three problem areas compliance officers experience are financial aid (44%), eligibility (46%), and extra benefits (44%). These three selected areas scored in the 40% range. Recruitment (40%) and academic fraud (38%) are also problem areas that compliance officers must handle on a regular basis. These two areas were the next highest in percentage. According to the data, unethical conduct (32%) and amateurism (35%) are only somewhat of a problem for compliance officers. These two areas scored in the 30% range with unethical conduct being the least problem faced.

Table 3 demonstrates the extent of benefits of compliance programs in all three divisions. Table 3 has four selected areas broken down into four categories which are: very great, great, some, and not at all. Higher graduation rates scored as the greatest benefit of compliance programs. The data showed that 72% of the administrators surveyed believe that compliance programs are a benefit for student athletes. The second highest percentage was increased student retention. This area scored only 1% lower than higher graduation rates. Education opportunities and grants/scholarships scored in the

TABLE 1**Extent of Involvement in Selected Areas of All Divisions****(n=176)**

	Very Involved	Involved	Marginally Involved	Not Involved
Communication	70%	28%	2%	0%
Monitoring	42%	29%	21%	9%
Continuing Eligibility	67%	23%	7%	3%
Initial Eligibility	68%	18%	6%	8%
Ethical Conduct	38%	46%	12%	4%
Recruitment	48%	24%	23%	5%
Transfer Students	53%	32%	14%	2%
Reinstatement Students	63%	28%	9%	1%
Playing and practice seasons/requirements	66%	27%	5%	2%

TABLE 2

**Extent of Involvement in Problems that Compliance Officers Face
in all Divisions**

(n=176)

	Very Great	Great	Some	Not At All
Extra Benefits	21%	24%	29%	26%
Academic Fraud	19%	19%	22%	40%
Amateurism	17%	18%	36%	30%
Unethical Conduct	15%	17%	43%	26%
Recruiting	19%	21%	43%	17%
Eligibility	19%	27%	35%	19%
Financial Aid	18%	26%	21%	35%

TABLE 3

Percentages of Benefits of Compliance Programs in all Divisions

(n=176)

	Very Great	Great	Some	Not At All
Higher Graduation Rates	36%	36%	21%	7%
Increased Student Retention	39%	32%	21%	9%
Initiative Grants/Post Graduate Scholarships	27%	35%	22%	16%
Education Opportunities	31%	32%	27%	9%

60% range. Education opportunities scored at (63%) and grants/scholarships at (62%) of benefits of compliance programs. Compliance programs help the NCAA remain true to its mission to maintain intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the educational program.

Table 4 presents percentages of support services available in all divisions. The table has six selected areas which the administrators rated based upon their institution. The table indicates that tutoring (88%) has the highest percentage of availability. The table also indicates that academic progress reports (84%) and personal counseling (83%) are provided in numerous institutions in all divisions. The data generated in the table also shows that study hall (81%) scored high in the ratings of services provided for student athletes. The two areas selected that scored the lowest were academic advising (74%) and study teams and groups (70%). Although, academic advising and study teams and groups, were rated lower than others, these areas still received high ratings. The six areas were selected to find the extent of services provided in institutions to help student athletes remain in compliance with NCAA rules and regulations.

Table 5 presents percentages of support services beneficial in all divisions. The table has six selected areas. Tutoring (76%) was the highest area selected in helping student athletes remain in compliance. The data collected generated academic advising and academic progress reports both (74%) beneficial in helping student athletes remain in compliance with rules and regulations. Personal counseling (72%) was the last area to score in the 70% range. Study hall (68%) and study teams and groups (65%) have the least beneficial programs provided for student athletes. While lower rated than the others, these two areas still got high ratings.

TABLE 4**Percentages of Support Services Available in all Divisions
(n=176)**

	Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Mandatory/Voluntary Study Hall	42%	39%	14%	6%
Specialized Academic Advising	43%	31%	17%	10%
Periodic Academic Progress Reports	57%	27%	10%	5%
Tutoring	60%	28%	8%	5%
Individualized Personal Counseling	50%	33%	12%	5%
Study Teams/Groups	30%	40%	22%	7%

TABLE 5

**Percentages of Support Services Beneficial in all Divisions
(n=176)**

	Very Much	Much	Some	Not At All
Mandatory/Voluntary Study Hall	40%	28%	24%	7%
Specialized Academic Advising	42%	32%	17%	9%
Periodic Academic Progress Reports	40%	34%	22%	4%
Tutoring	44%	32%	22%	3%
Individualized Personal Counseling	32%	40%	23%	5%
Study Teams/Groups	33%	32%	27%	9%

Inferential Statistics

In determining the extent to which differences exist among compliance programs based on divisional representation, I ran several one-way analysis of variances (ANOVA). The areas in the following tables (6-10) were selected based on their level of significance between divisions based on the results of ANOVA. The level of significance that was used to select the areas was $p \leq .05$.

Table 6 presents compliance officers' extent of involvement of job responsibilities by division. The table shows a significant difference between Division II and Division III in monitoring job responsibilities of compliance officers. Division II administrators are *very involved* in monitoring their student athletes while Division III administrators were less *involved* in the monitoring process. While the data in Table 6 show a statistically significant difference between Division I and Division III schools in the level of involvement among compliance officers regarding ethical conduct, the practical significance of this difference is less noteworthy. Both Division I and Division III administrators report similar levels of involvement between *very involved* and *involved*. The most contrast was shown in the area of recruitment among divisions. Division I compliance officers are *very involved* in the recruitment process of athletes whereas Division III compliance officers are between *somewhat involved* and *marginally involved*. The data analyzed showed that recruitment in compliance officers' job responsibilities in Division II and Division III is also slightly different. Division II compliance officers are between *very involved* and *involved* while Division III compliance officers are *involved* with recruitment in their job responsibilities. There was also a significant difference between Division I and Division III administrators regarding

TABLE 6

**Results of ANOVA
Extent of Involvement by Compliance Officers by Division
(n=176)**

1= Very Involved, 2= Involved, 3= Marginally Involved, 4= Not Involved

	Division I	Division II	Division III	Level of Significance
Monitoring		1.57	2.28	.000
Ethical Conduct	1.57		1.95	.025
Recruitment	1.38		2.34	.000
Recruitment		1.75	2.34	.001
Transfer Students	1.47		1.86	.018
Reinstatement of Students	1.24		1.65	.005
Playing and Practice/Requirements	1.24		1.65	.005

their involvement with transfer students. However, once again, the statistical difference is perhaps offset by its lack of important practical difference. Compliance officers in both divisions report that they are involved with transfer students in their job duties. Reinstatement of students and playing and practicing requirements both showed a significant level of difference between Division I and Division III. Compliance officers in both areas in Division I are *very involved* and Division III are *involved*.

The results of the ANOVA presented in Table 7 show the extent of problems compliance officers regularly face by division. Extra benefits showed a significant difference between all divisions. Division I compliance officers ranked extra benefits as a *great* problem whereas Division III compliance officers feel as though extra benefits are only *somewhat* of a problem. A significant difference was also shown between Division II and III compliance officers regarding extra benefits. Division II compliance officers ranked extra benefits as *great* problems whereas Division III administrators feel these benefits are only *somewhat* a problem. This maybe understandable given the fact that benefits, per se, are uncommon in Division III sports. Academic fraud was the next area to show a significant difference. Division I compliance officers handle a *great* deal of problems with this area whereas Division III compliance experience far fewer problems with academic fraud. A significant difference among compliance officers at in Division I and III colleges was observed regarding amateurism. Administrators in Division I found that amateurism is a *great* problem, whereas Division III compliance officers found amateurism only *somewhat* of a problem.

TABLE 7

**Results of ANOVA
Extent of Problems Compliance Officers Face by Division
(n= 176)**

1= Very Great, 2= Great, 3= Some, 4= Not At All

	Division I	Division II	Division III	Level of Significance
Extra Benefits	2.02		3.25	.000
Extra Benefits		2.47	3.25	.000
Academic Fraud	2.28		3.32	.000
Amateurism	2.24		3.34	.000
Unethical Conduct	2.31		3.25	.000
Unethical Conduct		2.75	3.25	.016
Recruiting	2.03		3.17	.000
Recruiting		2.45	3.17	.000
Eligibility	2.22		3.05	.000
Eligibility		2.26	3.05	.000
Financial Aid	2.36		3.23	.000
Financial Aid		2.49	3.23	.001

The results in Table 7 also show that the problem with unethical conduct was significantly different among all the divisions. The table shows a difference between Division I and Division III. Division I compliance officers consider unethical conduct to be a *great* problem whereas Division III found this type of conduct only *somewhat* of a problem. While the data in the table also show a statistically significant difference between Division II and Division III schools in dealing with unethical conduct, the practical significance of this difference is less noteworthy. Both Division II and Division III administrators report the extent of problems faced between *great* and *somewhat great*. The results in Table 7 also show a significant difference in recruitment problems that compliance officers face. Division I compliance officers face a *great* deal of problems with recruitment whereas Division III face only *some* problems. Moreover, Division II compliance officers face between a *great* and *somewhat* amount of problems as compared to Division III compliance officers who only deal with *some* problems. Table 7 further presents eligibility as another problem that compliance officers face that is significantly different among divisions. Division I and II compliance officers feel as though eligibility is a *great* problem whereas Division III feel that eligibility is only *somewhat* of a problem. The results from the ANOVA also showed that problems with financial aid are significantly different across the divisions. Division I and Division II compliance officers ranked financial aid as a *great* problem faced whereas Division III administrators ranked financial aid as only *somewhat* of a problem.

Table 8 presents the compliance officers' perceptions of the benefits of compliance programs by division. Division II administrators viewed higher graduation rates as much more of a benefit than did their Division III colleagues. Division I administrators also

TABLE 8

**Results of ANOVA
Extent of Benefits of Compliance Programs by Division
(n= 176)**

1= Very Great, 2= Great, 3= Some, 4= Not At All

	Division I	Division II	Division III	Level of Significance
Higher Graduation Rates		1.75	2.23	.019
Increased Student Retention	1.76		2.26	.017
Grants/ Post Scholarships	1.93		2.68	.000
Grants/ Post Scholarships		2.15	2.68	.017
Education Opportunities	1.76		2.52	.000
Education Opportunities		2.09	2.52	.043

viewed increased student retention as much more of a benefit than their Division III colleagues. Grants and post scholarships were also significantly different across all the divisions. Division I and II compliance officers found grants and scholarships to be a *great* benefit of compliance programs whereas Division III compliance officers ranked grants and scholarships to be only *somewhat* of a benefit of compliance programs. Table 8 presents education opportunities ranked by compliance officers with a significant difference across all three divisions. Division I and II compliance officers ranked education opportunities as a *great* benefit whereas Division III compliance officers ranked education opportunities as *somewhat* of a benefit.

Table 9 provides results of support services offered in institutions by divisions. The table indicates that there is a significant difference regarding Division I and Division III schools regarding study hall requirements. Study hall for Division I student athletes is mandatory whereas only some Division III institutions require study hall. Table 9 also shows significant difference between Division II and III study hall support services. Table 9 further indicates a significant difference between Division I and III regarding academic advising. Division I athletes have more specialized academic advising opportunities when compared to Division III student athletes. Every division has academic progress reports for student athletes. The difference among the divisions is that Division I institutions have more support services that offer progress reports. Table 9 shows a level of significant difference between tutoring services available to student athletes in Division I and III. Compliance officers ranked Division I institutions as *always* having tutors for athletes whereas the Division III schools reported tutors *sometimes* available. The data in Table 9 shows a statistically significant difference

TABLE 9

**Results of ANOVA
Extent of Support Services Provided by Division
(n= 176)**

1= Always, 2= Sometimes, 3= Rarely, 4= Never

	Division I	Division II	Division III	Level of Significance
Study Hall	1.41		2.29	.000
Study Hall		1.72	2.29	.001
Specialized Academic Advising	1.50		2.29	.000
Academic Progress Reports	1.36		1.97	.000
Academic Progress Reports		1.51	1.97	.012
Tutoring	1.38		1.80	.018
Personal Counseling	1.51		1.95	.018
Study Teams/Groups	1.76		2.25	.011
Study Teams/Groups	1.76	2.19		.040

among Division I and Division III schools in the extent of support services provided regarding personal counseling, but the practical significance of this difference is less noteworthy. Both Division I and Division III administrators report the extent of support services between *always* and *sometimes*. Finally, the data in Table 9 shows a significant difference among Division I, II, and III schools regarding study teams and groups among the divisions. Division I compliance officers rated study teams/groups as a support service *always* provided while Division II and Division III compliance officers rated this support service as *sometimes* provided.

Table 10 indicates the benefits of support services in helping student athletes remain in compliance. Table 10 shows a significant difference between study hall programs in all divisions. The table shows a significant difference between Division I and Division II schools in their perception of the extent to which study hall support services are beneficial, but the practical significance of this difference is less noteworthy. Division I compliance officers rated study hall as *always* beneficial and Division III compliance officers rated this support service as *sometimes* beneficial. Table 10 also indicates a significant difference between specialized academic advising and academic progress reports among Division I and Division III schools. In both selected areas, Division I compliance officers feel that these support services are *always* beneficial whereas Division III compliance officers feel that the support services are only *sometimes* beneficial. Table 10 also shows that academic progress reports present a significant difference among Division II and Division III schools. Division II compliance officers rated academic progress reports as *always* beneficial whereas Division III administrators rated this area as *sometimes* beneficial. The data in Table 10 show a statistically

TABLE 10

**Results of ANOVA
Extent of Support Services that are Beneficial in each Division
(n= 176)**

1= Always, 2= Sometimes, 3= Rarely, 4= Never

	Division I	Division II	Division III	Level of Significance
Study Hall	1.81	1.87		.040
Study Hall	1.81		2.23	.011
Specialized Academic Advising	1.59		2.26	.000
Academic Progress Reports	1.62		2.26	.000
Academic Progress Reports		1.77	2.26	.008
Tutoring	1.60		2.17	.001
Tutoring		1.68	2.17	.007
Personal Counseling	1.69		2.45	.000
Personal Counseling		1.77	2.45	.000
Study Teams/Groups	1.86		2.35	.018

significant difference among Division I, II, and III schools in their perceptions of the extent to which tutoring services are beneficial. The table shows Division I compliance officers rated tutoring *always* a beneficial service whereas Division III compliance officers rated tutoring to be *sometimes* beneficial. A significant difference is also shown in tutoring services which Division II schools rated *always* beneficial, whereas again Division III compliance officers rated it *sometimes* beneficial. The table indicates that the benefits of personal counseling are significantly different among the divisions. Division I and II compliance programs *always* have counseling for student athletes whereas Division III schools *sometimes* have personal counseling for student athletes. Finally, the results in Table 10 show a significant difference between Division I and III regarding the benefits of study teams/groups. Compliance officers in Division I institutions feel that study teams/groups are *always* beneficial whereas Division III compliance officers rated study teams/groups to be *sometimes* beneficial in institutions.

Discussion

Those who have been in intercollegiate athletics for a while marvel at the rapid growth and importance of the compliance officer position. The compliance officer position used to be mostly a part-time job held by individuals, but it is now staffed by highly skilled and qualified professionals. Compliance officers must be as prepared as possible to face the daily challenges of their positions and avoid any major infractions that could compromise their jobs.

The questionnaires I sent to the compliance officers targeted key areas in their programs. Data generated from this investigation compared the key areas and allowed

me to obtain a better perception of their job responsibilities. Table 1 presents communication, continuing eligibility, reinstatement of students, and playing/practice season requirements as key elements in compliance programs. These elements can strengthen an institution's compliance program. Key compliance tasks and responsibilities are communicated clearly to ensure eligibility criteria and playing/practice requirements. Ethical conduct and transfer students are also important areas compliance officers must monitor. It is important that compliance officers monitor the conduct of student athletes and enforce the honor and dignity of fair play. Compliance officers must also monitor transfer students' requirements and follow all transfer regulations. The data in Table 1 was consistent with the literature I found. The NCAA Manual for Division I, II, and III clearly states that institutional control in intercollegiate athletics is in compliance with the rules and regulations when communication, organization, documentation, and evaluation are coordinated in a compliance program.

The main focus of my research was how compliance programs and concepts differ between Division I, II, and III institutions. The data collected showed a major difference between Division I and Division III compliance programs. Table 6 clearly illustrates that Division I ethical conduct, recruitment, transfer students, reinstatement of students, and playing/practice requirements all have significant differences when compared to Division III. The results of the Division II institutions only showed a level of significant difference with Division III when comparing monitoring and recruitment. Although the Division II institutions showed significant differences with the Division III institutions, there was no important practical difference among the two areas. There was

no real practical difference regarding recruitment because Division II institutions have only a few more rules to abide with than Division III institutions. Division II prospective student athletes have limits on the number of recruiting contacts that are permitted. If these limits are exceeded, the prospective student athlete may be rendered ineligible for a scholarship.

The data are consistent with the literature. The findings from the current study suggested that Division I compliance officers are very involved in key areas selected whereas Division III compliance officers are less involved. Division I institutions are larger and have more money with sources of funding and budgeting that allow for more advanced compliance programs. The availability of scholarships is just one reason why Division I compliance programs differ from Division III. Another reason for the difference in compliance programs between divisions is the initial eligibility clearing house for Division I and II. It was interesting to discover that although Division II institutions have the most rules to abide by, there were not a lot of differences between Division I and II compliance programs. Another interesting aspect was there were no significant differences between Division I and II when comparing the extent of involvement of compliance programs.

Division I support programs are significantly different from Division III. Division I compliance officers ranked the areas of involvement as always being available to student athletes whereas Division III compliance officers ranked the areas as sometimes available. Once again Division II showed a significant difference from Division III but had no real practical difference. Division II and Division III institutions for the most part are closer in size and have lower budgets for funding support services.

The reasons why Division I institutions have more support programs are; the size of the institution, scholarships, more special admits, and the budget of the institution. The data are consistent with the literature. During my research I found more support programs offered in Division I and II institutions than in Division III. The NCAA National Office offers a compliance review program to member institutions in only Division I and II. At an institution's request, a membership services staff member will visit an institution to assist in reviewing all or any specific aspects of its compliance program. The review helps identify key areas where compliance systems are engaged and functioning.

My next objective was to find out how beneficial compliance programs are to NCAA member institutions. I learned that the number one benefit of these programs is higher graduation rates. The compliance programs help keep the athletes eligible while providing support services when needed. Study halls, tutoring, academic advising, and study teams help the athletes remain in compliance with the rules and regulations for intercollegiate athletic competition. Another benefit of compliance programs is increased student retention. The programs help the student athletes maintain academic standards by monitoring semester credit hours and eligibility.

There are three support services that compliance officers ranked most beneficial to student athletes. The tutoring service that institutions offer was the highest ranked. It is a compliance officer's responsibility to assign tutors to student athletes who need help in a subject matter. The next two support services which were identified were specialized academic advising and academic progress reports. Both programs have the same percentage rate and are critical in the academic success of student athletes.

The extent of problems compliance officers face in all divisions was the last area I analyzed in my research. I found that the number one problem compliance officers face is eligibility. Eligibility is a common problem for athletes because of the time constraints athletes are faced with. In-season athletes spend about twenty-five hours a week in practicing, competitions, and traveling. Sometimes student athletes fall behind in their studies because of poor time management. Extra benefits are another problem compliance officers are confronted with. Compliance officers must make sure athletes are not receiving gifts from coaches or others and are abiding by NCAA rules and regulations. Financial aid and recruiting violations are also frequent problems compliance officers face. Compliance officers must make sure coaches or others are not giving athletes money for tuition or for their services during competition. The NCAA prohibits coaches or others from giving student athletes or prospective athletes money or any type of gift. Previous research and literature suggests that these problems are the most common among all divisions and institutions. Overall, the results of the data collected were consistent with the literature I researched. The literature describes a compliance officer's position as a complex area requiring a diversified background of skills.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS

A compliance officer in the intercollegiate athletic environment requires a variety of skills. This research has outlined the extent of involvement of compliance officers in selected areas of all divisions. The results show that communication, eligibility, reinstatement of students, and playing/practicing requirements are essential requirements in compliance officers job responsibilities.

During this research I found that Division I compliance programs differ significantly from Division III. The main difference in programs is that Division I compliance officers are more involved in recruitment, transfer students, reinstatement of students, and playing/practicing requirements. The research and data results also illustrated that Division I offered more support services than Division I and II.

Compliance officers in each division found the programs to be beneficial to student athletes' academic success. The main problems that compliance officers face are eligibility, extra benefits, financial aid, and recruitment. In contrast, this research has outlined key areas in which compliance officers are involved and the services their institution provides to student athletes. This research explored specific areas of compliance officers among the three classifications of divisions.

Appendix A

Participating Institutions

Division I

University of Arizona
Auburn University
Ball State University
Boston College
Brigham Young University
University of California at Berkeley
University of Central Florida
Central Michigan University
University of Georgia
University of Hawaii
Indiana University
University of Kansas
Kansas State University
University of Louisiana at Lafayette
University of Miami
University of New Mexico
University of Oregon
Purdue University
University of Louisville
Ohio State University
University of Missouri
University of Memphis
Stanford University
University of Texas El Paso
Texas A&M University
Wake Forrest University
Yale University
Western Illinois University
Villanova University
Towson University
Tennessee State University
St. Peter's University
Southwest Texas State University
Southern Illinois University
University of San Diego
University of Delaware
California State University
Alabama Sate University
Utah University
Fordam University
West Michigan University
Bucknell University

Cornell University
Elon University
College of the Holy Cross
Indiana State University
University of Massachusetts
Norfolk State University
Robert Morris College
Lehigh University
Morris Brown College
Prairie View A&M University
University of Northern Iowa
University of Montana
Jacksonville University
East Tennessee State University
The Citadel
U.S. Air Force Academy

Participating Institutions

Division II

Arkansas Tech University	University of North Alabama
University of Alabama	Northern State University
Alderson- Broaddus University	Pace University
Bemidji State University	Quincy University
Bluefield State College	Seattle University
Bryant University	Slippery Rock University
California State University	University of Nebraska
Cameron University	Nova Southeastern University
University of Central Arkansas	University of North Dakota
Chardon State University	Ashland University
Clark Atlanta University	Pfeiffer University
Coker College	
Columbus State University	
Converse College	
Delta State University	
Drury University	
East New Mexico University	
Emporia State University	
Florida Southern College	
Ferris State	
Francis Marion University	
Gannon University	
Grand Canyon University	
Harding University	
Kentucky State University	
Lincoln Memorial University	
Humboldt State University	
Lynn University	
Lander University	
University of Indianapolis	
Lewis University	
University of Massachusetts	
Mesa State College	
University of Missouri	
University of Nebraska	
Northeastern State University	
Oakland City University	
Philadelphia University	
Savannah State University	
South Dakota State University	
Midwestern State University	
Molloy College	

Participating Institutions

Division III

Albright College	Gettysburg College
Alfred University	George Fox University
Alvernia College	Goucher College
Augustana College	Greensboro College
Arcadia University	Grinnell College
Anderson College	Hilbert College
Babson University	Hartwick College
Averett College	La Grange College
Aurora University	Johns Hopkins University
Benedictine University	Elmhurst College
Becker College	East Texas Baptist University
Bates College	Eastern Oregon University
Bowdoin College	Emory University
Bethel College	Drew University
Bennett College	College of DuPage
Bryn Mawr College	De Sales University
Bridgewater University	Clarkson University
Brandeis University	Cornell College
Cal. State University (Hayward)	Concordia University(CA)
Cal. Lutheran University	Concordia College
Buffalo State University	D'Youville College
Carnegie Mellon University	Curry College
Carleton College	Denison University
University of Cal. (Santa Cruz)	Defiance College
Centenary College	
Castleton State College	
Case Western Reserve University	
Central College	
Champan University	
Catholic University	
Clark University	
Christopher Newport University	
Chatham University	
Elmira College	
Emory & Henry College	
Fisk University	
Fairleigh Dickinson University	
Eureka College	
Fitchburg State College	
Franklin & Marshall College	
Gordon College	

Works Cited

- Judd, M.R. (1995). A gender comparison of competencies important success in college athletic administration. Journal of Physical Education, 6, 8-13.
- Leith, L.M. (1983). The underlying processes of athletic administration. Program Development Journal, 5, 12-25.
- Livingston, J.S. (1971). Myth of the well-educated manager. Business Review,12, 78-89.
- McKelvey, B., & Sekaran. H. (1977) A career-based theory of job involvement: A study of scientists and engineers. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22, 281-306.
- Parkhouse, B.I. (1980). Analysis of graduate professional preparation in sport management. Athletic Administration,14,11-14.
- NCAA III Manual (2001-2002). Constitution, Operating Bylaws, Administrative Bylaws
- NCAA II Manual (2001-2002). Constitution, Operating Bylaws, Administrative Bylaws
- NCAA I Manual (2001-2002). Constitution, Operating Bylaws, Administrative Bylaws
- NCAA Guide for the College- Bound Student-Athlete, 2001-2002, NCAA.
- NCAA News: History and Membership Criteria. (2001). <http://www.ncaa.org>.
- Regional Seminar Notebook Division III, NCAA 2001.
- Regional Seminar Notebook Division II, NCAA 2001.
- Regional Seminar Notebook Division I, NCAA 2001.
- Robbins, S. (1980). The athletic administrative process. Program Development, 8, 211-217.
- Sprandel, D.S. (1974). A crisis in athletic administration. The Physical Educator, 30, 44-46.

Summary of NCAA Regulations- Division I, Academic Year 2001-2002, NCAA News.

Summary of NCAA Regulations- Division II, Academic Year 2001-2002, NCAA News.

Summary of NCAA Regulations- Division III, Academic Year 2001-2002, NCAA News.

Ulrich, D. (1982). An alumni oriented approach to sport management curriculum design using performance ratings and a regression model. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 53, 64-72.

Williams, J.M. (1982). Intercollegiate athletic administration: preparation patterns. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 54,398-405.