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A. OVERVIEW

1. Introduction

   a. Retention – Early in the morning on October 30, 2014, six football student-athletes enrolled at California University of Pennsylvania (the “Institution” or “Cal U”) were arrested for aggravated assault in the Borough of California, Pennsylvania, as a result of an altercation outside of a local bar/restaurant (Spuds). These arrests followed a few prior incidents earlier in the semester in which other football student-athletes were arrested, including for disorderly conduct and marijuana possession.

   Soon after the arrests, on October 30, Cal U’s Interim President Geraldine Jones cancelled and forfeited the institution’s next home football contest on November 1, 2014. Further, a few days later, while agreeing to continue the football season, President Jones decided to hire an independent third party to conduct an external review of the Cal U football program.

   Communication subsequently occurred between the Office of Chief Counsel for Pennsylvania’s State System of Higher Education and The Compliance Group (TCG). In early December, TCG was retained by the Institution to perform the review; however, TCG’s reporting line was through the Office of Chief Counsel.

b. Purpose

   i. Goal – The overall goal of its retention, as provided to TCG by the University, was for TCG to “assess the current culture of the football program at Cal U in order to recommend changes, if appropriate, that would help the University create and maintain policies and practices best suited to recruit, retain, and graduate student-athletes in the football program who understand and embrace the educational opportunities afforded by a Cal U education and the obligations associated with being a part of a living-learning community. The University wants its football program to reflect its expressed core values of integrity, civility, and responsibility.”
ii. **Focus Areas** – Below are the focus areas of the review that were utilized to assist in the overall goal of assessing the culture of the football program. Based upon its experience, TCG believed that a review of these areas would provide a sense of the culture. TCG reviewed:

- Supervision/oversight within the football program, the athletics department, and the University.
- Recruiting philosophies resulting in team demographics (transfers versus four-year recruits and prospective and enrolled student-athlete academic analyses).
- Relationships between the football student-athletes and the football staff, athletics department, and campus personnel.
- Relationships between the football program, athletics department, and borough.
- Access to and availability of academic and student support resources for football student-athletes.
- Existence and utilization of certain policies and processes that relate to the football program and athletics department.

c. **Methodology**

i. **Gather Information** – TCG gathered information from: (i) a review of requested documents; and (ii) in-person or telephonic interviews. The primary focus was on the 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14 academic years.

Regarding requested documentation, TCG requested certain information from the institution prior to and after the on-campus interviews. The list below generally provides the nature of the information requested:

- The Student-Athlete Handbook and Student-Athlete Code of Conduct.
- The football eligibility checklists for each of the three years.
– Overall team GPA of each NCAA sports team.
– A list of team disciplinary actions for violations of football team, athletics department, and University rules and a list of football game suspensions for anti-social behavior and illegal activities.
– A list of football student-athletes who have been arrested, including dates and the formal charge, and the status of these arrests (i.e., dismissed, plea bargained, went to trial) for each of three years.

Regarding the interview process, TCG identified and interviewed approximately 66 individuals from all of the various constituencies who may have contact with the football program. No restrictions were placed upon TCG by the institution. (It was determined that an attempt to interview one individual would not be undertaken due to pending litigation). Attachment A is a listing of the individuals interviewed. On-campus interviews were conducted December 3 to 5, 2014, with numerous current or former football and other student-athletes, coaching staff members, others within the athletics department, and University personnel and students outside the football program. Interviews also were conducted with merchants and community officials from the borough of California. Subsequent telephonic interviews were conducted with a few of the same individuals or others.

Below is an overview of the types of individuals interviewed and approximate number of individuals interviewed within that group:

– Current Student-Athletes: 22
– Current Coaching or Other Athletics Department Staff Members: 24
– Institutional Personnel (Administrators, Faculty, Students): 14
– Community Members: 4
– Others: 2

ii. Draft Report and Develop Recommendations – Based upon the available information, TCG assessed the football program’s culture, identified potential issues, and then developed specific recommendations. General recommendations are included in Section B (Executive Summary) and specific recommendations are detailed in Section C (Specific Recommendations) of this report. Attachment B is a listing of both the general and specific recommendations.
These recommendations are intended to provide direction to the institution in particular areas to ensure that the football culture is aligned with the core values of the University. However, as is often the case with third party reviews/recommendations, the specific means to implement some of the recommendations are left to the University, as it has a better understanding of its campus personnel, practices, and the community. Further, TCG understands that budgetary constraints could impact the implementation of these recommendations.

This report also contains several charts to summarize factual information or illustrate general trends. The charts were derived from information provided by the institution.
B. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. **Overview of Information Reported** – Below is a list of consensus opinions organized in three general areas that are based upon information provided during the interviews. These are not necessarily TCG’s conclusions nor are they necessarily factually correct. Section C of this report provides more detail regarding these consensus points and applicable recommendations:

   a. Regarding the culture among the football team:

      - Current football student-athletes and coaching staff members believed that team unity, trust, and cohesiveness are excellent.
      - Alcohol and marijuana are part of the football culture.
      - African American student-athletes feel welcome within the athletics department and the University.
      - The majority of coaching staff members and student-athletes, who played under both coaches, stated that there is more structure, organization, and discipline under current Head Football Coach Mike Kellar, with most of the examples relating to on-the-field discipline. Opinions were mixed regarding the consistency of punishment for inappropriate behavior for off-field incidents.
      - The current football coaching staff believed that there are far less off-the-field incidents under Kellar’s leadership and that any perceived increase (including the incidents this year) is an aberration.
      - The number of high-risk transfers has been reduced since Kellar became the head coach, and some of the transfers that would have been recruited by the former head coach no longer are being considered by the staff. This is part of a change in recruiting philosophy to recruit more high school prospects and have less reliance on transfers.

   b. Regarding the relationship between the football program and the University:
− Many individuals not connected to the football program believed that the football program previously had an entitlement status and was over-funded, isolated, and privileged. However, due to President Jones and Kellar, this may be changing.
− While Kellar currently has a better relationship with University employees (e.g., faculty and staff) than the previous head coach, many have a “wait and see” attitude. The recent arrests have reinforced University employees’ previous beliefs about transfers and the football program overall.
− Several individuals reported that the football program’s practice of recruiting Division I talent (i.e., “bounce back players”) with serious criminal backgrounds should be discontinued. That conflicts with an interest by some that the University should be an institution that provides “second chances” to all students.
− The institution’s process for evaluating prospective student-athletes is clear in terms of NCAA process, compliance, academics, etc., but lacks consistency in terms of evaluating behavioral risks.
− Student-athletes, coaches, and institutional administrators believed that the academic support for student-athletes is excellent.
− Based upon information reported by the student-athletes and campus police, some tension exists between student-athletes and campus police.

c. Regarding the relationship between the football program and the local community:

− Tension exists between student-athletes and local law enforcement, in particular, football student-athletes based upon information from student-athletes, institutional personnel, and the local community.
− Arrests involving football student-athletes have appeared to increase over the past year, which may be attributable to the recruitment of transfers who have criminal backgrounds. These arrests have increased an already negative perception of football student-athletes among the community.

2. **Overall recommendations** – Below are several general recommendations that summarize many of the specific recommendations contained in more detail in Section C of this report.
- **Emphasize the behavioral expectations of the University to the football student-athletes and football staff.** Accountability is predicated on knowledge of expectations and the communication of consequences to be imposed for failure to meet those expectations. Lack of adequate or sufficient administrative leadership of the football program in articulating institutional values by the athletics department or other University administration has existed. Senior leadership (i.e., Director of Athletics and executive level administrators) should communicate to the football staff on a routine basis the expectations of the University as it pertains to the institutional core values of integrity, civility, and responsibility. Similarly, the football staff should communicate these values to the football student-athletes. A part of these expectations is a general understanding of the parameters for inappropriate behavior.

- **Assess reporting lines and duties of personnel involved in the supervision of the athletics department and student-athlete welfare.** The current duties and reporting lines of the Director of Athletics should be reviewed. Similarly, the responsibilities of the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) also should be assessed.

- **Increase education of all student-athletes.** Student-athlete education on various topics (e.g., alcohol and marijuana as gateway drugs, adapting to collegiate life, gender violence) should be increased. Examine programming within the University to facilitate a successful transition of primarily minority student-athletes into the University and community.

- **Require involvement, input, and approval of the recruiting philosophies of the football staff by an entity outside of the athletics department.** The football program is a representative of the University community. The program traditionally has utilized two- and four-year transfers in conjunction with the recruitment of four-year prospects to compose its football team. The recruitment of transfers presents certain potential challenges for the institution. This recommendation does not discourage the recruitment of transfers; rather, it suggests that the institution should: (i) evaluate whether this recruiting approach should continue and, if so: (ii) develop a more formal process of approval of transfers or other prospects potentially at risk by University personnel outside of the football staff.
- **Improve relations between the football program and local community, including law enforcement.** The institution should undertake more efforts to integrate football student-athletes into the community by going into the community (i.e., service projects) or getting the public onto campus. This report will include recommendations regarding increasing communication between the athletics department and University officials with local (and campus) law enforcement.

- **Evaluate the existence or consistent use of processes relating to the disciplining of student-athletes for criminal or team rules violations.** The absence of a consistent or transparent disciplinary policy concerning off-field incidents for all student-athletes frequently was noted during the interviews. Several recommendations relate to ensuring that existing processes are utilized through the Office of Student Conduct and to develop processes to be applied by the athletics department uniformly to all student-athletes.
C. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Supervision/oversight within the football program, the athletic department, and the University

   a. Overview of Information Reported – Under NCAA legislation, the Institution’s President has ultimate authority over the athletics department.

   Geraldine Jones was named Acting President in May 2012 and Interim President in March 2013. President Jones has been employed at Cal U in various capacities for the past 40 years. These capacities included Program Director for Upward Bound, chair of the Department of Academic Development Services, Associate Dean of the College of Education and Human Resources, and Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. President Jones has not been involved in operations of the football program to the extent of the previous President.

   The previous President was appointed in May 1992, and he served in that capacity until May 2012. According to information reported during the interviews, a significant accomplishment during his presidency was the development and expansion of athletics and non-athletics facilities on campus.

   Several individuals reported that the former President controlled the operations of the athletics program, especially football. The belief was that he had a specific interest in football, and the perception was that the football program received more preference in funding, amenities, etc. than all other sports or other University departments. It also was reported that a close relationship existed between the the former President and then Head Football Coach Luckhardt. Athletic expenditures under the former President increased significantly but recently were reduced by Interim President Jones due to overall institutional fiscal concerns.

   Significant cuts in athletics scholarships were undertaken beginning in the fall of 2012 that continued this current academic year. Several individuals reported that these reductions reduced the perception on campus that the football program was
above all other University programs. Below is a chart that depicts the reductions in athletics aid in football and all other sports over the past few years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>682,804</td>
<td>863,164</td>
<td>853,926</td>
<td>697,017</td>
<td>593,999</td>
<td>587,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Sports</td>
<td>1,361,879</td>
<td>1,729,051</td>
<td>2,133,732</td>
<td>1,748,075</td>
<td>1,383,786</td>
<td>1,423,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,044,683</td>
<td>2,592,215</td>
<td>2,987,658</td>
<td>2,445,092</td>
<td>1,977,785</td>
<td>2,010,511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*14-15 amounts are full year estimates.
+These totals in athletic aid were submitted by the University to the NCAA for EAPA purposes.

As noted above, the amount of athletics aid provided to football student-athletes decreased by approximately 30 percent from $863,164 in 2010-11 to $587,345 in 2014-15. Similarly, the chart below illustrates that the number of football student-athletes on athletics aid and the average amount of athletics aid awarded to each student-athlete during this period also decreased. In essence, fewer student-athletes are receiving less athletics aid than a few years ago. These reductions could affect the ability to recruit highly athletically talented student-athletes to be football team members as such athletes usually receive a full athletics grant-in-aid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Football Student-Athletes on Athletic Aid</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>11-12</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Amount of Aid Per Student-Athlete</td>
<td>$9,281</td>
<td>$9,383</td>
<td>$8,605</td>
<td>$8,485</td>
<td>$8,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Karen Hjerpe was named Director of Athletics in February 2014. She had been the Interim Director of Athletics since December 2011. She joined the Cal U athletics department staff in 1993 as the Head Volleyball Coach. Throughout the past 21 years, she has served in various positions at the University, including Athletics Business Manager. She currently serves as Senior Woman Administrator and the University’s sole NCAA compliance coordinator. Due to her heavy workload, TCG believes that she has limited time to devote to oversight of the athletics department or the football program, in particular. She typically has not been involved in disciplining student-athletes.

Dr. Thomas Pucci was the Director of Athletics from 1991 to 2011. He also taught classes at the University.
The Head Football Coach is responsible for all aspects of the football team, including student-athlete discipline. John Luckhardt was the Head Football Coach for 10 seasons (2002 through 2011) before retiring in July 2012. Luckhardt’s record was 88-33. The PSAC’s football competition is divided into East and West regions. Luckhardt’s teams won the West Region of the PSAC each of the last seven years, and the University was selected to participate in the NCAA Division II Football Championship (playoffs) during his last four seasons.

Mike Kellar was named the Head Football Coach in the summer of 2012. He has a record of 23-10 during his three years as the head coach at the Institution. Kellar was an Assistant Football Coach at Cal U from 2004 to 2008. He was the Head Football Coach at Concord University in West Virginia for the 2009 and 2010 seasons before returning to Cal U as the Associate Head Football Coach for Offense in 2011.

Kellar retained several of the assistant coaches who were employed under Luckhardt. Below is the current coaching staff and the number of years they were employed in a football staff capacity under Luckhardt:
- Mike Lopez, 0 years
- Dave Cole, 8 years
- Mike Evans, 9 years
- Thomas Rebholz, Jr., 2 years
- Chad Salisbury, 3 years
- Larry Wilson, 7 years

Several student-athletes reported that there is more consistency on disciplinary issues resulting from on-the-field or practice issues than off-the-field issues.

b. **Recommendations**

1. **Require the President to meet more frequently with all NCAA recognized teams prior to the teams’ first competitions.** At a minimum, the President annually should address all student-athletes at least collectively. In the sport of football, an in-person session should occur annually. The purpose of such meetings would be to reinforce the values of the institution and the expectations that the institution has of its student-athletes.
2. **Require regularly scheduled meetings between the Director of Athletics and the President.** The Director of Athletics currently reports to the Vice President of Student Affairs. At many institutions, the Director of Athletics has either a direct report or at least a dotted reporting line to the President. At a minimum, the Director of Athletics should have regularly scheduled meetings (on at least three occasions per semester) with the President.

3. **Assess the current responsibilities assigned to the Director of Athletics.** Besides the typical duties assigned to the Director of Athletics, Hjerpe also has NCAA compliance responsibilities. These compliance duties consume a significant amount of time and compromise her Director of Athletics responsibilities. The institution has 18 sports and approximately 400 student-athletes. Such a number of sports and student-athletes typically warrants a full-time compliance director. It is important for the Director of Athletics to have adequate time to evaluate the various sports programs.

4. **Schedule at least an annual meeting between the Director of Athletics and the Vice President of Student Affairs with the Head Football Coach to review all aspects of the program.** In light of the high visibility and success of the football program and its recent off-the-field issues, it seems appropriate that the Head Football Coach meet with a senior executive level administrator. This is not a performance evaluation; rather, it is a discussion of issues that may exist within the program and a review of expectations. The development of an “arrest tracker” is recommended elsewhere in this report and could be one of several agenda topics for this meeting.

5. **Require the athletics department, in conjunction with appropriate institutional officials, to develop general guidelines for student-athlete behavioral issues.** Similar to punitive guidelines for drug testing, the athletics department should establish department-wide guidelines that the Director of Athletics would impose in certain situations, primarily arising from legal or other issues involving violence (e.g., physical altercations, citations, arrests), it being
understood that some Director of Athletics discretion is needed. Sanctions should relate primarily to loss of athletic competition. (The Head Football Coach also could have guidelines for legal issues, but the coach’s focus is on discipline for violation of team policy. See recommendation below). A common concern during the interviews was the lack or inconsistent application of penalties for behavioral issues. A system to monitor the application of these guidelines that is undertaken by an individual or group outside of the athletics department should be implemented.

The guidelines could be set forth in a code of conduct and could include information on penalties and process. Some athletics departments have a student-athlete code of conduct. Regarding penalties, these codes indicate that an arrest or charge for a DUI results in a withholding of the next 10 percent of scheduled competitions. Regarding process, these codes often reference a conduct review panel, operated by the athletics department.

Given the recent challenges surrounding the football program, the athletics department should have little tolerance for arrests involving physical violence.

6. Require head coaches to develop specific expectations and consequences for student-athletes on their teams for failure to follow team rules. A head coach should clearly and frequently communicate his or her expectations regarding improper behavior, primarily team rules. Further, similar to the above recommendation, in addition to Director of Athletic guidelines, a head coach should be encouraged to inform the team of possible ramifications for not following these expectations. These would be guidelines or parameters, it being understood that some discretion should exist. This relates to on- and off-the-field violations.

7. Expand the role of the FAR. Increased activity should occur in the FAR’s interaction with: (i) student-athletes to ensure that student-athletes are aware of the role of the FAR; and (ii) faculty to ensure that faculty can contact the FAR if potential academic or behavioral issues arise with student-athletes.
The FAR historically has attended monthly athletics department staff meetings but has not addressed the teams on a routine basis. (NOTE: Nearly all of the student-athletes interviewed did not know who the FAR was or his responsibilities). Similarly, as is a standard practice for a FAR at many NCAA institutions, faculty members should understand that the FAR is the first contact when issues arise with student-athletes relating to academic or behavioral issues in the classroom.

8. **Include information in the Faculty Handbook that addresses the means by which academic issues with student-athletes (e.g., missed class time) should be addressed to the FAR.** The FAR is to be the liaison between student-athletes and the faculty. While the athletics department’s academic services staff can be helpful, the initial contact for faculty if questions or issues arise should be the FAR. The faculty needs to understand the FAR’s role, and the Faculty Handbook appears to be the most logical source.

9. **Ensure adequate avenues exist for University personnel (including athletics department staff members) to report incidents of inappropriate behavior of student-athletes (bullying, intimidation, etc.).** The institution should review existing systems to ensure that if such incidents arise, confidential opportunities exist to report information and to eliminate any concern about retaliation. No information was reported expressing a concern in this area; nevertheless, the institution may want to review existing systems and remind staff members of their opportunities.

2. **Recruiting philosophies resulting in team demographics (transfers versus four-year recruits and prospective and enrolled student-athlete academic analyses)**

   a. **Overview of Information Reported** – The recruitment and enrollment of Division I transfers in football continues to be a lightning rod for the football program.

   As noted earlier in this report, one of the catalysts that initiated this review was the arrest of several student-athletes during the fall 2014 semester. Numerous individuals
reported their belief that the October 2014 and other recent arrests resulted from emphasis by the football program to recruit transfer student-athletes, primarily from NCAA Division I institutions. However, only two of the six student-athletes who were arrested in late October were transfers. Overall, the involvement of transfers in the arrests was proportional to their overall percentage on the roster.

Regarding the number of transfers, below is the number of transfers organized by the head football coach who recruited the prospect:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruited By</th>
<th>First Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luckhardt</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellar</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Luckhardt resigned during the summer of 2012.

Below is an analysis of the percentage of transfers to all team members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Approx. No. of Student-Athletes on Team</th>
<th>No. of Transfers</th>
<th>Percentage of Team as Transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Since a change in the Head Football Coach position occurred during the summer of 2012, some transfers recruited by the previous head coach continued to participate. This information is based upon the eligibility checklists.

According to the 2014 football roster, there were 31 total transfers, of which 19 were from four-year institutions, nine were from two-year institutions, and three who have previous two- or four-year transfer experiences prior to enrolling at Cal PA.

Regarding the number of arrests, in light of the near tragic circumstances that prompted the need for this review, an analysis of arrests and citations in football was deemed necessary. Football student-athletes received citations or were arrested as depicted in the chart below. [Throughout this report, TCG’s focus was on behavioral-related citations, as opposed to traffic offenses like speeding. As a result, all references to arrests/citations reflect more behavioral incidents (i.e. disorderly conduct, assault, resisting arrest, drug possession, etc.).] The chart below spans the
period when Kellar has been the head coach, although some student-athletes were recruited by Luckhardt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruited By</th>
<th># of Citations/# of Student-Athletes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/12 to 7/13</td>
<td>8/13 to 7/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luckhardt</td>
<td>11/8</td>
<td>7/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellar</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12/9</strong></td>
<td><strong>12/11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This information was obtained from a chart prepared by the Director of Athletics. These figures relate to arrests and citations but not necessarily convictions. It is based upon her review of information forwarded to her or that she researched, all of which related to campus or local situations.

Generally speaking, the number of arrests during the last three years has been increasing. One reason may be the increased use of social media and technology to publicize certain behavior, while another may be related to less communication between the athletics department and law enforcement, as detailed elsewhere in this report.

Below is a chart that details the types of arrests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Arrest/Citation Occurred</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/12 to 7/13</td>
<td>8/13 to 7/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly – Trespassing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly – Noise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly – Gathering</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly – Fighting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly – Conduct</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly – House</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of Marijuana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Drunkenness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishing Liquor to Minor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorized Use of Vehicle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*On some occasions, several citations were issued for the same misbehavior.

As noted above, a common belief of those outside of the football program was that transfers were involved in many of the arrests, but this is incorrect based upon the available information. TCG analyzed whether the percentage of arrests involving transfers is similar to the percentage of transfers composing the team. According to the chart below, transfers’ involvements in arrests is not disproportional to their
representation on the team. Therefore, transfers, as a group, are not any more responsible for the upward trend in arrests than the rest of the team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th># of Student-Athletes Involved in Arrests</th>
<th>% of Transfers Involved in Arrests</th>
<th>Approximate % of Transfers on Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/12 to 7/13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33% (3/9)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13 to 7/14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27% (3/11)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/14 to 12/14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35% (6/17)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TCG also discovered a significant misunderstanding between the football staff and University senior administration concerning the approval/consent of the football staff’s recruitment of transfers who enroll at Cal U. The football coaching staff members generally believed that the athletics department and institutional administration approved of the football program’s general policy of recruiting transfer student-athletes. Specifically, they believed that the recruitment of high-risk transfers was vetted by the Director of Athletics and possibly another administrator. However, this was an incorrect belief in that no process exists for other campus administrators to approve general philosophies or specific prospects.

Although TCG did not find evidence to support the perception that transfer student-athletes accounted for the majority of the arrests/citations in the football program, Cal U should not disregard the fact that transfers often represent a higher risk for academic or behavioral issues if prior incidents at other schools have occurred. Thus, the review of the football recruiting philosophy must be a joint venture across campus to reduce the risk of admitting a student-athlete whose behavior does not align with the University’s core values.

b. **Recommendations**

1. **Review whether the athletic department wishes to continue its policy to recruit two- and four-year transfers and award athletics aid.** This should be an institutional as opposed to an athletics department, decision. If the decision is to continue to recruit such prospects, the institution may wish to provide guidelines to the appropriate entity (see recommendation below).
2. Appoint either a group or an individual outside of the athletics department for approving the recruitment of two- and four-year transfers to the institution and other prospects in football who could be considered high risk and develop a written process for this group or individual. The decision to recruit a specific prospect or group (e.g., two-year or Division I transfers) then becomes an institutional, as opposed to an athletics department, decision. This could be a group or an individual determining whether to allow the football program to recruit a specific prospect or transfer and provided athletics aid.

If the institution elects to continue the recruitment of transfers and high-risk prospects and award athletic aid and a group is utilized, this group could be composed of the FAR, Vice President for Academic Affairs or Vice President for Student Affairs, and a counselor from Academic Affairs. If an individual is utilized instead of a group, this individual could be the FAR or the Vice President for Academic Affairs or the Vice President for Student Affairs to which the athletics department reports.

The athletics department would forward all transfers and other potentially at-risk prospects, including high school prospects, to the group or individual for their approval prior to recruitment or admission to the University. (A role of this group or individual would be to identify means to classify a prospect as high risk).

A rating system to evaluate two- and four-year transfers should be established. The system would assign values to various factors such as academics (qualifier, non-qualifier, and test score minimums), legal issues (prior convictions or arrests), and other behavior issues (kicked off a team at a prior institution). Any prospect above a certain risk factor (i.e., score) would not be recruited. For example, a guiding principle could be that the institution would not recruit or accept football student-athletes that have been charged with violent crimes and/or crimes where another person has been victimized. The
appointed group or individual could request input from other campus entities in order to evaluate a prospect.

3. Request that the PSAC facilitate discussions regarding strategies for the successful integration of transfers into campus. Several conference schools recruit two- and four-year transfers. TCG is not suggesting that the conference consider a policy regarding such transfers, as that should be determined by each institution. However, the sharing of information about potential issues and successful strategies to counter any such issues could be shared among schools.

3. Relationships between the football student-athletes and the football staff, athletics department, and other campus personnel

   a. Overview of Information Reported – The reputation of the football team across the campus was improving prior to the incident in late October. The incident outside of Spuds restaurant served to reinforce to some personnel that the football program is privileged and that it recruits players with questionable backgrounds who would not be enrolled in the University if they were not playing football.

   The football student-athletes who were interviewed did not have a sense of how they were viewed on campus, as they generally socialize among themselves – an activity not unique to Cal U. The perception by football student-athletes and coaching staff members of the recent incident at Spuds was significantly different than the perception of the University community. The on- and off-campus community believed the recent arrests were due to the recruitment of student-athletes with questionable backgrounds, while the student-athletes and coaches believed a few student-athletes were in the wrong place at the wrong time (i.e., a coincidence that it happened when it did) and that the involved student-athletes made poor decisions. They believed the incident that prompted the cancellation of the game was not due to a systemic problem in the football program. The team did not view the majority of the seven student-athletes involved in arrests in October as having questionable character or behavioral issues prior to their arrests.
Other information reported from the University community included:

- The current administration is providing a significant change in the mentality of entitlement by football student-athletes by subjecting the football program to significant cuts in scholarships and operations, similar to all other sports.
- The football team is isolated and often not integrated into community or other campus activities.
- Campus police generally have an unfavorable opinion of football student-athletes based, in part, on the high number of on-campus incidents involving football student-athletes in comparison to the general student population.
- Campus (and borough) police are frustrated by the perceived lack of respect for authority from football student-athletes.
- Limited interaction occurs between executive level administration (President, Vice President, or FAR) and the football program or football staff.
- Football coaching staff members and student-athletes reported that they have very little contact with the Director of Athletics and President.
- Little knowledge existed by athletics department personnel of the specifics of the student code of conduct, including the means by which a student enters into the process or an employee’s responsibility for reporting information.
- Many of the service areas provided to student-athletes (academic services, equipment) are receiving the necessary support from the Head Football Coach.

b. Recommendations

1. Develop a consistent procedure concerning the sharing of information between the coaching staff members and athletics department with the Office of Student Conduct (OSC) of a potential violation of the student code of conduct. Police reports from the borough or campus police routinely are forwarded to the OSC. However, on occasion, it appears that coaches might be aware of an arrest in the borough, and the corresponding police report may not have been forwarded to or identified by the OSC as a student-athlete.
The intent of this recommendation is to ensure that all situations arising from an arrest/citation for a student-athlete either on campus or in the borough is inserted into the OSC process. (NOTE: This recommendation primarily addresses the issue of the OSC being informed of arrests/citations on campus and in the local community. It also attempts to identify those issues that arise outside the area. See below for an additional recommendation regarding out-of-area instances).

Also, to the extent possible, the OSC should share information concerning reported incidences with the athletics department.

2. Insert language in the Student-Athlete Handbook and reinforce to student-athletes that they have a responsibility to report instances of arrests (other than traffic citations) that occur outside of the local community. It is unrealistic for the institution to search law enforcement databases across the country to monitor ongoing citations involving student-athletes. Rather, more responsibility should be placed upon student-athletes to report such involvement to their head coach and the Director of Athletics. This language should indicate that a failure to report this information in a timely manner violates the policy and could increase the penalty. TCG understands that this initiative is based upon self-reporting by student-athletes, but believes it is better to have this language than no policy.

3. Develop a mentoring program for football student-athletes with University staff. The University should offer a mentoring program to football student-athletes using institutional staff (or community) members. The purpose is to provide a resource person for the student-athletes to assist and accelerate the assimilation of student-athletes into campus and the community. The mentor would need to be trained on NCAA legislation.

4. Improve relationships between football student-athletes and other student-athletes. One of the frequently reported comments was that the student-athletes in football were isolated and frequently did not interact with other
student-athletes. The institution has a Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC). The responsibility of increasing interaction between football student-athletes and other student-athletes should be assumed by the SAAC, as that is a common task for institutional SAACs, and information on programs used by other schools is easily accessible.

4. Relationships between the football program, athletic department, and borough:

a. Overview of Information Reported – The student-athletes and coaches generally believed that the borough police target student-athletes, especially African American student-athletes.

The University and the borough are similar to other non-urban Division II institutions regarding ethnicity. Below is a chart that illustrates ethnicity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate Percentage of Ethnicity Populations*</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Football Student-Athletes</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Student-Athletes (Not Counting Football)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Undergraduate University Students</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of California, PA†</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*General student data from University relating to 2014-15 enrollment; information related to student-athletes is from current squads and athletics department personnel.
†Some student-athletes may participate in more than one sport, and they are counted in each sport of participation.

It is not TCG’s position that the discrepancy of the ethnicity of the football team to the campus and surrounding community contributed to an increase in the number of arrests. Rather, it demonstrates the potential for cultural issues that African American student-athletes may encounter outside of the football program. The lack of understanding of cultural issues by others frequently was mentioned by student-athletes during their interviews. This potential cultural divide is an underlying component of several recommendations set forth in the next section of this report.

Borough (and campus) police believed that many of the incidents to which they respond involve student-athletes. They reported that currently, students generally
(and not just student-athletes) show less respect for their authority and are likely to confront law enforcement when they or others are arrested than in the past.

Communication between local law enforcement agencies and the athletics department is negligible. Under Luckhardt, some communication occurred, especially surrounding possible arrests of student-athletes. (NOTE: This communication possibly eliminated some arrests, which could have impacted the number of student-athletes arrested). While such communication potentially defuses a situation, it also could create a sense of entitlement that student-athletes, especially in football, are “above the law.” Local law enforcement agencies recently have not addressed the football team about their practices and procedures. Local community representatives are very concerned about the potential of an increasing trend of violent behavior by student-athletes.

Vulcan Village, a local apartment complex where many students (and student-athletes) reside, has been a location where numerous arrests have occurred. Vulcan Village Apartments are Cal U’s campus-affiliated apartment community, which is located next to Adamson Stadium and Roadman Park, approximately 1.5 miles from Cal U’s main campus. Vulcan Village Apartments is owned by the Student Association, Inc. (SAI) and managed by EdR, Inc., a national student housing management company. The property comprises ten, three-story buildings, with a total of 199 apartments and 768 beds.

The number of student-athletes residing at Vulcan Village has increased recently due to housing waivers at the Village provided to student-athletes on athletic scholarships. These waivers were an attempt to compensate for a reduction to the amount of athletic scholarship dollars. Below is an analysis of student-athlete housing:

a. All Student-Athletes
   - Approximate Number of Student-Athletes: 439
     - Living On Campus: 143
     - Living Off Campus: 296
       • Living at Vulcan Village: 123 (Approximately 41%)
b. Football Student-Athletes

- Approximate Number of Football Student-Athletes:
  - Living On Campus: 15
  - Living Off Campus: 80
    - Living at Vulcan Village: 51 (Approximately 63%)

c. Vulcan Village

- Approximate Number of Residents at Vulcan Village: 768
- Approximate Number of Student-Athletes Residing: 123
  - Approximate Number of Football Student-Athletes Residing: 51

TCG also notes that the issues that have occurred, especially in the bars, do not involve only Cal U students. The borough is a regional social destination, so the composition of a typical drinking crowd at a local bar includes local students, Cal U students, and regional residents.

b. Recommendations

1. **Increase supervision of Vulcan Village.** By providing housing waivers for student-athletes at Vulcan Village, the number of student-athlete residents has increased significantly. While this housing complex is a joint University and private venture, it is generally patrolled by borough police. Many of the football student-athlete arrests occurred at Vulcan Village. The issuance of the waiver and significant number of student-athlete residents places more responsibility on the institution to monitor these activities and to either eliminate or reduce the impact of any criminal actions that could result in an arrest. Strategies include reducing the number of student-athletes residing in the Village, hiring resident supervisors, increasing security, creating a monitoring system that includes members of the football coaching staff, etc.

2. **Appoint a Community Relations Committee that includes representatives from the University community, athletics department, local businesses, and campus and local law enforcement.** This formalizes informal sessions that the
President already has begun. The committee could have subcommittees such as criminal justice that would address the sharing of information concerning certain trends and ensure that all incidents involving Cal U students are inputted into the OSC.

3. **Continue communications to increase the involvement of campus police in the borough area.** The primary necessity for routine (or increased) patrolling by borough police in the evenings results from the presence of University students in the borough. As a result, some shared responsibility for monitoring student-athlete activity seems appropriate. It appears that student-athletes have more confidence in campus police than borough police. This may result from information reported about a few issues with two former members of the borough police (which were handled by the borough). TCG is not knowledgeable of the ramifications or feasibility of campus police patrolling in an area outside of campus. Nevertheless, the problem stems from Cal U students leaving campus and going into the borough to socialize. This problem is not unique to the University, and countermeasures used by other universities with similar demographics should be examined.

4. **Increase the amount of community engagement between student-athletes and athletics department personnel with the community.** More favorable interaction between student-athletes and the community should occur. This interaction could be primarily from student-athletes going into the community; however, it also should include encouraging residents to visit campus.

A focus of NCAA Division II is community engagement. Individual teams should continue to be encouraged to undertake team community engagement activities. The institution’s SAAC also should be encouraged to increase focus on all student-athlete community engagement projects. Extensive information exists on the NCAA website about developing and implementing student-athlete community engagement projects.
[While TCG’s focus was on athletics department integration into the community, the institution may consider broadening the impetus to also include more interaction between the faculty and staff with borough residents.]

5. Schedule, at least annually, an opportunity for all local law agencies (borough, county, and state police) to address the football team and coaches. A better relationship should exist between campus law enforcement and football student-athletes. Many institutions have ongoing presentations by campus, local, or regional law enforcement to student-athletes.

It appears that Luckhardt scheduled occasional presentations by law enforcement and received calls from them when situations arose. The athletics department should arrange, at least annually, presentations by law enforcement agencies with all student-athletes.

Communication between coaches and law enforcement, when arrests/issues occur, should be monitored. While such communication could assist the immediate situation, it also could be viewed as the head coach intervening on behalf of a student-athlete, possibly violating NCAA legislation. To avoid possible NCAA violations, all parties should have an understanding of the extent and nature of the communication that can be undertaken per NCAA legislation. The safeguard is educating all involved parties (i.e., coaches and law enforcement) on what can/cannot be undertaken for student-athletes. This ensures that when communication occurs between coaching staff members and institutional officials, appropriate protocols are followed.

Law enforcement officers should embrace this recommendation with sincere interests to develop and improve its relationship with student-athletes on campus (especially African America football student-athletes). Student-athletes should be advised to respect the authority of law enforcement officers.
5. **Access to and availability of academic and support resources for football student-athletes:**

a. **Overview of Information Reported** – Regarding academics, numerous individuals expressed significant support of the current academic assistance provided to student-athletes. This included accolades for personnel and programs of the Office of Academic Support of Student-Athletes. Of note:

- The average high school GPA of current football team members is 2.76, and the average SAT is 894. This average SAT and GPA is similar to about 25 percent of all entering students at the University. Below is a comparison of those averages to several recent incoming freshmen classes at the University:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>% of Entering Students Who Had SAT Less Than 900*</th>
<th>GPA &lt; 2.76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The increase in the number of entering students with less than 900 is believed to be, in part, due to the institution’s increased focus on high school GPA as a primary admissions factor.

- The football program had the lowest GPA of all 18 sports in four of the last six semesters. This is not unusual when reviewing other institutions in Divisions I or II:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Football GPA</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Next Closest</th>
<th>Average for All Sports (Football Not Included)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>2.612</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>MGF 2.696</td>
<td>3.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>2.740</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>WBB 2.743</td>
<td>3.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>2.507</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>MBB 2.549</td>
<td>3.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>2.819</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>WBB 2.931</td>
<td>3.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>2.438</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>MBB 2.749</td>
<td>3.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>2.680</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>MBB 2.729</td>
<td>3.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.633</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.732</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TCG also compared the institution’s academic success to other schools in the conference, and both the football program and the institution’s overall sports teams ranked in the upper half when compared with other conference members using the NCAA’s Academic Success Rate (ASR) as a criterion. The ASR is a graduate metric...
developed by the NCAA that is calculated only for student-athletes and widely used by institutions and conferences since ASR information is to be submitted annually to the NCAA. It generally is considered more reflective of a sports program than the Federal Graduation Rate (FGR) since it includes information on transfers and mid-year enrollees. The graduate rate is determined six years after initial enrollment. The most recent available information “tracks” the entering class of 2007. Based upon that information:

- The institution’s football team had a 66 score and ranked fifth versus other conference teams, with the overall conference average ASR being 62, with the highest and lowest being 81 and 38.
- The institution’s overall student-athletes had an 80 ASR score and ranked sixth versus other conference teams, with the overall conference average ASR being 77, with the highest and lowest being 88 and 42.
- The institution’s football team score of 66 ASR is appreciably above the national average of 53 percent for football.

More specifically, TCG also examined whether current football student-athletes were graduating soon after their eligibility expired. Of the 11 seniors on the 2014 football team, nine have graduated or will graduate by the end of the 2015 spring semester. Of the remaining two, one will graduate in the fall of 2015, and the other is expected to graduate following the 2016 spring semester. Of those 11, five were two- or four-year transfers, and two of these five are the two that will graduate following the fall or spring semester of the 2015-16 academic year.

Regarding non-academic support services, fewer services were available. Football student-athletes appear to have limited access/exposure to the Life Skills program. Incoming student-athletes from high-risk home environments have not been provided with the necessary support to increase their chances for a successful cultural transition to the University and the local community.

Student-athletes spoke generally about alcohol and marijuana use, but when pressed concerning specific incidents, users, and penalties, they were reluctant to provide
examples. Football student-athletes were aware of the random drug testing program; however, not one of the football student-athletes interviewed reported being tested.

b. **Recommendations**

1. **Conduct a drug test of all football student-athletes by the end of the 2015 calendar year.** This provides a baseline to access issues within the program and provides sufficient time to act as a deterrent. The testing should occur on several occasions during the designated time period. It is not necessary to test all football student-athletes again unless significant issues arise.

2. **Increase the number of occasions of random drug testing of football student-athletes.** After all football student-athletes are tested, a less rigorous program is recommended. However, the emphasis should be on the number of occasions as opposed to the number of student-athletes tested as the number of occasions acts as the deterrent.

The University has drug tested previously; however, as illustrated in the chart below, due to fiscal concerns, fewer tests recently have occurred. The responsibility for the drug testing program for student-athletes has rested with Dr. Timothy Susick, Vice President for Student Affairs, who supervises the OSC. The testing is performed by a representative from the University Health Center. Below is an overview of the number of tests performed over the past few academic years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Sports</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilizing numerous occasions annually, the athletics department should develop drug testing policies and implement a program that tests at least 25 percent of all student-athletes (approximately 100) annually. The NCAA drug testing program can be utilized to assist in this 25 percent goal.
understands that an increased level of testing results in increased costs but believes that any current drug use, regardless of its level, can be reduced significantly with frequent testing.

3. Review the institution’s drug testing policies to ensure that the policies are in line with the institution’s values. Section D of the institution’s Handbook of Intercollegiate Athletics contains the drug testing policies. The policy should be reviewed and discussions should occur about the various components of the policy, including ramifications for one or more positive tests.

Safeguards should be in place to ensure that if a positive result occurs, the appropriate action mandated by the policy for that positive test is implemented. Athletics department staff members, including coaches, should be updated on the provisions of the policy.

4. Increase the level of education provided to student-athletes, with emphasis on alcohol and drug education. The institution has an alcohol education course that is taken by many students. This can be incorporated into its Life Skills presentations, with the addition of information on other drugs. TCG believes existing courses already may be applicable and can be modified slightly. Marijuana and alcohol are considered gateway drugs to other harmful narcotics and opiates and should be treated as a threat to student-athlete welfare. The legalization of marijuana in a few states, increased discussion about the use of marijuana for medicinal purposes, and the increased use of marijuana by adolescents and young adults should be considered when developing a drug education program.

5. Increase emphasis on the Life Skills program and make appropriate adjustments focusing on activities relating to adapting to college life in the institution’s environment. The institution previously has undertaken some activities in the general Life Skills area, but primary responsibility rested with the specific sports teams, as they often undertook their own initiatives. Cal U should evaluate its current offerings and develop a plan, combining group
presentations, small focus group discussion, online education, etc. that is applicable to all sports.

The focus should be on adapting to college life, including the specific environment at the institution and borough. These sessions focus not only on awareness of differing cultures and backgrounds, but they also provide strategies on handling/responding to various scenarios that may arise. While many institutional Life Skills programs relate to developing skills that will be used after college, the institution’s program may need to focus more on assisting student-athletes in having a successful collegiate experience.

One component of the speaker presentations would be the utilization of former football student-athletes. These individuals provide a unique perspective since they previously were exposed to similar challenges. Given that Cal U has recently produced successful NFL players, the football program should consider utilizing high-character, former, Cal U student-athletes in its speaker series.

6. Develop a presentation for entering freshmen and transfers that details the expectations regarding and consequences of criminal behavior or misconduct generally. After the institution implements a program to all student-athletes that at least annually reinforces its expectations of its student-athletes, more or separate emphasis may need to occur with those annually entering the program who previously had not participated in such presentations. These presentations should be made by the Director of Athletics or the FAR.

7. Create a detailed exit survey asking football student-athletes for recommendations to improve the student-athlete experience. The primary outreach to student-athletes leaving the program occurs when the Director of Athletics meets with each team individually at the end of each season. Anonymous input from student-athletes also is encouraged. No individual, in-person, meetings recently have been conducted. TCG recommends using a more uniform, written, process and possibly including other representatives of
the athletics department in one-on-one meetings. The survey should include questions on identifying issues related to discipline. (The survey could be used for all sports).

6. Existence and utilization of certain policies and procedures that relate to the football program and athletics department

   a. Overview of Information Reported – The student judicial system process is not clearly understood by student-athletes. This process is to be applied when a student is involved in an on- or off-campus incident. However, the number of incidents involving student-athletes processed through the Judicial Office is inconsistent with the total number of incidents involving student-athletes on or off campus.

   b. Recommendations

      1. Develop a “tracker chart” that follows each incident or arrest of a student-athlete. In order to understand the issues that result in the arrests and to ensure that a uniform application of applicable University processes are applied, the institution should track the situation of the arrest and its disposition through the systems. Attachment C is a draft of a possible chart of the information that could be contained on the chart. The institution should modify it to more closely align with its applicable processes. The Director of Athletics would have responsibility to update this chart, and it would be referenced during ongoing meetings between athletics department and supervisory institutional personnel.

      2. Require the officers of the OSC to speak to the football team and football staff to explain their process. Another recommendation in this report encourages the development of a system to ensure that consistency exists between incidences occurring on and off campus concerning possible violations of the Student Code of Conduct. If increased utilization of the OSC occurs, more knowledge of how the system operates should be provided. Further, this
provides an opportunity to reinforce to student-athletes the specifics and importance of abiding by the student conduct code.

3. Consider amending the head coaches’ annual performance evaluation to include as an evaluation criterion the amount of disciplinary or criminal actions involving the student-athletes in their sports. Head coaches in all sports are evaluated annually using specific criteria, none of which appear specifically to relate to student-athlete behavior. The evaluation of job performance, in part, based upon student-athlete conduct, increases efforts to monitor conduct.
E.  CONCLUSION

President Jones should be commended on her willingness to retain an outside agency to conduct an independent assessment. No parameters were placed on TCG regarding interviews or requested information.

TCG notes its appreciation to Acting Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Bruce Barnhart and Executive Staff Assistant Marissa Gillis for their assistance in obtaining information and arranging interviews.