

Evaluation of the Self-Study

Accuracy

From conversations during on-campus interview sessions and from analysis of supporting documents related to the self-study, the peer-review team believes that the institutional report is an accurate and complete portrayal of conditions at California Polytechnic State University pertinent to the certification process. Each of the required self-study items has been responded to satisfactorily except where noted later in this report. Major issues have been identified and addressed, and conclusions reached in the self-study are, in the judgment of the peer-review team, based on reliable records and data. Similarly, the institutional response to the NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification (hereafter referred to as "committee") analysis report does not contain any factual inaccuracies or misrepresentations.

Broad-Based Participation in the Self-Study Process

The self-study plan as initially conceived was designed to involve representatives of the major constituencies of the institution. Broad-based participation in the certification process both in drafting as well as reviewing the self-study report as it evolved, was achieved by the appointment of a steering committee, three subcommittees and task forces involving more than 30 faculty, staff, students, student athletes, alumni and community members. Not only were these multiple stakeholder groups included by design, but a review of minutes and discussion with subcommittee and task force chairs also confirmed that those in attendance at most meetings were broadly representative of these various constituent groups.

In addition, those directly involved in the self-study process made extensive efforts to keep others informed by creating an interactive Web site, and making presentations to numerous governance groups including the president's management staff, academic senate, dean's council, student body board of directors, student-athlete advisory committee and the athletics governing board.

Many of those interviewed by the peer-review team members confirmed that the transparency of Cal Poly athletics program was greatly enhanced by the self-study process and, in particular, by the appointment to the committees and task forces of broad representation from these significant stakeholders groups. The peer-review team members believe that broad-based participation in the self-study process has been achieved.

It should also be noted that the athletics governing board has been empowered to review all aspects of the athletics department, including budget recommendations and significant changes to the budget throughout the year. Since this board has broad-based representation, the athletics governing board members were instrumental to insuring broad-based participation in the self-study report and strong campus support for the athletics program in general.

Governance and Commitment to Rules Compliance

1.1 Institutional Control, Presidential Authority and Shared Responsibilities

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

The committee did not identify any issues.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

1.2 Rules Compliance

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

1. NCAA Operating Principle 1.2 requires an institution to have a clear and unambiguous commitment to rules compliance as a central element in all personnel matters for individuals involved outside the intercollegiate athletics program. In order to demonstrate conformity with this operating principle, an institution must include a statement regarding the importance of rules compliance in all of the following documents: contracts or letters of appointment, performance evaluations and job descriptions for administrative staff outside the athletics department who are associated with athletics. After reviewing Page No. 15 of your institution's self-study report, the NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification (hereafter referred to as "committee") noted that your institutional practice is not to include duties and descriptions of responsibilities (including those related to NCAA rules compliance) in contracts or letters of appointment for all administrative staff outside the athletics department who are associated with athletics. However, inclusion of compliance-related language in contracts or letters of appointment or related addendums is a requirement for demonstrating conformity with this operating principle. Therefore, your institution must provide written evidence that a statement regarding the importance of rules compliance is included in the contracts or letters of appointment for those individuals outside the athletics department who are associated with athletics.

Peer-Review Team Report

Rationale as to how the committee's issue has been addressed:

In reviewing Cal Poly's self-study report, the committee noted that the institution does not include reference to the importance of rules compliance in its contracts and letters of appointment for administrative staff outside the athletics department. After interviewing several administrators, the compliance director and reviewing related documentation, it was verified that the following statement has now been included in contracts and letters of appointment for outside staff members: "You are expected to remain knowledgeable in and adhere to all NCAA, conference and university rules and regulations applicable to the performance of your duties". Therefore, the peer-review team believes this issue has been satisfied.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

The following recommendations in the area of rules compliance were noted following discussions involving current athletics department personnel:

1. Institution should consider expanding the compliance office. Since compliance is an ongoing process and encompasses multiple departments on campus, it may be necessary to increase the staff available to assist with the day-to-day operations of compliance. Currently, only one employee is working in compliance and that individual also carries the load of simultaneously being the senior woman administrator (SWA). Hiring additional compliance staff would allow better coverage in the area of compliance as well as enable the current compliance director to perform her other duties.
2. Ongoing and periodic rules-education efforts involving student-athletes and coaches should be increased, especially in light of the significant number of sports (20) offered by the institution and the ever-changing nature of NCAA rules and regulations.
3. Enhanced education efforts in the areas of drug and alcohol abuse for student-athletes should be considered. This is another area in which additional compliance staff would allow for a greater level of education in an area in which all institutions must be cognizant.

Academic Integrity

2.1 Academic Standards

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

The committee did not identify any issues.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

2.2 Academic Support

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

1. Operating Principle 2.2 requires academic support services for student-athletes to be reviewed and approved at least once every three years by appropriate academic authorities outside the department of intercollegiate athletics. In order to demonstrate conformity with this operating principle, an institution must demonstrate that academic support services for student-athletes are subject to a comprehensive review at least once every three years by academic authorities outside of athletics who do not have day-to-day responsibilities in the academic support services area. After reviewing Page No. 37 of your institution's self-study report, the committee noted that the Athletic Governing Board performs this review at your institution on a quarterly basis. However, there was no description of the process for the review, which support services are reviewed, which board members actually conduct the review, or how a particular support service ultimately is approved. Further, the board does not provide the results of its review in written form. Therefore, your institution must provide written evidence that each of your academic support services provided to student-athletes has been subject to a periodic, comprehensive review and approval by appropriate academic authorities outside the department of intercollegiate athletics who do not have day-to-day responsibilities in the academic support services area.

Peer-Review Team Report

Rationale as to how the committee's issue has been addressed:

Operating Principle 2.2 requires academic support services for student-athletes to be reviewed and approved at least once every three years by appropriate academic authorities outside the department of intercollegiate athletics. Based on a review of the athletics governing board's minutes, interviews during the evaluation visit and the institution's response to the committee analysis, discussions regarding the review of the academic support services area occurred during the athletics governing board meetings. However, an independent review has still not been accomplished. The institution's response of having at least two of the four athletics governing board faculty members perform a review every May appears adequate. Consideration of expanding the review team to include an outside college advising staff member and someone who works daily with other university tutoring programs may enhance the proposed institutional corrective action. Since the independent review has not been accomplished as of the evaluation visit, the peer-review team does not consider this issue to have been satisfied.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

Operating Principle 2.2 recognizes that student-athletes should have access to adequate academic support services. Based on peer-review team observations and interviews with student-athletes, the steering committee and athletics department staff, it appears that the academic support services could be improved. The peer-review team notes that the academic support facility size and staffing were limited in relationship to the number of student-athletes needing services. The institution has increased the staff to help satisfy the demand; however, due to the high academic standards, the requirement to declare a major prior to admission (and the related difficulty in changing a declared major after admission), the additional advising necessary due to institution's quarter system and the inherent demands on a student-athlete's time, it appears that the demand for academic support (tutoring, academic advising, etc.) is greater than the current facilities and staff can provide. It is recommended that during the annual review of the academic support services that particular attention be given to the student-athletes' academic needs and the scope of those academic needs.

Equity and Student-Athlete Welfare

3.1 Gender Issues

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

The committee did not identify any issues.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

None.

3.2 Minority Issues

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

The committee did not identify any issues.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

Operating Principle 3.2 requires institutions to satisfy eight program areas within the mandatory plan for improvement. One of these areas, evaluation, requires periodic review of athletics department activities for consistency with goals and objectives set forth in the institution's athletics department's written commitments to diversity. Based on observations and discussions with institutional representatives, the minority issues committee has been designated to accomplish the program area of evaluation (per self-study report Page Nos. 70 and 77). However, this committee has not yet been formed and the composition of the team has not yet been determined. The peer-review team recommends that Cal Poly determine the composition of the minority issues committee and create the committee during the winter quarter of 2006-07 so that adequate evaluation can be accomplished.

3.3 Student-Athlete Welfare

A. Evaluation of the Athletics Program in Relation to the Operating Principle.

Committee on Athletics Certification Identified Issues

The committee did not identify any issues.

B. Additional Peer-Review Team Issues

None.

C. Opportunities for Enhancement

1. Operating Principle 3.3 requires evidence of programs to protect the health and safety of student-athletes. Based on peer-review team observations and discussions with student-athletes, athletics department staff and a review of exit interviews, the services provided by the athletic training staff has improved but still requires attention. Even though the training staff has been recently increased to four full time and two graduate assistant certified trainers, the workload for over 500 student-athletes in 20 sports appears to be significantly more than the staff can adequately handle considering the new standards set by the National Athletic Trainers' Association. Additionally, the limited space of the one training facility, the institutional schedule for the training room, the lack of a training area in the baseball/softball/soccer practice complex (a significant distance from the training room) and the considerable workload due to the filing of insurance documentation all contribute to reducing the ability of the athletic training staff to respond to student-athlete needs. Finally, the limited number of physicians in the surrounding area has made it difficult at times to get timely medical treatment for student-athletes despite the continued efforts of the institution. The institution should consider reviewing athletic training policies, facilities, scheduling and staffing to ensure adequate athletic training services are provided to all student-athletes.

2. Operating Principle 3.3 requires how the institution is organized to further its efforts related to student-athlete welfare. The peer-review team noted that issues regarding academic support, rules compliance and athletic training services were in need of further examination in regards to staffing. Relatedly, it was observed that due to the higher cost of living, recruitment and retention of coaches and staff may be issues in select areas. After discussions with athletics department staff and review of salaries for coaches and staff at other institutions in the same conference, it appears that several coaching positions and a majority of the staff positions were not very competitive, which could be a factor in the areas identified above for further examination. It is recommended that Cal Poly examine the compensation issues surrounding the affected areas.

Individuals Interviewed on Campus

Name	Title
Bailey, Phil	chair of equity and student-athlete welfare subcommittee
Baker, Warren	president
Barber, Cliff	athletics governing board
Bream, Hugh	head women's tennis coach
Bromley, Kevin	head men's basketball coach
Cisco, Willimena	student-athlete
Clark, Kevin	athletics governing board
Colvin, Kurt	athletics governing board
Condon, Jenny	head softball coach
Cone, Alison	athletics director (AD)
Conn, David	vice provost for academic programs and undergraduate education
Connover, Mark	head men's cross country coach
Crawford, Terry	director of cross country
Day, Sharon	student-athlete
Demers, Jerry	chair of governance and commitment to rules compliance subcommittee
Durgin, Bill	chair of athletics governing board
Eggleston, Jessica	student-athlete advisory committee member
Ellerson, Rich	head football coach
Hanks, John	student-athlete advisory committee member
Hood, Myron	chair of academic integrity subcommittee
Kelker, Ardia	student-athlete
Kontra, Robyn	student-athlete advisory committee member
Lee, Larry	head baseball coach
Maki, Todd	student government president
Manley, John	student-athlete advisory committee member
Martinez, Barbara	compliance director/SWA
Monteiro, Matt	student-athlete
Morton, Cornel	vice president for student affairs
Motroni, Nicholas	athletics governing board
Mumford, Frank	executive director, Cal Poly corporation
Payne, Carl	athletics governing board
Shelton, Titus	student-athlete
Souza, Brendan	athletics governing board
Waldron, Kevin	student-athlete advisory committee member
Walker, Ken	faculty athletics representative (FAR)
Wing, Ally	student-athlete advisory committee member
Woo, Melissa	student-athlete

Institutional Records Reviewed on Campus

Records Reviewed
Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act forms for last three years
compliance policies and procedures (e.g., compliance manual)
documentation of conference involvement in reviewing compliance efforts
documentation of secondary rules violations for last three years
documentation related to periodic evaluation of rules-compliance program by some authority outside athletics
information from student-athletes' exit interviews
information regularly reported to president, FAR and AD concerning the academic performances of sport teams
job descriptions, contracts and evaluation forms for athletics staff (and others outside the athletics department who are involved in rules compliance)
minutes from steering committee meetings
minutes of athletics board meetings for last three years
minutes of each subcommittee meeting
policies and procedures for athletics department
published policies of governing board
random sampling of student-athlete eligibility files
sports and facility schedules - for all sports
student-athlete handbook