

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ACADEMIC STANDARDS
BY THE NCAA FOR DIVISION I MEMBER
INSTITUTIONS FROM 1905 - 1987

A Seminar Paper
Presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate College
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

by
Jeanine Marie Bessette

May, 1987

WS
87
.B4
c.2

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
La Crosse, Wisconsin 54601

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Candidate: Jeanine Marie Bessette

I recommend acceptance of this seminar paper in partial fulfillment of this candidate's requirements for the degree Master of Science in Education. The candidate has completed her oral report.

Robert G. Gallo II
Seminar Paper Advisor

May 5, 1987
Date

292TT000 4HET E

This seminar paper is approved by the College of Education

Howard C. Rose
Dean, College of Education

May 11, 1987
Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Dr. Robert Culbertson, advisor, for his support and encouragement throughout the study.

The author wishes to thank Mickey Bessette for his positive thoughts and guidance.

Next, a thank you is extended to Pamela Turner for her never ending friendship and encouragement.

The author would like to thank her typist Mrs. Sharon Aalseth for all of her hardwork and dedication to the project.

The author extends a thank you to Keith Miner who gave continued support and motivation throughout the research.

A thank you is also given to the UW-L Central Office Staff and the Hutchison Hall Staff for their patience and advice.

Finally, a special thanks goes to the authors parents who have shown patience and support throughout the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Research Questions	2
Purpose of the Study	2
Significance for the Study	3
Limitations of the Study	3
Definition of Terms.	4
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	7
III. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS	44
Conclusions.	49
Recommendations.	49
REFERENCES.	51
APPENDICES.	55

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Average SAT Scores For White and Black Students From 1976-1982.	35

ABSTRACT

This study conveys to the reader the development of the academic standards of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. The primary purpose of the study was to present the development of the academic standards from 1905-1987. A second purpose was to gain a better understanding of the reasons and justifications of the NCAA in regard to changes that have occurred in the academic standards. A third purpose was to gain knowledge of Proposition 48. The final purpose was to study the controversy surrounding Proposition 48. A chronological approach is used to make record of the eighty-two year history of the academic standards of the NCAA.

This study depicts the founding of the NCAA, its initial academic standards and the belief in the importance of academics for the student-athlete, and the many proposals passed over the years, including the 1.600 rule, the 2.000 rule and Proposition 48.

A narrative approach is used to describe each change that occurred during the NCAA's history in regards to academic standards. The study reveals the continued significance of academic standards in the NCAA and with Proposition 48, a continued and needed commitment to the "student" in student-athlete.

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

On December 28, 1905, an organization named the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States was formed. The founders of this organization were primarily educators and scholars. The purpose was to form one ruling body for the college sport of football. Five years later, the organization was renamed the National Collegiate Athletic Association and is now the Voice of College Sports (Falla, 1981).

Since the formation of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the founders have set high priority on academic achievement of student athletes. At the Association's first convention in 1906, the first policy on academic eligibility was established.

"No student shall represent a college or university in any intercollegiate contest who is not taking a full schedule of work as prescribed in the catalog of the institution" (Falla, 1981).

During the period of 1905-1939, the educational aspect of college athletics was of great importance to the NCAA but no enforcement structure was in place. The firm belief of the NCAA was that member institutions were to control the enforcement of academic standards on their individual campuses.

It was not until 1939 that the National Collegiate Athletic Association voted to establish eligibility rules that were enforceable by the Association's Eligibility Committee. Many rule changes were to follow including the 1.600 rule established in 1965, the 2.00 rule established in 1973 and the current Proposition 48 established in 1982 and put into effect in 1986.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The statement of this research is to examine the historical aspects of the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I member institutions' academic standards with an emphasis on the 1986 Proposition 48.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions for this paper were:

1. How have the academic standards for the National Collegiate Athletic Association developed since the foundation of the organization?
2. What have been the reasons and the justifications for the development of the standards?
3. What are the details of the current Proposition 48?
4. What are the pros and cons of the current Proposition 48?

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to convey the historical development of the academic standards of the National

Collegiate Athletic Association from 1905-1987. A second purpose of this research is to gain a better understanding of the reasons and justifications of the members of the NCAA in regards to the changes that have occurred in the academic standards for the organization. A third purpose of this research is to gain knowledge on Proposition 48. The final purpose of this study is to examine the controversy surrounding Proposition 48.

SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE STUDY

As John B. Slaughter (1987), Chancellor of the University of Maryland stated at the ACPA/NASPA Conference in Chicago in March, 1987, "Academics is the number one reason for colleges and universities with athletics complimenting the institutions". It is imperative for members of higher education to be aware of the rules and regulations of the NCAA in regards to academic standards in order to better facilitate the needs of the athlete. This paper presents a necessary compilation of information about the academic standards of the NCAA so that higher education professionals gain the knowledge of the regulations that govern the student-athlete.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The limitations of the study are as follows:

1. This study is limited to National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I member institutions.

2. This study is limited to research conducted during the time period of December 1986-April 1987.

3. This study is limited to incoming freshmen and continuing students.

4. This study is limited to the perceptions of those individuals who were included in the collection of the data.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Division I member institution - Any college or university who is a dues paying member of the National Collegiate Athletic Association and who sponsors a minimum of six intercollegiate varsity sports including at least two team sports, involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females (NCAA Manual, 1987).

Student Athlete - any student who is enrolled at a college or university who is participating in college sponsored athletics.

American Council on Higher Education - It was founded in 1918 and composed of institutions of higher education and national and regional education associations, it is the nation's major coordinating body for post-secondary education. Through voluntary and cooperative action, the council provides comprehensive leadership for improving education standards, policies, procedures, and services (Greene, 1984).

National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) - A private, non-profit organization consisting of approximately

1000 members. Membership is open to four-year institutions who meet certain academic standards. The organization is operated by a Constitution and Bylaws which are formulated by the membership and subject to change by the membership.

National Collegiate Athletic Association Council - A group of twenty-two members who are elected by the membership and responsible for the running of the organization in the interim between conferences.

Sanity Code - The Sanity Code was a set of principles that were believed, in 1948, to bring sanity back to intercollegiate athletics.

Scholastic Aptitude Test - The SAT is a test that measures the learning gained by the student in two subject areas that are indicators for success at the college level. The subjects are Verbal skills and Quantitative skills.

American College Testing - The ACT is a test that provides an indication of how well a student will perform in college in the following areas: English, math, social studies and natural science (ACT handbook).

Principle of Sound Academic Standards - One of the principles found in the Sanity Code which specified new requirements for academic standards for those participating in the National Collegiate Championships.

The Principles for Conduct of Intercollegiate Athletics - A survey that was distributed to the member institutions to examine the state of intercollegiate athletics. Later

it was renamed the Sanity Code.

Incoming Freshmen - Any student who attends a Division I member institution directly after completing high school.

Continuing Student - Any student who begins at a Division I member institution and matriculates there until the completion of a degree or athletic eligibility.

CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The following Chapter will present a discussion of the academic standards of the National Collegiate Athletic Association from 1905-1987. The author will present information on many of the standards that have been set over the years including the 10-point code, the Sanity Code, the 1.600 rule, the 2.000 rule and the heavily debated Proposition 48. In the discussion of Proposition 48, the pros and cons will be presented.

The formation of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States, later to be renamed the National Collegiate Athletic Association, came about because of the sport of football. By the 1870's, the sport of football was becoming increasingly violent and many men were being seriously injured or killed while playing. On November 23, 1876, Yale, Princeton, Harvard and Columbia Universities met to form the Intercollegiate Football Association in an attempt to bring some order to the sport of football (Menke, 1975). This association made token attempts at lessening the violence in the sport of football, but it still continued to prevail at this time (Falla, 1981).

On February 23, 1894, a football rules committee was formed when Harvard, Pennsylvania, Princeton and Yale

Universities met at the University Athletic Club in New York. As was the case with the Association, few rule changes were made and football continued to be a violent sport. By 1900, the general public was becoming much more angry about the state of football violence. Legislators were beginning to take notice of the feelings and sentiments of the public (Falla, 1981). On October 9, 1905, President Theodore Roosevelt, who was a big fan of the game of football, attempted to take matters into his own hands and called a meeting at the White House to discuss the issue of violence in football (Spears, 1978). Among the thirteen participating eastern institutions, were representatives from Harvard, Princeton, and Yale Universities. From this meeting, came a statement that was released to the country. The statement was signed by Walter Camp and John E. Owsley from Yale, J. B. Fine and A. R. Hillebrand from Princeton and Edward H. Nichols and William T. Reid, Jr. from Harvard. It read:

"At the meeting with the President of the United States it was agreed that we consider that an honorable obligation exists to carry out in letter and spirit the rules of the game of football relating to roughness, holding and foul play, and the active coaches of our universities being present with us pledged themselves to so regard it and to do their utmost to carry out that obligation" (Whitney, 1906).

Despite the intent of the letter, no major changes occurred in the sport of college football.

Chancellor Henry M. MacCracken of New York University sensed that if something was not done quickly to change the

sport of football, that the cry would be to abolish the sport entirely (Shea, 1967). He decided to call a meeting in New York City that was not sanctioned by the football rules committee. The purpose of this initial meeting was to consider abuses that had arisen in the sport of college football (Pierce, 1935). On December 9, 1905, sixty-eight schools met in New York City to discuss changes that could be made to make the sport of football safer for the participating student-athletes. Among the sixty-eight institutions in attendance were schools from Maine to Texas and Colorado to New York (Pierce, 1909). Based on the discussions that were held at Chancellor MacCracken's meeting, the group consensus was to attempt to make changes in the rules and that a second meeting would be held at a later date to implement those changes (Falla, 1981).

On December 28, 1905, the second meeting was held with twenty-eight institutions in attendance. One of the delegates, Captain Palmer E. Pierce suggested that an organization should be formed to continue the pursuit of eliminating the violence in college football. Many of the delegates agreed but felt that the organization should be expanded to include all aspects of intercollegiate athletics (Falla, 1981). Those present at the first gathering felt a great need to form an organization to help solidify and in a way control the undertaking of college athletics (Pierce, 1910). Based on this discussion, the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United

States was formed and the new organization would be open to all colleges, universities and institutions of learning in the United States (Savage, 1929). The purpose of this organization would be for "the regulation and supervision of college athletics throughout the U.S., in order that the athletic activities in the colleges and universities may be maintained on an ethical plane in keeping with the dignity and high purpose of education" (Pierce, 1935). Five years later, it would be renamed the National Collegiate Athletic Association (Shea, 1967). Thus, Captain Pierce became an important part of the foundation of the NCAA by making the 1905 meeting more than a gathering to discuss the violence in football but the beginning of a long-standing organization (Falla, 1981).

From the onset of the association, most of the members were educators and scholars who believed firmly that academics was a high priority for the student-athlete. The organization believed that college athletics and academics needed to be kept in the proper perspective (Pierce, 1909). At the first association meeting on March 31, 1906, much discussion occurred about faculty control of athletics. From this discussion, came the association's first statement on academic standards for student-athletes. To be eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics, a student-athlete must have met the following requirement:

"No student shall represent a college or university in any intercollegiate contest who is not taking a full schedule of work as prescribed in the catalog of the institution" (Falla, 1981).

This and other general rules were set forth between the years of 1906-1938. Despite the rules and the NCAA's commitment to education, no enforcement structure was in place during this period of time. The principles and interpretations of the principles were very diverse. Each member institution made their own decisions on how to enforce and interpret the policy. The Association had no control over the member institutions' own policies ("Development of Significant", 1983). The primary reason behind the lack of enforcement was that the organization was formed on the home rule principle. As Palmer Pierce stated, "the ideals striven for by all are the same, but the methods of securing them vary with local conditions" (Pierce, 1909).

Despite the lack of enforcement power, the common belief of the Association during the early years was that faculty should expect good scholarship from athletes. The belief continued to be that student-athletes came to school first for an education with athletics coming second (Dudley, 1912). To further expand on the importance of academics for intercollegiate athletics, one needs to examine the faculty opinion on the matter. Dr. Paul C. Phillops (1916) a professor of Physical Education at Amherst College believed that academic standards in intercollegiate

athletics arose from the faculties attempt to control athletics so as to continue the pursuit of high academic achievement for the atudent-athlete.

One of the rules established was the ten-point code of 1922. The code was established because the Association felt that it was important to reiterate its policies, principles and practices in regards to college sports. Two academic standards that were adhered to were the freshmen rule and absolute faculty control. The ten-points are as follows:

1. The organization of sectional conferences.
2. That amateruism as defined by this Association be taught and strictly adhered to.
3. The general adoption of the freshmen rule.
4. That each conference adopt a strict rule against participation of migrants.
5. That participation be for a period of three years only.
6. That participation be denied graduate students.
7. That playing on any team other than one representing his own institution, whether in term time or vacation, be prohibited except by faculty consent and under strict supervision.
8. That the whole moral force of faculty and athletic organization be directed toward suppressing the betting evil.
9. Absolute faculty control.
10. That each district representative make it an important part of his duty to visit the colleges of his district in order to advocate the principles of this Association (Morehouse, 1922).

A continued awareness of how important academics was for

the student-athlete can be seen in a speech given by Professor G. E. Dawson (1923) in which he simply stated "College is an educational experience." The nature of the speech exemplifies the continued importance of academics for the student-athlete. He also discussed the fact that there was much public cynicism in regards to the educational quality for the student-athlete but he believed that institutions of higher learning were not ignoring the student-athletes educational needs (Dawson, 1923).

In 1935, Major John L. Griffith spoke out against those who believed the colleges and universities were not enforcing the academic eligibility rules of their institutions. He believed that the faculty was very concerned about academics and were honest in their dealings with athletes. Despite his statements, public sentiment continued to be that athletes were not receiving a quality education that they rightfully deserved (Griffith, 1935).

In 1939, The Association gained some enforcement power over academic standards by establishing eligibility rules for National Collegiate Championships. By a vote at the convention, the enforcement of eligibility rules was placed in the hands of the Eligibility Committee. They were given the authority to rule on the academic eligibility of those student-athletes who participated in NCAA meets and tournaments ("Development of Significant", 1983). Much of the NCAA's response to academic standards arose from the opinions of both the public

and administrators who believed that athletics must be coordinated with classroom efforts to insure the academic success of the student-athlete (Harmon, 1940).

In 1946, the Conference of Conferences was held in Chicago and it resulted in the first draft of "The Principles for the Conduct of Intercollegiate Athletics." The draft was more in the form of a questionnaire than of policy and it was sent out to member institutions to get feedback on the issues that it addressed (Falla, 1981). One of the key issues was that of academic standards and the desire to have student-athletes be representative of the student body academically. Partly because of the discussion on the questionnaire and partly out of a desire to make the academic standards more specific, a change was made in the academic standards in 1946. In order to participate in the National Collegiate Championships, a student-athlete was required to have been admitted by the published admissions standards of their institution, that were applicable to the general student body of that institution and that at the time of competition, the athlete must have been enrolled in at least a minimum full-time program of studies as defined by his institution (Falla, 1981). Although the rules were becoming more specific, the admissions standards and the full-time student definition were still unique to the institution.

On January 10, 1948, "The Principles for the Conduct of

Intercollegiate Athletics" was adopted. This stemmed from the overwhelming response from the member institutions to the questionnaire that was sent out in 1946. The name given to these new regulations was the Sanity Code (Shea, 1967). The reason for the name was that many felt that this new code helped bring back the sanity to college athletics. The Sanity Code was adopted as Article 3 of the Constitution (Appendix A). The membership of the Association also passed a resolution giving the leadership of the Association the authority to establish a rules-enforcement body. At that point, a three-member committee was formed called the Constitutional Compliance Committee (Falla, 1981).

One aspect of the Sanity Code was that of the "Principle of Sound Academic Standards". The academic requirements at this time became even more specific. The new requirements for National Collegiate Championships included a one-year residency rule for transfer students, a three year limit on varsity competition, restriction of competition to undergraduates only and ineligibility for freshman for NCAA-sponsored events (Falla, 1981).

At the 1950 conference, one of the main discussions was what to do with schools who had violated the Sanity Code. Although some members were in favor of throwing them out of the NCAA, at the 1951 conference, the Association choose to eliminate the Sanity Code rather than deal with the violators

("For Hire", 1951). The Sanity Code was repealed not because it was a bad idea, but perhaps it was implemented too quickly. The implementation neglected to take into account how to enforce the Code and what to do with those who violated it (Falla, 1918). To follow, would be a more slow process but a process that would preserve the sense of amateurism in college athletics.

During the time between the repeal of the Sanity Code and the development of enforceable legislation, the Council developed a 12-point program. The 12-points are as follows:

1. Confine practice sessions to the recognized season of the sport or limit and rigidly supervise out-of-season practice.
2. Limit the number of games in each sport, particularly football and basketball.
3. Reexamine postseason games in the light of the pressures they create.
4. Urge reconsideration of the free substitution rule (football).
5. Insist upon normal academic progress toward a degree for purposes of eligibility.
6. Deny eligibility to any athlete not admitted under the institution's published entrance requirements.
7. Limit the number and amount of financial grants to athletes.
8. Top-level institutional administrators should "enlist the support of true lovers of wholesome college athletics, particularly in alumni areas, to reduce undesirable recruiting."
9. Demand strict adherence to the letter and spirit of the rules, once they have been established by regional or national groups.

10. Rule ineligible any athlete who knowingly enters into college for the purpose of receiving gifts or subsidy beyond that regularly permitted by the institution or conference.
11. Eliminate excessive entertainment of prospective athletes.
12. Give close attention to the curriculum of the athlete to assure that he is not diverted from his educational objective (Falla, 1981).

Although the 12-points were only advisory at this point with no enforcement to back them up, they would end up evolving into the fundamental principles that would govern intercollegiate athletics. At this point, as in the past, a commitment was made to the student-athlete that close attention would be paid to his curriculum to insure that he was getting the education necessary to continue after college athletics. The 12-point code is the first mention in the history of the NCAA that a student-athlete should be making normal progress towards a degree in order to continue participation in college athletics (Falla, 1981).

In 1952, the advisory statement was voted on and became a part of the Association's constitution. Normal progress towards a degree as defined by the institution was now a part of the constitution and must have occurred in order for an athlete to continue participation in sports (Falla, 1981). The Association established a Membership Committee that would be responsible for hearing complaints about institutions that were not abiding by the new rules (Tow, 1981).

In 1959, the Association took its first step towards quantifying the academic standards. Two additions were made to Bylaw 4 (Appendix B) that helped to clarify full-time student and years an athlete could participate. The Bylaw stated that a student-athlete must be enrolled, at the time of competition, in a minimum full-time program of studies as defined by the institution but that it could not be less than twelve semester or quarter hours (Falla, 1981). The other amendment to Bylaw 4 stated that a student-athlete could only compete in intercollegiate athletics for ten semester or fifteen quarter hours of residence starting from the beginning semester or quarter that he enrolled at the institution ("Development of Significant", 1983).

At the 1962 convention the length of time a student-athlete could participate was revised slightly and became known as the five-year rule. This rule governs all intercollegiate participation by a student-athlete and it states:

"He must complete his seasons of participation within five calendar years from the beginning of the semester or quarter in which he first registered at a collegiate institution, time spent in the armed forces or on compulsory church missions being excepted" (Falla, 1981).

Also in 1962, the NCAA Executive committee approved funds to be allocated for a study that would look at predicting academic success as a basis for awarding athletically related financial aid. The committee found it necessary to study

academic success for several reasons. First, because of the continued commitment to the education of the student-athlete. Secondly, that student athletes who represent an institution should be representative of the entire student body of that institution. Also, a public cynicism was beginning to develop toward the student-athlete. Many felt that the student-athlete was not getting the education so highly talked about by the NCAA, but that they were only in college to participate in athletics (Falla, 1981). The NCAA Executive Committee had the desire to keep its position that when a student-athlete enters college that he has a reasonable chance of achieving a degree.

During 1963 and 1964, the study was carried out by the Academic and Testing Requirements Committee. The chair of the committee was James H. Weaver of the Atlantic Coast Conference. The committee analyzed the individual academic performance of 40,900 students at 80 member institutions. In 1965, the committee produced an "expectancy table" which was based on high school academic performance correlated with scores on one of the standard college entrance tests (Falla, 1981). Lawrence C. Woodruff of the University of Kansas, a committee member, stated that the purpose of the study was "to enable a college to judge the probability that a student to whom we are granting an athletic scholarship will succeed academically in college and thus participate in the sport for

which he is being considered" (Falla, 1981).

On January 12, 1965, the Association adopted the 1.600 rule which would become effective on January 1, 1966 (Shea, 1967). Although one reason for the new rule was the study conducted by the Academic and Testing Requirements Committee, this was not the sole reason. In the past, in order for a student-athlete to participate in athletics, he had to meet the academic standards of his own school. There was growing concern that the diversity of admissions standards at the member institutions brought about inequity for some athletes. Many felt that more consistency was needed.

The 1.600 rule had the following components:

"A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team of individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet unless the institution: (1) limits its scholarship or (athletic) grant-in-aid awards and eligibility for participation in athletics...to incoming student-athletes who have a predicted grade-point average of 1.600 (based on a maximum of 4.000) as determined by demonstrable institutional, conference or national experience tables, and (2) limits subsequent ...awards and eligibility for participation to student-athletes who have a grade-point average, either accumulative or for the previous academic year, of at least a 1.600" (Falla, 1981).

The components that were used in determining the student-athlete who qualified under the 1.600 rule were ACT or SAT scores in combination with the high school grade-point average at the sixth, seventh or eighth semester. The 1.600 rule quantified both admissions standards and what was meant by normal progress towards a degree. When Sports Illustrated

reported the enactment of the 1.600 rule, they stated "The 1.600 rule is a long-overdue piece of legislation designed to guarantee that every student-athlete in all of the NCAA's member schools maintains at least a C-minus average. A mark of C-minus amounts to a 1.600 on the 1.000-4.000 grading system" (Falla, 1981).

During the 1966 and the 1968 conventions, legislation was defeated that would have abolished or weakened the 1.600 rule. As a matter of fact, in 1968 the 1.600 rule was strengthened by an amendment that was passed that insured that member institution's prediction tables were representative of the student population and that they were equal to or more strict than the national tables. The NCAA required that a member institution who was using a table that was less strict than the NCAA's table would be required to meet a minimum level of continuing academic attainment for their student-athletes (Falla, 1981).

In the late 1960's, higher education began to make drastic changes. The social structure and the economy of the United States began to have a large impact on higher education. Many federally funded financial aid programs were begun primarily to provide education to those students who were disadvantaged financially. Many colleges, in an effort to provide academic opportunities to those students, began an "open-door" policy for admissions. Many of the member

institutions felt that the 1.600 rule took away institutional autonomy and responsibility. Once again in 1971, a proposal was defeated that would have rescinded the 1.600 rule but a proposal was passed that would allow financial aid to bona fide disadvantaged students (Falla, 1981).

Up until 1973, the 1.600 rule remained in effect. Many factors led to its abolishment at the 1973 convention by a vote of 204 to 187. The first concern was that of the validity of the tests and the expectancy table. Secondly, was a continued concern that the institutions were losing their autonomy and responsibility. Third was the continued increase in federally financed college aid programs for disadvantaged students. Finally, more and more member institutions were moving toward an "open-door" admissions policy and believed what was required of the general student population should be the same for athletes (Falla, 1981).

In place of the 1.600 rule, the convention voted on and passed the 2.000 rule. Simply put, the 2.000 rule required that a student-athlete would be eligible for athletic grant-in-aid programs only if he had a minimum 2.000 accumulative grade-point average for all work taken and certified officially by the high school. Also, the 2.000 rule stated that an athlete could continue participation in athletics only if he met the requirements of the college in regards to normal progress toward a degree (Falla, 1981).

For many years following the enactment of the 2.000 rule, concerns were raised by the members in regards to academic standards. One of the main concerns of some members was that high school grade point averages were not significant because of the diversity of high schools across the nation. Also, many believed that high schools were granting grades to exceptional athletes just to keep them eligible to participate. An example of this is given by Bill Hunt who rode shotgun for the NCAA. He told the New York Times:

"Violations of these academic rules are definitely on the increase. You have the high school figuring out what it takes to get a 2.0 for the boy and then giving such a grade where needed. We've had boys go into their senior year with a 1.7 average and get a 3.0 average their senior year so they have a 2.0 for high school. Sometimes he hasn't even attended classes in his senior year. If we'd made the rule a 2.5 needed average, they'd have given the athletes 2.5 averages" (Michenor, 1976).

Many proposals were brought to the convention floor to reinstate the 1.600 rule but all of them were defeated.

The following is a brief listing of the proposals that were brought to the convention floor during the period of 1976-1980 that were in regards to academic standards ("Development of Significant", 1983).

1976 A proposed amendment was defeated that would have required the earning of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of credit by the beginning of the second year and after that the earning of 12 credits for each academic term attended. The proposal failed because the members were reluctant to state specific rules that would define normal academic progress.

- 1977 A proposed amendment was defeated that would have allowed an athlete to continue participating in athletics after he had completed his baccalaureate degree as long as he had eligibility left during his five-year eligibility period and if he completed his athletic endeavors at the college he received his degree.
- 1978 A proposed amendment was passed to state that an athlete must carry a full load as required by his institution in order to be eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics with the exception to this requirement being during his last semester of his degree program.
- 1978 A proposed amendment was defeated that related to institutional eligibility for NCAA Championships. It was called the "Triple Option". The proposal read "This proposal allowed for the student-athlete to establish his eligibility on the basis of a 2.25 high school grade-point average or an ACT score of 17 or an SAT score of 750." This proposal would have also limited practice and participation but still permitted the awarding of financial aid. The two reasons for this proposals defeat was that many member institutions believed that the ACT and the SAT were racially biased and that there was no indication that if the NCAA raised its academic standards that this would cause a higher graduation rate.
- 1978 A proposal was defeated to reinstate the 1.600 rule because of no discussion.
- 1979 Once again the "Triple Option" proposal was brought before the convention and once again it was defeated for the same reasons as previously.
- 1980 A proposed amendment was defeated that would have raised the grade-point average from a 2.000 to a 2.200 but allowed for a student who had a 2.000 to still be eligible if he had an ACT score of 17 or a SAT score of 750. This was defeated for the same reasons as the others previously.

In 1981, the NCAA began to make what proved to be major changes in the academic standards for student-athletes. At the 1981 convention, the Association approved a national satisfactory progress rule which set quantitative standards for all institutions in the NCAA. Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6) (Appendix C) was amended to "require that all student-athletes successfully complete an average of twelve credit hours during each term of attendance or satisfactorily complete twenty-four semester or thirty-six quarter hours since the beginning of the student-athlete's last season of competition" (Falla, 1981).

Three additional proposals were passed at the 1981 convention. First was an amendment to Constitution 3-3 (Appendix D) which required a student-athlete to be enrolled in a minimum full-time program of study in order to participate in organized practice sessions. Secondly, a student-athlete could only receive extension or credit by examination from the institution in which the student-athlete was enrolled as a full-time student in regards to the satisfactory progress of that student-athlete. Along with that change was the fact that in order for a student-athlete to gain credit for courses taken at another institution during the summer term, the student-athlete had to have the permission of the institution in which he/she was enrolled in order to have the credit be applicable to satisfactory progress. The final

proposal was that all member institutions publish information stating the requirements that a student-athlete was to meet in order to maintain satisfactory progress toward a degree. Once again in 1981, a proposal to change the grade-point average requirement from a 2.000 to a 2.200 was defeated due to the fact that no evidence was available that stated that a 2.200 was a better predictor of academic success. The vote on this proposal was 90-147 ("Development of Significant", 1983).

At the 1982 convention, the satisfactory progress rule was once again revised to read that a student-athlete must complete an average of twelve hours during each of the academic terms in academic years in which the student-athlete was enrolled (Falla, 1981).

On April 30, 1981, a five-year study that was sponsored by the NCAA was released by the American College Testing Program that showed that the student-athlete was better educated than most people believed. The study measured the performance of male students who entered college in the fall of 1975. As of the spring of 1980, fifty-two percent of the male athletes had graduated as compared to only forty-one and a half percent of non-athletes. Also, the drop-out and transfer rate of athletes was lower than that of non-athletes with only thirty-one and a half percent of athletes as compared to forty-three percent of non-athletes (Falla, 1981).

From 1983-1987, the main discussion in regards to academic standards of the NCAA centered around Proposition 48 and proposal 56, both of which were introduced at the 1983 convention by the American Council of Education's President's Ad Hoc Committee. The Committee believed that it was time to propose stiffer academic standards. As Joab L. Thomas stated, "We've simply got to establish some kind of reasonable academic floor" (Vance, 1982). Proposition 48 spelled out requirements for incoming freshman and was to be put into effect in August of 1986. The proposal passed at the 1983 convention and read as follows:

College Freshman Eligibility Requirements NCAA Bylaw 5-1-(j)

"Effective August 1, 1986, in order to be eligible for practice, participation in regular-season competition and athletically related financial aid during the first academic year in residence, a student entering a Division I NCAA member institution directly out of high school must have:

(i) Graduated from high school with a minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum 4.000) in a core curriculum of at least 11 academic full-year courses, including at least three in English, two in mathematics, two in social science and two in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory class, if offered by the high school) as well as a 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections or a 15 composite score on the ACT" ("NCAA Guide to", 1986).

"Additionally, a student-athlete failing to meet the initial standard could be admitted to the institution and have four seasons of eligibility if he or she met the satisfactory progress standards in the first year" (Greene, 1984).

In January 1986, several proposals were brought to the convention by black leaders in an attempt to amend Proposition

48. Two of the proposals were defeated, one of which would have eliminated the best scores completely and the second which would see the test score used only for academic placement. The votes were overwhelming in defeat of both proposals (Appendix E) (Farrell, 1986). The amendment to Proposition 48 that was passed established an index that allowed a student-athlete to compensate for a low grade point average with a higher test score or for a low test score with a higher grade point average. The qualifier would only be in place for the 1986-1987 and 1987-1988 academic years. After 1988, the index would no longer be in effect and Proposition 48 would stand as it was passed in 1983 ("Guide to the College", 1986).

The index is as follows: ("NCAA Guide to", 1986)

(ii) For those freshmen entering subsequent to August 1, 1986 and prior to August 1, 1987:

GPA	SAT	ACT
2.200-above	660	13
2.100-2.199	680	14
2.000-2.099	700	15
1.900-1.999	720	16
1.800-1.899	740	17

For those freshmen entering subsequent to August 1, 1987 and prior to August 1, 1988:

GPA	SAT	ACT
2.100-above	680	14
2.000-2.099	700	15
1.900-1.999	720	16

A second proposal presented to the convention was proposal 56 which was also introduced by the Ad Hoc Committee.

It read as follows:

"the presently-required minimum credit hours (24 semester hours or the quarter-hour equivalent (sic) in the year preceding competition) be in a specific baccalaureate degree program. The intent of this proposal is to increase the graduation rates of student-athletes in the high pressure sports and to assure that student-athletes are not being counseled primarily into courses designed to safeguard their eligibility, with little or no concern for their progress toward graduation" (Greene, 1984).

Both Proposition 48 and proposal 56 were brought to the convention floor by the American Council of Education's President's Ad Hoc Committee. The American Council of Education was founded in 1918 "to advance education... through comprehensive, voluntary, and cooperative action on the part of American educational associations, organizations, and institutions...(and to) serve education in such undertakings as may be required and approved from year to year and from generation to generation for the common welfare" (Greene, 1984). This council is the principle coordinating body for post-secondary education and is comprised of 1600 colleges and universities (Greene, 1984). The interest that ACE had in intercollegiate athletics gave rise to the Ad Hoc Committee which was founded in 1982. The reason for the founding of the Ad Hoc Committee was "to give campus executive a new forum to deal with college athletics, which have been tainted recently by charges of recruitment violations, illegal payments to student-athletes, tampering with academic records,

and other problems" (Greene, 1984).

The Ad Hoc Committee is comprised of forty college presidents, the ACE president and executive vice president, and a representative from the Association of American Universities (Greene, 1984). In August of 1982, the organizational meeting for the Ad Hoc Committee drew twelve members who decided from the outset that they should first focus their attention on academic standards for intercollegiate athletics.

On November 29, 1982, twenty-two members (Appendix F) met to formulate the final draft of the proposals that would be presented at the 1983 convention. Those proposals were Proposition 48 and proposal 56. Both proposals were passed at the 1983 convention after much heated discussion (Greene, 1984).

Proposition 48 has by far received the most publicity and has caused the most debate between the two proposals. The members of the Ad Hoc Committee had several reasons why they proposed Proposition 48 and why they believed it to be a sound and needed rule. According to Derek Bok chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee and President of Harvard University and J. W. Peltason, the initial decision to focus on academics was very simple. In a letter to presidents of Division I institutions in November 1982, they stated:

"(As) educators, these are the topics where we have the greatest expertise and for which we have a

clear and inescapable responsibility to assert the supremacy of academic values. We are concerned that in the zeal to produce winning teams, athletic eligibility has often been placed ahead of academic qualification. The concern of eligibility also results in some athletes being counseled to take courses which may not satisfy a degree program" (Greene, 1984).

The stated purpose of the Ad Hoc Committee for the passage of Proposition 48 is to "require that academically high risk students demonstrate satisfactory progress before attaining athletic eligibility. A student-athlete failing to meet the initial eligibility standards could be admitted to the institution and have four seasons of eligibility if he or she met the satisfactory progress standards in the first year" (Humphries, 1983).

One firm belief of the Ad Hoc Committee was that colleges and universities were suffering from negative publicity with regard to college athletics. As Donald Shields from Southern Methodist University and a member of the Ad Hoc Committee stated, "It seems clear to many of us that in these days of increasing national concern about inadequate academic standards in our secondary schools and colleges that this legislation is not only appropriate but indeed is necessary to preserve the organizational integrity of the NCAA as well as the institutional integrity of our member institutions" ("Proceedings", 1982).

The Ad Hoc Committee believed that it is the NCAA's responsibility to set academic standards. As it would be

ideal if individual institutions would take charge and promote high academic standards, college athletics has become a big money game. As Derek Bok stated, "...we can count on presidents to take such measures only if they can proceed within the framework of reasonable rules to which other colleges must subscribe" (Greene, 1984). His belief is basically that some schools would stand by high academic standards but would be at an unfair disadvantage if other institutions did not stand by the same standards. The Ad Hoc Committee believed that the addition of the core courses and the test scores would add two new dimensions to the academic standards. First, the core courses made it clear that the NCAA wanted student-athletes to be prepared for college by taking classes that would translate into the needed high school education to be fully prepared for college. Secondly, the test scores would serve as an indicator that the student had learned what was needed in high school ("Proceedings, 1982).

The debate over Proposition 48 does not exist over academic standards in general. All administrators believe that high academic standards are essential for the student-athlete. John Slaughter, University of Maryland Chancellor and an opponent of Proposition 48, stated "Higher Education is there to educate the student. Academics must take precedence over athletics" (Sullivan, 1986). Also, most admit that college

sports has been criticized for making academic compromises in the interest of intercollegiate athletics (Eitzen, Hufnagel, Durdy, 1985). The debate exists in three main areas:

- (1) The lack of black representation on the Ad Hoc Committee,
- (2) The factor of discrimination of black athletes, and
- (3) The argument over other options available to the NCAA to attack the problem.

To begin, one needs to understand where the debate originated. The primary opposition came from predominantly black institutions (Farrell, 1986). These institutions were represented by the National Association For Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO) which represents 114 traditionally black colleges and universities. Also involved in the criticism of the new rule were other black leaders including the National Alliance of Black School Educators (NABSE), Reverend Jesse Jackson, President of People United to Serve Humanity (Operation PUSH), Reverend Benjamin Hooks, executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and Reverend Joseph Lowery, President of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) (Edwards, 1983).

The first concern of black leaders was that there was no representation on the Ad Hoc Committee of any black leaders. There seems to be no debate over the fact that there were no black leaders on the Ad Hoc Committee, although members of

the committee said that invitations were sent to some black leaders. These invitations were turned down because black leaders felt that they were just afterthoughts (Greene, 1984). Jack W. Peltason defended his Association's procedures. Initially, all Division I-A president's were invited to attend and at the time, there were no black institutions in Division I-A. As the committee began to see academic standards as a priority, the invitations were sent to black leaders to become involved in the committee. All of them choose not to serve on the committee except for President Luna I. Mishoe of Delaware State University, who joined the committee only a few weeks prior to when the proposal came to the floor of the convention (Crowl, 1983). Joseph B. Johnson from Grambling State University stated that the lack of representation of predominantly black institutions showed the committee's "...lack of sensitivity to and the knowledge of the contributions of these institutions of intercollegiate athletics and to the potential impact of this proposal to those programs" ("Proceedings", 1982). He also believed that the committee showed extreme racism in not initially involving the black leaders (Creamer, 1983).

The factor that many black leaders are claiming is discriminatory is the use of the test scores. Black leaders believe that the tests scores discriminate against black student-athletes (Farrell, 1986). The black college

presidents stated that the test is culturally biased on the fact that approximately 56% of black high school students attain SAT scores of less than 700 (Creamer, 1983). The average SAT scores for blacks and whites from the years 1976-1982 can be seen in the following table (Farrell, 1983):

TABLE 1
Average SAT Scores For White And Black
Students From 1976-1982

Year	White Students	Black Students
1976.....	944	686
1977.....	937	687
1978.....	931	686
1979.....	927	688
1980.....	924	690
1981.....	925	694
1982.....	927	707

Although the College Board does not believe that the SAT and ACT are discriminatory in nature, they do concur that the NCAA has misused the ACT and SAT scores in the setting of academic standards. As George Hanford, (1985) President of the College Board wrote, "...the new NCAA regulation for determining freshmen eligibility violates the principles of proper test use by being national and not institutional in application and by not having a validated rationale." As was stated, the College Board does not concur with black leaders as to the discriminatory nature of the tests scores.

A recent two-year study conducted by the National Academy of Science indicated that black students tend to score lower than white students because they are less privileged educationally and socioeconomically than whites (Hanford, 1985). A black leader who concurred with the views of the College Board was Edward B. Fort of North Carolina A&T State University, who stated that he believed that hundreds, if not thousands, of youths which would primarily consist of blacks and rural, isolated whites, would be excluded from an opportunity to participate in Division I sports if the SAT were to become the measuring device for the new academic standards ("Proceedings", 1982). It is a fact that students from upper-income families tend to score an average of 100 points higher than those students from disadvantaged families. Edward Fort stated that "It (the SAT score) has nothing to do with academic potential" (Sanoff, 1983). Dr. Norman C. Francis, president of the traditionally black Xavier University of Louisiana and immediate past chairman of the College Board explained that the SAT is not just a measure of potential aptitude, but a measure of what a student has learned to that point in their life. This is why high school programs that have less money and provide lower levels of education tend to produce students who score lower on the SAT (Edwards, 1983).

The members of the Ad Hoc Committee believed that the

test scores serve as a validation of the high school grade point average ("Proceedings, 1982). Many people are in total support of the use of test scores as they believe that finally, the NCAA has academic standards that are much harder to manipulate. They believe that test scores will give a more clear picture of whether or not the student-athlete will succeed in college (Davison, 1984). Charles Alan Wright, a professor of constitutional law at the University of Texas Law School believed that the test scores and the grade point average requirement were necessary to provide academic standards for those institutions that had no academic requirements other than a high school diploma. He believed that Proposition 48 would eliminate those students who entered school who were destined with academic failure (Wright, 1985).

Black leaders also believe that this proposition is an attempt to eliminate black athletes from competition. As Joseph Johnson stated, "I think a message has been sent out to black athletes across the country. There's just too many of you on America's teams" (Creamer, 1983). In agreement with this statement was Dr. Jesse N. Stone, Jr., the president of the Southern University System of Louisiana, who said:

"The end result of all this is the black athlete has been too good. If it (Rule 48) is followed to its logical conclusion, we say to our youngsters, "Let the white boy win once in a while." This has set the black athlete back twenty-five or thirty years. The message is that white schools no longer want black athletes" (Edwards, 1983).

Some have the attitude that Proposition 48 eliminates athletes who at least would attain some education even if it was only minimal. As University of Georgia Attorney Hale Almand stated, "We may not make a university student out of (an athlete), but if we can teach him to read and write, maybe he can work at the post office rather than as a garbage man when he gets through with his athletic career" ("Competition in College", 1986) (Kappan, 1986).

The fact is that many black athletes would be eliminated from competition as freshmen under Proposition 48 as was seen by a study conducted in the Big Eight Conference. The study showed that over 60% of black student-athletes currently enrolled in institutions in the Big Eight Conference would have been ineligible as freshmen. But as James O'Hanlon of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln discussed, "It was time to stop kidding ourselves and to realize that we've been admitting a lot of people who have no business being here. You can only be hypocritical for so long" (Vance, 1983).

Some blacks are in support of Proposition 48. Charles Harris, currently Athletic Director at Arizona State University believed that although the legislation was not perfect, that it was in fact needed (Creamer, 1983). Also in support of Proposition 48 is Harry Edwards of the University of California. He stated:

"For decades, student athletes, usually seventeen-to-nineteen-year-old freshmen, have informally agreed

to a contract with the universities they attend: athletic performance in exchange for an education. The athletes have kept their part of the bargain; the universities have not" (Edwards, 1983).

Those black leaders who are in favor of Proposition 48 and the many other supporters, believed that because black athletes are very often the ones exploited by major colleges, black and white educators alike should be in favor of reforms ("Competition in College", 1986). As Joe Paterno stated at a speech given at the 1983 convention, "For fifteen years, we have had a race problem. We have raped a generation and a half of young black athletes. We have taken kids and sold them on bouncing a ball and running with a football and that being able to do certain things athletically was going to be an end in itself. We cannot afford to do that to another generation" ("Proceedings", 1982).

Harry Edwards (1983) stands firm by the belief that black educators who do not support Proposition 48 are selling black student-athletes short. He believes that the message that these students are getting is that people do not believe that they can achieve those type of scores. Huel D. Perkins (1983) agreed when he explained:

"What the opponents of Proposition 48 overlook in their rush to attack it as racist is that their arguments actually support the racist view that blacks are dummies. They said, in effect, that even after four years of taking the prescribed curriculum, blacks would be unable to achieve minimum scores on the standardized tests. They were, in effect, confirming the contentions of racists and bigots that black are intellectually inferior, cannot pass tests, cannot

read or write no matter how much schooling is available to them."

Many believe that Proposition 48 will force high schools to upgrade their curriculum to better prepare student-athletes for college (Sanoff, 1983). The belief is that if high schools allow students to slide by with easy courses or by "giving" them grades, that students will not be prepared to do well on the standardized tests, thus it is the high schools responsibility to prepare the student-athlete for college (Ross, 1983).

Despite the required test scores and high school grade point averages, many still believe that illegalities will take place both in high schools and in testing centers. The fear is that special classes will be established that meet the requirements but are easier so the student-athlete has a better chance to attain the appropriate grade. In addition, some felt that "ringers" would be sent in to take tests for the athletes to insure a suitable score (Uehling, 1983).

In addition to possible cheating, most high school administrators have not notified their student-athletes of the changing rules. The facts are, according to a survey conducted by Clemson University, that high schools have not, as of 1984, boosted their standards and have not attempted to help the student-athlete become more prepared for college. The study also found that the NCAA has not fulfilled its responsibility in notifying high school administrators and

high school athletes of the new rules and how best to prepare for them ("Schools Found", 1984).

Opponents of Proposition 48 feel that it blames the victim by placing all of the responsibility on the student-athlete to meet requirements for participation in intercollegiate athletics instead of putting the responsibility on the educational institution. The belief was that the athlete has been exploited in the past and that the colleges and universities of our country should shoulder the blame for the lack of education the students are receiving (Vance, 1983).

Another major complaint of Proposition 48 is that it sets the same standards for all institutions despite the institution's published academic standards. For example, the same standards are set for Harvard as for schools who have lower academic standards ("A Plan For", 1985). In addition, many black institutions have lower academic standards than those set forth in Proposition 48. Some believe that the standards for athletes should not be higher than those for students admitted under the institutions general academic requirements (Williams, 1983).

The drive to tighten academic standards has drawn strong support and also strong opposition from many. Many, who both favor the proposal and who are against the proposal, feel that other alternatives to the control of academics could be

used (Vance, 1982). Two options that have been mentioned throughout the past four years are, (1) Freshmen ineligibility, and (2) Institutional control.

A viable option to the continued pursuit of high academic standards for the student-athlete is that of freshmen ineligibility. The fact is that very often a freshmen participates in his first football game before he ever attends a class. This seems absurd to educational leaders who believe in academics first, athletics second (Will, 1986). Student-athletes should have one year to adjust to the academic environment of college before they are thrown into the rigors of demanding athletic schedules and the high pressure of competition ("Competition in College", 1986). A stumbling block to this proposal is that athletics are such a money-making endeavor and some freshmen are big draw competitors, that if they were made ineligible, the institution would lose money.

Others believe that the responsibility for academic reform lies with the institutions themselves not with the NCAA. As Dr. Robert Randolph, president of Alabama State pointed out, "...This is not to deny the philosophical thrust of what the NCAA is trying to do - that is, to correct wrongdoings that have occurred. Some institutions have done very well. Some have not. But it ought to be corrected by the individual institutions. I can't argue with the NCAA's

wish to set rules, but academic qualification is the responsibility of an institution's board of trustees" (Creamer, 1983). The basic problem with institutional control is that if all schools do not comply, then those who do are put at an unfair disadvantage (Bok, 1983).

In summary, the National Collegiate Athletic Association has made many changes over the years in their academic standards including the 1.600 rule, the 2.000 rule and Proposition 48. Proposition 48 is the most recent change and currently stands as the organization's academic standards for incoming freshmen and continuing students. Proposition 48 has caused the most controversy, with many black leaders believing that it is discriminatory in nature against black athletes. Those in favor of Proposition 48 believe that it meets the goal of the organization which is to have high academic standards for student-athletes to insure that they receive an education in exchange for their athletic ability.

CHAPTER THREE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

The author of this study has attempted to show the progression of the academic standards for the National Collegiate Athletic Association from the formation in 1905 to Proposition 48 which went into effect in August 1986. The chronological study shows the many changes that have occurred over the years in regards to the academic standards.

The Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States (later to be renamed the National Collegiate Athletic Association) was formed on December 28, 1905. The initial meeting was held to examine the problems and concerns that leaders of higher education had with regard to intercollegiate football. The violence was getting so out of control, that many were looking toward the abolishment of the sport entirely.

Chancellor Henry M. MacCracken of New York University realized that something needed to be done in order to save the sport of football and called the first meeting of what would later become the NCAA. The group that met at this initial meeting decided that abolishment of the sport was not necessary but that reforms were imperative. They choose to hold another meeting on December 28, 1905. At this meeting, the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States was formed.

From the beginning of the NCAA, a major emphasis was placed on the importance of academics for the student-athlete. The organization was formed on the belief that the student-athlete was a student first and an athlete second. The first statement made by the Association regarding academic standards was that any student-athlete participating in intercollegiate athletics must be a full-time student as defined by the institution he attended.

Although the intent of high academic standards was present in the NCAA, there was no enforcement power in place. The NCAA was founded on the home rule principle which gave full enforcement and interpretations of policies to the individual institution. This policy continued from 1905-1939.

In 1922, a ten-point code was passed by the Association which reiterated the policies, principles and practices of the NCAA. Two key academic standards were that of no freshmen eligibility and absolute faculty control.

In 1939, the Association gained some enforcement power over the National Collegiate Championship with the establishment of the Eligibility Committee. They were given the authority to rule on the academic eligibility of those student-athletes who participated in NCAA meets and tournaments.

The next major step in academic standards came with the passage of the Sanity Code in 1948. The Sanity Code originated

from a 1946 survey entitled "The Principles for the Conduct of Intercollegiate Athletics" which was used to gain feedback on major issues in intercollegiate athletics. The Sanity Code was then adopted as Article 3 of the Constitution.

In 1951, the Sanity Code was repealed and in its place was a 12-point code that served only in an advisory capacity. One of the key points was the insistence that a student-athlete should be making normal progress towards a degree in order to participate in intercollegiate athletics. The 12-point code held the first statement in the history of the NCAA regarding the normal progress toward a degree and this would continue to be the policy for years to come.

In 1959, the Association took its first step towards quantifying the academic standards of the NCAA. Two changes were made to Bylaw 4 one of which stated that the student-athlete must be a full-time student as defined by the institution he attended but that the class hours could not be less than the equivalent of 12 semester hours. Also, that a student-athlete's eligibility was limited to ten semester or fifteen quarters starting from the beginning quarter or semester that he enrolled at the institution.

On January 12, 1965, the Association instituted the 1.600 rule for freshmen eligibility. The 1.600 rule was instituted out of a growing concern that the diversity of the admissions standards at the member institutions brought

about an inequity for student-athletes. The student-athlete was determined to be eligible for competition if the individual had a 1.600 (based on a maximum 4.000) as determined by demonstrable institutional, conference or national experience tables. The factors that were used to determine the 1.600 rule were the ACT or SAT scores and high school grade point average at the sixth, seventh or eighth semester. In addition to the admission standards, the 1.600 rule also quantified what was meant by normal progress toward a degree by stating that a student-athlete must have a 1.600 grade point average cumulative or for the preceding academic semester to continue to participate in intercollegiate athletics.

In the late 1960's, higher education began to make many changes. Among those was financial aid for disadvantaged students and most importantly an "open-door" policy for admissions. In order to meet the growing need to provide higher education to as many students as possible, institutions began to allow borderline students to enter on probation.

In 1973, the 1.600 rule was abolished and in its place came the 2.000 rule. The 2.000 rule simply stated that a student-athlete must have a 2.000 grade point average for all work taken in high school. The new rule also reverted back in regard to the normal progress toward a degree by allowing that to be determined by the individual institution.

Between 1976-1980, much was said about academic standards

in the NCAA. Many were concerned that the standards were not set high enough. Different proposals were brought to the convention floor in an attempt to strengthen the standards. One proposal that passed made it mandatory for a student-athlete to carry a full-load as prescribed by the institution of attendance.

A major change in freshmen eligibility came about in 1983 when both Proposition 48 and proposal 56 were passed. Proposition 48 stated that a student-athlete must score a 700 on the SAT or a 15 on the ACT and have a cumulative 2.000 grade point average in 11 core courses in order to be eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics his/her freshmen year of college. A student could still be granted admission to the institution, receive financial aid and have four years of eligibility left after completing their freshmen year if they met the satisfactory progress standards.

In 1986, an amendment was made to put an indexing system in effect until 1988 that would allow student-athletes to compensate for a low grade point average with a higher test score or a low test score with a higher grade point average.

Proposal 56 was put into effect to insure that the student-athlete was taking classes that were in pursuit of a degree program at the institution of attendance. The intent of this proposal was to help insure that the student-athlete had the best possible chance to receive a degree upon completion of his college career.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The NCAA has made significant changes in the academic standards of the NCAA over the span of the organization.

2. The NCAA has placed a continued emphasis on academic standards and the importance of athletes gaining an education.

3. Proposition 48 has caused the greatest controversy among the NCAA membership and academic leaders than any other change that the NCAA has made in its history.

4. The committee who proposed Proposition 48, the Ad Hoc Committee, believed that it was an important change because it provided both a required grade point average in core courses that are important to success in college and a requirement for a test score that would help to validate the high school grade point average.

5. Many black leaders believed that Proposition 48 is discriminatory in nature because of the great effect that it could potentially have on black student-athletes who tend to score lower on the tests and come from less privileged socioeconomic backgrounds.

6. Many members of the NCAA are exploring other options for academic standards including no freshmen eligibility and institutional control of the standards.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The National Collegiate Athletic Association should continue to examine the academic standards for the student-athletes competing at Division I member institutions.

2. The National Collegiate Athletic Association should reexamine their home rule principle to determine if academic standards should be set by the NCAA or by the individual institutions.

3. The National Collegiate Athletic Association should study the effects for the student-athlete if he/she were not allowed to compete in intercollegiate athletics their freshman year.

4. The National Collegiate Athletic Association should conduct a study that follows the academic and athletic career of those students who do not qualify under Proposition 48.

REFERENCES

ACT Assessment, 1986-87.

Bok, Derek (1985). Presidents Need Power Within the NCAA to Preserve Academic Standards and Institutional Integrity. In Donald Chu, Jeffrey D. Segrave & Beverly J. Becker (Eds.), Sport in Higher Education (pp. 207-210). Illinois: Human Kinetics Publishers, Inc.

Competition in College Sports (1986). Phi Delta Kappan, K1-K8.

Creamer, Robert W. (1983, January 24). Furor in San Diego: A testing Problem for the NCAA. Sports Illustrated, 58, 9.

Crowl, John A. (1983, January 19). NCAA Votes Stiffer Academic Requirements for Participants in Intercollegiate Sports. Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 1, 20.

Davison, Fred C. (1984, Winter). Eliminating Sports Abuses The Best Measure to Take. National Forum, 41-42.

Dawson, Professor G. E. (1923). Intercollegiate Athletics from the Viewpoint of Education. Proceedings from the 18th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, 83-92.

Development of Significant Academic Legislation (1983).

Dudley, William L. (1912). The Proper Control of Athletics. Proceedings from the 7th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, 38-65.

Eitzen, D. Stanley, Hufnagel, Rick and Purdy, Dean A. (1985). Are Athletes Also Students? The Educational Attainment of College Athletes. In Donald Chu, Jeffrey O. Segrave & Beverly J. Becker (Eds), Sport and Higher Education (pp. 221-234). Illinois: Human Kinetics Publishers, Inc.

Edwards, Harry (1983, August). Educating the Black Athlete. The Atlantic Monthly, 252, 31-38. ✓

Falla, Jack (1981). NCAA: The Voice of College Sports. Kansas: NCAA.

- Farrell, Charles S. (1986, February 19). Presidents Panel to Focus on Academics, Finances and Rules Enforcement. Chronicle of Higher Education, 29-30.
- Farrell, Charles S. (1986, January 22). NCAA Votes to Bar Varsity Competition by Freshmen with Low Test Scores. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 30-31.
- Farrell, Charles S. (1983, January 26). The Chronicle of Higher Education, 17-19.
- For Hire (1951, January 22). Time, 57, 58.
- Greene, Linda S. (1984). The New NCAA Rules of the Game: Academic Integrity or Racism? Unpublished manuscript.
- Griffith, Major John L. (1935). The President's Address. Proceedings from the 30th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, 61-67.
- Guide to the College Freshman Eligibility Requirements for NCAA Division I Institutions (1986).
- Hanford, George H. (1985). Proposition 48. In Donald Chu, Jeffrey O. Segrave & Beverly J. Becker (Eds.), Sport and Higher Education (pp. 367-372). Illinois: Human Kinetics Publishers, Inc.
- Harmon, John M. (1940, April). Educational Principles in Administering Intercollegiate Athletics. Education Digest, 60, 513-516.
- Humphries, Frederick S. (1983, October 24). Academic Standards and the Student-Athlete. Unpublished manuscript.
- Menke, Frank G. (1975). The Encyclopedia of Sports. New York: A. S. Barnes and Company.
- Michener, James A. (1976). Sports in America. New York: Random House.
- Morehouse, D. W. (1922). New Business. Proceedings from the 17th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, 65-66.
- NCAA Guide for the College-Bound Student-Athlete 1986-1987.
- NCAA Manual (1987-88).

- Perkins, Huel D. (1983, September 7). Higher Academic Standards for Athletes Do Not Discriminate Against Blacks. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 88.
- Phillips, Doctor Paul C. (1916). Scholastic Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics. Proceedings from the 30th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, 77-80.
- Pierce, General Palmer E. (1910). The Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States. Proceedings from the 5th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, 37-39.
- Pierce, Captain Palmer E. (1909). The Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States. Proceedings from the 3rd Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, 26-29.
- A Plan for Cleaning Up College Sports (1985, September 30). Sports Illustrated, 63, 36-27.
- Proceedings from the 78th Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, 103-127.
- Ross, C. Thomas (1983, December). Is Student-Athlete a Contradiction in Terms? The Education Digest, 94, 75-76. ✓
- Savage, Howard J. (1929). American College Athletics. New York: The Carnegie Foundation.
- Schools Found Not Telling Athletes About Academic Rules (1984, February 24). The Chronicle of Higher Education, 23-24.
- Shea, Edward J. and Wieman, Elton E. (1967). Administrative Policies for Intercollegiate Athletics. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.
- Spears, Betty and Swanson, Richard (1978). History of Sport and Physical Activity in the United States, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers.
- Sullivan, Robert (1986, October 13). Barely Touching the Platter. Sports Illustrated, 65, 17.
- Tow, Ted C. (1981). The Governance Role of the NCAA. In James Frey (Ed.), The Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics pp. (108-116). New York: Leisure Press.

- Uehling, Barbara S. (1983, June 6). Academics and Athletics. Vital Speeches, 49, 504-507.
- Vance, N. Scott (1982, October 6). College Presidents Panel to Ask NCAA to Tighten Academic rules for Athletes. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 19-22.
- Vance, N. Scott (1982, December 8). Presidents Lobby NCAA Delegates for Tighter Academic Standards. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 15.
- Vance, N. Scott (1983, February 16). Academic Rules Would Affect Blacks Far More Than Whites, Study Finds. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 17-18.
- Vance, N. Scott (1983, February 2). Testing-Service Head Hits NCAA's Academic Rules. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 1, 18.
- Vance, N. Scott & Miller, Lawrence (1983, December 7). Academic Standards for Athletes Still Controversial. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 27-29.
- Whitney, Caspar (1906, January). The View Point. Outing, 47, 489-496.
- Will, George F. (1986, September 15). Our Schools for Scandal. Newsweek, 101, 64.
- Wright, Charles Alan (1905), October 11). A Texas Lawyer Critiques SI's Plan for Cleaning Up College Athletics. Sports Illustrated, 63, 20-23.

APPENDIX A

ARTICLE THREE

PRINCIPLES FOR THE CONDUCT OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Section 1. Principle of Amateurism and Student Participation. An amateur student-athlete is one who engages in a particular sport for the educational, physical, mental and social benefits derived therefrom and to whom participation in that sport is an avocation. *(Revised: 1/9/74)*

O.I. 1. A "student-athlete" is a student whose matriculation was solicited by a member of the athletics staff or other representative of athletics interests with a view toward the student's ultimate participation in the intercollegiate athletics program. Any other student becomes a "student-athlete" only when the student reports for an intercollegiate squad that is under the jurisdiction of the department of intercollegiate athletics as specified in O.I. 12. A student is not deemed a "student-athlete" solely because of prior participation in high school athletics.

(a) An individual shall not be eligible for participation in an intercollegiate sport if the individual: *(Revised: 1/10/79)* [Case Nos. 3 through 6]

(1) Takes or has taken pay, or has accepted the promise of pay, in any form, for participation in that sport, including the promise of pay when such pay is to be received following completion of the intercollegiate career; or [Case Nos. 7 through 15, 105]

(2) Has entered into an agreement of any kind to compete in professional athletics in that sport or to negotiate a professional contract in the sport; or [Case Nos. 16 through 20]

(3) Has directly or indirectly used athletic skill for pay in any form in that sport; however, an individual may: *(Revised: 1/9/74, 1/8/75, 1/13/78, 1/16/85)* [Case Nos. 7 through 9, 11 through 14, 21 through 26, 105, 218]

(i) Accept or have accepted scholarships or educational grants-in-aid administered by an educational institution that do not conflict with the governing legislation of this Association;

(ii) Receive compensation authorized by the United States Olympic Committee to cover financial loss occurring as a result of absence from employment to prepare for or participate in the Olympic Games, and [Case No. 22]

(iii) Borrow against his or her future earnings potential from an established, accredited commercial lending institution exclusively for the purpose of purchasing insurance (with no cash surrender value) against a disabling injury that would prevent the individual from pursuing his or her chosen career, provided no third party (including a member institution's athletics department staff members or representatives of its athletics interests) is involved in arrangements for securing the loan. The student-athlete shall report any such transactions to the member institution and shall file copies of the loan documents and insurance policy with the member institution. *(Adopted: 1/16/85)* [Case No. 8]

O.I. 2. The term "pay" specifically includes, but is not limited to, receipt directly or indirectly of any salary, gratuity or comparable compensation; division or split of surplus; educational expenses not permitted by governing legislation of this Association, and excessive or improper expenses, awards and benefits. Expenses received from an outside amateur sports team or organization in excess of actual and necessary travel and meal expenses for practice and game competition shall be considered pay. [Case No. 11]

(b) Any individual who signs or who has ever signed a contract or commitment of any kind to play professional athletics in a sport, regardless of its legal enforceability or the consideration (if any) received; plays or has ever played on any professional athletics team in a sport, or receives or has ever received, directly or indirectly, a salary, reimbursement of expenses or any other form of financial assistance from a professional organization in a sport based upon athletic skill or participation, except as permitted by the governing legislation of this Association, no longer shall be eligible for intercollegiate athletics in that sport. (*Revised: 1/9/74, 1/8/75, 1/10/79*) [Case Nos. 1 through 6, 27 through 30]

(1) A student-athlete shall be eligible although, prior to enrollment in a collegiate institution, the student-athlete may have tried out at his or her own expense with a professional athletics team in a sport or received not more than one expense-paid visit from any one professional organization in a sport, provided such a visit did not exceed 48 hours and any payment or compensation in connection with the visit was not in excess of actual and necessary expenses. [Case No. 31]

(2) A student-athlete shall not try out with a professional athletics team in a sport during any part of the academic year (i.e., from the beginning of the fall term through completion of the spring term, including any intervening vacation period) while enrolled in a collegiate institution as a regular student in at least a minimum full-time academic load, unless the student-athlete has exhausted eligibility in his or her sport. The student-athlete may try out with a professional organization in a sport during the summer or during the academic year while not a full-time student, provided the student-athlete does not receive any form of expenses or other compensation from the professional organization. (*Revised: 1/10/79*) [Case No. 32]

(c) Any individual who contracts or who has ever contracted orally or in writing to be represented by an agent in the marketing of the individual's athletic ability or reputation in a sport no longer shall be eligible for intercollegiate athletics in that sport. An agency contract not specifically limited in writing to a particular sport or particular sports shall be deemed applicable to all sports. Securing advice from a lawyer concerning a proposed professional sports contract shall not be considered contracting for representation by an agent under this rule unless the lawyer also represents the student-athlete in negotiations for such a contract. A proposed contract also may be reviewed by an authorized institutional career counseling panel, which may meet with the student-athlete and representatives of professional teams. Any

individual, agency or organization representing a prospective student-athlete for compensation in placing the prospect in a collegiate institution as a recipient of athletically related financial aid shall be considered an agent or organization marketing the athletic ability or reputation of the individual. (*Revised: 8/1/74, 1/17/76, 1/10/79, 1/14/86*) [Case Nos. 3, 4, 33, 34, 35]

(d) An individual may participate singly or as a member of a team against professional athletes; but if the individual participates or has ever participated on a team known to the individual or which reasonably should have been known to the individual to be a professional team in that sport, that individual no longer shall be eligible for intercollegiate athletics in that sport. (*Revised: 1/9/74, 1/10/79*) [Case Nos. 3, 6, 36 through 38]

O.I. 3. A professional team shall be any organized team that is a member of a recognized professional sports organization, that is directly supported or sponsored by a professional team or professional sports organization, that is a member of a playing league that is directly supported or sponsored by a professional team or professional sports organization, or on which there is an athlete receiving directly or indirectly payment of any kind from a professional team or professional sports organization for the athlete's participation. [Case No. 36]

O.I. 4. A noncollegiate amateur team or playing league that receives financial support from a national amateur sports administrative organization or an administrative equivalent, either of which receives developmental funds from a professional team or professional sports organization, shall not be considered a professional team or league.

O.I. 5. An individual may compete on tennis or golf teams with persons who are competing for cash or a comparable prize, provided the individual does not receive payment of any kind for such participation.

(e) Subsequent to becoming a student-athlete (per O.I. 1), an individual shall not be eligible for participation in intercollegiate athletics if the individual accepts any remuneration for or permits the use of his or her name or picture to directly advertise, recommend or promote the sale or use of a commercial product or service of any kind or receives remuneration for endorsing a commercial product or service through the individual's use of such product or service. (*Revised: 8/1/72, 1/9/74*) [Case Nos. 39 through 49, 218]

(1) If a student-athlete's appearance on radio or television is related in any way to athletic ability or prestige, the student-athlete shall not receive under any circumstances remuneration for that appearance; nor shall the student-athlete make any endorsement, expressed or implied, of any commercial product or service. The student-athlete may, however, receive legitimate and normal expenses directly related to such an appearance. [Case No. 23]

(2) It is permissible for a student-athlete's name or picture or the group picture of an institution's athletics squad to appear in an advertisement of a particular business, commercial product or

service provided the advertisement does not include a reproduction of the product with which the business is associated or any other item or description identifying the business or service other than its name or trademark; there is no indication in the makeup or wording of the advertisement that the squad members, individually or collectively, or the institution endorse the product or service of the advertiser, and the student-athlete has not signed a consent or release granting permission to use the student-athlete's name or picture in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of this paragraph. (*Revised: 1/14/81*) [Case No. 48]

(3) It is permissible for a student-athlete's name or picture to appear in books, articles or other publications, films, videotapes or other types of electronic reproduction related to sport skill demonstration, analysis or instruction provided such print and electronic media productions are for educational purposes, there is no indication that the student-athlete expressly or implicitly endorses a commercial product or service, the student-athlete shall not receive under any circumstances any remuneration or expenses for such participation, and the student-athlete has signed a release statement that conditions the use of the student-athlete's name or image in a manner consistent with the requirements of this subparagraph and has filed a copy of the statement with the member institution in which the student is enrolled. (*Adopted: 1/11/84*)

(f) Compensation may be paid to a student-athlete only for work actually performed and at a rate commensurate with the going rate in that locality for services of like character. Such compensation may not include any remuneration for value or utility that the student-athlete may have for the employer because of the publicity, reputation, fame or personal following the student-athlete has obtained because of athletic ability. A student-athlete who receives compensation prohibited under this legislation no longer shall be eligible for participation in intercollegiate athletics, unless the compensation is authorized by the United States Olympic Committee to cover financial loss occurring as a result of absence from employment to prepare for or participate in the Olympic Games. (*Revised: 1/13/78*) [Case Nos. 49 through 51, 218]

(1) A student-athlete may serve as a coach or an instructor for compensation in a physical education class outside of the student-athlete's institution in which the student-athlete teaches sports techniques or skills or both, but a student-athlete shall not be so employed if the employment is arranged by the student-athlete's institution or a representative of its athletics interests. (*Revised: 1/12/77, 1/12/82*) [Case No. 52]

(2) A student-athlete may not receive compensation for teaching or coaching sports skills or techniques in the student-athlete's sport on a fee-for-lesson basis. (*Revised: 1/12/82*) [Case Nos. 52 through 54]

(3) A student-athlete may be employed by his or her institution to work in the institution's summer camp unless otherwise restricted by the provisions of the bylaws and interpretations relating to playing and practice seasons and summer camps. (*Adopted: 1/12/82*) [Case No. 218]

(4) A student-athlete may officiate games or contests for

compensation except those involving teams that are members of or affiliated with a recognized professional sports organization.

(g) The following practices shall constitute "pay" for participation in intercollegiate athletics and are expressly prohibited:

(1) The award to a student-athlete of financial aid that exceeds the cost of attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at that institution or that exceeds the limitations set forth in Bylaw 6-1 for the membership division of the institution the student-athlete attends, whichever is less. (*Revised: 8/15/75, 1/17/76, 1/13/78, 1/9/87*) [Case Nos. 55 through 59, 130, 136]

(2) Payment of excessive or improper expense allowances, including, but not limited to, payment of: [Case Nos. 7, 23, 60]

(i) Money to team members or individual competitors for unspecified or unitemized expenses;

(ii) Expenses incurred by a student-athlete that are prohibited by the rules governing an amateur noncollege event in which the student-athlete participates, or

(iii) Expenses incurred by a student-athlete competing in an event that occurs at a time when the student-athlete is not regularly enrolled in a full-time program of studies during the regular academic year, or not eligible to represent the institution, except that expenses may be paid for a student-athlete to compete only in regularly scheduled intercollegiate events and established national championships occurring between terms and during the summer months, provided the student-athlete is representing his or her institution and was eligible for intercollegiate competition the preceding term, and in international competition approved by the NCAA Council. (*Revised: 1/9/74, 1/8/75*)

(3) Awarding complimentary admissions in excess of four per student-athlete per contest and awarding complimentary admissions to student-athletes in sports other than those in which the student-athlete is a participant, except as provided in Constitution 3-1-(h)-(6) and the bylaws. The student-athlete may not receive any payment from any source for the complimentary admissions and may not exchange them for any item of value. Procedures for the administration of complimentary-admissions programs for each division shall be controlled by bylaws enacted by the Association. (*Revised: 8/1/75, 8/1/78, 8/1/80, 8/1/83, 8/1/84, 8/1/85, 1/9/87*) [Case Nos. 25, 61 through 63]

(4) Payment of expenses of any student-athlete returning home to receive an award for athletics accomplishments or for other personal purposes.

(5) An extra benefit. As used in this subparagraph, the phrase "extra benefit" refers to any special arrangement by any institutional employee or representative of the institution's athletics interests to provide the student-athlete or the student-athlete's relative or friend with a benefit not expressly authorized by NCAA legislation. Receipt of a benefit (including those benefits specifi-

cally listed below) by student-athletes or their relatives or other friends is not a violation of this section if it is demonstrated that the same benefit is generally available to the institution's students or their relatives or other friends. Examples of special arrangements that are specifically prohibited include, but are not limited to: (*Revised: 1/9/74, 8/1/79, 8/1/80, 1/14/81, 1/12/83*) [Case Nos. 8, 24 through 26, 46, 59, 63 through 85]

(i) A special discount, payment arrangement or credit on a purchase (e.g., airline ticket, clothing) or service (e.g., laundry, dry cleaning);

(ii) A loan of money;

(iii) A guarantee of bond;

(iv) The use of an automobile;

(v) Transportation to or from a summer job;

(vi) A benefit connected with on-campus or off-campus student-athletes' housing (e.g., individual television sets or stereo equipment, specialized recreational facilities, room furnishings or appointments of extra quality or quantity);

(vii) Signing or cosigning a note with an outside agency to arrange a loan;

(viii) An institution selling a student-athlete ticket(s) to an athletics event.

(h) The permissible expenses that an institution may provide a student-athlete are defined as follows:

(1) Actual and necessary expenses on intercollegiate athletics trips, reasonable trips (within the state in which the member institution is located or a distance not to exceed 100 miles if outside that state) to practice sites other than those of the institution, or to transport a team a reasonable distance (not to exceed 100 miles) to an off-campus site for a postseason team award or recognition meeting; however, it shall be permissible to provide expenses when a team is invited by the President of the United States to be accorded special recognition in the national capital. (*Revised: 1/10/79, 1/11/84*) [Case Nos. 10, 73, 86 through 94]

O.I. 6. Nationally recognized service organizations and church groups (including the Fellowship of Christian Athletes) may underwrite the actual and necessary expenses of student-athletes to attend Fellowship of Christian Athletes encampments. This interpretation specifically excludes member institutions or athletically related organizations from underwriting such expenses.

(2) Actual and necessary expenses incurred by the spouse of a student-athlete in accompanying the student-athlete to a certified postseason football game or an NCAA championship in the sport of football in which the student-athlete is certified eligible to participate, if prescribed by the bylaws of the Association; (*Revised: 8/1/75*)

(3) Actual and necessary expenses for participation in national championship events; Olympic, Pan American and World University Games qualifying competition, or bona fide amateur competition during the Christmas and spring vacations as listed on the institution's official calendar; (*Revised: 1/11/84*)

(4) Identified benefits incidental to a student's participation in intercollegiate athletics that may be financed by the institution are: [Case Nos. 74 through 77, 95 through 99]

(i) Tutoring expenses;

(ii) Athletics medical insurance;

(iii) Death and dismemberment insurance for travel connected with intercollegiate athletics competition and practice;

(iv) Drug-rehabilitation expenses; (*Adopted: 1/14/86*)

(v) On-campus student development and career counseling utilizing sources from outside the institution, and (*Adopted: 1/14/86*)

(vi) Counseling about a future professional athletics career through a panel of at least three persons appointed by the institution's chief executive officer (or his or her designated representative from outside the athletics department). No more than one such panel member may be an athletics department staff member, and all other panel members must be selected by the institution from among its full-time employees employed outside the athletics department. All panel members shall be identified to the NCAA national office. (*Adopted: 1/11/84, Revised: 1/14/86*)

(5) An institution may rent dormitory space to a prospective or enrolled student-athlete during the summer months only at the regular institutional rate, if it is the institution's policy to make such dormitory space available on the same basis to all prospective or enrolled students.

(6) Admission for each student-athlete to all of the institution's regular-season home intercollegiate athletics contests. Actual tickets for events cannot be issued. Institutions may use a printed student-athlete pass or a certified gate list of names of all student-athletes. Institutions must require proof of identity by student-athletes upon admission to events. (*Adopted: 8/1/84*)

(7) Transportation and housing expenses for parents (or legal guardians) of a student-athlete and for the student-athlete's teammates to be present in situations in which a student-athlete suffers a life-threatening injury or illness, or in the event of a student-athlete's death, to provide these expenses in conjunction with funeral arrangements. (*Adopted: 1/9/87*)

The 81st NCAA Convention approved the following new subparagraph (8), effective September 1, 1987:

(8) Actual and necessary expenses for participation in USOC Olympic Festival basketball tryouts. (*Adopted: 9/1/87*)

(i) The permissible awards that a student-athlete may receive without jeopardizing eligibility for intercollegiate athletics are defined as follows: [Case No. 100]

(1) Individual intercollegiate athletics awards and similar mementos to student-athletes shall be limited to those approved or administered by the member institution, or a member conference, in keeping with the following requirements:

(i) Institutional awards for recognition of intercollegiate athletics participation may include letter sweaters, letter jackets, sports blazers and blankets with appropriate institutional insignia or letter; watches or rings or equivalent personalized awards with institutional insignia or comparable identification; pen and pencil sets, cameras, binoculars, clock radios, and luggage with institutional insignia or comparable identification, as well as scrolls, photographs and plaques. In addition, senior awards as listed above may be presented. Merchandise items that cannot be properly personalized (e.g., gift certificates, appliances, television sets) shall be prohibited. *(Revised: 1/8/80, 1/11/84)*

(ii) Awards for special events such as postseason football games, NCAA meets and tournaments and featured individual competition may be presented only by the management of such an event and an institution that has had or will have a team participate in such event. All awards shall be properly personalized and conform to the standards enumerated in paragraph (i) above. Multiple awards are permissible for a special event, but the value of any and all awards received by any one competitor in such special event may not exceed \$300. *(Revised: 8/1/72, 8/1/75, 1/8/80, 8/1/82)* [Case Nos. 15, 101 through 103]

(iii) Awards may be presented by a member institution and a member conference (or an organization approved by either) in recognition of conference or national championships. [Case Nos. 103, 104]

(iv) Most-valuable-player awards presented in established meets, tournaments and postseason football contests may be permitted if the selection of the recipient is by a recognized organization approved by a member institution or conference and the award conforms to paragraph (ii).

(v) Awards received by a student-athlete while enrolled during the academic year (i.e., from the beginning of the fall term through completion of the spring term, including any intervening vacation period) as a regular student in a minimum full-time academic load, or awards received by a student-athlete while representing the student-athlete's institution at some other time, shall be governed by the preceding paragraphs of this section. Awards received by a student-athlete participating in an event while not enrolled as a regular student during the academic year or received during the summer while not representing the student-athlete's institution shall conform to the regulations of the recognized amateur organization(s) applicable to that event, except the receipt of cash or its equivalent for such participation shall not be permitted in any case. *(Adopted: 1/9/74, Revised: 1/13/78)* [Case No. 105]

(2) In paragraph (i) above, the awarding institution may provide multiple awards annually in recognition of a student-athlete's accomplishment; but the total value of any and all awards received during a particular academic year by an individual student-athlete may not exceed \$100, except when combined with

the permissible senior awards, in which case the total value of all awards received by a senior student-athlete may not exceed \$200. In paragraphs (iii) and (iv) above, the awarding institution, conference or other organization may not provide more than one award each in recognition of a student-athlete's accomplishment, and the cost of any single award may not exceed \$150 for a conference championship or most-valuable-player recognition or \$300 for a national championship. (*Revised: 8/1/74, 1/13/78, 8/1/80, 1/12/82, 1/16/85*)

(3) Neither paragraph (ii) nor (iii) permits individual awards in recognition of specialized performances in particular contests or events. It is permissible, however, for members to provide awards in recognition of special attainments or contributions to a team's competitive season (e.g., scholar-athlete, most improved player, most minutes played); such awards must conform in form and value to the preceding limitations. [Case Nos. 106 through 108]

Section 2. Principle of Institutional Control and Responsibility. The control and responsibility for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics shall be exercised by the institution itself and by the conference, if any, of which it is a member. [Case Nos. 47, 109 through 111]

(a) Administrative control or faculty control, or a combination of the two, shall constitute institutional control. Administration and/or faculty staff members shall constitute at least a majority of the board in control of intercollegiate athletics or of the athletics advisory board; and if either board has a parliamentary requirement necessitating more than a simple majority to transact some or all of its business, then the administrative and/or faculty members of the board shall be of at least sufficient number to constitute that majority. [Case Nos. 112 through 117]

(b) An institution's annual budget for its intercollegiate athletics programs shall be controlled by the institution and subject to its normal budgeting procedures. The institution's chief executive officer or an institutional administrator from outside the athletics department designated by the chief executive officer shall approve the annual budget in the event that the institution's normal budgeting procedures do not require such action. (*Adopted: 6/21/85*)

(c) All expenditures for or in behalf of an institution's intercollegiate athletics programs, including those by any outside organization, agency or group of individuals (two or more), shall be subject to an annual financial audit conducted for the institution by a qualified auditor who is not a staff member of the institution and who is selected either by the institution's chief executive officer or by an institutional administrator from outside the athletics department designated by the chief executive officer (in addition to any regular financial audit policies and procedures of the institution). The audit report for one fiscal year shall be completed and presented to the chief executive officer prior to the end of the institution's next fiscal year. (*Adopted: 6/21/85, Revised: 1/9/87*)

The 81st NCAA Convention amended the foregoing paragraph (c) to read as follows, effective August 1, 1987:

(c) All expenditures for or in behalf of an institution's intercollegiate athletics programs, including those by any outside organization, agency or group of individuals (two or more), shall be subject to an annual financial audit conducted for the institution by a qualified auditor who is not a staff member of the institution and who is selected either by the institution's chief executive officer or by an institutional administrator from outside the athletics department designated by the chief executive officer (in addition to any regular financial audit policies and procedures of the institution). The audit report for one fiscal year shall be completed and presented to the chief executive officer prior to the end of the institution's next fiscal year. A member institution with an operating budget for intercollegiate athletics of less than \$300,000 (excluding staff salaries), as verified in writing to the NCAA by the chief executive officer, shall be exempt from this legislation. (*Adopted: 6/21/85, Revised: 1/9/87, 8/1/87*)

(d) An institution's "responsibility" for the conduct of its intercollegiate athletics program shall include responsibility for the acts of an independent agency or organization when a member of the institution's executive or athletics administration, or an athletics department staff member, has knowledge that such agency or organization is promoting the institution's intercollegiate athletics program. (*Revised: 1/10/79*)

(e) An institution's "responsibility" for the conduct of its intercollegiate athletics program shall include responsibility for the acts of individuals when a member of the institution's executive or athletics administration has knowledge or should have knowledge that such individual has participated in or is a member of an agency or organization as described in paragraph (d) of this section, has made financial contributions to the athletics department or an athletics booster organization of that institution, has been requested by the athletics department staff to assist in the recruitment of prospective student-athletes or is assisting in the recruitment of prospective student-athletes, has assisted or is assisting in providing benefits to enrolled student-athletes or is otherwise involved in promoting the institution's athletics program. Any individual participating in such activities shall be considered a "representative of the institution's athletics interests." Once a person is identified as a representative, it is presumed the person retains that identity. (*Adopted: 1/10/79*)

(f) Institutional staff members found in violation of NCAA regulations shall be subject to disciplinary or corrective action as set forth in the provisions of the NCAA enforcement procedure, whether such violations occurred at the certifying institution or during the individual's previous employment at another member institution. (*Adopted: 9/1/85*)

(g) Contractual agreements between a coach and an institution shall include the stipulation that a coach who is found in violation of NCAA regulations shall be subject to disciplinary or corrective action as set forth in the provisions of the NCAA enforcement procedure, and shall include the stipulation that the coach annually shall report all

athletically related income from sources outside the institution (including, but not limited to, income from annuities; sports camps; housing benefits; complimentary ticket sales; television and radio programs, and endorsement or consultation contracts with athletics shoe, apparel or equipment manufacturers) through the director of athletics to the institution's chief executive officer. (*Adopted: 9/1/85, Revised: 1/9/87*)

Section 3. Principle of Sound Academic Standards. (a) A student-athlete shall not represent an institution in intercollegiate athletics competition unless the student-athlete:

(1) Has been admitted as a regularly matriculated, degree-seeking student in accordance with the regular, published entrance requirements of that institution; (*Revised: 1/11/84*) [Case No. 118]

(2) Is in good academic standing as determined by the faculty of that institution, in accordance with the standards applied to all students, and [Case Nos. 119 through 122]

(3) Is enrolled in at least a minimum full-time program of studies and is maintaining satisfactory progress toward a baccalaureate or equivalent degree as determined by the regulations of that institution, except that a student-athlete who is enrolled in less than a minimum full-time program of studies and has athletics eligibility remaining may participate if the student-athlete is enrolled in the final semester or quarter of the baccalaureate program and the institution certifies that the student-athlete is carrying for credit the courses necessary to complete degree requirements as determined by the faculty of the institution. Further, a student-athlete who has received a baccalaureate or equivalent degree and who is enrolled in the graduate or professional school of the institution attended as an undergraduate, or who is enrolled and seeking a second baccalaureate or equivalent degree at the same institution, may participate in intercollegiate athletics provided the student-athlete has athletics eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within the period set forth in Bylaw 4-1. (*Revised: 8/1/72, 8/1/74, 8/1/77, 1/13/78, 1/11/84*) [Case Nos. 119 through 124]

O.I. 7. The phrases "good academic standing" and "satisfactory progress" are to be interpreted at each member institution by the academic authorities who determine the meaning of such phrases for all students, subject to the controlling legislation by the conference or similar association of which the institution is a member.

O.I. 8. Correspondence, extension and credit-by-examination courses taken from an institution other than the one in which a student-athlete is enrolled as a full-time student shall not be used in determining a student's "academic standing" or "satisfactory progress." The Academic Requirements Committee may grant exceptions to this restriction in response to written requests from member institutions for the evaluation of specified programs of studies involving the use of such courses. In addition, prior approval by appropriate academic officials of the certifying institution is required if courses taken

during another institution's summer term are to be utilized in determining the student's "academic standing" or "satisfactory progress."

(b) A student-athlete shall not be eligible to participate in organized practice sessions in a sport unless the student-athlete is enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies as determined by the regulations of the certifying institution. (*Adopted: 1/14/81*) [Case No. 124]

(1) A student-athlete who is enrolled in less than a minimum full-time program of studies and has athletics eligibility remaining may participate in practice sessions if the student-athlete is enrolled in the final semester or quarter of the baccalaureate program and the institution certifies that the student-athlete is carrying for credit the courses necessary to complete the degree requirements as determined by the faculty of the institution. (*Adopted: 1/14/81*)

(2) A student-athlete who has received a baccalaureate or equivalent degree and who is enrolled in the graduate or professional school of the institution attended as an undergraduate, or who is enrolled and seeking a second baccalaureate or equivalent degree at the same institution, may participate in practice sessions provided the student-athlete has athletics eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within the period set forth in Bylaw 4-1. (*Adopted: 1/14/81, Revised: 1/14/86*)

Section 4. Principles Governing Financial Aid. (a) Any student-athlete who receives financial assistance other than that administered by the student-athlete's institution shall not be eligible for intercollegiate competition except as provided in Constitution 3-1-(a) and (b), and except where: (*Revised: 1/13/78*) [Case Nos. 7, 136]

(1) Assistance is received from anyone upon whom the student-athlete is naturally or legally dependent; or

(2) Assistance is awarded solely on bases having no relationship to athletic ability; or [Case Nos. 12, 13, 81, 125]

(3) Assistance is awarded through an established and continuing program to aid students, and the award is made on the basis of the recipient's past performance and overall record as measured by established criteria of which athletics participation shall not be the major criterion; disbursement of the assistance shall be through the member institution for the educational expenses of the recipient in attending that institution which the recipient has selected, and the recipient's choice of institutions shall not be restricted by the donor of the assistance. (*Adopted: 8/1/73*) [Case Nos. 12, 13]

(4) Assistance is awarded through an established and continuing program for the recognition of outstanding high school graduates on the basis of the recipient's past performance and overall record as measured by established criteria of which athletics participation may be a major criterion; disbursement of the assistance shall be through the member institution for the educational expenses of the recipient in attending that institution which the recipient has selected; the recipient's choice of institutions shall not be restricted by the donor of the assistance; the awarding individual or organization and the donor of the assistance shall not

be a representative of the athletics interests or an athletics booster group of a member institution; the value of the award shall not exceed the Association's definition of commonly accepted educational expenses; the award is provided to the recipient on only one occasion; and provided that if the recipient is recruited, the award is considered "financial aid" per O.I. 600, the recipient is considered a "countable player" per Bylaw 6-3 and the amount is applied to the maximum awards limitations of Bylaw 6 for the sport in question. (*Adopted: 1/16/85, Revised: 1/14/86*) [Case Nos. 13, 125]

O.I. 9. Financial assistance is "administered by" an institution if the institution, through its regular committee or other agency for the awarding of financial aid to students generally, has the final determination of the student-athlete who is to receive the award and its value. This prohibits a donor from contributing funds to an institution to finance a scholarship or grant-in-aid for a particular student-athlete. A donor may contribute funds for a particular sport, but the decision as to how such funds are to be allocated in the sport shall rest exclusively with the institution.

(b) Financial aid, including a grant-in-aid that carries with it a partial work requirement, may be awarded for any term (semester or quarter) during which a student-athlete is in regular attendance as an undergraduate with eligibility remaining under Bylaw 4-1, or within six years after initial enrollment in a collegiate institution (provided the student does not receive such aid for more than five years during that period), or as a graduate eligible under Constitution 3-3-(a)-(3), provided the student-athlete is not under contract to or currently receiving compensation from a professional sports organization. Financial aid awarded by an institution to a student-athlete shall conform to the rules and regulations of the awarding institution and of that institution's conference, if any. (*Revised: 1/9/74, 1/12/77, 1/16/85*) [Case Nos. 126 through 128]

(1) Financial aid may not be provided a student while attending a summer school or summer term unless the student has been in residence a minimum of one term during the regular academic year or the student is attending a summer orientation program for which participation (by both athletes and nonathletes) is required and financial aid is administered on the same basis for all participants in the program. Such financial aid may be utilized only to attend the awarding institution's summer term or summer school, except that the NCAA Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to this restriction for member institutions that have summer terms or summer schools curtailed because of the use of their facilities for the Olympic Games. (*Revised: 8/1/73, 1/12/82, 1/11/84*) [Case No. 129]

(2) If the student-athlete lives and eats in noninstitutional facilities, the institution may pay the student-athlete an amount equal to the institution's official board and room allowance as listed in its catalog, or the averaged board and room costs of all of its students living on campus, excluding those living in the athletics dormitory or eating at the training table. Meals provided

on the training table shall be deducted at the regular cost figure from such a student-athlete's board allowance. (*Revised: 8/1/84*) [Case Nos. 130 through 132]

(3) An institution shall not waive, pay in advance or guarantee payment of the following expenses for a prospective student-athlete, unless such benefits conform to institutional policy as it applies to other prospective student-grantees generally: (i) the processing fee the institution requires before its admissions office evaluates a prospect's application, (ii) the fee for orientation-counseling tests required of all incoming freshmen, (iii) the fee for preadmission academic testing, (iv) advance tuition payment or room deposit, (v) damage deposits for dormitory rooms or ROTC deposits for military equipment, (vi) any other preenrollment fees required of prospective student-grantees. If the student-athlete enrolls and is awarded financial assistance covering institutional fees, the fees described in (i) through (iv) above may be rebated as a part of the institution's regular fees. [Case No. 59]

(c) Financial assistance may not be awarded a prospective student-athlete conditioned on the recipient reporting in satisfactory physical condition. If a student-athlete has been accepted for admission and awarded financial assistance, the institution shall be committed for the term of the original award even though the student-athlete's physical condition prevents the student-athlete from participating in intercollegiate athletics for any reason.

(1) Institutional aid may not be graduated or canceled during the period of its award (i) on the basis of a student-athlete's ability or contribution to a team's success, (ii) because of an injury that prevents the recipient from participating in athletics or (iii) for any other athletics reason. [Case Nos. 133, 142]

(2) Aid may be graduated or canceled if the recipient (i) renders himself or herself ineligible for intercollegiate competition; or (ii) fraudulently misrepresents any information on an application, letter of intent or tender; or (iii) engages in serious misconduct warranting substantial disciplinary penalty, or (iv) voluntarily withdraws from a sport for personal reasons. Any such graduation or cancellation of aid is permissible only if such action is taken for proper cause by the regular disciplinary or scholarship awards authorities of the institution and the student-athlete has had an opportunity for a hearing. Under (iv) above, such graduation or cancellation of aid may not occur prior to the conclusion of that term (semester or quarter). (*Revised: 8/1/72, 8/1/76*) [Case Nos. 134, 135, 142]

(d) Where a student-athlete's ability is taken into consideration in any degree in awarding unearned financial aid, such aid shall not be awarded for a period in excess of one academic year. (*Revised: 8/1/73, 1/9/87*) [Case Nos. 136 through 140]

(e) In all cases, the institutional agency making the financial aid award shall give the recipient a written statement of the amount, duration, conditions and terms thereof. The chair of the regular committee or other agency for the awarding of financial aid to students generally, or the chair's official designee, shall sign the written state-

ment. The signature of the director of athletics, attesting to the committee's award, does not satisfy this requirement. [Case Nos. 141, 142]

(f) The renewal of a scholarship or grant-in-aid award shall be made on or before July 1 prior to the academic year it is to be effective. The institution promptly shall notify each student-athlete who received an award the previous academic year and who is eligible to receive an award and has eligibility remaining under Bylaw 4-1 or Constitution 3-3-(a)-(3) for the ensuing academic year whether the grant has been renewed or not renewed. In the latter event, the institution also shall inform the student-athlete that if he or she believes the grant has not been renewed for questionable reasons, the student-athlete may request, and shall have the opportunity for, a hearing before the institutional agency making the financial award. The institution shall have established reasonable procedures for the prompt hearing of such a request. (*Revised: 8/1/73, 1/16/85*) [Case Nos. 143 through 146]

(g) The bylaws of the Association may prescribe additional limitations concerning financial assistance, including restrictions on the amount of financial aid each student-athlete may receive in addition to those set forth in Constitution 3-1-(g)-(1), and limitations as to the number of financial aid awards a member institution may provide to student-athletes. Any financial assistance permitted by a division that would result in a student-athlete's total financial aid exceeding the value of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books and up to the maximum permitted by Constitution 3-1-(g)-(1) and Bylaw 6-1-(a) shall be based upon the demonstrated financial need of the individual student-athlete. (*Adopted: 8/1/73, Revised: 1/9/87*)

Section 5. Principle Governing Recruiting. The recruiting of student-athletes shall be controlled by bylaws enacted by the Association.

Section 6. Principles of Ethical Conduct. It shall be a member institution's responsibility to apply and enforce the following principles:

(a) Individuals employed by, or associated with, a member institution to administer, conduct or coach intercollegiate athletics and all participating student-athletes shall deport themselves with honesty and sportsmanship at all times so that intercollegiate athletics as a whole, their institutions and they, as individuals, shall represent the honor and dignity of fair play and the generally recognized high standards associated with wholesome competitive sports.

(1) Conduct by a student-athlete or an institutional staff member that may be considered unethical includes, but is not limited to: (*Adopted: 1/12/83*)

(i) Refusal to furnish information relevant to investigation of a possible violation of an NCAA regulation when requested to do so by the NCAA or the individual's institution;

(ii) Knowing involvement in arrangements for fraudulent academic credit or false transcripts for a prospective or an enrolled student-athlete;

(iii) Knowing involvement in offering or providing a prospective or an enrolled student-athlete an improper inducement or extra benefit;

(iv) Knowingly furnishing the NCAA or the individual's institution false or misleading information concerning the individual's involvement in or knowledge of a violation of an NCAA regulation.

(2) Student-athletes found in violation of the provisions of this regulation shall be ineligible for further intercollegiate competition, subject to appeal to the NCAA Eligibility Committee for restoration of eligibility. Institutional staff members found in violation of the provisions of this regulation shall be subject to disciplinary or corrective action as set forth in Section 7-(b)-(12) of the NCAA enforcement procedure. (*Adopted: 1/12/83*)

(b) Staff members of the athletics department of a member institution or others employed by the intercollegiate athletics program who have knowledge of the use contrary to Bylaw 5-2 by a student-athlete of a substance on the list of banned drugs set forth in Executive Regulation 1-7-(b), and who fail to follow institutional procedures dealing with drug abuse, shall be subject to disciplinary or corrective action as set forth in Section 7-(b)-(12) of the NCAA enforcement procedure. (*Adopted: 8/1/86*)

(c) Staff members of the athletics department of a member institution and student-athletes shall not knowingly provide information to assist individuals involved in organized gambling activities concerning intercollegiate athletics competition, solicit a bet on any intercollegiate team, accept a bet on any team representing the institution or participate in any gambling involving intercollegiate athletics through a bookmaker, a parlay card or any other method employed by organized gambling. (*Adopted: 1/11/84, Revised: 1/16/85*)

(d) Staff members of a member institution's athletics department shall not accept compensation or gratuities of any kind whatsoever, either directly or indirectly, for representing a professional sports organization in the scouting or contacting of athletic talent or the negotiating of a contract. Any compensational arrangement between a professional sports organization and a college staff member (e.g., for scouting other professional teams or assisting the professional employer in coaching its team) shall be prima facie evidence of an indirect arrangement to assure the staff member's assistance in evaluating or procuring college talent. [Case Nos. 147 through 152]

(e) Staff members of member institutions and others serving on the Association's committees or acting as consultants shall not, directly or by implication, use the Association's name or their affiliation with the Association in the endorsement of products or services, nor shall athletics department staff members, directly or by implication, use the institution's name or logo in the endorsement of commercial products or services for personal gain without prior approval from the institution. (*Revised: 1/9/87*)

(f) Staff members of the athletics department of a member institution shall not knowingly participate, directly or indirectly, in the management, coaching, officiating, supervision, promotion or player

selection of any all-star contest involving student-athletes that is not certified by the Association's Extra Events Committee. [Case No. 153]

(g) Staff members of the athletics department of a member institution shall not represent, directly or indirectly, a student-athlete in the marketing of athletic ability or reputation to a professional sports team or professional sports organization and shall not receive compensation or gratuities of any kind, directly or indirectly, for such services. (*Adopted: 1/8/75*)

(h) Contractual agreements between a coach and an institution shall include the stipulation that the coach may be suspended for a period of time, without pay, or that the coach's employment may be terminated if the coach is found to be involved in deliberate and serious violations of NCAA regulations. (*Adopted: 1/12/83*)

(i) Staff members of a member institution's athletics department shall not accept, prior to receiving approval from the institution's chief executive officer, compensation or gratuities of any kind whatsoever, either directly or indirectly, excluding institutionally administered funds, from an athletics shoe, apparel or equipment manufacturer in exchange for the use of such merchandise during practice or competition by the institution's student-athletes. (*Adopted: 1/9/87*)

(j) Staff members of a member institution's athletics department shall not accept compensation or gratuities of any kind whatsoever, either directly or indirectly, for scheduling athletics contests or individual meet participation with another institution or sponsor of athletics competition. This specifically precludes the acceptance of compensation or gratuities from other institutions, schedule brokers or agents and television networks or syndicators. (*Adopted: 1/9/87*)

Section 7. Principle Governing Competition in Postseason and Noncollegiate-Sponsored Contests. Competition by member institutions in postseason contests and in meets and tournaments that are not sponsored, promoted, managed and controlled by a collegiate entity shall conform to the provisions of this constitution and to the rules or regulations prescribed by the bylaws of the Association, which may include penalties for violations of these requirements by sponsoring agencies. (*Revised: 8/1/78*)

Section 8. Principles Governing Playing and Practice Seasons. (a) Member institutions shall not schedule intercollegiate athletics contests in conjunction with professional sports contests or exhibitions.

(b) Organized practice and playing seasons in all sports may be controlled by bylaws enacted by the Association.

Section 9. Principles Governing the Eligibility of Student-Athletes. An institution shall not permit a student-athlete to represent it in intercollegiate athletics competition unless the student-athlete meets the following requirements of eligibility:

(a) The student-athlete shall be denied the first year of intercollegiate athletics competition if: [Case Nos. 154, 155]

(1) Following completion of high school eligibility in the student-athlete's sport and prior to the student-athlete's high school graduation, the student-athlete was a member of a squad that engaged in an intrastate all-star football or basketball contest that was not specifically approved by the appropriate state high school athletics association or an interstate all-star football or basketball contest that was not specifically approved by the NCAA Council; or (*Revised: 1/12/83*)

(2) Following graduation from high school and before enrollment in college, the student-athlete was a member of a squad that engaged in an interstate all-star football or basketball contest that was not specifically approved by the NCAA Council; or (*Revised: 1/12/83*)

(3) Following completion of high school eligibility in the student-athlete's sport and prior to the student-athlete's high school graduation, the student-athlete participates in more than two approved all-star football contests or two approved all-star basketball contests. (*Revised: 8/1/80, 1/12/82, 1/12/83*)

(4) The Council of the Association may designate a committee to act in its place or in place of any state association that declines to assume the jurisdiction described in this paragraph. (*Revised: 1/12/82*)

(b) The student-athlete shall not participate in any organized basketball competition except while representing the institution in intercollegiate competition in accordance with the permissible playing season specified in Bylaw 3, and except as permitted in the following subparagraphs. Such participation shall require the member institution to rule the student-athlete ineligible for intercollegiate competition in the sport of basketball. This provision shall not apply to participation in the official Olympic Games and the final tryouts that directly qualify competitors for the Olympic Games. (*Revised: 8/1/73, 8/1/74, 1/13/78*) [Case Nos. 156 through 158]

(1) A student-athlete may compete during the period between June 15 and August 31 on a team in a league approved by the NCAA Council, if the student-athlete has received written permission from the institution's director of athletics (or the director's official representative) for such participation. For such a league to be approved, it shall meet the following requirements: (*Adopted: 1/13/78*) [Case Nos. 159, 160]

(i) No member team shall include on its roster more than one player with intercollegiate eligibility remaining in the sport of basketball from any one college, university or junior college. (*Adopted: 1/13/78*)

(ii) Neither the league nor any member team shall have on its staff or as a participant any person associated in any employment capacity with a college, university or junior college. (*Adopted: 1/13/78, Revised: 1/16/85*) [Case No. 161]

(iii) No member team shall make any payments for play or expenses directly or indirectly to any player. (*Adopted: 1/13/78*)

(iv) All players must limit their competition to one team in one league. (*Adopted: 1/13/78*)

(v) No admission shall be charged for any game, no fee shall be charged for parking to attend any game, no revenue shall be realized at any game from raffles or similar activities and no revenue shall be realized from over-the-air or cable television or radio rights fees for any game. (*Adopted: 1/13/78, Revised: 1/16/85*)

(vi) No all-star games of any kind shall be permitted. (*Adopted: 1/13/78*)

(vii) Postseason play-offs or tournaments shall be permitted, provided such play-offs or tournaments involve intra-league competition and are completed by August 31. (*Adopted: 1/13/78, Revised: 1/10/79*)

(viii) League play shall be within 100 miles of the student-athlete's official residence or within 100 miles of the institution the student-athlete attends. (*Adopted: 1/13/78*) [Case No. 162]

(2) Participation by residents of Puerto Rico in the Superior Basketball League of Puerto Rico is exempted from this ruling.

(3) A student-athlete may compete in one game a year involving players from the student-athlete's former high school and its alumni team.

(4) The Council shall have the authority to waive this provision by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting to permit student-athletes to participate in: (*Revised: 8/1/73, 8/1/74, 1/12/77, 1/13/78, 1/10/79, 1/8/80, 1/14/81*) [Case No. 170]

(i) Official Pan American tryouts and competition;

(ii) Officially recognized competition directly qualifying participants for final Olympic tryouts;

(iii) Official tryouts and competition involving national teams sponsored by the appropriate Group A member of the U.S. Olympic Committee (or, for student-athletes representing another nation, the equivalent organization of that nation);

(iv) The United States against United States national teams;

(v) Officially recognized state and national multisport events sanctioned by the Council, or

(vi) Other international competition scheduled during a period other than the involved institution's intercollegiate basketball season, sanctioned by the Council.

O.I. 10. Outside basketball competition shall be considered "organized" if any of the following conditions exist: Teams are regularly formed or team rosters are predetermined, competition is scheduled and publicized in advance, official score is kept, individual or team standings are maintained, official timer or game officials are used, squad members are dressed in team uniforms, admission is charged, or a team is privately or commercially sponsored. Further, competition that is either directly or indirectly sponsored, promoted or administered by an individual, an organization or any other agency shall be considered organized.

(c) The student-athlete shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate competition in his or her sport for the duration of the season if, following enrollment in college and during any year in which the student-athlete is a member of an intercollegiate squad or team, he or she competes or has competed as a member of any outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition (e.g., tournament play, exhibition games or other activity) in the sport, other than the official Olympic Games and the final tryouts therefor, during the institution's intercollegiate season. However, a student-athlete may compete in one game a year during the institution's intercollegiate season in the sport involving players from the student-athlete's former high school and its alumni team, provided such competition takes place during an official vacation period of the institution's academic year. (*Revised: 8/1/73, 8/1/74, 8/1/75, 1/13/78, 1/10/79*) [Case Nos. 163 through 167]

(1) The intercollegiate season in a sport shall be the period of time between opening of the institution's formal varsity practice and its last regularly scheduled game. [Case Nos. 168, 169]

(2) The Council shall have the authority to waive this provision by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting to permit student-athletes to participate in: (*Revised: 1/12/77, 1/13/78, 1/10/79, 1/8/80, 1/14/81*) [Case No. 170]

(i) Official Pan American tryouts and competition;

(ii) Officially recognized competition directly qualifying participants for final Olympic tryouts, or

(iii) Official tryouts and competition involving national teams sponsored by the appropriate Group A member of the U.S. Olympic Committee (or, for student-athletes representing another nation, the equivalent organization of that nation, or for student-athletes competing in a non-Olympic sport, the equivalent organization of that sport).

(d) The student-athlete shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate competition in all sports if the student-athlete has been guilty of fraudulence in connection with an entrance or placement examination or has otherwise exhibited dishonesty in evading or violating NCAA regulations. (*Revised: 1/12/77*)

(e) The student-athlete shall be denied further intercollegiate eligibility in that sport if the student-athlete engages as a member of a squad in any college all-star football or basketball contest that is not certified by the Association's Special Events Committee. (*Revised: 1/12/77*)

(f) The student-athlete shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate track and field competition if, while a candidate for the intercollegiate team in track and field, the student-athlete participates in track and field competition that is subject to the certification program specified in Bylaw 2 but that has not been certified.

(g) The student-athlete shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate gymnastics competition if, while a candidate for the intercollegiate team in gymnastics, the student-athlete participates in gymnastics competition that is subject to the certification program specified in Bylaw 2 but that has not been certified.

(h) The student-athlete shall be denied eligibility for the championship meets and tournaments sponsored by this Association unless

the student-athlete meets the individual eligibility requirements that shall be provided for in the bylaws.

(i) The student-athlete annually, prior to participation in intercollegiate competition during the academic year in question, shall sign a statement in a form prescribed by the NCAA Council in which the student-athlete submits information related to eligibility, recruitment, financial aid, amateur status and involvement in organized gambling activities concerning intercollegiate athletics competition under the governing legislation of this Association, and consents to be tested for the use of drugs prohibited by NCAA legislation. Failure to complete and sign the statement annually shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation in all intercollegiate competition. (*Adopted: 8/1/75, Revised: 8/1/84, 8/1/86*)

(j) Additional eligibility requirements for intercollegiate athletics competition may be prescribed by the bylaws of the Association. (*Adopted: 1/14/81*)

Section 10. Principle Governing Personnel and Squad Limitations. The bylaws of the Association may prescribe limitations as to the number of coaches a member institution may employ or otherwise utilize, the size of a squad in any sport and game scouting activities. (*Adopted: 8/15/75*)

Section 11. Principle Governing Football Television. The telecasting, cablecasting or otherwise televising of intercollegiate football games of member institutions may be subject to the provisions of bylaws enacted by the Association. (*Adopted: 1/12/82, Revised: 1/16/85*)

APPENDIX B

ARTICLE FOUR

ELIGIBILITY RULES FOR IN-SEASON COMPETITION

(Adopted: 1/14/81)

Section 1. Individual Eligibility. An institution shall not permit a student-athlete to represent it in intercollegiate athletics competition unless the student-athlete meets the following requirements of eligibility:

Div. I* (a) Division I—The student-athlete shall complete his or her seasons of participation within five calendar years from the beginning of the semester or quarter in which the student-athlete first registered at a collegiate institution, time spent in the armed services, on official church missions or with recognized foreign aid services of the U.S. government being excepted. *(Adopted: 1/14/81)* [Case Nos. 264 through 273, 276, 277]

(1) The Council, or a subcommittee designated by it, shall have the authority to waive this provision by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting to permit student-athletes to participate in: *(Adopted: 1/11/84)* [Case No. 274]

(i) Official Pan American and Olympic training, tryouts and competition;

(ii) Officially recognized training and competition directly qualifying participants for final Olympic tryouts, or

(iii) Official tryouts and competition involving national teams sponsored by the appropriate Group A and B members of the U.S. Olympic Committee (or, for student-athletes representing another nation, the equivalent organization of that nation, or, for student-athletes competing in a non-Olympic sport, the equivalent organization of that sport).

(2) The Council, or a subcommittee designated by it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve a one-year extension of this five-year period of eligibility for a female student-athlete for reasons of pregnancy. *(Adopted: 1/16/85)*

(3) The Council, or a subcommittee designated by the Council to act for it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve such additional exceptions as it deems appropriate. *(Adopted: 1/14/81)* [Case No. 275]

(4) If a student-athlete enrolls in a regular term of a collegiate institution at the first opportunity following completion of any one of the three commitments described in the exceptions to this bylaw, the elapsed time between completion of the commitment and enrollment will not count toward the student-athlete's five years of eligibility. *(Adopted: 1/14/81)* [Case No. 278]

Divs. II and III** (b) Divisions II and III—The student-athlete shall complete his or her seasons of participation during the first 10 semesters or 15 quarters in which the student is enrolled in a collegiate institution in at least a minimum full-time program of studies as determined by the regulations of that institution. *(Adopted: 1/12/82)* [Case Nos. 264 through 267, 270, 276, 277]

*The provisions of Bylaw 4-1-(a) pertain to Division I members only.

**The provisions of Bylaw 4-1-(b) pertain to members of Division II and Division III only.

(1) For an institution that determines registration other than on a traditional semester or quarter basis, the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee shall determine an equivalent enrollment period. (*Adopted: 1/12/82, Revised: 1/9/87*)

Divs.
II
and
III*

(2) The Council, or a subcommittee designated by it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve a two-semester or three-quarter extension of this period of eligibility for a female student-athlete for reasons of pregnancy. (*Adopted: 1/16/85*)

(3) The Council, or a subcommittee designated by the Council to act for it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve such additional exceptions as it deems appropriate. (*Adopted: 1/14/86*) [Case No. 275]

(c) The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to this section on behalf of student-athletes of the national service academies who have exhausted eligibility in one sport but wish to compete in another sport or sports in which they have eligibility remaining.

(d) Division I—Complimentary admissions shall be provided only by a pass list for individuals designated by the student-athlete. No more than one of the complimentary admissions may be provided to anyone other than family members, relatives or fellow students. “Hard tickets” shall not be issued. The institution shall be responsible for this administrative procedure, and the student-athlete’s eligibility shall be affected by involvement in action contrary to the provisions of Constitution 3-1-(g)-(3). (*Adopted: 1/9/87*) [Case Nos. 62, 279]

Div.
I**

(e) Division II—Complimentary tickets shall be distributed only to persons designated by the student-athlete and who have identified themselves and signed a receipt therefor. The institution shall be responsible for this administrative procedure, and the student-athlete’s eligibility shall be affected by involvement in action contrary to the provisions of Constitution 3-1-(g)-(3). (*Adopted: 1/9/87*) [Case No. 62]

Div.
II***

(f) Division III—Complimentary tickets shall be distributed only to persons designated by the student-athlete. The institution shall be responsible for this administrative procedure, and the student-athlete’s eligibility shall be affected by involvement in action contrary to the provisions of Constitution 3-1-(g)-(3). (*Adopted: 1/9/87*) [Case No. 62]

Div.
III

*The provisions of Bylaw 4-1-(b) pertain to members of Division II and Division III only.

**The provisions of Bylaw 4-1-(d) pertain to Division I members only.

***The provisions of Bylaw 4-1-(e) pertain to Division II members only.

****The provisions of Bylaw 4-1-(f) pertain to Division III members only.

APPENDIX C

**Divs.
I
and
II***

(6) A student-athlete who has completed at least one academic year in residence or utilized one season of eligibility in a sport at the certifying institution shall be required to satisfy the following minimum academic progress requirements for continuing eligibility. (*Adopted: 8/1/81, Revised: 1/12/82*) [Case Nos. 323, 324]

(i) Eligibility for financial aid and practice during each academic year after the student-athlete's initial year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in a sport shall be based upon the rules of the institution and the conference of which the institution is a member. (*Adopted: 8/1/81, Revised: 1/12/82*)

(ii) Eligibility for regular-season competition subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in a sport shall be based upon: (1) satisfactory completion prior to each term in which a season of competition begins of an accumulative total of semester or quarter hours of academic credit that is equivalent to the completion of an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms in academic years in which the student-athlete has been enrolled in a term or terms, or (2) satisfactory completion of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of academic credit since the beginning of the student-athlete's last season of competition. For purposes of this provision, a student-athlete shall meet the "satisfactory completion" requirement by maintaining a grade-point average that places the student-athlete in good academic standing as established by the institution for all students who are at an equivalent stage of progress toward a degree. (*Adopted: 8/1/81, Revised: 1/12/82, 1/16/85, 8/1/85*) [Case Nos. 324, 325]

(iii) The calculation of credit hours under the provisions of subparagraph (ii) shall be based upon hours earned or accepted for degree credit in a specific baccalaureate degree program for the student-athlete at the certifying institution. Hours earned in the period following the regular academic year at the institution (e.g., hours earned in summer school) may be utilized to satisfy academic credit requirements of this regulation. (*Adopted: 8/1/81, Revised: 8/1/84*) [Case Nos. 326, 327]

(iv) A student-athlete shall designate a program of studies leading toward a specific baccalaureate degree at the certifying institution by the beginning of the third year of enrollment (fifth semester or seventh quarter). In addition to the continuing student, this subparagraph shall be applicable to the eligibility of a transfer student from a four-year or two-year collegiate institution who is entering his or her third year of collegiate enrollment even if the student has not yet completed an academic year in residence or utilized a season of eligibility in a sport at the certifying institution. (*Adopted: 8/1/85*) [Case Nos. 326, 327]

(v) A graduate student who is otherwise eligible for

*The provisions of Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6) pertain to members of Division I and Division II only.

regular-season competition shall be exempt from the provisions of this regulation. (*Adopted: 8/1/81*)

Divs.
I
and
II*

(vi) The NCAA Academic Requirements Committee shall establish appropriate criteria for additional exceptions to this legislation, which shall be administered by the member conferences of the Association and, in the case of an independent institution, by the NCAA Eligibility Committee. (*Adopted: 8/1/81*) [Case No. 328]

(vii) An institution that determines registration other than on a traditional semester- or quarter-hour basis shall submit a statement describing the continuing eligibility requirements applicable to its student-athletes for approval by the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee. (*Adopted: 8/1/81*)

(7) A transfer student from a four-year institution shall not be eligible for any NCAA championship until the student has fulfilled a residence requirement of one full academic year (two full semesters or three full quarters), and one full calendar year has elapsed from the first regular registration and attendance date at the certifying Division I or Division II institution. Further, a transfer student-athlete admitted after the 12th class day may not utilize that semester or quarter for the purpose of establishing residency under either the academic-year or calendar-year requirement. At a Division III institution, eligibility is not permitted for one calendar year from the student's official withdrawal date from the previous institution. (*Revised: 8/1/72, 1/13/73, 1/9/74, 1/12/77, 8/1/86*) [Case Nos. 302, 329, 330]

(i) If the first day of classes of the regular academic term (semester or quarter) in which the transfer student would become eligible at the certifying institution is earlier than the completion of the one-calendar-year requirement, and if the student has fulfilled the one-academic-year requirement, then the student shall be eligible on that first day of classes. (*Adopted: 8/1/77, Revised: 1/13/78*)

(ii) If the date of the first scheduled intercollegiate contest falls earlier (between semesters) than the first day of classes of the regular academic term (semester or quarter) in which the student would become eligible, and if the student has fulfilled the one-academic-year requirement, then the student shall be eligible on that playing date. (*Adopted: 8/1/77, Revised: 1/13/78*)

(8) A transfer student from a junior college who was a qualifier is not eligible in Division I institutions for any NCAA championships the first academic year in residence unless the student has: (*Revised: 8/1/75*) [Case Nos. 329 through 331, 337]

Div.
I**

(i) Graduated from the junior college and has satisfactorily completed a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalau-

*The provisions of Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6) pertain to members of Division I and Division II only.
**The provisions of Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(8) pertain to Division I members only.

APPENDIX D

Section 3. Principle of Sound Academic Standards. (a) A student-athlete shall not represent an institution in intercollegiate athletics competition unless the student-athlete:

(1) Has been admitted as a regularly matriculated, degree-seeking student in accordance with the regular, published entrance requirements of that institution; (*Revised: 1/11/84*) [Case No. 118]

(2) Is in good academic standing as determined by the faculty of that institution, in accordance with the standards applied to all students, and [Case Nos. 119 through 122]

(3) Is enrolled in at least a minimum full-time program of studies and is maintaining satisfactory progress toward a baccalaureate or equivalent degree as determined by the regulations of that institution, except that a student-athlete who is enrolled in less than a minimum full-time program of studies and has athletics eligibility remaining may participate if the student-athlete is enrolled in the final semester or quarter of the baccalaureate program and the institution certifies that the student-athlete is carrying for credit the courses necessary to complete degree requirements as determined by the faculty of the institution. Further, a student-athlete who has received a baccalaureate or equivalent degree and who is enrolled in the graduate or professional school of the institution attended as an undergraduate, or who is enrolled and seeking a second baccalaureate or equivalent degree at the same institution, may participate in intercollegiate athletics provided the student-athlete has athletics eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within the period set forth in Bylaw 4-1. (*Revised: 3/1/72, 3/1/74, 3/1/77, 1/13/78, 1/11/84*) [Case Nos. 119 through 124]

O.I. 7. The phrases "good academic standing" and "satisfactory progress" are to be interpreted at each member institution by the academic authorities who determine the meaning of such phrases for all students, subject to the controlling legislation by the conference or similar association of which the institution is a member.

O.I. 8. Correspondence, extension and credit-by-examination courses taken from an institution other than the one in which a student-athlete is enrolled as a full-time student shall not be used in determining a student's "academic standing" or "satisfactory progress." The Academic Requirements Committee may grant exceptions to this restriction in response to written requests from member institutions for the evaluation of specified programs of studies involving the use of such courses. In addition, prior approval by appropriate academic officials of the certifying institution is required if courses taken

during another institution's summer term are to be utilized in determining the student's "academic standing" or "satisfactory progress."

(b) A student-athlete shall not be eligible to participate in organized practice sessions in a sport unless the student-athlete is enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies as determined by the regulations of the certifying institution. (*Adopted: 1/14/81*) [Case No. 124]

(1) A student-athlete who is enrolled in less than a minimum full-time program of studies and has athletics eligibility remaining may participate in practice sessions if the student-athlete is enrolled in the final semester or quarter of the baccalaureate program and the institution certifies that the student-athlete is carrying for credit the courses necessary to complete the degree requirements as determined by the faculty of the institution. (*Adopted: 1/14/81*)

(2) A student-athlete who has received a baccalaureate or equivalent degree and who is enrolled in the graduate or professional school of the institution attended as an undergraduate, or who is enrolled and seeking a second baccalaureate or equivalent degree at the same institution, may participate in practice sessions provided the student-athlete has athletics eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within the period set forth in Bylaw 4-1. (*Adopted: 1/14/81, Revised: 1/14/86*)

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

Members in attendance at the Ad Hoc Committee meeting

November 29, 1982

Derek Bok, (chairman), president of Harvard University
Fred Davison, president of the University of Georgia
Glen Driscoll, president of the University of Toledo
Edward T. Foote, II, president of the University of Miami
E. K. Fretwell, Jr., chancellor of the University of North
Carolina at Charlotte
William Friday, president of the University System of North
Carolina
William P. Gerberding, president of the University of
Washington
Father Timothy Healy, president of Georgetown University
The Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of
the University of Notre Dame
Edward H. Jennings, president of Ohio State University
Richard G. Kandini, president of Indiana State University
M. Cecil Mackey, president of Michigan State University
The Reverend J. Donald Monan, S.J., president of Boston
College
Wesley Posvar, chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh
J. C. Powell, president of Eastern Kentucky University
Harold Robinson, chancellor of Western Carolina University
Ronald W. Roskens, president of the University of Nebraska
John W. Ryan, president of Indiana University
Otis A. Singletary, president of the University of Kentucky
Bernard F. Sliger, president of Florida State University
Charles E. Young, chancellor of the University of California,
Los Angeles
James H. Wharton, chancellor of Louisiana State University