NCAA Concern:
• Did not provide a complete response to the SSI.
• Did not explain the role and involvement of individuals or groups listed in the SSI for each major decision made related to intercollegiate athletics since the institution's previous self-study.

Resolved:

5a. President
In December 2004, President Don W. Kassing was directly involved with the hiring of the current Athletics Director, Thomas Bowen. In addition, in 2004, San José State University [SJSU] hired a new Football Head Coach, Richard Tomey.

In 2005, President Kassing assisted with the hiring of the Men’s Basketball Head Coach, George Nessman. During this time, a new Academic Center was established and several additional staff members were added to the Athletics Department.

In the spring of 2006, President Kassing participated in the hiring of the Women’s Basketball Head Coach, Pam DeCosta.

In fall 2006, SJSU went through an extensive review of its academic services program and issued an appeal to the NCAA regarding APR findings. The President’s Office provided counsel and advice during this time.

In 2008, President Kassing elected to leave San José State University and John Whitmore was hired as President. In 2009, President Whitmore assisted Athletics Director Tom Bowen with the hiring of a new Football Head Coach, Mike MacIntyre.

5b. Athletics Board
In 2005, student fee for Athletics were increased, based in part on the Athletics Board’s participation and recommendation for the request.

In 2006, SJSU was found out of compliance with the new APR standards. The Athletics Board was directly involved in the plan to improve the University’s APR and worked closely with the academic community and the University’s Academic Senate.

In 2007, the Athletics Board discussed the need to publically recognize the excellent academic work being accomplished by SJSU student-athletes. The Board elected to sponsor and create the scholar-athlete awards program for both SJSU individuals
and teams. In addition, the Board approved the recommendation that APR scores become an annual part of the coaches’ evaluation and review, including the decision for merit increases.

In 2009, the Athletics Board began working with the Office of the President to review and evaluate the work being accomplished by the Director of Athletics.

5c. Faculty Senate (known as the Academic Senate at SJSU)
In the spring of 2004, the University’s Academic Senate passed a referendum that limited the Athletics Department’s general fund allocation to a maximum of two percent (2%). To insure compliance with this, the Academic Senate receives regular updates regarding the Athletics program. These updates are presented through documents and through presentations by Athletic Department staff members, including Tom Bowen, the Athletics Director.

5d. Student-Athlete Advisory Committee [SAAC]
In 2005, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee [SAAC] submitted a proposal to Athletics Director Tom Bowen to request the reinstatement of a fifth year program for student-athletes. This proposal was adopted and continues to provide financial assistance to fifth year student-athletes.

In 2007, the Committee proposed more community involvement & service, the official formation of the SAAC & the annual student-athlete talent show.

This committee continues to be an important conduit between the administration and the sense of important issues facing our student-athletes.

5e. Director of Athletics
Tom Bowen was hired as the Athletics Director in 2005. Since then, he has hired numerous coaches and staff, including head coaches for men’s basketball, men’s golf, women’s golf, men’s cross country, women’s basketball, men’s softball, women’s soccer, women’s’ swimming and diving and strength and conditioning.

In addition, Mr. Bowen has continued to build his team, by hiring in the following positions: Senior Associate Athletic Directors for External Affairs, Senior Women’s Administrator, Director of Business, and Director of Student Services.

In 2007, two additional directors joined the Athletic Department: Director of Sports Medicine and Director of Media & Marketing. Recently, the Athletics Department has added academic advisors, a video coordinator, and directors for football and for basketball operations.

The most recent hires are the Football Head Coach, who Mr. Bowen hired in early 2010, and a Chief Operating Officer, who Mr. Bowen hired in Spring 2010.
5f. Faculty Athletics Representative [FAR]
In 2006, when the athletic program was out of APR compliance, President Kassing appointed Dr. William Campsey as the Faculty Athletics Representative [FAR]. Dr. Campsey and Director Bowen worked together to re-build the current academic performance and accountability for student-athletes at SJSU.

In Fall 2009, Dr. Campsey served as a member of the selection committee for the hiring of the new Football Head Coach. As a member, Dr. Campsey vetted the finalists about their commitment and knowledge of academic success and the NCAA APR program.

5g. Senior Woman Administrator [SWA]
Since 2005, four different individuals have served as the Senior Woman Administrator [SWA], with each individual serving an important role structuring and development of SASS (Student-Athlete Success Services). The SWA position at SJSU works directly with both the President’s and Provost’s Office on matters that are relevant and immediate to the Athletic Department. The SWA participates in every search for a Head Coach and serves as the department representative to the Western Athletic Conference [WAC].

Prior to the hiring of the current COO, Marie Tuite, the SWA also served as the Chief Operating Officer [COO] in the Athletics Department. Since July 2010, the SWA is an annual appointment to a female Administrator who has demonstrated leadership, interest and potential.

The current COO, Marie Tuite, serves as the Senior Associate for Internal Operations. She is also a member of the senior leadership team in the Athletics Department.

5h. Other campus constituencies
The other campus constituency that has participated in decisions about the Athletics Department is the Spartan Foundation. Since 2005, the Spartan Foundation has been an integral part of working to elevate the exposure and interest of home athletic contests, through the “re-branding “of the Spartan athletics program. In addition, the University’s community outreach program has been enhanced by the efforts of the members of the Spartan Foundation. Spartan members actively inform, attend and support the efforts of our student-athletes including community service activities and home events. They are important stakeholders in the University’s efforts to increase the awareness of the excellent work by the SJSU Athletics Department.
**OP 1.1a/ Line Item 6/ Pg. 12**

**NCAA Concern:**
- Not meeting the measurable standard.
- Did not provide evidence that written communication is provided annually to its governing board with respect to athletics.

**Resolved:** While the President regularly updates the Board, there is no specific requirement that this be done on a regular basis. In the University’s Plan for Improvement in this section, an annual, written report on the athletics governance policies will be required to be presented to the Athletics Board.

**OP 1.2d/ Line Item 5/ Pg. 25-26**

**NCAA Concern:**
- Not meeting the measurable standard.
- Did not provide written evidence that all individuals outside the department of athletics have statements regarding the importance of rules compliance in the following documents: Contracts or letters of appointment, Job descriptions, Performance evaluations.

**Resolved:** In a Plan for Improvement under this section, the University will require all staff outside the athletic department who are involved in or associated with rules compliance activities to have statements regarding the importance of rules compliance in position descriptions and performance evaluations.

**OP 1.2e/ Line Item 13/ Pg. 32-33**

**NCAA Concern:**
- Not meeting the measurable standard.
- Did not review APP, Amateurism or Commitment of personnel to rules-compliance activities during external rules-compliance evaluation. Institution conducted evaluation April 28-30, 2008, so these areas did not have to be included in the evaluation. However, institution must create a plan for improvement to include these areas within the next scheduled external rules-compliance evaluation.

**Resolved:** In a Plan for Improvement under this section, the University will review APP, Amateurism and Commitment of Personnel to Rules-Compliance Activities to be included in the University’s next external review.

**OP 1.2/ Line Item 17/ Pg. 37-38**

**NCAA Concern:**
- Did not provide a complete response to the SSI.
- Institution indicated in SSI #5 they would create a plan for improvement to include importance of rules compliance language within contracts and letters of appointment, job descriptions and performance evaluations for employees outside of athletics with compliance related responsibilities.
• Institution needs to include in their plan for improvement the missing areas from SSI #13 to be included in the next scheduled external rules-compliance evaluation.
• Plan for improvement must receive formal institutional approval.

Resolved: In a Plan for Improvement under this section, the University will require all staff outside the athletic department who are involved in or associated with rules compliance activities to have statements regarding the importance of rules compliance in position descriptions and performance evaluations and will also review APP, Amateurism and Commitment of Personnel to Rules-Compliance Activities to be included in the University’s next external review. This Plan for Improvement was approved by the San José State University President.

OP 2.1b/ Line Item 5/ Pg. 46-47

NCAA Concern:
• Did not provide a complete response to the SSI.
• Did not describe the process by which students who do not meet the institution’s standard or normal entrance requirements may be admitted.
• Did not identify the agency vested with the responsibility.

Resolved: Beginning with the 2009-2010 academic year, SJSU declared impaction and eliminated the special admissions process. This means that all students must meet the minimum CSU criteria for admissions to SJSU. Additionally, all special admissions committees that provided any second-level or subsequent review processes or appeals procedures were disbanded, since this new policy eliminated the possibility of any student who did not meet the minimum CSU admissions standards to be specially considered. This policy is still in place and will continue indefinitely.

OP 2.1b/ Line Item 6/ Pg. 47, 118

NCAA Concern:
• Did not provide complete response to the SSI.
• Institution did not provide the correct numerical percentage of first-year student-athletes receiving athletics aid who were admitted through the special exception provisions during the four most recent academic years.

Resolved: During the first year of data compiled (2006-2007), the percentage of first-year student-athletes receiving athletics aid who were admitted through special admission provisions comprised 10.3 % of the total percentage of first-year students in general who were specially admitted. That same year, the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics implemented a plan to monitor and limit the number of special admits into its programs as part of its APR improvement efforts. As a result, the actual raw numbers of special admits for the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics dropped from 24 in 2006-2007 to 12 in 2007-2008, 10 in 2008-2009 and 14 in 2009-2010. Accordingly, the percentage of first-year student-athletes receiving athletics aid who were admitted through special admission provisions went down, comprising only 8.71% (2007-2008) and 6.41% (2008-2009) of the total percentage of first-year students in general who were specially admitted.
For 2009-2010, (even though there were only 14 student-athlete special admits) the percentage of first-year student-athletes receiving athletics aid who were specially admitted comprised 50% of the total percentage of first-year students in general who were specially admitted. This jump can be attributed to the institution adopting a new admissions policy. Beginning with the 2009-2010 academic year, SJSU declared Impaction and eliminated the special admissions process altogether. At that point, the special admissions committees were disbanded as the new policy eliminated the possibility of any student who did not meet the admissions standards to be specially considered. The only exceptions to the new admissions standard were (and currently are) to accommodate the “special talents” needs of various university programs such as athletics, music, drama and art. The 5.6% drop on the general student population of special admits is indicative of this change in policy. The total raw number of special admits to the university was 231 in 2006-2007, 278 in 2007-2008, and 227 in 2008-2009. However, the university’s total number of special admits dropped drastically to just 28 in 2009-2010 as a result of the new admissions policy.

NCAA Concern:
- Not meeting the measurable standard.
- Statement "in each of the four years of data, the female student-athlete cohort demonstrated a higher SAT average than the general female student population" is inaccurate.
- Did not assess the reasons why male student-athletes are being outperformed by the general male student population in three out of the four years of data.
- The following areas show average test scores are below all entering first-year students in multiple years and need to be explained: Asian/PI, Black, Hispanic, White, NR Alien, Other.
- The following teams show average test scores are below male student-athletes in multiple years and need to be explained: Football, Men's Basketball, Baseball, Men's Other Sports and Mixed Sports, Women's Basketball, Women's Track/Cross Country.
- Core GPA data is missing in men's basketball, men's track/cross country and women's track/cross country.
- Test score data is missing in men's basketball and women's track/cross country.
- Test score data is missing for NR Aliens in the Old Race/Ethnicity chart for all entering first-year student-athletes on aid.

Resolved:

Standardized Test Score Analysis by Gender

With regard to gender, the admissions profiles of student-athletes who received athletics aid (as demonstrated by standardized test scores) compared to the admissions profiles of students in general over the past four years do not indicate any extreme differences. In three of the four years of data, the female student-athlete cohort demonstrated a higher SAT average than the general female student population. While
the female student-athlete subgroup test score in 2009-2010 (972) was lower than the general female student population test score (978), the difference was only six points. Additionally, the average Core GPA for the same student-athlete subgroup was 3.182, indicating an ability to achieve in the classroom.

While the male student-athlete subgroup test scores were lower than the general male student population in three of the four years of data, it is significant to note that the most recent average test score for male student-athletes (1000) is over 50 points higher than the average test score for male student-athletes just three years prior (943). Quite likely, the tracking and limiting of special admits in several of our men’s programs (implemented as part of SJSU’s APR Improvement plans) has contributed to the increase in newcomer test scores for that subgroup. Further, of the three years of data indicating male student-athlete standardized test scores lower than those of the general male student population, those scores (931 being the lowest) were not below the regular admissions requirements of the university.

**Standardized Test Score Analysis by Racial/Ethnic Group**

With regard to race and ethnicity, nine of the cells in the Old Race/Ethnicity Categories Chart contain “**” because there were two or fewer student-athletes in the subgroup for that particular year. The chart instructions indicate that “institutions are not required to report data if the number of students in a group is two or less”. Those subgroups are: Am. Ind./AN (2006-2007, 2008-2009, 2009-2010), NR Alien (2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010), and Other (2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010). The NR Alien test score cell for 2006-2007 is blank because there is no SAT data available for the three new student-athletes in the subgroup for that year. However, it should be noted that two of the three have graduated from San Jose State. The third transferred to a university in his home country, leaving San Jose State with a cumulative GPA of 3.691.

Most importantly, it is noteworthy that during the latest year of data, every student-athlete subgroup (aside from the white category) indicated a higher SAT average for incoming student-athletes than that of the general incoming student population.

Following is a chart of the remaining test scores requiring explanation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Student-Athlete Test Score</th>
<th>General Student Test Score</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/PI '06-'07</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/PI '07-'08</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/PI '08-'09</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/PI '09-'10</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black '06-'07</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black '08-'09</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgroup</td>
<td>Student-Athlete Test Score</td>
<td>General Student Test Score</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic '06-‘07</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic '07-‘08</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic '08-‘09</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White '06-‘07</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White '07-‘08</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White '08-‘09</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White '09-‘10</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other '06-‘07</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Asian/PI discussion:** The difference between the Asian/PI student-athlete average standardized test score and the Asian/PI general student average standardized test score was only 9 points in 2006-2007, while the difference grew to 30 points in 2009-2010. Considering data fluctuates more with a lower number in the cohort (only between five to twelve per year for student-athletes compared to approximately 1,000 for general students), the average test scores for this student-athlete subgroup have remained relatively constant over the course of the four years of data. However, the general student average standardized test scores have risen by more than 20 points over the same time period. The university’s higher standards in eliminating special admits, coupled with Athletics’ need to continue recruiting specific talents in addition to academic credentials is the likely reason. Also, the student-athlete test scores (943 being the lowest) were not below that of the regular admissions requirements of the university.

**Black discussion:** While the black general student population outscored the black student-athlete population in two of the four years of data (2006-2007 and 2008-2009), the black student-athlete population outscored the black general student population by 54 points in 2007-2008 and by 119 points in 2009-2010. This fluctuation in scores with one group scoring higher than the other group in alternating years can be attributed to the random changes in averages when there are low numbers in the cohort (16 to 22 for student-athletes and 126 to 254 for general students).

**Hispanic discussion:** In 2006-2007, the Hispanic student-athlete average test score was 103 points lower than the average for Hispanic students in general. By 2008-2009, the same student-athlete subgroup demonstrated an average test score of only 15 points less than the general student population. Further, in the latest year of data (2009-2010), Hispanic student –athletes outscoresed Hispanic students in general by 99 points.

**White discussion:** The white subgroup of student-athletes consistently demonstrates lower test scores than the white general student population (by 28 to 58 points). However, with the lowest average test score year (2009-2010) being 996 for white student-athletes, this particular subgroup is consistently within 10 points of the overall
SJSU student test scores of approximately 1000. This discrepancy can be attributed to Athletics’ need to recruit specific talents in addition to academic credentials.

**Other discussion:** With only 4 student-athletes in the 2006-2007 other population, it is difficult to compare the group to the other general student cohort of 229. Further, the 947 average test score is the median average score for all of the student-athlete subgroups in that particular year.

**Standardized Test Score Analysis According to the Eight Sport Subgroups**

With regard to specific sport groups, eight of the cells in the Test Scores and GPA by Sport Chart contain “**” because there were two or fewer student-athletes in the subgroup for that particular year. The chart instructions indicate that “institutions are not required to report data if the number of students in a group is two or less”. Those subgroups are: Men’s Basketball (2008-2009), Men’s Cross Country (2008-2009 and 2009-2010), and Women’s Cross Country (2009-2010).

Following is an analysis of sport subgroup test score data for first-year student-athletes on athletics aid:

**Football:** While the 2008-2009 average test score for first-year football student-athletes on athletics aid (870) was significantly lower than the average test score for all male first-year student-athletes on athletics aid (1046), in each of the other three years of data football student-athletes outscored the all male student-athlete group by 23 to 65 points. The 2008-2009 football average test score is an anomaly in the data which is likely to occur over time. Most importantly, the average test score for first-year football student-athletes on athletics aid in the most recent year of data (2009-2010) was 1065, well above (by 60+ points) that of the male student-athletes and all SJSU students in general for that same year.

**Men’s Basketball:** The men’s basketball average test score for first-year student-athletes was lower than the average test score for all male first-year student athletes in two of the four years of data (2006-2007 and 2009-2010). This is commonly the case throughout Division I basketball institutions across the country. SJSU recognizes that this particular group enters the institution at a higher academic risk, and provides special academic support in the form of academic advising, learning specialists and tutoring to these student-athletes.

**Baseball:** The baseball average test score for first-year student-athletes was lower than the average test score for all male first-year student athletes in two of the four years of data (2008-2009 and 2009-2010). While these test scores were not as high as those from our other men’s programs for these years, baseball is faced with the need to recruit for specific abilities in order to be competitively successful. Some years, their test score data is actually higher than the average for other men’s programs. This particular team has earned either the highest SJSU men’s team cumulative GPA or the 2nd highest SJSU men’s team cumulative GPA in each of the past 4 years.
**Women’s Basketball:** The women’s basketball average test score for first-year student-athletes was lower than the average test score for all female first-year student athletes in two of the four years of data (2008-2009 and 2009-2010). In 2009-2010, their average test score was only 9 points lower than the average for all female student-athletes. The 2009-2010 difference was more significant (105 points lower). However, they outscored the general female student-athletes in each of the prior two years. Further, SJSU recognizes that this particular group enters the institution at a higher academic risk due to the slightly lower test scores, and provides special academic support in the form of academic advising, learning specialists and tutoring to these student-athletes.

**Women’s Cross Country:** While the women’s cross country average test score for first-year student-athletes on athletics aid is lower than the female student-athlete average test score for first-year student-athletes in general (2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009), they are consistently one of the top performing academic teams in the Department of Athletics. Their incoming test scores were 3.035 in 2006-2007, 3.183 in 2007-2008, and 3.495 in 2008-2009, indicating their strong ability to succeed academically. Further, the team has regularly earned over a 3.2 cumulative GPA every semester for the past 5 years.

### NCAA Concerns:
- Not meeting the measurable standard.
- Data is included and explained, but the data provided does not match the data within the chart on page 119 from SSI #6.
- If data is different, explanation will be different.

### Resolved:
Data available for those student-athletes admitted to SJSU as special admits over the last four years is displayed in the chart below. Evaluation is challenging since the university declared impaction in the spring of 2009. This change in the university’s admissions standing resulted in the elimination of special admits to SJSU. Therefore, the AAFAC and EAC special admission committees became obsolete. The 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009 number of student-athletes evaluated for this question reflects those admitted through one of the two special admission committees. In 2009-2010, the number of student-athletes represents those admitted through the use of a special talents tag granted to the department of athletics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>Ave. GPA After 1st Year</th>
<th># Retained After 1st Year</th>
<th>Graduated or Still in School Sp’11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.433</td>
<td>20 (83.3%)</td>
<td>13 (54.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.563</td>
<td>9 (81.8%)</td>
<td>9 (81.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.383</td>
<td>9 (90.0%)</td>
<td>8 (80.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.532</td>
<td>12 (85.7%)</td>
<td>11 (78.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After their first year of enrollment is rather random for each of the four years evaluated. However, ranging from 2.383 to 2.563, the average GPA for each year is well above the minimal eligibility and SJSU good standing standard of 2.0.

**SJSU Athletics Special Admit Retention Analysis:** The percentage of special admits who are retained after one year at SJSU is relatively consistent between 80% and 90%. More importantly, however, the retention rates through spring 2011 for special admits are significantly higher in the most recent three years than in the first year of data. This can be attributed to the focus on APR Improvement Plans which have included special admit limitations. Additionally, there has been a shift in Student-Athlete Success Services philosophy (begun two years ago) from advising to meet NCAA eligibility to advising to graduate. This has likely contributed to the higher persistence of special admits towards graduation. Details of this philosophy are described in operating principle 2.2 question #4 and question #6.

The addition of weekly advising meetings for all newcomers (freshmen and transfer) as well as continuing at-risk student-athletes may be another reason more special admits are persisting as eligible student-athletes. These meetings have helped at-risk student-athletes to better connect with the support system in place in Student-Athlete Success Services as well as support services throughout the university. The content and structure of the weekly meetings are detailed in question #8 in operating principle 2.1 and question # 6 in operating principle 2.2.

**OP 2.1d/ Line Item 17/ Pg. 69-72**

**NCAA Concern:**
- Not meeting the measurable standard.
- Did not explain the most recent four-class retention rates for the following teams: Men's Cross Country Hispanic/Latino and Men's Soccer Black/African American.

**Resolved:** While there are several anomalies between the most recent four-class retention rate for student-athlete subgroups and the most recent four-class retention rate for all student-athletes, the SJSU overall student-athlete APR and graduation and retention rates have been rising over the past 6 years. The results of APR Improvement Plan implementation (as outlined in 2.2 question #12) demonstrate the Division of Intercollegiate Athletics’ attention and focus on improving retention rates for student-athletes overall and for specific student-athlete subgroups. Further, the Student-Athlete Success Services Unit has adopted a plan to emphasize graduation within a four year window so that every student-athlete graduates and exhausts eligibility in the same semester or sooner.

The following charts show the SJSU student-athlete sub-group cohorts with a four-class retention rate below the SJSU all-student-athlete four-class retention rate of 936 highlighted in blue. These charts were used to identify which sub-groups mandated four-class retention rate sub-group analysis and explanation.
### Gender Retention Rate Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>SJSU All Student-Athlete Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MALE Ethnicity Retention Rate Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity Sub-Group</th>
<th>All SJSU Male Student-Athletes</th>
<th>Baseball</th>
<th>Basketball</th>
<th>Cross Country</th>
<th>Football</th>
<th>Golf</th>
<th>Men's Soccer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./AN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian /PI</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR Alien</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FEMALE Ethnicity Retentions Rate Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity Sub-Group</th>
<th>All SJSU Female Student-Athletes</th>
<th>Basketball</th>
<th>Cross Country</th>
<th>Golf</th>
<th>Gymnastics</th>
<th>Softball</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./AN</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian /PI</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR Alien</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following list provides analysis and explanation of differences between the most recent four-class retention rates for those student-athlete sub-groups indicating a rate lower than the corresponding all-student-athlete retention rate of 936.

1. **Overall Team by Team Comparison:** All of the SJSU teams with a four-class retention rate below the SJSU all student-athlete retention rate (based on 2008-2009 data) have higher overall APR scores in 2009-2010. Since one half of the APR score represents retention points, these teams are clearly making positive strides in their retention rates. The APR improvements for each of those teams with a retention rate lower than the all student-athlete retention rate of 936 are listed in the chart below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>4-class Retention Rate</th>
<th>2008-2009 APR</th>
<th>2009-2010 APR</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>+26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Basketball</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Soccer</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>+34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Basketball</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Baseball:** The White/Non-Hispanic baseball retention rate is 925 and the Hispanic/Latino baseball retention rate is 684. These rates are lower than the all student-athlete rate due, in part, to a high number of baseball student-athletes professionalizing prior to graduation. Additionally, baseball has traditionally had a higher number of transfers than many of SJSU’s other sports. This is consistent with the culture of baseball across the country.
3. **Men’s Basketball**: The Black/African American men’s basketball subgroup has a retention rate of 878. This can be attributed to several student-athletes from that subgroup professionalizing immediately upon exhausting eligibility, but prior to completing their degrees. The Student-Athlete Success Services 2009 implementation of a 4-year graduation plan for all student-athletes is now allowing more of these student-athletes to graduate and exhaust eligibility in the same semester.

4. **Men’s Cross Country**: The Hispanic/Latino men’s cross-country subgroup retention rate is 833. As a result of APR improvement plans implemented for this sport, the team’s overall APR scores have increased dramatically. This team’s roster is typically 10 or fewer; and the actual number of Hispanic/Latinos on the roster for a given year is usually two or less (sometimes zero). Thus, failing to retain just one student-athlete from this particular cohort can skew the subgroup retention rate drastically downward. Further, the chart below shows that the team’s APR for 2010 is +37 points higher than the 2009 APR data used to identify the current retention rates and over 250 points higher than APR data from just four years prior. With an overall 2010 APR of 967, the Hispanic/Latino men’s cross country subgroup is likely to have a more current retention rate closer to the all student-athlete retention rate of 936.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>+/- Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>+37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>+93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>+23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>+124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>-267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Football**: The Black/African American football subgroup retention rate (900), Hispanic/Latino football subgroup retention rate (865), NR Alien subgroup retention rate (833), and Other subgroup retention rate (923) are below the all student-athlete retention rate (936). This is lower than the all student-athlete rate due, in part, to a high number of football student-athletes unable to complete their degrees in the same semester they exhaust their eligibility. The Student-Athlete Success Services 2009 implementation of a 4-year graduation plan for all student-athletes is now allowing more of these student-athletes to graduate and exhaust eligibility in the same semester.

6. **Men’s Golf**: The Asian/PI men’s golf subgroup retention rate is 667, and the Hispanic/Latino men’s golf subgroup retention rate is 750. While these retention rates are low, the men’s golf GSR is 60% indicating that student-athletes who transfer from this program tend to be academically eligible. Also, since the actual number of student-athletes in these two men’s golf subgroups is very small (within a very small overall men’s golf roster size), just one transfer can drastically skew the
retention data downward. Note: the men’s golf overall team retention rate is 937 (one point higher than the all student-athlete retention rate).

7. **Men’s Soccer**: The Hispanic/Latino men’s soccer subgroup retention rate (917), White/Non-Hispanic men’s soccer subgroup retention rate (906), Black/African American men’s soccer subgroup retention rate (883), and Other men’s soccer subgroup retention rate (889) are below the all student-athlete retention rate (936). As a result of APR improvement plans implemented for this sport, the team’s overall APR scores have increased dramatically. The chart below shows that the team’s APR for 2010 is +34 points higher than the 2009 APR data used to identify the current retention rates. With an overall 2010 APR of 962 (over 120 points higher than four years prior), the Hispanic/Latino, White/Non-Hispanic, Black/African American, and Other men’s soccer subgroups are likely to have more current retention rates closer to the all student-athlete retention rate of 936.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>+/- Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>+34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>+51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>+27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **Women’s Basketball**: The Black/African American women’s basketball subgroup retention rate (918), White/Non-Hispanic women’s basketball subgroup retention rate (897), and Other women’s basketball subgroup retention rate (800) are below the all student-athlete retention rate (936). Over the past five years, this team has experienced the stress of coaching changes and several losing seasons in a row. In particular, three years ago the new coach needed to “clean house” in order to bring about a culture change in the program. Consequently, there have been quite a few transfers from the program due to factors unrelated to academic integrity. Even so, the chart below shows the team’s consistent overall APR improvement from year to year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>+/- Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>+28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **Softball**: The Asian/PI softball subgroup retention rate (857) and the Black/African American softball subgroup retention rate (778) are below the all student-athlete
retention rate (936). The number of student-athletes in these subgroups is very small relative to the overall make-up of the roster. Therefore, just one transfer can drastically skew the retention data downward. Note: the softball overall team retention rate is 943 (seven points higher than the all student-athlete retention rate).

10. **Women’s Soccer:** The Other women’s soccer subgroup retention rate (667) is below the all student-athlete retention rate (936). This subgroup is very small, and the team’s overall retention rate is 940 (four points higher than the all student-athlete retention rate).

11. **Women’s Tennis:** The NR Alien women’s tennis subgroup retention rate (917) is below the all student-athlete retention rate (936). Since the actual number of student-athletes in this women’s tennis subgroup is very small (within a very small overall women’s tennis roster size), just one transfer can drastically skew the retention data downward. Note: the women’s tennis overall team retention rate is 981 (forty-five points higher than the all student-athlete retention rate).

### OP 2.2a/ Line Item 5/ Pg. 88

**NCAA Concern:**
- Not meeting the measurable standard.
- Did not explain how the academic support services are meeting the needs of student-athletes at the institution based on staffing, physical space and financial support.

**Resolved:** As part of the Cycle 3 Certification self-study process, the institution’s staffing, physical space and financial support for student-athlete academic support services was reviewed by the Associate Provost (Maureen Scharberg), FAR (Bill Campsey), and Athletics Board Chair (Annette Nellen). They evaluated the academic support services section of the Head Coaches’ Needs Assessment Survey administered in the Fall of 2010 and interviewed members of the Student-Athlete Success Services staff, SJSU Disability Resource Center and SJSU Learning Assistance Resource Center. As a result, they identified five issues that are listed in a plan for improvement currently submitted in ACS:

1. Need more tutors
2. Need to increase experience and training of tutors
3. Lack of instructor participation in academic progress reporting
4. Academic Support space is limited and used for multiple purposes
5. Study hall is often overcrowded and loud during the evening

### OP 2.2/ Line Item 13/ Pg. 116-117

**NCAA Concerns:**
- Institution noted that no plan for improvement was developed.
- A plan for improvement is in ACS.
- Plan must be developed through a process involving broad-based participation and must receive formal institutional approval.
Resolved: The institution’s staffing, physical space and financial support for student-athlete academic support services was reviewed by the Associate Provost (Maureen Scharberg), FAR (Bill Campsey), and Athletics Board Chair (Annette Nellen). This review resulted in the creation of a plan for improvement addressing five issues:

1. Need more tutors
2. Need to increase experience and training of tutors
3. Lack of instructor participation in academic progress reporting
4. Academic Support space is limited and used for multiple purposes
5. Study hall is often overcrowded and loud during the evening

The plan for improvement was presented to the Division of Athletics Senior Staff, Athletics Board, Gender Equity and Diversity in Athletics Committee, the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs. The Plan for Improvement was approved by the San Jose State University President.

OP 3.1a/ Line Item 2/ Pg. 131-134

NCAA Concern:
- Did not provide a complete response to the SSI.
- Did not explain why Goal #1 was partially completed.
- Institution must provide an explanation for partial completion of a plan.

Resolved: Goal #1 is complete. Head and assistant coaches in like sports are paid equitable salaries. In the case of baseball and softball, the current softball coach was brought in at a comparable rate to conference members and like conference institutions. The discrepancy in baseball and softball coach salaries is due to the head baseball coach being in place for 25 years opposed to a four year coaching span of the head softball coach.

OP 3.1b/ Line Item 9/ Pg. 142-160

NCAA Concern:
- Not meeting the measurable standard.
- Did not describe how the institution has ensured a complete study of each of the 15 program areas.

Resolved: As part of the self-study for the Cycle 3 Certification, a written survey was developed and conducted across all 16 of the men’s and women’s programs, asking the participants to answer the specific questions within each of the 15 program areas for review. Please see attached survey along with tabulation of answers from all head coaches. The analysis of the data for each of the program areas as presented in #9 as conducted by the self-study subcommittee of gender equity.
NCAA Concern:

• Not meeting the measurable standard.
• Did not provide specific timetables for the following program areas: Accommodation of Interests and Abilities, Athletic Scholarships, Scheduling of Games and Practice Times, Travel Allowances, Academic Support Services, Locker Rooms, Practice and Competitive Facilities, Medical and Training Facilities and Services, Publicity and Awards, Retention and Participation in Governance and Decision Making.
• Program area of Athletic Scholarships lists "implement a plan" within the steps to achieve goals. Implementing a plan is not actually a step to achieving the goal. This is more of a plan to plan.
• The program area of Equipment and Supplies lists "create a process" within steps to achieve goals. Creating a process is not actually a step to achieving the goal. This is more of a plan to plan.
• The program area of Coaches lists "develop a recruiting process" within steps to achieve goals. Developing a process is not actually a step to achieving the goal. This is more of a plan to plan.
• The program area of Housing and Dining Facilities and Services lists "proposes a plan" within steps to achieve goals. Proposing a plan is not actually a step to achieving the goal. This is more of a plan to plan.

Resolved:
Added dates to Gender Equity Plan
Steps to Achieve Goals in:

• Athletic Scholarships:
  Strike “Implement a plan”

• Equipment and Supplies:
  Strike “create a process for” and substitute “appoint”

• Coaches:
  Strike “Develop a recruiting process that identifies and reaches” and substitute with “Identify and recruit the best female coaches.”

• Housing and Dining Facilities:
  Strike “proposes a plan to incrementally”

NCAA Concern:

• Not meeting the measurable standard.
• Institution did not describe how it will review its plan on an annual basis and needs to include this in the plan for improvement.
Resolved: SJSU has developed a five-year plan for improvement during the self-study process for Operating Principle 3.1. The plan will be reviewed annually by the GEDAC (Gender Equity and Diversity Advisory Committee) and presented to the Athletics Board for approval. This review will also include annual evaluation of the EADA report, NCAA financial reports, and an annual survey and evaluation of the 15 program areas.

As stated earlier, the Sr. Woman Administrator will be responsible for developing this review in concert with the Faculty Athletics Representative. The review will be evaluated and approved, with necessary recommendations, and then forwarded to the President’s Office.

**OP 3.1c/ Line Item 12/ Pg. 161-164**

NCAA Concern:
- Not meeting the measurable standard.
- It remains unclear if the plan for improvement received formal institutional approval.

Resolved: The Plan for Improvement was approved by the San Jose State University President.

**OP 3.2/ Line Item 9/ Pg. 172-173**

NCAA Concern:
- Not meeting the measurable standard.
- Did not provide evidence that an assessment and comparison of the institution’s and department of athletics' hiring practices has occurred at least once every five years.

Resolved: The standards in the submitted areas include but are not limited to the assessment of the applicant pools prior to hire, to insure the recruitment of underrepresented applicants. Additionally, HR assesses and monitors all University staff hires including the Athletic Department to insure compliance with Affirmative Action and Federal Laws. The University and the Athletics Department’s staff hires are assessed by Human Resources and the process is the same for all staff University positions. To that end, the Athletic Department’s staff hiring process is not unique and is audited and assessed by Human Resources during every recruitment.

**OP 3.2c/ Line Item 15/ Pg. 182, 185-186**

NCAA Concern:
- Not meeting the measurable standard.
- Timetables within the plan for improvement are not specific in all four program areas.

Resolved: Added the following dates:

- Assessment Timetable #4:
  Spring 2011 and ongoing, annually
• Retention Timetable #1:  
  Spring 2011 and ongoing, annually

• Retention Timetable #2:  
  Spring 2011 and ongoing, annually

• Partnerships Timetable #1:  
  Spring 2011 and ongoing, annually

• Participation in governance and decision making Timetable #1:  
  Spring 2011 and ongoing, annually

NCAA Concern:
• Not meeting the measurable standard.
• Institution described how it will review its plan on an annual basis. However, it needs to include this in the plan for improvement.

Resolved:  Added specific timetables to the plan

NCAA Response:
• Not meeting the measurable standard.
• It remains unclear if the plan for improvement received formal institutional approval.
• Did not identify the length of the plan for improvement.

Resolved:  The Plan for Improvement was approved by the San Jose State University President. Plan will be a 5-year plan congruent with Certification Cycles.

NCAA CONCERN:
• Did not provide complete response to the SSI.
• Did not include dates the steps were completed within the additional goal.

Resolved:  The steps taken were updated with dates. New version is below.

a. Steps taken by the institution to achieve the goals:
  The following steps have been taken by San Jose State University Department of Athletics to improve Student-Athlete Well-Being:
  • Redefinition of Student Academic Success Services and the establishment of a new mission statement and core values was achieved in August 2010, in preparation for the Fall 2010 semester.
  • Renovation of San Jose State University Athletic Compliance Department was completed in September 2010 by the newly appointed
Associate Athletic Director for Compliance, Lynn Meade to advance Student-Athlete knowledge of NCAA Rules and Regulations. This was accomplished by education modules integrated into Student-Athlete orientation and the online publication of “The Whistler” a monthly Compliance Newsletter.

- In Fall 2009, the SJSU Athletic Department began development of the Student-Athlete Orientation Program with the goal of enhancement of the Pre-Season Meetings and the establishment of the Student Athlete Code of Conduct Program (p. 9 Student handbook) to improve Student-Athlete Personal Accountability. Completed August 2009.
- An elevation in status and importance of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) and an inherent department-wide commitment made to the CHAMPS Life Skills Program was completed in Fall 2008 and is a continuing commitment as SAAC and CHAMPS become more central to the operations of the Athletic Department.
- Revision and expansion of the Student Athlete Handbook occurred in July 2010 for the Fall 2010 semester (last revised 2010) to 55 pages, that includes specific chapters on: Spartan Student Services (pp 21-26); Student-Athlete Physical Welfare (pp29-36), and Student-Athlete Environment (pp 45-55).

OP 3.3a/ Line Item 4/ Pg.189-190

NCAA Concern:
- Not meeting the measurable standard.
- Institution’s exit interview instrument does not contain questions related to letters b, c and f within the measurable standard. (b was stricken from the record, as it was addressed in the original submission.)

Resolved: The Student Athlete Exit Interview Instrument was revised in June 2011. The new version has already been adopted and will be used for any SA Exit Interview from June 20, 2011.

The instrument was changed to include letters c and f.
  c. The institutions efforts to measure the extent of time demands encountered by student-athletes.
  f. The institution’s commitment to informing student-athletes about the NCAA Special Assistance Fund and NCAA Student Athlete Opportunity Fund

The SA Exit Interview is attached as Appendix A

The changes to the SA Exit Interview have been made on page 4 of the SA Exit Interview Instrument, Student Services; one item was included to address letter c.

5. My Head Coach’s awareness of time demands placed on student-athletes

The changes have been made on page 3, Student Services; two items were included to address letter f.

6. Received information for NCAA Special Assistance Fund and NCAA Student-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Athlete Opportunity Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Received information of campus resources and programs available to all University students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>