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Association of Chief Admissions Officers of Public Universities (ACAOPU)

The Association of Chief Admissions Officers of Public Universities (ACAOPU) is the premier national professional organization for directors/deans of admission at the nation's public flagship universities.

The mission of ACAOPU is to facilitate the sharing of information and best practices among the directors/deans of admissions at the nation’s public flagship universities to enable them to continually improve their service to their institutions.

A. By design, ACAOPU operates as a relatively informal professional organization. It is a 401-C3 non-profit organization that has modest annual dues. ACAOPU does not have a paid staff and has chosen, to date, not to have a website.

B. ACAOPU's strength and effectiveness stems from its members who are some of the most influential admissions officer from some of the largest and most prominent institutions in the United States.

C. The work of ACAOPU is primarily accomplished through:
   a. An annual summer meeting.
   b. Meetings during national meetings of organizations such as the College Board and AACRAO.
   c. An active listserv.

ACAOPU Executive Council

The overall governance of ACAOPU rests with its Executive Council. The Executive Council is comprised of the current and the past presidents of ACAOPU who are still active in the admissions profession.

The current president of ACAOPU is Pam Horne, Associate Vice Provost for Enrollment Management and Dean of Admissions, Purdue University.

ACAOPU past presidents who are members of the Executive Council are:

- Robert Barkley, Director of Admissions, Clemson University.
- Wayne Sigler, Director of Admissions, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities.
- Christine Van Giesen, Director of Admissions and Associate Dean for Enrollment Management, University of California-Santa Barbara.
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Genesis of the Athletic Admissions Best Practices Committee

The flagship status and public mission of ACAOPU institutions, combined with their membership in major athletic conferences, requires that ACAOPU directors and deans of admission work in highly visible, high-stakes, and sensitive roles.

In carrying out their responsibilities, ACAOPU directors and deans (referred to in this document as AM, ACAOPU members) insure that admission decisions, policies and procedures comply with federal, state, and institutional laws and regulations. The AM also work in concert with their respective Departments of Intercollegiate Athletics to insure the application procedures and outcomes of prospective P athletes (PSAs) comply with institutional regulations and those of the NCAA and the athletic conferences.

NCAA regulations are designed to create a level field for recruiting PSAs. For most ACAOPU institutions, admission guidelines are often more stringent than NCAA clearinghouse eligibility guidelines for athletic participation. In addition, institutional admission policies and procedures often differ from one another. These differences may cause concerns about competitive disadvantages in the recruiting process.

The following must be emphasized:

- the majority of PSAs are capable students who represent themselves and their institutions in an excellent manner, and are admitted without issue
- the number of PSA admission cases that are problematic represent an extremely small percentage of an institution's application pool
- the vast majority of coaches, athletic officials, athletic conference officials, and admissions officers work very well together and share these common goals:
  - to run admissions and athletic programs that abide by the rules and regulations and are a credit to their institutions
  - to have PSAs graduate in a timely fashion and move on to productive lives and careers

The few PSA situations that arise as a result of the differences noted above are magnified because of the public nature of Division I athletics. The appropriate management of the athletic admission process is critical to avoid harm to students, staff and institutions.

In an effort to proactively address potentially problematic situations that can arise, the ACAOPU Athletic Admissions Best Practices Committee was formed in 2010 to:
1. Identify the various athletic-related admissions issues that are not specifically addressed by the NCAA or conference legislation; and
2. Develop consensus-based best practice recommendations for addressing these issues.

To carry out its charge, eight volunteer members of the ACAOPU Athletic Admissions Best Practices Committee prepared this draft report. In preparing the draft, the Committee participated in a two-day work session in Chicago in December 2010, which was preceded by extensive work by the committee members who drafted the issues and recommended best practices for discussion. During the Chicago meeting, the Committee consulted with representatives from the ACT Corporation, the College Board, the Educational Testing Service, the NCAA, and met briefly with Jim Delaney, Commissioner of the Big Ten Conference, to update him on its work. A first draft of the report was shared with all ACAOPU members during its summer 2011 meeting in Chapel Hill. Comments were solicited from the membership and through the membership, from staff in Athletic Departments and other university leadership.

Cautions: (1) Committee members do not speak for their athletic conferences. (2) ACAOPU members are not bound to follow the consensus-based best practice recommendations contained in this report.

This report will have a major influence on the admission profession because it represents the consensus of some of the most influential admission officers from some of the largest and most prominent public institutions of higher education in the country. It provides directors and deans of admission with professionally developed best practice recommendations and the endorsement from a national professional association.

The issues and attendant best practice recommendations contained in this report will continue to evolve, therefore, the ACAOPU Athletics Admissions Best Practices Committee will periodically update and revise the report. The Committee will also continue to reach out to other professional organizations which have a stake in the contents of the report.
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I) Working Relationship and Communication

1. The Office of Admissions and the Athletic Department should seek a collaborative working relationship with transparency and clarity as goals. Specifically, the Admission Office and Department of Athletics (including the Compliance Office) should:
   a. Understand and appreciate the unique nature of Division I athletics and the pressures placed upon coaches and PSAs.
   b. Offer strong support of each office in upholding institutional, conference and NCAA regulations.
   c. Provide clear and frequent two-way communications regarding the level of academic preparation of students the institution enrolls, the institution’s admission policies, and minimum requirements for admission, where applicable.
   d. A structured ongoing process should be in place in which admissions provides feedback to the athletic department on the admissibility of individual PSAs. Every attempt should be made to avoid surprises.
   e. Provide timely alerts on eligibility concerns for PSAs. Every attempt should be made to avoid surprises.
   f. Identify a staff member in the Admission Office to work directly with staff in the Athletic Department’s Compliance unit who will regularly communicate on admission matters. Regardless of the funding source (Admissions or Athletics) for this position, the incumbent should be housed in and report to the Office of Admissions.
   g. Review policies and procedures periodically for effectiveness to determine needs for improvement.
   h. Focus on protecting the integrity of the institution’s mission, policies and procedures.
   i. Provide one another timely answers on questions from each office. Responses must be based on best practices in the Athletic Compliance and Admission professions.
   j. Direct contact between Admission staff and coaches around admission decisions is discouraged. Many institutions have policies which restrict communication around admission decisions and explicitly exclude coaches. This is recommended.

II) Admission Policy Issues
1. The Office of Admissions is responsible for making admission decisions based upon institutional mission, institutional policies and best practices of the admission profession. The potential for academic success of the applicant is fundamental in every process. In selective admission processes, an assessment about where the applicant stands in the pool is done.

2. Admission is a central function of a university, and policies which guide individual decisions must be administered consistently, fairly, and in a timely manner. The Office of Admissions must protect the best interest of the applicant, the institution, and the integrity of the process.

3. According to NCAA policy, PSAs must be considered on the same admissions standards as all applicants.

4. The authority for admission decisions rests with the Office of Admissions unit head (typically Director, Dean or Assistant/Associate Vice President). If another entity holds the admission authority, this should be clearly articulated at each institution. Admission decisions for PSAs are the responsibility of the admission authority.

5. Offers made by coaches and Intercollegiate Athletic staff are not equivalent to offers of admission. This should be made clear to PSAs.

6. The University's admission policy should address, in a transparent fashion, how it will review applicants with special skills and talents, such as athletes.

7. While NCAA qualifier status is a standard for participation in intercollegiate athletics, it does not equate to an offer of admission nor is it an assurance of admission.

8. Some institutions provide, as a part of its admissions policies, an appeals process for cases of students with special talents. This option should be approved and supported by the institution's senior leadership. It is recommended that admissions offices make general admissions policies, appeals policies, and policies on admission of students with special talents available to the public, such as on the admission website or in the academic bulletin or catalog.

9. The Athletic Compliance office should provide regular training on NCAA and conference rules and regulations to those involved in the admission process, and should alert the admissions office to any changes.
10. The Athletic Compliance office should ensure the coaching staff is aware of NCAA, conference, and institutional rules, regulations and policies governing the admission of PSAs.

11. Institutions offering admission to PSAs with NCAA eligibility pending need to identify a process which may result in admission being rescinded if the applicant does not become a qualifier by a date determined by the Admissions Office. This should be clearly communicated between the Admissions Office, Intercollegiate Athletics and the PSAs.

12. The PSA should receive the same reminders from the admissions office that all students receive (e.g., missing information communications, deadlines reminders, etc.).

13. Unless the institution routinely offers conditional admission, these offers should only be made on a rare, case-by-case basis. The conditions of admission should be clearly specified and strictly enforced.

14. Admission decisions should be made using official documents. Unless the institutions routinely offers admission based upon unofficial documents, their use should be restricted to unusual situations with extenuating circumstances. If unofficial documents are used in making an admission decision, any conditions of admission (e.g., date by which official documents must be received) must be clearly communicated to the PSA and the Athletics Department.

III) Admission Exceptions

1. It is recommended that institutions establish a limit on the number of exceptions to regular admission requirements which can be made for PSAs.

2. Once limits for students with special talents are set, there should be clear guidelines on what constitutes an exception and what special requirements are in place to support students (e.g., summer programs, enrollment in specific courses or majors).

3. Institutions should have procedures in place to monitor admission exceptions and routinely review their academic performance and overall success. Adjustments to the number of admission exceptions should be made after considering the academic success of PSAs in this category.
4. PSAs who are admitted as admission exceptions may not be notified of this unless the institution requires conditions or restrictions as a part of their status.

IV) **Timing of Admission**

A. **Timely receipt of application, fees and supporting materials**

1. PSAs should be encouraged to apply by all regular application deadlines.

2. Some high profile sports have signing dates that may not be consistent with regular institutional deadlines. In these cases, it is typical to require an application within 30 days of signing a National Letter of Intent or June 1 (for fall semester), whichever is first.

3. Regardless of the timing of the application for admission, the Office of Admissions must perform appropriate due diligence in accordance with its established policies and procedures. Not doing so would place the institution in serious risk.

4. The Office of Admissions must communicate to Intercollegiate Athletics the last date that the institution will allow a student to be admitted. The admissions process should not be open-ended. The Admissions Office must set a series of deadlines before that date that the applicant must meet. An example can be the deadline to submit a final transcript and prove admissibility. If the applicant does not meet one of the deadlines, the application should not be considered for that term.

5. Students should not plan travel to campus for classes until they have been admitted.

V) **The Admission Decision, General**

A. **Accurate and complete records**

1. In order to render the best admission decision possible, the Admissions Office must have full and complete knowledge of the applicant’s academic record.
2. Most admission programs require applicants to provide transcripts from all prior educational institutions attended, secondary and post-secondary.

3. Standardized test scores are only official if they come from the testing agency. It is not recommended to accept standardized test scores from other sources (e.g., the applicant, coach, high school or college transcript).

4. It is not recommended to accept unofficial or third-party documents.

5. Gaps in enrollment should be accounted for, and the Admissions Office should request the applicant provide a complete explanation and record of time spent since high school graduation.

6. The institution should make full use of available resources (e.g. website searches, transcript review, or National Student Clearinghouse searches) to secure relevant admission information, especially if there is suspicion of irregularities.

7. Applicants should submit all admission test scores despite performance so the Admissions Office has a full range of information to make the most informed decision possible.

B. Document Accuracy

1. Credentials fraud is an international concern in all industries. Colleges and universities are not immune from this threat and must be vigilant to avoid procuring falsified documents. Applicants are responsible for the authenticity of their admission materials. The Admissions Office can support PSAs by following strict procedures intended to guard against fraud.

2. Admission-related documents, such as high school transcripts and letters of recommendation should be sent from the high school or author directly to the Office of Admission. Each Admissions Office should develop a policy dictating the receipt of official documents.

3. Third parties, such as coaches, should not be involved in receiving admission materials.

4. There are occasions when it is appropriate for a designated office, such as Athletic Compliance, to receive documents needed to determine NCAA eligibility. In these cases, it is a best practice to present documents in unopened envelopes to the Admission Office.
5. Credentials should only be deemed official if sent directly from sending authority (high school, college, test agency, etc.) to the Office of Admissions, or an office or department authorized by the Office of Admissions (such as Compliance, etc.).

Several important resources for ensuring the authenticity of documents can be found at AACRAO’s website (www.aacrao.org). Some resources include:

- *The AACRAO 2011 Academic Record and Transcript Guide*
- *The AACRAO International Guide: A Resource for International Education Professionals*
- *Counterfeit Diplomas and Transcripts*
- *Accreditation Mills*
- *Guide to Bogus Institutions and Documents*

C. Online course enrollment

1. Online courses are an acceptable mode of instruction and are becoming more prevalent in education. Online courses need to be scrutinized to determine level and rigor in relation to in-person instruction.

2. Check the high school transcript or profile for any designation that the course was taken online.

3. Check with Compliance Office to determine if the high school is on the NCAA “non-eligible” list. If “yes”, do not consider the work done at that school for admissions purposes.

4. If not on the NCAA “non-eligible” list:
   a. Contact the NCAA Clearing House to determine if the online program is under NCAA review.
   b. Check on the school’s website for available information, including accreditation.
   c. Review other online information as available.

5. Contact that State Board of Education for an assessment of the high school.

6. Consult with colleagues in that state for their assessment of the validity of that school’s work.
D. Admission of students with documented learning disabilities

1. Students with documented disabilities must be able to perform college level work with reasonable accommodation.

2. Generally, students should have been tested within last 5 years and have a Diagnostic Statistic Manual (DSM) diagnosis in order to qualify for disability services. It is recommended that a licensed psychologist (Clinical, School or Educational Psychologist) perform the battery of tests necessary for a specific diagnosis found in the DSM. An Individualized Education Program (IEP) may not be sufficient to adequately determine needs and accommodations.

3. The review of students who present learning disability documentation (see above) should be consistent between PSAs and all other applicants.

4. Disclosure of a learning disability during the admission process and post enrollment is completely voluntary. Students should not be instructed to submit learning disability documentation unless they choose to disclose this during the admission process.

5. The policy and process guiding the admission of students with learning disabilities should be discussed between the Office of Admissions, General Counsel, and Disability Services Offices.

6. A learning disability may not explain large score differences and should be susceptible to a test score review using institutional policies and a verification from ACT or College Board if the score variance exceeds guidelines.

7. PSAs with learning disabilities who meet NCAA eligibility requirements do not need to seek a waiver with the NCAA. PSAs with learning disabilities who do not meet NCAA eligibility requirements may request special consideration for initial eligibility. The institution may submit the Initial-Eligibility Waiver (IEW).

8. All students must register with the Disability Services Office at their college/university in order to receive accommodations as specified in their documentation. This is the case for PSAs whether or not they meet NCAA eligibility requirements.

E. PSAs not yet determined to be qualifiers.
1. Achievement of NCAA qualifier status is not an assurance of admission.

2. If an institution decides to admit an applicant with athletic eligibility pending, it should be with the stipulation that admission may be rescinded if the applicant does not become a qualifier by a date determined by the Admissions Office.

VI) Freshman Admission

A. High school accreditation.

1. Institutions should publish high school accreditation requirements and use the same for PSAs and all students.

B. Test Score Accuracy

1. It is a best practice in the admissions community to review significant test score inconsistencies for all applicants.

2. The written test score review policy must be administered uniformly for PSAs and all applicants.

3. The Admissions Office should ensure that the Athletic Department staff, especially in Athletic Compliance, understand the test score review policy.

4. It is recommended for the Admissions Office to request verification of scores from ACT or SAT whenever there is a variance between scores of:

   SAT sum increase (critical reading and math) 300
   SAT critical reading or math increase 150
   ACT composite increase 5
   ACT sub score increase 6

5. If a PSA has taken both the ACT and SAT exams, scores should be compared according to the ATC/SAT conversion chart available at http://www.act.org/aap/concordance or http://professionals.collegeboard.com/profdownload/act-sat-concordance-tables.pdf for the variances indicated above.

6. If there is only one score, it should be questioned if there is a significant disparity between the test score and the high school transcript. For example, students who have consistently low grades in math, but a high math score, or
students whose overall coursework and achievement does not match a high test score. (See Appendix B.)

7. Significant variances in TOEFL scores should be reviewed, especially if the exams were taken within a few months of each other.

C. Test Score Review

1. It is not necessary to notify a student that the institution has requested a score review until the testing service has decided to conduct the review, unless the timing impacts the admission decision. Most score reviews are initiated by the testing service and scores are validated without issue.

2. If the testing service elects to conduct an inquiry, the institution may require a PSA to sign a release authorizing the institution to speak directly with the testing service to obtain more information about the investigation.

3. Institutions may also require PSAs to submit all correspondence to and from the test service regarding the investigation.

4. Once authorization has been granted by the student, the Office of Admissions and/or Athletics Compliance may consult with the testing agency to help facilitate the process of resolving the score review.

D. High School Validity

1. The Office of Admissions should have confidence that credit earned in high school, whether at a public high school, independent school, home school or home school association, prep school, on-line credit, or other type of school, is valid and is an accurate and authentic representation of the student’s work. The Admissions Office should review schools as needed in accordance with office policy.

2. The NCAA Eligibility Center compiles a list of high schools questioned by the NCAA. Courses from schools on this list may not be used toward NCAA eligibility. Check with the institution’s Compliance Office to determine if the high school is on the NCAA “non-eligible school” list.
   a. The “non-eligible school” list can also be viewed at

3. If the high school is not on the NCAA “non-eligible” list, check that it is not currently under NCAA review.
4. Additional school review:
   a. Check on the school’s website for available information, including accreditation.
   b. Review online material to gain a better understanding of the school and curriculum.
   c. Contact the appropriate State Board of Education for its assessment of the school and curriculum.
   d. Consult with about their assessment of the school and curriculum.

5. Applicants attending “non-eligible” schools should be reviewed on a case by case basis and considered according to the same standard of review and due diligence as other applicants.

E. High School Transcript Issues

1. In situations where student performance is inconsistent, it is advisable to contact the school counselor to discuss recent performance in light of earlier work to assess the validity of the performance change.

2. Request the applicant to provide a written explanation about what caused the change in grades, asking specific questions if appropriate and necessary.

3. If deemed necessary, ask the high school principal to certify in writing that the grades are valid.

4. It is important to know the timing of course enrollment to understand sequencing and trends in a student’s curriculum. If a course timeframe is not readily available, consult with the high school counselor or Registrar.

5. If a transcript shows grade changes or discrepancies:
   a) The key is to determine which grade is valid.
   b) Contact the school guidance counselor (or Registrar’s Office, if a transfer student) to see if he/she can offer any helpful insights into this situation and verify the grade changes.
   c) If deemed necessary, ask the high school principal or college Registrar to certify in writing which grades are valid.

F. Test Score Choice

1. Students are required to submit scores from all tests to the NCAA Eligibility Center. However, applicants who take the ACT and/or SAT can chose to send
to a college or university only test scores from a single test date. Not sharing all test scores with the Admissions Office limits the complete understanding of the student’s academic record, makes it difficult for institutions to spot test score inconsistencies, and may be in violation of institutional policy, as many schools require all scores from all tests taken.

2. Admissions Offices can compare the scores at the NCAA Eligibility Center to those received by admissions and/or on the high school transcript. Admissions officers can have access to the Eligibility Center information (either by website or through their Athletic Compliance Offices) to review test scores.

3. PSAs should submit all official test scores from all sittings and verify that there are no omissions. (See Appendix A.)

G. Summer course enrollment used for admission and NCAA eligibility

1. The applicant’s entire academic record, including the courses taken after high school graduation must be considered in the admission decision, regardless of how post-graduation coursework is considered by the NCAA for eligibility purposes.

2. Students taking courses after high school graduation are more likely to have irregular records and should be carefully reviewed.

H. Enrollment in multiple high schools.

1. The key is to determine that all courses and grades are valid and that the courses were appropriately transferred among schools by contacting the applicant’s school counselor.

2. Ask the student to explain in writing why multiple schools were attended and to answer specific questions related to the issues/concerns identified in the initial review by the Office of Admissions.

3. If there are concerns, contact the prior high school to solicit information about the student and reasons for transfer.

4. Review the number and title of courses on the transcript to ensure that they have appropriate course titles and students are taking courses in sequence.
I. Honors courses taken by students with weak academic records.

1. Review the school’s academic profile to understand the curriculum, explanations of honors placement and grading scale. If not clearly stated, contact the applicant’s guidance counselor to solicit useful information.

2. If concerns remain, contact the teachers of honors subjects to learn about nature and rigor of the course, and about the study habits and approach to learning of the PSA.

J. Home School instruction

1. Review the curriculum to determine appropriate academic preparation.

2. Special attention should be given to online course enrollment.

3. Determine validity of home school academic experience by checking accreditation and recognition by the State Board of Education.

4. Review should occur similarly for PSA and all applicants. Special consideration of standardized test scores may be necessary.

5. If additional evidence of validity of home school experience is necessary, request course syllabi and text books used, and homework and papers completed.

VII) Transfer Admission

A. Transfer Admission Policy

1. Institutions should have written transfer admission policies which should guide the admission of PSAs and all students.

2. Mid-year admission for PSAs who are transfer students is common, especially in football given the timing of the NLI signing date.

3. If the PSA must complete an associate’s degree in order to be eligible, the Admissions Office must outline with Compliance each office’s responsibilities. (For example, will Admissions contact the student’s previous institution to obtain verification of the degree?)
B. **Transfer Credit**

1. Institutions may have differing credit policies, especially in degree/major progress. Transfer credit policies should be clearly articulated between Admissions, the Office of the Registrar and Intercollegiate Athletics.

2. All applicants must be considered based on the same transferability criteria.

3. A determination of transfer credit needs to occur early in the recruiting process. This information must be promptly relayed to the Compliance Office and the PSA.

4. It is not recommended for the Admissions Office to accept credit from only the most recent institution attended. A full review of all credit received at prior institutions should occur.

5. Athletic Compliance must be kept aware of transfer credit totals in order to determine athletic eligibility.

6. Some transfers apply without indicating a major and often need to fit themselves into a major to be eligible for admission.

7. Advisors and others who work with PSAs need to be knowledgeable about degree programs offered to offer assistance is selecting a major appropriate given career interests and eligibility requirements.

VIII) **International PSA Admission**

A. **General**

1. Institutions should have written international admission policies which should guide the admission of PSAs and all students.

2. Application deadlines for international students may be earlier than for other applicants due to visa clearance timing issues.

3. Additional documentation related to finances and citizenship will likely be required of international student applicants, regardless of athletic status.

4. It is especially important for Intercollegiate Athletics, Compliance and the Admissions Office to closely communicate about international PSAs because
of the complexity of their admission, NCAA eligibility and visa clearance issues.

B. English Proficiency

1. Non-native English speakers must demonstrate sufficient command of the English language in order to succeed in college level courses taught in English.

2. English proficiency requirements and alternatives for meeting them should be clearly stated in an institution's admission policy and shared with Athletic Compliance staff and, in turn, with coaches. Examples include minimum SAT Critical Reading, ACT English, TOEFL, IELTS, Advanced Placement English, Cambridge Certificate of Proficiency in English scores, etc.

3. Admission policies may include a provision to waive English proficiency exams if standardized tests, grades in courses, or institutional tests or measures are used as a proxy and deemed sufficient to determine proficiency. A waiver may require meeting minimum grades/scores in English courses, in SAT Critical Reading, SAT Writing and ACT English scores strong enough to illustrate English proficiency. (Please note some components of English proficiency, including spoken communication, are not measured by the SAT or ACT.)

4. Athletic Compliance staff and coaches should be aware of English proficiency requirements, e.g., tests accepted and minimum scores for achieving proficiency.

5. Students not meeting minimum English proficiency can be guided toward special English programs offered at the college/university.

6. Athletic Compliance staff should be aware how enrollment in English language programs effects initial and continuing athletic eligibility.

7. PSAs needing English language proficiency course enrollment should be notified of this in writing by the Admissions Office.

C. Transfer Credit for International Students

1. Transfer credit at many institutions is reviewed post-admission. Due to NCAA eligibility requirements, this review should be done either in advance or at the
same time as admission. This provides information necessary to determine the likelihood of NCAA eligibility.

2. Differences between international educational systems and the traditional US system pose challenges for admission and transfer credit evaluation. A written grade equivalency policy is important. Consult with AACRAO and World Education Service (WES) to learn about guidelines and scales which can be used. These can be used as a basis to inform institutional policy.

3. Institutional policy regarding transfer credit should be applied consistently for all applicants, regardless of NCAA international equivalency for eligibility purposes.

IX) Admission of Walk-On Student-Athletes

1. Given some roster limits for sports with counters, many schools allow “recruited walk-ons” to be considered as they would scholarships student athletes.

2. In order to be classified as a “recruited walk-on,” prospects should be athletically competitive enough to make the team, and should be a strong candidate for a scholarship, if one becomes available.

3. Walk-on student-athletes at Division I institutions are often recruited by individual sports and important to the success of athletic teams. This is generally factored into an institution’s holistic admission process. “Recruited walk-ons” generally do not receive the same level of consideration in the holistic admission process as tendered athletes.

4. It is not recommended to consider managers, athletic trainers, cheerleaders, etc., in the process as one would scholarship athletes, unless the institution has specific academic programs which recruit students for these purposes.

5. The Athletic Department should provide information regarding walk-on student athletes to the Admissions Office in a timely fashion, as they would scholarship athletes.
X) Timing of Recruiting PSAs

A. **PSAs identified or recruited late (two weeks or less prior to the beginning of classes).**

1. Regardless of the timing of the application for admission, the Office of Admissions must perform appropriate due diligence in accordance with its established policies and procedures. Not doing so would place the institution at serious risk. For example, if the institution does not conduct appropriate due diligence and the student-athlete competes in intercollegiate competition and then is found to be ineligible to compete, this could result in NCAA sanctions on the institution and the forfeiture of games won.

2. The Office of Admissions must communicate to athletics the last date that the institution will allow a student to be admitted, preferably well in advance of the start of class. Before setting this deadline, it should be vetted with senior administration, the Athletic Department and the Office of Admissions to insure adequate time for application processing and any validation that might need to occur. Please note, international student applicants may have an earlier deadline, due to I-20 and visa preparation requirements.

3. The admission process should not be open-ended. It is recommended for the Office of Admissions to set a series of deadlines culminating in the final application deadline (e.g., mid year transcript, application and fee, final transcript) If the applicant does not meet one of the deadlines, the application should not be considered for that term.

4. Deadlines are in place to protect the institution by allowing the time necessary to thoroughly and accurately evaluate the student’s academic record. Failure to enforce deadlines can increase the potential for rushed decisions and mistakes. Extending flexibility may result in unfair treatment to the applicant.

5. The Athletic Department should establish its own internal deadlines earlier than those established by the Admissions Office and require coaches and prospective students to meet those deadlines.

6. The institution’s senior leadership should fully support the Office of Admissions in this process.

7. It is not recommended that institutions offer “conditional” or “provisional” admissions (admission based on incomplete or unofficial information) to PSAS. However, if institutional policy allows for conditional admission, such offers
should be made on a case-by-case basis, and the requirements for conditional admission should be clearly specified and strictly enforced.

B. PSAs identified or recruited early (prior to 11th grade)

1. Coaches and PSAs must be aware that athletic scholarship offers to applicants do not equate to an admission decision.

2. If coaches extend early offers to younger students, they should be clear to the student that the offer is contingent on the student meeting institutional admission and conference and NCAA athlete eligibility requirements.

3. In these cases, it is particularly important for PSAs to be aware that the admission decision is independent of NCAA eligibility and the National Letter of Intent is not a promise of admission.

C. PSAs recruited midyear prior to high school graduation

1. Mid-year PSA applicants are becoming more common. These students meet minimum high school graduation requirements, but may not graduate until the completion of the spring semester.

2. The Athletic Department and Admissions Office staff should feel confident the student is academically prepared and sufficiently mature to begin college early. Students who would benefit from a final semester of high school to gain additional college preparatory coursework and maturation should not be encouraged to leave high school early.

3. Proof of graduation shown on the final high school transcript should be submitted immediately upon availability. If an official final transcript is not available, request a letter stating the student has met all graduation requirements with the expected graduation date included. A final high school transcript must be sent once the graduation date has passed.

4. The timing of transcript receipt is an important consideration in mid-year admission situations. Typically, a review of the fall transcript is a necessary component of the admission process. Given the lack of alignment between high schools and most college academic calendars, a quick transcript release, receipt and admission review will need to occur for mid-year admission.

5. In some cases, PSAs are requested to send final high school transcripts directly to the institution, which in turn sends them to the NCAA Eligibility Center for tracking purposes.
XI) Admission Situations Requiring Additional Review/Scrutiny

A. Students with prior misconduct or legal issues

1. Institutions should have a policies and procedures in place for handling applicants with prior misconduct or legal issues. These policies and procedures must be the same for PSAs and all students.

2. It is advisable to consult with the Office of Student Conduct and/or Legal Counsel in these cases. Many institutions require students with prior misconduct or legal issues to be reviewed by both the Office of Student Conduct and the Office of Admissions prior to admission.

3. In these matters, it is crucial for the Admissions Office to clearly communicate the policies and procedures in place.

B. Admission officers sometimes encounter situations when they suspect some form of irregularity which could impact the admission process.

1. Potential areas of irregularity identified by admissions directors include:
   a. Questionable test scores (e.g., SAT, ACT, TOEFL).
   b. Questionable or irregular high school or college transcripts or documents.
   c. Questionable secondary schools and/or courses, including on-line institutions and suspected “diploma mills”.
   d. Scores inconsistent with the high school record or other test scores.
   e. Dramatic improvement in high school grades in the senior year.
   f. High school courses taken out of sequence.
   g. Attending multiple high schools.
   h. Unexplained grade changes.

3. Often these irregularities, when reviewed by admissions, are found to have a reasonable explanation and are determined to be valid. However, in rare cases, fraudulent behavior is the cause.

4. In the cases of irregularity, the major issue for admission officers is determining the extent of due diligence necessary to ensure the integrity and authenticity of the student’s record. At the heart of this issue is the student’s academic preparation and ability to succeed in the classroom. Admission Directors often find that procedures for dealing with such cases are not clearly defined or are guided by regulations at the national or state level.
5. The difference in views between admission directors and athletics personnel is not whether cheating should be condoned. It is more typically about the degree of due diligence required, and who is responsible for the process (i.e., the institution, either admissions or athletics compliance, national testing agencies, and/or the NCAA Clearinghouse.)

6. An appropriate level of due diligence is vital. The alternative could result in eligibility issues for the student, NCAA violations for the institution and harmful negative publicity. These negative consequences are exacerbated when the student-athlete has already been allowed to participate in intercollegiate athletic events.

7. Keys to making the due diligence process less stressful:
   a. Have policies and procedures in place identifying the types of issues that may result in due diligence, and make certain the Athletic Department and Admission Office are aware of them.
   b. Clearly define who is responsible for which components of the review.
   c. Clearly define the potential outcomes if impropriety is discovered.
   d. Open and genuine communication is crucial, especially when potential irregularities occur.
   e. Require PSAs to submit applications and supporting credentials in a timely manner so there is plenty of time to review cases of concern.

XII) Communication Regarding Level of Tender or Walk-On

1. The level of special talent and skill possessed by an applicant can typically be best assessed outside of Admissions. Areas of talent may include athletics, music, drama, art, debate, leadership, etc.

2. The interest of the Athletic Department in an applicant or the certification of the applicant by the NCAA to participate in intercollegiate athletics does not ensure that an applicant will be admitted. It is one factor among many the Office of Admissions takes into consideration in reviewing an application. Unless specified in institutional admission policy, coaches should not promise PSAs they will be admitted based solely on NCAA eligibility.

3. The recruitment of PSAs must be tracked by the Department of Athletics and shared with the Office of Admissions. Frequent communication should occur about the coach’s level of interest in a PSA because they may impact the admission decision.
4. The projected level of support provided to the student by the Athletic Department must be clearly indicated to the Office of Admissions (e.g. full or partial scholarship, recruited walk-on, non-recruited walk-on).

5. If the tender level changes, the Admission Office must be notified immediately.

6. PSAs who are admitted as exceptions (not meeting the prevailing standard for regular admission) must also meet NCAA eligibility requirements and with the expectation they participate.

7. If the level of tender commitment is adjusted after a PSA is admitted, the Office of Admissions can reserve the right to change the admission decision based on the individual circumstances of the case. A change to an admission decision generally requires highly compelling circumstances and while the level of tender may be a factor, it should not be the sole factor.

XIII) Ensuring Student Privacy

1. Protection of student privacy is crucial. All federal, state, and institutional regulations must be strictly followed.

2. Only authorized University data stewards, such as the Director of Admissions, can release information when it is appropriate to do so.

3. The Athletic Department and high school officials may be involved and interested in a PSAs admission status. However, the responsibility and authority for submitting the application and all supporting materials is the PSAs. The Office of Admissions should communicate directly with the student in the same manner as with all applicants. Students can designate preferred contact information in the application for admission.

4. FERPA may apply to specific cases; university officials need to be trained on the appropriate disclosure of information.

5. The Admissions Office and the Athletic Department should never discuss PSA admission status with a third party unless written permission from parent/guardian or the PSA is granted. Even with authorization, it is not recommended that a student’s academic record or admission status be discussed with anyone who does not have an “educational reason to know.”

6. Consult with institutional legal counsel for further guidance.
XIV) Faculty Admission Committees and the Review Process

1. There should be one admission authority for the undergraduate program. It is strongly recommended that this authority rest with the chief admission officer and all undergraduate decisions be centralized within the Office of Admissions.

2. If a committee is used in the review process of PSAs, the Director of Admissions must be involved in the process as either a member or ex officio.

3. Suggested committee membership: Director of Admissions, Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), Athletics Compliance or Academic Support representative, Faculty Senate Admissions Committee Chair (or other representative of the faculty), Academic Affairs representative (Provost Office designee).

4. If there is an appeals process, it should be clearly defined in the admission policy.

XV) Senior Administration's Role in the Admission of PSAs

Recommended Best Practice:

1. Given the high profile nature of some sports, the Admissions Office should advise senior administrators, including the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), the Provost, President, of any potentially controversial cases.

2. In general, the senior level administrators of the college or university should limit its involvement in admissions cases to that prescribed by policy. Admission decisions should be the responsibility and authority of the Admissions Office. Senior level administrators should restrict their involvement to matters related to policy development and other appropriate items, such as appeals cases.

3. Senior level administrators should support the Office of Admissions and its responsibility to maintain institutional control, and to render consistent and fair admission decisions in accordance with best practices and institutional policy.

4. Senior level administrators should not consider direct appeals from coaches or other interested parties who have not followed the defined appeals process.
XVI) Conference Items - What kind of support should we expect from our athletic conferences?

1. Some conferences and member institutions adopt academic triggers to ensure that every institution is reviewing similar concerns.

2. The Southeastern Conference (SEC) requires member institutions to review cases with credential validity concerns and report those to the conference each semester. The conference reviews these cases and rules on eligibility. See Appendix E, for information on the SEC requirement.
Appendix A:
University of South Carolina Office of Undergraduate Admission’s Policy on Validity of Academic Credentials
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SEC Conference Bylaw Policy for the Review of Academic Credentials
University of South Carolina Office of Undergraduate Admission’s Policy on Validity of Academic Credentials

I. Candidates seeking admission to the University of South Carolina are expected to adhere to the rules and regulations of the University indefinitely from the time of application. All applicants attest to the following at the time of application:

“I certify that all information provided in this application is complete and correct, and I understand that any false information or omission of SAT or ACT scores, current or previous high school or college attendance, is cause for immediate revocation of admission and cancellation of registration or enrollment at the University of South Carolina...I promise to uphold and abide by the University’s code of conduct, policies, and procedures.”

All documents, materials and credentials submitted to the Office of Undergraduate Admissions are expected to be complete, accurate and authentic, and may be scrutinized and validated by the university if any irregularities are found. Students that submit false, incomplete, or misleading information are subject to disciplinary action and possible revocation of admission to the university.

II. Possible Reasons to Question the Validity of Academic Credentials

The Office of Undergraduate Admissions may question the validity of academic credentials and conduct an internal investigation when any of the following occur:

1. If a student submits entrance examination scores that are significantly different from one test administration to another, those scores will be questioned. The discrepancy may be from one SAT administration to another, from one ACT to another, or in comparing an ACT to an SAT score. SAT scores will be questioned if there are critical reading scores that vary more than 200 points, if there are math scores that vary more than 200 points, or if there are total scores that vary more than 300 points. ACT scores will be questioned if there is a five-point difference in any one subject-area score or in the composite scores. If the student presents both SAT and ACT scores, the ACT composite score will be converted to the equivalent SAT total score. If any ACT converted score varies more than 300 points from any SAT total score, the scores will be questioned.

2. The student transfers or withdraws from high school in his or her senior year

3. The number of core courses taken during the student’s senior year is disproportionate to the number of core courses completed prior to the senior year

4. The student has been enrolled in sequential courses in a single academic year or term

5. Core courses have been taken out of sequence
6. Revisions (other than to correct clerical errors) are made to the high school transcript that raises the grade in one or more core courses; or

7. The student has completed core coursework through nontraditional means (e.g., virtual high school or a correspondence course).

III. Procedures for Validating Credentials

1. In the case of score discrepancies, the Office of Admissions will contact the testing agency and request the scores be validated.

   a. Students will be required to provide the Office of Admissions with a signed waiver allowing the Director of Admissions to discuss the investigation with the testing agency.

   b. If the scores are validated by the testing agency, the application will be processed normally.

   c. If the scores are not canceled, but the Director of Admissions still has concerns about the academic record, the appropriate administrative or faculty governing body may be consulted and an additional investigation may be conducted.

   d. If the scores are canceled by the testing agency, the reason for cancellation will be determined before an admission decision is made.

   e. If the scores were invalidated due to alleged academic dishonesty on the part of the student, the student will be denied admission.

If the discrepancy is discovered after the student enrolls, the student will be subject to the same investigation and, in cases of alleged academic dishonesty, the student will be subject to the university’s code of student conduct, appropriate judicial action, and admission may be revoked.

2. In cases of questionable transcripts or matters of high school curriculum, the Office of Admissions will contact the student’s high school counselor for more information and an explanation.

3. In all other cases, the Office of Admissions will conduct an internal review and may request more information from the student, the high school, or other parties that may be in a position to provide an explanation and supporting information.

4. The Director of Admissions will review each case thoroughly and may determine in cases where there is a reasonable explanation of an irregularity to allow the application to follow the normal application review process.

5. If the Director of Admissions is not able to find a reasonable explanation, or if there is clear evidence of academic dishonesty, the applicant may be denied admission, or the case may be referred to the appropriate administrative or faculty committee on admissions for
additional review, and/or the Office of Student Judicial Programs for appropriate judicial action.

IV. Prospective Student Athletes

In the case of prospective student athletes, SEC By-Law 14.1.2.2 will also apply. The Director of Admissions will notify the Faculty Athletics Representative, the Senior Associate Director of Athletics, and the Director of Athletic Compliance of any irregularities identified in a student’s application and whether an investigation is to be conducted. The results of an investigation of the validity of academic credentials will be reported annually in accordance with SEC By-Law 14.1.2.2.

Office of Undergraduate Admissions
SEC Conference Bylaw Policy for the Review of Academic Credentials

Athletic Conferences can be helpful in setting procedures to help ensure the validity of academic credentials. The following pages are those guidelines and procedures outlined by the Southeastern Conference bylaw.
SEC Bylaw 14.1.2.2
Validity of Academic Credentials
“SEC Proposal 9-A”
(revised May 30, 2008)

14.1.2.2. Validity of Academic Credentials. Each SEC member institution bears primary responsibility for reviewing and ensuring the validity of the NCAA Eligibility Center certification of initial eligibility of each prospective student-athlete (“PSA”) who has been offered an athletics scholarship, in accordance with this Bylaw 14.1.2.2.

[Revised 5/30/2008; effective immediately; Revised 6/1/2007; effective immediately; Revised 6/2/06; effective immediately; Revised 6/5/99]

(a) Before admitting any PSA, each SEC member institution must review and ensure that all the academic credentials (including but not limited to transcripts and standardized test scores) (herein the “Credentials”) supplied to the NCAA Eligibility Center by each PSA are valid, accurate, and fairly reflect the academic abilities and qualifications of the PSA, whether the NCAA Eligibility Center challenges or specially reviews those Credentials or not.

(b) Each SEC member institution shall establish and maintain its own process for the review of Credentials required by subsection (a) of this Bylaw 14.1.2.2. The guidelines and policies governing such process shall be reduced to writing, and periodically revised and updated as appropriate. A copy thereof shall be provided annually (on or about July 1) by each member institution’s President or Chancellor to the SEC Commissioner.

(c) Even if an SEC member institution has admitted a PSA and determined in accordance with its own process that the NCAA Eligibility Center certification of eligibility is based upon valid and accurate Credentials that fairly reflect the academic abilities and qualifications of the PSA, the member institution shall provide a special written report (the “Special Report”) to the SEC Commissioner, in accordance with subsections (d) and (e) of this Bylaw 14.1.2.2, concerning such PSA if:

1. Any one or more of the PSA’s college entrance examination scores or subscores have varied (higher or lower) from any other college entrance examination score in an amount equal to or greater than the security standards of ACT and/or SAT;

2. The PSA transfers or withdraws from high school in his or her senior year;
(3) The number of core courses taken during the PSA’s senior year is disproportionate to the number of core courses completed prior to the PSA’s senior year;

(4) The PSA has been enrolled in sequential courses in a single academic year or term;

(5) Core courses have been taken out of sequence by the PSA;

(6) Revisions (other than to correct clerical errors) are made to the PSA’s transcript that raise the PSA’s grade in one or more core courses; or;

(7) The PSA has completed core coursework through nontraditional means (e.g., virtual high school or a correspondence course).

(d) Each Special Report to be submitted to the Commissioner as required by subsection (c) of this Bylaw 14.1.2.2 shall:

(1) Specify which of the numbered subparagraphs of subsection (c) of this Bylaw 14.1.2.2 triggered the requirement for a Special Report;

(2) Attach complete and correct copies of all of the PSA’s Credentials supplied to the NCAA Eligibility Center and to the SEC member institution;

(3) Set forth in detail the review made by the member institution to determine whether the Credentials are valid, accurate, and fairly reflect the academic abilities and qualifications of the PSA;

(4) Include such supporting material as is reasonably necessary and appropriate under the circumstances to establish that the PSA’s Credentials are valid, accurate, and fairly reflect the academic abilities and qualifications of the PSA;

(5) Be submitted at the earliest possible opportunity but no later than prior to the PSA’s initial full time enrollment in a regular academic term, or prior to a PSA’s participation in or attendance at preseason practice at the member institution, whichever is earlier;

(6) Include a certification by the President or Chancellor of the member institution affirming that he or she has personally reviewed and approved the Special Report and the decision made by the member institution concerning the admission of and eligibility of the PSA; and

(7) The current street address and telephone number of the PSA.

(e) The supporting material required by subparagraph (4) of subsection (d) of this Bylaw 14.1.2.2 shall include the following, to the extent applicable:

(1) If, but only if, the requirement for a Special Report is triggered in whole or in part by numbered subparagraph (1) of subsection (c) of this Bylaw 14.1.2.2, the Special Report shall include verification of
college entrance examination scores from the testing authority (i.e., College Board or the ACT, Inc.).

(2) If, but only if, the requirement for a Special Report is triggered in whole or in part by numbered subparagraph (2) of subsection (c) of this Bylaw 14.1.2.2, the Special Report shall include a full and complete explanation of the circumstances and cause for the withdrawal or transfer, and verification that the transfer was not for the purpose of avoiding inadequate grades in core course(s) or for the purpose of securing adequate grades in core course(s) without actually meeting the academic requirements of such course(s); and

(3) If, but only if, the requirement for a Special Report is triggered in whole or in part by any of numbered subparagraphs (3) – (7) of subsection (c) of this Bylaw 14.1.2.2, the Special Report shall include verification that the PSA in fact properly completed and satisfied the academic requirements of all core courses and that the PSA’s grades in those courses are valid, accurate, and fairly reflect the academic abilities and qualifications of the PSA.

The member institution may also include in the Special Report such additional information and materials as may be of assistance to the Commissioner in making the determination required under subsection (h) of this Bylaw 14.1.2.2.

(f) The Special Report shall specifically call to the attention of the Commissioner and provide full and complete information concerning any known disabilities identified by the PSA that might bear on the validity of the Credentials of the PSA, or on the PSA’s academic abilities and qualifications. Prospective student athletes with disabilities are subject to and must comply with the standards and procedures set forth in this Bylaw 14.1.2.2; provided, however, that (i) in satisfying such standards, such students may take advantage of any applicable NCAA or SEC Bylaws that have the purpose or effect of providing reasonable accommodation to disabled individuals, and (ii) the Commissioner may waive or modify the standards in this Bylaw 14.1.2.2, in his sole discretion, if and as necessary or appropriate to comply with applicable laws or regulations. [Modified 6/1/08]

(g) Prior to the Commissioner determining pursuant to subsection (h) of this Bylaw 14.1.2.2 that a PSA is not eligible for intercollegiate athletic competition at an SEC member institution, the Conference shall provide the PSA with a copy of the Special Report by overnight courier service (to the address of the PSA specified in the Report), along with a copy of this Bylaw 14.1.2.2. The PSA may then submit any and all reasonable materials to the Commissioner that the PSA wants the Commissioner to consider, provided
that the PSA’s submission must be received by the Conference office within fifteen (15) calendar days after the Special Report is deposited with the overnight courier service for delivery to the PSA. If the PSA submits materials to the Commissioner, the PSA shall simultaneously provide a copy of the entire submission to the SEC member institution at which the PSA proposes to participate in intercollegiate athletics. In such event, the SEC institution may, at its option, provide a supplemental submission of its own to Commissioner addressing any matter in the PSA’s submission; provided that such supplemental submission must be furnished to the Commissioner, with a copy to the PSA at the address specified in the Report (or such other address as may be specified in the PSA’s submission), within thirty (30) calendar days after the Special Report is deposited with the overnight courier service for delivery to the PSA.

(h) As expeditiously as is reasonably feasible after receiving the Special Report and any submissions pursuant to subsection (g) of this Bylaw 14.1.2.2., the Commissioner shall issue a determination of the PSA’s eligibility to compete in intercollegiate athletic competition, based on the following criteria:

(1) The burden of demonstrating to the reasonable satisfaction of the Commissioner that the PSA’s Credentials are valid, accurate, and fairly reflect the academic abilities and qualifications of the PSA shall be on the SEC member institution. If the SEC member institution fails to meet that burden, the Commissioner shall determine that the PSA is ineligible.

(2) The Commissioner shall not conduct an independent review, but shall base his or her determination on the Special Report and on any submission the PSA may choose to make pursuant to subsection (g) of this Bylaw 14.1.2.2.

(3) The Special Report must adequately address and resolve all material factual issues concerning the validity and accuracy of the Credentials, or concerning whether those Credentials fairly reflect the academic abilities and qualifications of the PSA.

(4) The Commissioner shall take into account and comply with any applicable legal requirements concerning the rights of persons with disabilities in making his or her determination.

The Commissioner’s determination shall be final and not subject to appeal or review.

(i) A PSA for whom a Special Report is required to be submitted pursuant to subsection (c) of this Bylaw 14.1.2.2 shall not be eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletic competition at an SEC member institution unless
and until the Commissioner has determined that the PSA is eligible as contemplated by subsection (h).
**SEC BYLAW 14.1.2.2 REPORTING FORM**

Supporting documents must be provided for each student-athlete listed

**Fall Term_____ Spring Term_____**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Test score variance</th>
<th>Transfer/withdrawal from HS following junior year</th>
<th>Disproportionate number of core courses during senior year</th>
<th>Concurrent enrollment in sequential core courses</th>
<th>Core courses taken out of sequence</th>
<th>Transcript revisions</th>
<th>Coursework through non-traditional means</th>
<th>Other irregularities</th>
<th>NCAA Core GPA</th>
<th>Test score used to establish initial eligibility</th>
<th>Admitted?</th>
<th>Eligibility Center certified?</th>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(revised June 12, 2008)
Appendix B: ACT’s Score Review Process

The ACT Corporation has provided ACAOPU Membership with information regarding their review of test scores.
January 31, 2011

Dear Members of the ACAOPU Athletic Issues Committee;

Thank you for inviting ACT to meet with the ACAOPU Athletic Issues Committee. We appreciated the opportunity to discuss and understand your needs regarding test score issues. Based on our discussions, we understand that the Athletic Issues Committee plans to compile a consensus-based “best practices” document for ACAOPU members dealing with athletic-related admissions issues. ACT welcomes the invitation to work with ACAOPU to develop and review this document. Please do not hesitate to utilize us throughout this process. The information in this letter will update you concerning ACT’s efforts to better meet your needs and provide additional information for the best practices document you are compiling.

Information Concerning ACT’s Score Review Processes
By March 1, 2011, ACT will launch a new webpage designed to provide high schools, colleges and universities a one-stop webpage for information concerning how to question test scores and explaining ACT’s score review processes. At this webpage you will find:
- An online Score Inquiry Form for submitting concerns you may have regarding an examinee’s ACT scores;
- Easy access to ACT’s Test Security Hotline;
- A description of the process ACT uses for score review matters;
- Frequently Asked Questions concerning official score reviews; and
- A PDF of ACT’s Authorization to Release Personal Information form.

We will notify ACAOPU as soon as this webpage is live and we welcome your suggestions for additions or improvements. (Editor’s Note: ACT Score Inquiry webpage is located at http://www.act.org/aap/scores/inquiry)

Submitting Information to ACT
ACAOPU members, as well as other institutions and high schools, regularly submit score inquiries to ACT. As noted above, the process for submitting a score inquiry will be available online by March 1, 2011. The committee asked whether ACT will use additional information submitted by a college or university, such as handwriting samples or other test scores, in analyzing a score inquiry.

ACT both welcomes and encourages the submission of additional information. Such information helps ACT to better understand the reasons prompting the score inquiry and allows us to more quickly determine whether to open an official score review. Please do not hesitate to submit information such as handwriting samples, other test scores, high school transcripts, examinee grade point average, and any other information that has led the college or university to question an
examinee’s ACT score and which the institution may permissibly share with ACT. When submitting an online ACT Score Inquiry Form, you will find a prompt requesting the reasons for your inquiry, such as whether the examinee’s ACT scores are out of line with other test scores or the examinee’s grade point average. In addition, please feel free to forward handwriting samples and high school transcripts to ACT with a cover letter using the contact information below. The cover letter should reference the online inquiry submission and state that the institution has permission to share the information with ACT.

**Direct Contact Information for ACT Test Security Matters**
When need arises to talk directly to ACT concerning a score review matter, ACAOPU members should feel free to contact Stuart Bevan in ACT’s Test Security department for assistance. Test Security’s address, email and fax number, as well as Stuart’s direct phone number, are provided below for your convenience.

Address: ACT Test Security (53)  
500 ACT Drive  
PO Box 168  
Iowa City, IA 52243-0168

Email: test.security@act.org  
Phone: 319/341-2312  
Fax: 319/341-2303

**Access to Score Review Information**
The committee indicated a desire for admissions offices to have access to information in ACT’s files regarding an examinee’s score review. For privacy reasons, ACT cannot release information concerning an examinee’s file without authorization. However, this information can be readily accessed with the examinee’s authorization.

The following two steps should be followed to receive additional information regarding an examinee’s score review:

1. The examinee should sign and return ACT’s Authorization to Release Personal Information form listing you, or another member of your institution, as an individual to whom ACT may release information. The Authorization to Release Personal Information form is sent to all examinees whose scores are under review by ACT. In addition, by March 1, 2011, the form will be available at the webpage designed for use by high schools, colleges and universities to submit score review concerns or to obtain additional information concerning ACT’s score review process.

2. The examinee, or his or her authorized representative, should send a written request to ACT’s Test Security department asking for additional information concerning ACT’s score concerns and directing ACT where to send that information.
Once both documents have been received by ACT’s Test Security department, we will provide to the examinee and his or her authorized representative a detailed letter explaining the reasons ACT questioned the examinee’s scores. If the examinee has directed ACT to send that letter to your office, we will provide a copy to you.

**Shortening the Timeframe for Processing Score Reviews**

ACT understands that the timeframe for score reviews is a concern for examinees and score users alike. We are actively working to shorten the timeframe for score reviews and have several efforts underway that will allow us to more quickly raise and resolve score review concerns with students.

As you compile best practices, you may wish to note that one of the quickest ways a prospective student athlete can resolve a score concern is by choosing the option to take a free retest. ACT will work with the student to arrange a convenient location for the retest and we will provide a flexible timeframe for the student to schedule a retest. If the examinee comes within 3 points of the questioned Composite score, our score review is closed and the examinee keeps both the questioned score and the free retest score. If the examinee fails to come within 3 points of the questioned composite score, ACT will cancel the questioned score, but the examinee is allowed to keep the free retest score. If you are interested in learning more about this option, please feel free to contact Stuart at 319/341-2312.

Thank you again for the opportunity to meet with the Athletic Issues Committee and to discuss your questions, concerns, and suggestions. We value our partnership with all colleges and universities and we certainly welcome the opportunity to increase our communication and cooperation with ACAOPU. This is very important to us as we jointly share a similar mission. We look forward to continued discussions with ACAOPU and invite you to contact us if you have any questions or desire additional input in compiling and finalizing the best practices document.

Sincerely,

Nancy Rehling

ACT, Inc.
Research shows that of the students who took the ACT more than once:
- 57% increased their Composite score on the retest,
- 21% had no change in their Composite score on the retest, and
- 22% decreased their Composite score on the retest.

For students with an initial ACT Composite score between 12 and 29, the typical ACT Composite score from the second testing is about 1 point higher (see Table below).
- The lower your initial ACT Composite score, the more likely your second score will be higher than the first score.
- The higher your initial ACT Composite score, the more likely your second score will be the same as or lower than the first score.

Example for how to read the table below:
For students who received an ACT Composite score of 20 the first time they tested:
- the typical ACT Composite score from the second testing was 21;
- the middle 50% of students with an initial score of 20 received an ACT Composite score of 20, 21, or 22 the second time they took the test;
- 58% of students increased their scores, 21% scored the same, and 21% saw their scores decrease.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT Composite score from first testing</th>
<th>ACT Composite score from second testing</th>
<th>Range for middle 50% of students</th>
<th>Percentage of students whose scores from first to second testing*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typical score</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35--</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34 to 35</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34--</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33 to 35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32 to 34</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31 to 33</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30 to 32</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29 to 32</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28 to 31</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27 to 30</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26 to 29</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26 to 28</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table

**Summary Information for Retesting By Initial ACT Composite Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT Composite score from first testing</th>
<th>ACT Composite score from second testing</th>
<th>Percentage of students whose scores from first to second testing*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typical score</td>
<td>Range for middle 50% of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25 to 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24 to 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23 to 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22 to 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21 to 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20 to 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19 to 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18 to 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17 to 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16 to 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15 to 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14 to 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13 to 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12 to 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12 to 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

** Results for these ACT Composite scores are based on a relatively small number of students with these scores.

Table based on: approximately 660,400 junior or senior students who took the ACT for the first time on a national test date in 2008-09 or 2009-10 and retested a second time during this period. Some students tested first as a junior; others as a senior. The length of time between the first and second testing was not taken into account. Students might have tested more than two times, but only their first two sets of scores were used in this analysis.
Appendix C: College Board

The College Board has provided ACAOPU members with information about the test score review process.
Wayne Sigler  
Chairman ACAOPU Athletics Issues Committee  
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities  
240 Williamson Hall  
231 Pillsbury Drive SE  
Minneapolis MN 55455-0213

Dear Wayne and members of the ACAOPU Athletics Issues Committee,

The College Board is very grateful that you have engaged us to discuss issues of concern to your membership. As a member-driven organization, we also recognize the importance of collaborating closely with our member institutions on important topics like admissions test score integrity.

Just like ACAOPU institutions, the SAT® Program takes matters of score integrity very seriously. We have in place highly rigorous procedures for identifying, investigating, and resolving score validity issues that bear up under all legal scrutiny, and afford all involved students fairness and due process. While the College Board stands firmly behind the rigor of our policies and procedures to ensure the integrity and timely resolution of score investigations, we too, are interested in finding ways to improve the score validity investigation process to meet the needs of valued constituents like ACAOPU institutions. In an effort to support the ACAOPU Athletic Issues Committee in preparing a “best practices” document, the following information, some of which was shared during the meetings in Chicago earlier this year, will hopefully prove useful.

**Rigorous Review of Scores Prior to Score Release**

After every SAT test administration, and prior to the release of scores, the College Board conducts a rigorous score validation process that includes a review of all reported testing irregularities and any reported violations of our test fairness policy. In addition, we undertake a comprehensive student-level score comparison for all test-takers who have more than one SAT score on file, to identify any cases of large score variances. This comparison is based on a well-defined construct of score thresholds and tolerances across all parts of the exam. Whenever legitimate questions arise about the validity of a score before that score is reported, the score is immediately placed on hold and cannot be reported to any institution until concerns about its validity are completely resolved.

**Score Validity Cases Related to Student Athletes and the NCAA**

In light of the fact that the Committee’s focus is on student athletes, the following analysis of SAT scores reported to the NCAA Eligibility Center, conducted by the College Board and our test administrator, Educational Testing Service (ETS), may be of interest. The number of SAT scores that were reported to the NCAA and then eventually cancelled as a result of a score validity investigation is exceedingly small. Over a period of three years (the 2007-10 academic years), we found fewer than fifty cases where scores were canceled after they were reported, out of hundreds of thousands of students who sent scores to the NCAA. Furthermore, the average time to resolve such validity investigations was approximately fifty days. Much of this time can be attributed to mandatory wait periods between notifications to test takers and actions that can be taken by ETS and/or the College Board. Certified mail is used to notify students of initial score validity concerns and when notifying a student that their scores will be cancelled. Each notification provides clear deadlines and options.

Collaboration with Colleges and Universities
The College Board considers college admissions officers and high school officials, as well as the NCAA< as critical partners in maintaining academic integrity. Although we conduct a rigorous review of scores prior to releasing them, we rely on third party information from others who have the ability to review a variety of student academic information, like high school transcripts and other standardized test scores, in order to identify concerning discrepancies, especially in the case where the student has only taken the SAT once. We believe it is very important to have a collaborative relationship with colleges and universities and we encourage admissions officials to contact us whenever score validity concerns arise. Based on our experience, there can be many factors that might raise concern about the validity of SAT or Subject Test™ scores, including SAT scores that significantly differ from those that would be expected based on high school grades, significant discrepancies between SAT scores and other standardized test scores used in the admissions process, unofficial scores being provided by the student’s high school or by the student directly, and rumors of alleged impropriety such as impersonation.

**Reporting Score Validity or Other Test Security Concerns**
Whenever concerns related to SAT or Subject Test score validity arise, or anytime a concern is raised regarding the security of any SAT or Subject Test administration, officials should contact the Office of Testing Integrity directly at (609) 406-5430 with as much detail as possible and, as requested, provide documents or other information needed to conduct a thorough investigation. If the involved student chooses to allow the release of confidential information to third parties, the progress and results of the investigation can be disclosed to the parties designated by the student.

**Possible Improvements**
The College Board shares the interest of ACOPU and its member institutions in having a fair and prompt resolution to score validity investigations. We are currently exploring the ability and implications of shortening score validity investigation timelines and enhancing communications with students and score recipients. We have also proposed to collaborate with the NCAA on a process to ensure that the Eligibility Center appropriately identifies discrepant student information and properly shares concerns regarding SAT score validity with us. ACAOPU institutions are critical partners of the College Board and we hope that the information contained here is helpful in the Committee’s ongoing efforts. We believe it is very important to have a collaborative relationship with the Committee and look forward to working closely with ACAOPU to ensure appropriate coordination on the important topic of score validity concerns.

Sincerely,

Steven J. Kotten
Senior Director, SAT Policy & Program Management
The College Board

---

ACAOPU
Association of Chief Admissions Officers of Public Universities
## Effects of Repeating the SAT®

### Percentage of Students with Senior-Year Score Gain or Loss (2010 Cohort)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Junior-Year Scores**</th>
<th>-140 &amp; below</th>
<th>-110 to -130</th>
<th>-80 to -100</th>
<th>-50 to -70</th>
<th>-20 to -40</th>
<th>-10 to +10</th>
<th>0 to 10</th>
<th>+20 to +40</th>
<th>+50 to +70</th>
<th>+80 to +100</th>
<th>+110 to +130</th>
<th>+140 &amp; above</th>
<th>Junior-Year Score</th>
<th>First Senior-Year Score**</th>
<th>Average Gain or Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680-720</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630-670</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-620</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530-570</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480-520</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430-470</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380-420</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330-370</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280-320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680-720</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630-670</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-620</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530-570</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480-520</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430-470</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380-420</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330-370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280-320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Scores are included based on data from the College Board's 2010 SAT® Report.
* Scores are included from students who took their first SAT® in March, May or June of their junior year. **The earliest SAT score from the October, November and December administration was used.
Definitions of statistical terms are provided online at professionals.collegeboard.com/data-reports-research/sat/definitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Junior-Year Scores*</th>
<th>-140 &amp; below</th>
<th>-110 to -130</th>
<th>-80 to -100</th>
<th>-50 to -70</th>
<th>-20 to -40</th>
<th>-10 to +10</th>
<th>0 to 10</th>
<th>+20 to +40</th>
<th>+50 to +70</th>
<th>+80 to +100</th>
<th>+110 to +130</th>
<th>+140 &amp; above</th>
<th>Junior-Year Score</th>
<th>First Senior-Year Score**</th>
<th>Average Gain or Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680–720</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630–670</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580–620</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530–570</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480–520</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430–470</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380–420</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330–370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280–320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Clemson University’s NCAA Transfer Eligibility Checklists
Clemson University’s NCAA Transfer Eligibility Checklists

TRANSFER ADMISSIONS ROUTING SHEET (2010-11)

Deadline to Return Completed Checklist to Compliance Services:
Monday, November 15, 2010 for enrollment in Spring Semester 2011
Friday, April 1, 2011 for enrollment in 1st Summer Session 2011
Tuesday, May 17, 2011 for enrollment in 2nd Summer Session 2011
Friday, July 1, 2011 for enrollment in Fall Semester 2011

Prospect’s Name ____________________ Original Institution ________________________
Sport ______________________________ Term of Projected Enrollment ___________
Intended Major ______________________ Amount of Athletic Aid ________________

Directions: The Coach completes the information above and Part I of the checklist and sends it to the Director of Compliance Services. The Director of Compliance Services completes Part II and forwards it to the Director of Academic Services. The Director of Academic Services forwards the checklist to the Senior Associate Registrar who coordinates the process for determining transfer credit and forecasting NCAA eligibility with the Senior Associate Director of Admissions.

Note – all materials must be legible or process stalls until clearly readable documents are secured.

Part I: Coach
Provides the following information on the prospect and former institution (s).
____ Copy of complete transcript(s) showing all college work to date.
____ Historical data form.
____ Copy of release.
____ Proof of NCAA qualifier status. [Eligibility Center ID# ____________________]

Submitted to Director of Compliance Services by ____________________ Date: __________.

Part II: Director of Compliance Services
Determines application of NCAA transfer, financial aid and seasons-of-eligibility rules.
____ Detailed transfer release sent to previous institution, if applicable.
____ Type of transfer and transfer exception. Cite NCAA Bylaw ________________.
____ Years eligibility used ________ and number of years received athletic aid ________.
____ Provide copy of transcript and checklist to Associate Director of Athletic Academic Services.
Transfer material submitted to Director of Admissions by _________Date _______.

**NCAA Transfer Eligibility Checklists (Part of Application File)**
Clemson University Office of Admissions

Name: __________________________ Sport: __________________________

**OFFICE MANAGER:**

YES/NO

___1. Has the student signed the application form?

___2. Is the student a scholarship athlete?
   a. Application coded with *tiger paw* stamp.
   b. ___Application fee is 9. ___Application fee is 1.
   c. Application is placed in orange folder.

___3. Is the student a walk-on athlete?
   a. Application is coded with *walk-on* stamp.
   b. Application fee is 1.
   c. Application is placed in orange folder.

___4. Are all materials and credentials date-stamped? (application, transcript(s), correspondence)

___5. Has all time been accounted for since high school graduation?

   If no, what action was taken to resolve this? ________________________
   ________________________
   ________________________

___6. Has the student attended more than one college? If yes, how many? ______

   List in order of attendance:

   College: 2 / 4 _________________ Year: _______________

   College: 2 / 4 _________________ Year: _______________

   College: 2 / 4 _________________ Year: _______________
7. Is the transcript(s) official? _____ seal _____ signed _____ stamped
8. Has AARC/Director referral? Date checked______________________________

9. Is the transcript(s) final?
   College: ________________________________ Y - N
   College: ________________________________ Y - N
   College: ________________________________ Y - N

10. Is the student a junior college transfer: (Student has attended only two
     years of school.)
     If no, what type of transfer: 4-2-4  2-4-4  4-4

11. If answer to questions “9” is yes, and the student did not or will not
    graduate from the junior college, does the file contain an official copy of
    the student’s high school transcript and SAT/ACT score sheet?

12. If the answer to question “10” is no, are appropriate documents relative to a
    four year transfer (waivers, exemptions) in the file?

13. Has the evaluation been typed? _____ Major: _______________________________

   Initial Review
   Office Manager ________________________________  Date ________________

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF ADMISSIONS


15. Has AARC/Director approved? Date checked______________________________

16. I have also reviewed the application in accordance with general office
    procedures.
    (AFT, RES, NTANA, GAWR, ED: NRPTL AARC)

17. If the student attended more than one high school/college, were all the
    transcripts used in the evaluation?

18. Was the student a qualifier out of high school? Is the IEC printout enclosed?
19. Does the institution use an A-F grading scale?

If an A-F scale is not used, what grade is equivalent to a “C”?

____________________________________________________________________________________

20. If needed, is the “One Time Transfer Exception” form enclosed?

NCAA Checklist

21. All credits transferred have been evaluated by University faculty (TCEL)?:

   Number of hours transferred by institution:
   College: ___________________________ Number of Hours: ______
   College: ___________________________ Number of Hours: ______
   College: ___________________________ Number of Hours: ______

22. The credits approved by the faculty for transfer have been reviewed by the Registrar, Associate Registrar, or Assistant Registrar?:

    REC. & REG. ___

23. If the student transferred from a junior college, but did not graduate, was he/she an initial qualifier? (Attach a complete Freshman Eligibility Checklist.)

24. Did the student graduate with an A.A. or A.S. degree?
   Was this a vocational or technical degree? ___

25. Does this transfer student meet the NCAA eligibility requirements?
    REC. & REG. ___

   NCAA regulation cited: ________________________________

26. Can this student be admitted in accordance with the University’s regular, published requirements? (If yes, send provisional acceptance letter. If no, route to admissions exceptions committee.)
27. Does this student meet the NCAA amateurism requirements? (If no, notify the Compliance Office).

Associate Director of Admissions: __________________________ Date ________

Registrar, Associate Registrar, or Assistant Registrar:
_______________________________ Date __________

Director of Admissions: __________________________ Date ________

Faculty Representative: __________________________ Date ________

(REVISED 6/2010)
Part III: Admissions

A. Director of Admissions
   _____ Review prospect’s academic credentials.
   _____ Request review by AARC (if applicable).
   Director of Admissions signature: __________________ Date ________________.

Materials sent to Senior Associate Director of Admissions.

B. Senior Associate Director of Admissions
   _____ Transcripts distributed to transfer credit evaluators.
   _____ TCEL updated (or created) with copy provided to Associate Director of
     Athletic Academic Services.
   Course evaluations forwarded to Senior Associate Registrar ______________ Date
   __________.

Part IV: Senior Associate Registrar
   _____ Forecast NCAA eligibility and email Associate Director of Athletic Academic
     Services, Director of Admissions, Senior Associate Director of Admissions, and
     Faculty Athletics Representative. (Email to Senior Associate Director of Admissions
     triggers TCEL to Associate Director of Athletic Academic Services.)

Part V: Student-Athlete
   _____ Student meets with faculty advisor to set schedule for the next semester and
     completes official credit evaluation form. Date __________.
   _____ Student meets with Vickery advisor and reviews schedule for the semester.
     Date __________.
   Completed checklist returned to prospect’s file and Compliance Services by ______
   Date: ______.
INTERNATIONAL TRANSFER ADMISSIONS CHECKLIST (2010-11)

Deadline to Return Completed Checklist to Compliance Services:
Friday, October 15, 2010 for enrollment in Spring Semester 2011
Friday, April 1, 2011 for enrollment in 1st Summer Session 2011
Tuesday, May 17, 2011 for enrollment in 2nd Summer Session 2011
Friday, July 1, 2011 for enrollment in Fall Semester 2011

Prospect’s Name _______________________ Country of Origin ___________________________
Sport ________________________ Term of Projected Enrollment ___________
Intended Major ______________________ Amount of Athletic Aid __________

Directions: This checklist is used for international prospects transferring from an international institution to Clemson. The Coach completes the information above and Part I of the checklist and submits the checklist to the Director of Compliance Services who completes Part II and forwards it to the Director of Admissions. The Director of Admissions forwards the checklist to the Senior Associate Director of Admissions who will coordinate the process for determining transfer credit and forecasting NCAA eligibility with the Senior Associate Registrar.

Note – all materials must be legible or the process stalls until clearly readable documents are secured.

Part I: Coach
Provides the following to Director of Compliance Services
____ International prospect student-athlete (PSA) form
____ Copy of official transcripts from post secondary school(s). Must be provided in a sealed envelope, unopened. (Coach can provide faxed copies but official copies will be required if student seeks admission.)
____ Certified translation of transcripts. Instruct translator to initial each page and attach official seal. It must be provided in a sealed envelope, unopened. (Coach can provide faxed copies of translations, but official copies will be required if student seeks admission.)
____ Post-secondary course descriptions. Course descriptions must be translated for all courses taken post secondary.
____ Historical data form.
____ Copy of release.
____ Proof of NCAA qualifier status, if applicable.
____ Statement of activity since completing secondary education to account for all time.

Submitted to Director of Compliance Services by ______________________ Date __________.
Part II: Director of Compliance Services

Compliance reviews international questionnaires and considers amateur issues. Submits information to the Director of Admissions.

- Detailed transfer release sent to previous institution, if applicable.
- Type of transfer and transfer exception. Cite NCAA Bylaw ____________.
- Years eligibility used ______ and number of years received athletic aid ________.
- Communicate with Director of Admissions if concerns about admissibility exist. Date ______.
- Provide post-secondary transcripts to WES or Lisano for course-by-course evaluation. Date ______.
- Provide WES or Lisano to Senior Associate Director of Admissions once returned. Date ______.
- Provide course descriptions to Senior Associate Director of Admissions for transferable credit evaluation. Date ______.
- Provide copy of checklist to Associate Director of Athletic Academic Services. Date ______.

Submitted to Director of Admissions by __________________________ Date ____________.

Part III: Admissions

A. Director of Admissions

- Review prospect’s academic credentials.
- Request review by AARC (if applicable). Date ____________.

Director of Admissions signature: ____________________________ Date ____________.

Materials sent to Senior Associate Director of Admissions

B. Senior Associate Director of Admissions

- Course descriptions and Lisano/WES documents distributed to transfer credit evaluators.
- TCEL updated (or created) and provided to Vickery Hall once Senior Associate Registrar has completed forecast.

Course evaluations forwarded to Senior Associate Registrar ____________ Date ____________.

Part IV: Senior Associate Registrar
_____ Forecast NCAA eligibility and email Associate Director of Athletic Academic Services, Director of Admissions, Associate Director of Admissions, and Faculty Athletics Representative. (Email to Associate Director of Admissions triggers TCEL to Associate Director of Athletic Academic Services.)

Part V: Student-Athlete

_____ Student meets with faculty advisor to set schedule for the next semester and completes official credit evaluation form.
Date __________.

_____ Student meets with Vickery advisor and reviews schedule for the semester.
Date __________.
Completed checklist returned to prospect’s file and Compliance Services by __________
Date: __________.
Appendix E: University of California-Berkeley Student Athlete Admission Policy 2010
1. **Introduction and Background**

This Student Athletic Admissions Policy is set forth by the Academic Senate to govern the admission to the Berkeley campus of talented student athletes recruited to compete in the campus's Intercollegiate Athletic programs. The policy is grounded in the Guiding Principles that govern the comprehensive review process for admission for all undergraduate students. The policy articulates additional guiding principles for the admission of recruited student athletes and lays out policies and procedures for the admission of these student athletes both at the freshman and the advanced standing levels. Finally, the policy sets forth some performance goals for student athletes.

Athletics is a significant and cherished aspect of both high school life and college campus life. Many students participate in recreational athletics, in intramural competition, and a smaller but significant number participate in interscholastic and intercollegiate competition. Excellence in athletics can tell us about an applicant’s character, dedication, determination, potential for leadership, and the contribution that an applicant can make to the campus. Excellence and achievement in athletics is therefore properly one of the criteria, along with many others, that enter into the comprehensive review process for undergraduate admissions at Berkeley.

In the regular admissions process, the fact that an applicant mentions that he or she played soccer in the 10th grade will not add value to the application. What does matter is continuing and sustained involvement and leadership. For instance, playing soccer for four years and being team captain or MVP is something that will be an overall plus for the applicant. If, in addition, the team competes successfully in regional, state, or national competitions, more weight is given. Ranking or recognition of an student athlete at the league, regional, state or national level is a plus, as is successful competition in regional, state, national, or international tournaments. The greater the level of achievement, recognition, and leadership, plus what that achievement and leadership tell us about the determination or other personal qualities of the applicant, the more it will count in the admission process.

However, intercollegiate athletics presents a challenge to the undergraduate admissions process because two different goals often come into conflict. The first goal is to admit, using a broad definition of merit, an academically well-qualified class of students who can be expected to succeed academically. The second is to admit a number of exceptionally talented student athletes who have been identified and recruited by the coaches with the expectation that those student athletes will contribute significantly to producing winning intercollegiate athletic teams. The campus has for many decades granted special admission to talented recruited students.
student athletes, and the purpose of this document is to provide a comprehensive, Senate-approved policy governing the admission of those recruited student athletes. More specifically, the goal is to put in place a policy that:

1. sets forth guidelines and procedures for admission of recruited student athletes that will be viewed as fair and defensible by the campus community and the public,

2. grounds these policies and guidelines in the context of the selective and competitive comprehensive review admissions process, and

3. recognizes the practical needs for efficiency and expediency, especially when the campus is competing with other colleges and universities for top student athletes.

The Berkeley campus fields 29 intercollegiate athletic teams and about 900 undergraduate students (or approximately 4% of all undergraduate students) compete on these teams. These numbers are higher than for any other UC campus but are not as high as for many private universities. Stanford, for instance, fields 34 teams and because their undergraduate student body of 6,600 is much smaller than that of Berkeley, a significantly higher percentage of their undergraduates will compete on intercollegiate athletic teams. It is quite common that 10% to 30% of undergraduates compete in intercollegiate athletics in many private colleges and universities. In round numbers, about 260 freshman entering Berkeley in the fall will compete on intercollegiate teams, plus smaller numbers of spring freshman admits and transfer admits for both the fall and spring terms.

The coaching staffs actively recruit student athletes to apply to Berkeley and play on their teams once admitted. The academic credentials of these students are given a preliminary screening by Intercollegiate Athletics, and in some cases the credentials are found so lacking that recruitment of the prospective student athlete is discontinued. Those for whom the record appears promising are asked to complete an application for admission and submit it to the Office of Undergraduate Admissions (OUA). These are called the “tagged student athletes”.

All applications from tagged student athletes are first sent through the usual comprehensive review process. Some small number of the tagged athletic applicants, perhaps 25 in a typical year, will be accepted for admission using the standard criteria. These students are not regarded as tagged student athletes. In addition there are a number of student athletes who have not been recruited by the coaches, who apply to Berkeley and are accepted. When they arrive on campus, they try out and are selected to play on an intercollegiate athletic team. These "walk-ons" together with the student athletes who are admitted on their own total around 50 per year. Thus about 20% of the total number of students competing in
intercollegiate athletics are students who were admitted through the regular admissions process.

The Student Athlete Admissions Policy does not apply to the students described above who are admitted using the standard criteria. Rather, the policy describes a supplemental process for the review and admission of tagged student athletes who were not admitted through the usual comprehensive review process. This supplemental process is a comprehensive review process that weighs many different factors but in which some factors, notably athletic excellence and the perceived contribution that the student would make to an Intercollegiate Athletics program, play a substantially larger role in the decision than they do in other parts of the admissions process. Academic preparation and an assessment of the student's chance of succeeding at Berkeley are carefully weighed on their own and in the context of the support that the Athletic Study Center (ASC) can provide. The student's character and determination, which are critical factors both on the athletic field and in the classroom, are considered. Additional information from the coaches, the Athletic Study Center, and in some cases letters of recommendation, enter into the review so the process has some similarities with the Augmented Review (AR) procedures that are already an established part of the admissions process.

This policy went into effect for the Fall 2004/Spring 2005 admission cycle, and has been updated periodically.

2. Guiding Principles

Berkeley's Athletic Admissions Policy is grounded in and must be consistent with the Academic Senate Committee on Admissions, Enrollment and Preparatory Education's (AEPE's) Guiding Principles for Undergraduate Admissions, which are as follows.

1. The admissions process honors academic achievement and accords priority to students of exceptional academic accomplishment. At the same time, the decision-making process employs a broad and multifaceted definition of merit, including an assessment of contributions that a student will make to the intellectual, cultural, or other aspects of campus life.

2. Each applicant is judged individually and comprehensively and all achievements are evaluated in the context in which the student learned and lived, as well as the opportunities available to the student and how he or she responded to challenges. In keeping with Berkeley's status as a public institution, ability to pay fees and expenses is never a criterion in the admission decision.
3. The admission process should select students of whom the campus will be proud, and who give evidence that they will use their education to make contributions to the intellectual, cultural, social, and political life of the state and the nation.

4. The admissions process should further the Regents' Policy that each campus should enroll a "...student body ... that encompasses the broad diversity of cultural, racial, geographic, and socio-economic backgrounds characteristic of California." The process must also comport with Proposition 209.

5. The admissions process should select only those students whose academic preparation ensures a strong likelihood that they will persist to graduation.

6. The process should consider each applicant fairly, given the information available to the campus, and should seek to be perceived as fair by the various publics of the campus.

The first Guiding Principle sets forth the importance of academic achievement, but also makes clear that the criteria for admission are based on a broad definition of merit that can include athletic achievement as well as character traits that are displayed in athletics. At Berkeley a student athlete must be a successful student as Guiding Principle number five makes clear. The priority for each student athlete is the attainment of a superior education and the completion of a degree. The ability to participate in intercollegiate sports is an important achievement but it is not a sufficient condition in any decision to admit.

The following are some additional, more specific principles that will govern the admission of student athletes.

1. Depending on their levels of competitiveness or preparedness for admission, student athlete candidates are subject to varying levels of admissions review. These reviews are necessary to validate the admissions of student athletes whose application profiles noticeably diverge from the substantial majority of non-athlete students who are admitted.

2. Issues of character and commitment of the applicant, which are of importance both on and off the playing field, will play a significant role in the admissions decision. Above all, the demonstration of a commitment of the student athlete to engage in the academic enterprise of the campus is key to the admissions decision. The further the applicant's academic profile diverges from the norm, the more compelling must be the demonstration of this commitment.

3. A student's designation as a recruited (tagged) student athlete signifies that professional Intercollegiate Athletics staff have acquired significant knowledge of the student's academic as well as athletic and character history. It further
signifies that Intercollegiate Athletics staff have compiled evidence of the student’s interest in academic growth, her/his demonstrated ability to persist and succeed, and her/his potential to make a positive contribution to the campus community.

4. All campus entities that can affect the success of student athletes bear some responsibility for continually assessing, reviewing, and modifying their programs/policies to assure that they fit with the realities of student athlete life. This responsibility includes a review of calendars, program expectations, and related matters.

5. The policies and practices utilized by the Office of Undergraduate Admissions are consistent with the policies established by the Academic Senate, and may be more restrictive than the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) evaluation rules. Berkeley’s admissions decisions must be consistent with both Academic Senate and NCAA policies and practices.

3. **Review Criteria:**

Tagged student athletes who are not admitted in the regular admissions process will undergo an additional comprehensive review process (student-athlete review) which brings to bear additional information provided by Intercollegiate Athletics concerning the applicant’s athletic skills and achievements, what the student can contribute to the campus’s intercollegiate athletic programs, plus information about the character, determination, and work ethic of the applicant and his or her eagerness to engage in the academic enterprise of the campus. General information of this kind plays a role in the regular admissions review process, but additional and more complete information is available in the student-athlete admission review and it carries more weight than in the ordinary review process.

Tagged student athletes on average will show a different academic profile than regularly admitted students and will be at a correspondingly higher academic risk if admitted as Berkeley students. The athletic review process will, on the basis of consideration of a broad range of criteria, classify applicants into one of five categories: A, B, C, D, or E. The academic profile will be an important component of this review, and the further the academic profile differs from the norm, generally the lower will be the classification. However, many other factors will enter into the final determination. Those applicants placed in category A will be those meeting minimum admission standards and not likely to be at academic risk, but who were not admitted in the regular review process. Those placed in categories B, C, and D will be those who are judged to be admissible, but who are at increasing levels of academic risk. Those placed in category E are those judged to be unacceptable for admission.
The first element of the policy is a limitation on the total number of tagged student athletes that can be admitted in the various categories. At most 280 freshmen and 60 advanced standing applicants can be admitted under this policy. Then the policy establishes limits within this overall limit for the number of applicants that can be admitted within the various subcategories. These limits are expressed in terms of the sum of number of admits allowed in a category plus all categories below it. The limits include both Fall and Spring admits, and also include both freshmen and advanced standing admits.

The first limit is on the sum of those in B, C, and D, about 100; the second limit is on those in C and D, about 20; and finally a limit for those admitted in category D, about 4. While the limits for the total number of athletic admissions—280 and 60 are regarded as firm, the limits on the subcategories are permitted to have a small degree of flexibility from year to year depending on circumstances and the applicant pool.

The limits are summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A+ B+C+D</th>
<th>B+C+D</th>
<th>C+D</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced standing</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers exclude any student athlete admitted in the regular competitive admissions process.

4. Freshman Applicants

The following are criteria to be used in classifying freshman athletic applicants in categories A, B, C, D, and E.

To qualify for category A, a freshman applicant must meet the UC A-G subject requirements for eligibility as evidenced by the high school transcript. In the case of out-of-state and international applicants, the Visual and Performing Arts requirement and Language Other Than English requirement should be flexibly evaluated in the context of the applicant’s school opportunities and native language; formal credit in those areas is not always required. Equally important, the combination of the students A-G weighted GPA and average standardized test scores should exceed the criteria\(^1\) shown in Table 1.

\(^1\) As a historical note, these numerical criteria were developed from the standards for UC eligibility in 2005-2006. Category A is essentially identical to that formula for eligibility, category B is defined by having a GPA no more than 0.25 points below the formula for eligibility at a given average test score, and
For all criteria in the freshman policy, the grade point average (GPA) to be used is the usual UC weighted GPA in college preparatory courses that meet UC’s A-G subject requirements. The average SAT score used is nominally the average of the best scores on the individual SAT I and SAT II exams that are used in calculating basic UC eligibility. Not all candidates will have SAT II scores, however, and we want to encourage students to take those exams, and to take additional exams. Therefore the average SAT is calculated so that applicants will not be disadvantaged by taking SAT II exams or retaking SAT exams:

- If the applicant does not have SAT II scores, the average SAT score will be the average of the three exams that make up the SAT I. If there are scores from multiple sittings, the best individual scores are used.
- If the applicant has one SAT II exam score, the average SAT score will be the larger of average of the best scores on the three exams that make up the SAT I, or the average of the three best SAT I exam scores and the SAT II exam score.
- If the applicant has two or more SAT II scores, the average SAT score will be the largest of the average of the best scores on three components of the SAT I exam; the average of the best scores on three components of the SAT I exam plus the highest SAT II score; or the average of the best scores on three components of the SAT I exam plus the two highest SAT II scores.
- ACT scores, when available, can be used in place of SAT scores using the usual conversion method.

Candidates who have SAT II scores could therefore receive a small plus in the review process and should be encouraged to take them.

For athletic applicants who meet the category A criteria, no further review is required other than certification from Intercollegiate Athletics of a high level of athletic achievement and the applicant’s value to the athletic program.

To qualify for category B, a freshman applicant’s coursework should be close to that required for UC eligibility. To make this a bit more precise, generally such an applicant would be missing no more than 3 or 4 semesters of A-G subject requirements and lacking no more than one or two semesters of courses in Mathematics and English. In the case of out-of-state and international applicants, the Visual and Performing Arts requirement and Language Other Than English requirement should be flexibly evaluated in the context of the applicant’s school opportunities and native language; formal credit in those areas is not always required to qualify for category B. Equally important, the combination of the student’s weighted GPA and average standardized test scores should exceed the

---

category C is defined approximately by having a GPA no more than 0.75 points below the formula for eligibility at a given test score. This is only of historical interest, however, as the policy is now defined based on Berkeley’s experience with student-athletes admitted under this policy.
criteria shown in Table 1. However, if an applicant meets these formulaic criteria, there is no guarantee that the applicant will be classed in category B. There must be additional evidence of the applicant’s character, work ethic and desire to engage in the academic enterprise. If such evidence is weak or missing or if there is evidence to the contrary, the applicant could receive a lower classification, including classification in category E (non admit).

As a guidepost in the process of determining whether an applicant falls into category C, D or E, a quantitative Academic Index (AI) will play a role. This index should also be useful as well to coaches, assistant coaches and other UC staff to allow them to make a preliminary assessment of a candidate’s chances for admission. The index is \[ AI = 1000 \times (GPA) + 3 \times (Average \ SAT \ exam \ score) \], where GPA and average SAT exam score are as defined above. When an applicant’s average SAT exam score is less than 410, which is expected to be quite rare, some additional considerations described below apply as well.

As an initial estimate, one can approximate the Academic Index as \[ 1000 \times GPA + \text{(total score on the three SAT I exams)} \].

In order to be considered for classification in category C, a freshman applicant should generally be lacking no more than 6 to 8 semesters of A-G required courses with no more than 3 or 4 semesters of missing courses in Mathematics and English combined. In the case of out-of-state and international applicants, the Visual and Performing Arts requirement and Language Other Than English requirement should be flexibly evaluated in the context of the applicant’s school opportunities and native language; formal credit in those areas is not always required. A preliminary indicator for this classification will be an Academic Index score of no less than 3730 if the average SAT exam score is at least 410. If the average SAT exam score is less than 410, then the GPA and SAT must meet the following condition: \[ 1000 \times (GPA) + 6 \times \text{average SAT score} \] must be at least 4960.\(^2\) Again, merely meeting these numerical conditions does not assure that the applicant will be classed in category C. Additional information about character, work ethic, and desire to engage in the academic enterprise is required and will be taken into account in the comprehensive review. If that information is negative, weak or missing, it could result in a lower classification. On the other hand, if an applicant’s academic index is well above the minimum and the supplemental evidence is especially strong, the

\(^2\) What this means is that if the average SAT exam score is lower than 410, there must be compensating evidence of achievement in the classroom with a stronger GPA; note that a GPA of 2.5 and SAT of 410 yields an AI of exactly 3730, and the formula with 6 times the SAT yields exactly 4960 so the two conditions coincide for this combination of GPA and SAT. What the supplemental condition means is that for every additional 5 points the average SAT exam score falls below 410, the GPA must be higher by 0.06. It should be noted that the relationship between SAT and GPA defining UC eligibility has a very similar pattern and forms a precedent for this kind of relationship.
applicant could win classification in category B. Finally, for classification in category C there must be evidence presented by Intercollegiate Athletics that the applicant is a student athlete who will have a clear impact on the athletic program to which he or she is being recruited.

For consideration in category D, a freshman applicant must meet minimum NCAA eligibility requirements (as all tagged student athletes must). Evidence from Intercollegiate Athletics on the applicant’s character, work ethic and desire to engage in the academic enterprise must be strong and compelling, as must the evidence that the applicant is a "blue chip" student athlete who can be expected to make a substantial impact on the program to which he or she is being recruited.

Category E will consist of applicants who are deemed inadmissible to Berkeley because they fail to meet the criteria outlined above.

5. Transfer Applicants

The following are criteria to be used to classify transfer student-athlete applicants in the various categories A, B, C, D, and E. Based on past experience, it is expected that the overwhelming majority of transfer student-athlete applicants will be freshman/sophomore students with only a few a year who are upper division advanced standing applicants.

For junior transfer applicants, category A would mean a GPA of at least 2.4 in 60 units of transferable courses, completion of lower division breadth requirements, and appropriate major preparation requirements. Category B would mean applicants with a GPA of at least 2.2 and completion of breadth and major requirements together with a showing that this student could succeed at Berkeley. Presumably there would be few if any applicants in category C or D at this level.

Lower division freshman/sophomore applicants present a far wider diversity of files depending on how many units of transferable work the applicant has completed. For applicants who have completed a substantial number of transferable units, say 30 or 40 units, category A would be appropriate if the applicant has maintained a 2.5 or 2.6 in this work, has cleared any A-G subject deficiencies from high school, and has made good progress toward satisfying breadth and major requirements. If this applicant continued for 60 units of transferable work at about this level of achievement, he or she would become clearly eligible for junior transfer admission. Applicants with this number of units would be eligible for classification in category B if they show the same kind of progress in their work except that the GPA could be up to 0.2 lower than what would be required for applicants to qualify for category A, and/or there are two or three subject deficiencies. Applicants with this number of units could be considered for Category C if they show reasonable progress on breadth and major requirements.
but have GPAs lower than what would be required for category B. Also there has to be credible evidence that this student could succeed at Berkeley as well as evidence that the applicant is a "blue chip" student athlete.

Applicants who have completed substantially fewer transferable units are more like high school students who have completed a few college level courses and should be placed in categories in accord generally with the classification rubrics described for freshman applicants. It is very unlikely that such an applicant would qualify for classification in category A. The applicant’s high school record will be considered as well as the record in transferable college work. The more transferable units in rigorous, preparatory, academic courses, the greater the likelihood of a favorable outcome for admission.

6. Procedures

Student athlete admissions will be under the direction of a Student Athlete Admissions Committee (SAAC). This Committee will consist of the Chair of AEPE, another member of AEPE to be selected by AEPE, the Dean of the Division of Undergraduate Studies in the College of Letters and Sciences, the Faculty Athletic representative, the Director of the Athletic Study Center, the Director of Undergraduate Admissions, and the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Admissions and Enrollment. The committee will be co-chaired by the Assistant Vice Chancellor of Admissions and Enrollment and the Chair of AEPE. The Committee should be prepared to meet on short notice in order to consider recommendations. The group should also be prepared to have virtual meetings by email or conference call with materials circulated electronically or by fax so that quick decisions can be made without undue jeopardy to the interest and patience of the applicant. Four members of the SAAC to include at least one of the two AEPE members constitutes a quorum and action will be by majority vote. In order to facilitate timely meetings, AEPE representation on the Committee may rotate according to availability of AEPE committee members.

The following documents are required for freshman provisional admissions decisions at levels B through D.

1. High school transcript through the seventh semester whenever possible, sixth semester for early signers, plus a list of course work in progress or planned
2. SAT I or ACT score; 2 SAT Subject Test (SAT II) scores desirable, but not necessary
3. TOEFL score for international applicants
4. Completed admissions application
5. Letter of support from coach (C&D applicants only, unless requested by the Committee)
6. Academic (Evaluation) Profile form
Required documents for all transfer standing applicants include the following.

1. High School transcripts and transcripts from all colleges attended plus a list of course work in progress or planned
2. TOEFL score for international applicants
3. Completed application form, including personal statement
4. Letter of support from coach (C&D applicants only, unless requested by the Committee)
5. Academic (Evaluation) Profile form

Files of athletic applicants will be forwarded by Intercollegiate Athletics to OUA and will be reviewed and evaluated by the Athletic Admissions Officer in OUA. The Athletic Admissions Officer may seek the advice of the Director of the Athletic Study Center. If the file meets the criteria for category A, then the applicant will be admitted by the Director of OUA. If the recommendation from the Athletic Admissions Officer is that a file be classed in category B, the case will go on a consent calendar for the Student Athlete Admissions Committee. If the recommendation of the Athletic Admissions Officer is that the file be classed as in category C, D or E, the file will be reviewed by the Student Athlete Admissions Committee and a final classification of the file will be determined by the Committee.

In cases where it is appropriate, the Committee may send a letter to the applicant informing them that the Committee has decided that they are admissible, and giving them information on further steps needed to complete the admission process. This is not to appear to be a formal offer of admission, which must come directly from the Office of Undergraduate Admissions through the usual procedures. Rather, it is intended to ensure that the applicant understands their true status, and to provide information that will help them arrive successfully at Berkeley.

Any student athlete who appears to be C or D or even a low B and who visits the campus must meet with the Director of the ASC. Those who do not visit the campus will have a telephone interview. This interview will serve to put the student and the ASC on each other’s radar screen early on, and allow an opportunity for an additional assessment of personal qualities. It is intended that this interview be a non-threatening experience.

OUA will notify Intercollegiate Athletics by March 10 of the admission outcomes for all prospective freshman student athletes whose applications were completed by February 15 and reviewed through the regular admissions process. Intercollegiate Athletics will either tag or drop all prospective student athletes under consideration as of this date. Student athletes who are tagged but not successful in the regular application process, or whose applications are incomplete, will be reviewed in accordance with the guidelines and policies above and in keeping with the total number of spaces allocated to Intercollegiate Athletics for tagged student athletes.
It is the intention of this process that all admission decisions will be made as early as possible once complete information is available. In any case, admission decisions will be made before May 31st of each year except in unusual circumstances. Due to processing delays that will result in an athlete being unable to start school with the rest of students, no applications will be accepted after the second business day after the 4th of July for Fall admission and December 15th for Spring admission except in unusual circumstances.

For both freshmen and transfer admissions, the process does not end with the letter of admissions. All admission decisions are provisional and are contingent upon completion of conditions including satisfactory grades in required courses, and receipt of all official documents, transcripts, certificates, test scores and examination results used in support of the admission. Student athletes in category C and D are also required to attend Summer Bridge as a condition of admission. The committee will review the progress of a student in Summer Bridge and determine if that progress has been sufficient. Students who make insufficient progress will ordinarily be required to redshirt for the full current academic year.

It is essential to the integrity of the admissions process, as well as for NCAA, financial aid and scholarship considerations, that OUA receive all required documents by the deadlines stated in the Conditions of Admission. Students who do not meet these deadlines will have their registration blocked, and a list of these students will be sent to the Associate Director of Intercollegiate Athletics. It is expected that Intercollegiate Athletics will make every effort to help obtain missing documents. OUA alone is responsible for determining whether documents, certificates, transcripts, test scores and examination results are acceptable and official.

When a student who is accepted under this policy decides not to attend or has admission rescinded, that admission no longer counts toward the total number of students admitted that year.

7. Outcomes and Reports

The admissions policies detailed above are intended to enable Berkeley to select the most promising student athletes, but also to limit the number of student athletes admitted whose academic preparation differs in degrees from that of the general population of students admitted and enrolling at Berkeley. A simple numerical tool for monitoring and measuring one aspect of that difference is the Athletic Index (AI) described above. As a goal, the campus should strive to ensure that the mean AI for enrolled freshman tagged student athletes should be within two standard deviations
of the mean for all enrolled freshmen where the standard deviation refers to the standard deviation of the population of all enrolled freshman.\(^3\)

While input variables such as these are of importance, actual successful academic performance once enrolled and graduation are of even greater importance. The Student Athlete Admissions Committee is charged to review every year the academic achievement and graduation rates of all student athletes in detail and prepare annual statistical reports on the overall academic achievement and graduation rates of student athletes at Berkeley. These reports will be presented to AEPE and to the Undergraduate Admissions Coordination Board.

Additionally, this policy establishes the following goals for graduation rates of student athletes: First, the six year graduation rate for student athletes should be at least 95\% of the six year graduation rate for all entering freshman. Second, if one excludes from the count those student athletes who leave the campus in good academic standing prior to using up their four years of athletic eligibility, then the goal is that the six year graduation rates for these student athletes should be at least equal to the six year graduation rate for all entering freshmen.

In conclusion, the goal of this policy is to design a process to select student athletes who can both contribute to the campus’s athletic programs and who will prosper as Berkeley students and graduate in a timely manner. Responsibility for the success of these student athletes is a shared responsibility of many different groups on campus.

\(^3\) For purposes of comparison, the Ivy league Index Agreement requires each Ivy League institution to limit the difference between the mean of the Ivy Index (which is similar to our AI) for recruited athletes to one SD below the mean index for all freshmen. A norm of two standard deviations seems more appropriate for Berkeley where tagged athletes are about 5\% of the total as compared to as much as 20\% in the Ivy League schools.
**Table 1:**

The following table shows the minimum GPAs required for freshman applicants by average SAT score. The average SAT score should be computed as described in section 4 above. Note that this same table is used for all freshman applicants, regardless of where they attended high school.

To use this table, read down until you find the last cell with a value smaller than the applicant’s average SAT score. If the applicant’s UC A-G GPA is greater than or equal to the value in the “Minimum GPA for A” column, then the applicant is eligible for category A if all other conditions are met. If the applicant’s UC A-G GPA is greater than or equal to the value in the “Minimum GPA for B” column, then the applicant is eligible for category B if all other conditions are met.

The “Approx. GPA for C” and “Approx. GPA for D” columns give approximate minimum GPA values for category C and D. Please note that decisions as to whether a student is in category C or D require careful consideration of the details of the applicant’s qualifications, and that the GPA and test score criteria are just one factor of many.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average SAT score</th>
<th>Minimum GPA for A</th>
<th>Minimum GPA for B</th>
<th>Approx. GPA for C</th>
<th>Approx. GPA for D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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