



Media Contacts:

Brandon Moyer 804-814-7275, Brandon.Moyer@knights.ucf.edu

Michaela Robbins 423-991-7212, Mrobbi12@knights.ucf.edu

Keeping Score When It Counts: Academic Progress/Graduation Success Rate Study of 2015 NCAA Division I Men's and Women's Basketball Tournament Teams

*Study Reveals Women Are Doing Better Than Men But
The Gap Between African-American and White **Women More Than Doubled***

Orlando, FL... March 17, 2015– The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport (TIDES) at the University of Central Florida (UCF) released its annual study, **“Keeping Score When It Counts: Academic Progress/Graduation Success Rate Study of 2015 NCAA Division I Men's and Women's Basketball Tournament Teams,”** which compares graduation rates and academic progress rates for Division I teams that have been selected for the men's and women's brackets of the 2015 NCAA Basketball Tournaments.

Dr. Richard Lapchick, the primary author of the study, is the director of TIDES and Chair of the DeVos Sport Business Management Graduate Program at UCF. The study was co-authored by Evanna Howell and Maclin Simpson.

This study is a follow-up report to the men's tournament study that was released on March 16, 2015. The study compared the academic performance of male and female basketball student-athletes and of African-American and white basketball student-athletes by examining the Graduation Success Rates (GSR) and the Academic Progress Rates (APR) for the tournament teams. The women graduated at a rate of **88** percent vs. 75 percent for the men. The women and men teams both had **only** one team in the tournament with an APR below a 930.

Lapchick stated, “Once again, the women's teams bring good news to the report this year with **19** women's teams that have a 100 percent graduation rate in the 2015 field and **four** teams that scored a perfect APR score of 1000. Student-athletes on women's basketball teams graduate at a higher rate than student-athletes on men's basketball teams.

The gap between white and African-American student-athletes has always been significantly smaller on women's teams than on men's teams. **While this was still true,** there was a **significant seven** point increase in the disparity between graduation rates of white and African-American **female** student-athletes which resulted in a **12** percentage point gap compared to a **24** percentage point gap for the men's teams.”

RICHARD E. LAPCHICK, DIRECTOR

C. KEITH HARRISON, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR • SCOTT BUKSTEIN, RESEARCH ASSOCIATE

Tel: 407-823-1516 or 407-823-4887 • Fax: 407-823-3771 • Web: www.tidesport.org

~MAKING WAVES OF CHANGE~

All of the women's teams graduated more than 60 percent of their student-athletes except Florida Gulf Coast University and [Savannah State University](#).

This year Dayton, Notre Dame, and Duke had a team in the men's and women's tournament each of which had a 100 percent graduation rate on both teams.

[Lapchick said](#), "There are many categories where the women outperform the men academically. White female basketball student-athletes on tournament teams graduated at a rate of [96](#) percent compared to [84](#) percent for African-American female basketball student-athletes. White male basketball student-athletes on tournament teams graduated at the rate of [93](#) percent versus only [69](#) percent of African-American male basketball student-athletes. The [12](#) percentage point women's gap is far less than the [24](#) percent men's gap. [However, the more than doubling of the gap for women from five percent in 2014 to 12 percent in 2015 is alarming and needs to be tracked in the future.](#) The gap for men [in 2015 remained the same as 2014 at a terrible](#) 24 percent gap.

In 2015, [100 percent](#) of the women's tournament teams graduated at least 50 percent of their basketball student-athletes. In comparison, [93](#) percent of the men's teams in this year's tournament graduated at least 50 percent of their basketball student-athletes. Thus there is a 7 percentage point gap between women's and men's basketball graduation rates at the 50 percent mark in the 2015 tournament."

Lapchick added that, "while there is so much good news in both the men's and women's reports regarding GSRs and APRs, it is still not acceptable that in 2015, [24](#) percent of the women's tournament teams and [39](#) percent of the men's teams had a 30 percentage point or greater gap between the graduation rates of white and African-American basketball student-athletes."

In addition:

- [91](#) percent of the women's teams compared to 65 percent of the men's teams graduated at least 70 percent creating a [26](#) percent gap.
- 97 percent of the women's teams compared to [79](#) percent of the men's teams graduated at least 60 percent resulting in an [18](#) percent gap.
- No women's team graduated less than 40 percent while two men's teams were below this mark.

Based on Graduation Success Rate data, additional highlights from the study include the following:

70 percent graduation rates

- **[95](#) percent** of the women's tournament teams graduated 70 percent or more of their white basketball student-athletes, while **[78](#) percent** graduated 70 percent or more of their African-American basketball student-athletes, which resulted in an **[17](#) percentage point gap, which was a [eight percentage point increase from nine percent in 2014.](#)**
- Among the men's teams, **[86](#) percent** of the men's tournament teams graduated 70 percent or more of their white basketball student-athletes, while only **[52](#) percent** graduated 70 percent or more of their African-American basketball student-athletes, resulting in a **[34](#) percent percentage point gap** among the men, which was a **[6 percentage](#) point decrease from [40](#) percent in 2014.**

60 percent graduation rates

- **97 percent** of the women's tournament teams graduated at least 60 percent or more of their white basketball student-athletes, while **92 percent** graduate 60 percent or more of their African-American basketball student-athletes which resulted in a **five percentage point gap** which was a **five** point increase from there being **no disparity in 2014**.
- Among the men's teams, **98 percent** graduated 60 percent or more of their white basketball student-athletes, while only **65 percent** graduate 60 percent or more of their African-American basketball student-athletes. This resulted in a **33 percent percentage point gap**, which **remained the same from the 33 percentage point gap in 2014**

50 percent graduation rates

- **98 percent** of the women's teams graduated at least 50 percent or more of their white basketball student-athletes, and **98 percent** graduated 50 percent or more of their African-American basketball student-athletes which resulted in a **no disparity between African-American women basketball student-athletes and white women basketball student-athletes**. Last year's study showed a **one percentage point disparity** favoring white student-athletes.
- **100 percent** of the men's tournament teams graduated 50 percent or more of their white basketball student-athletes, while only **79 percent** graduated 50 percent or more of their African-American basketball student-athletes. This resulted in a **21 percent gap** among the men, which **was a one percentage point decrease from the 22 percent gap reported in 2014**.

These were among the distressing results:

- The GSR data shows **15 women's tournament teams** (27 percent) had a 30-percentage point or greater gap between the graduation rates of white and African-American basketball student-athletes; 13 of the teams (24 percent) with a 30-percentage point or greater gap experience higher graduation rates for white student-athletes while two teams (four percent) had a similar disparity in favor of African-American student-athletes.
- 22 men's tournament teams (41 percent) had a 30-percentage point or greater gap between the graduation rates of white and African-American basketball student-athletes. 21 of the teams (39 percent) with a 30-percentage point or greater gap experience high graduation rates for white student-athletes while one team (2 percent) had a similar disparity in favor of African-American student-athletes.
- 24 women's teams (44 percent) had a 20-percentage point or greater gap between the graduation rates of white and African-American basketball student-athletes. 21 of the teams (38 percent) with a 20 percentage point or greater gap experience higher graduation rates for white student-athletes, while three teams (six percent) experience higher graduation rates for African-American student-athletes.
- 28 men's teams (52 percent) had a 20-percentage point or greater gap between the graduation rates of white and African-American basketball student-athletes; 26 of the teams (48 percent) with a 20 percentage point or greater gap experience higher graduation rates for white student-athletes, while two teams (4 percent) experience higher graduation rates for African-American student-athletes.

There are **19** women's teams that had a 100 percent graduation rate: American University, DePaul University, Duke University, George Washington University, Iowa State University, Princeton University, Quinnipiac University, Tulane University, University of Connecticut, University of Dayton, University of Kentucky, University of Nebraska -- Lincoln, University of Notre Dame, University of Oklahoma, University of Pittsburgh, University of South Florida, University of Tennessee, University of Washington, and University of Wisconsin-Green Bay.

RICHARD E. LAPCHICK, DIRECTOR

C. KEITH HARRISON, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR • SCOTT BUKSTEIN, RESEARCH ASSOCIATE

Tel: 407-823-1516 or 407-823-4887 • Fax: 407-823-3771 • Web: www.tidesport.org

~MAKING WAVES OF CHANGE~

Lapchick noted, "There are [four](#) teams within the women's basketball tournament field and five in the men's field that scored a perfect APR score of 1000."

The NCAA has raised its standards to a 930 or greater APR. [Savannah State](#) University was the lone team in the women's field below 930. On the men's side, Coastal Carolina University was the lone team to fall under the 930 score.

The APR, developed in 2004, is a four-year average of academic performance that rewards student-athletes for remaining eligible as well as continuing their education at the same school. The NCAA voted to institute stricter policies with regards to APR performance and postseason athletic participation by raising the score from 925 to 930, equivalent to a 50 percent graduation rate, to qualify for postseason participation the following year. The current system provides that teams scoring below a 930 APR can lose up to 10 percent of their scholarships. Teams can also be subject to historical penalties for poor academic performance over time.

The APR data does not include data from the 2013-14 academic performances of the teams in the study, but instead uses the four years of data ending in the 2012-13 school year. This is the most updated data available on the NCAA website..

All of the women's basketball tournament-bound teams in the Football Bowl Subdivision conferences represented in the APR study did well this year. The AAC, ACC, Big Ten, Big 12, Mountain West, Pac 12, SEC, and Sun Belt had their entire tournament-bound member institutions receive an APR score greater than 930. The [Big East](#), [ACC](#) and [Big 10](#) are each represented by at least [two](#) teams in the top 15 APR scores.

Lapchick stated that, "[We are confident that women's basketball student-athletes will continue to succeed and hope that the men will continue to do better.](#) Women's basketball student-athletes epitomize the balance that is needed to be a successful contemporary student-athlete, and we [hope that we](#) will see a [reversal of the increased disparity between white and African-American female student-athletes and bigger decreases in the disparity between white and African-American male student-athletes.](#)"

Note: The percentages for the women's report were calculated as follows:

1. Overall rates were based on 64 women's teams.
2. Rates for African-American student-athletes were based on 60 teams due to Gonzaga University – Spokane, Princeton University, South Dakota State University and University of Montana had no reported African-American basketball student-athlete data in the period recorded.
3. Rates for white student-athletes were based on 58 teams due to [Alabama State University](#), Princeton University, Savannah State University, Tennessee State University, University of Pittsburgh, and University of South Florida had no reported white basketball student-athlete data in the period recorded.
4. The disparity figures were based on 55 teams due to a lack of reporting for white or African-American student-athletes or there was not a certain race represented on a team.

Note: The percentages for the men's report were calculated as follows:

1. Overall rates were based on 68 men's teams.

2. Rates for African-American student-athletes were based on 66 teams due to Davidson College, and University of Wisconsin -- Madison had no African-American basketball student-athletes in the period recorded.
3. Rates for white student-athletes were based on 56 teams due to Georgetown University, Georgia State University, Hampton University, Indiana University, Louisiana Tech university, New Mexico State University, North Carolina Central University, St John's University (NY), Temple University, Texas Southern University, University of Cincinnati, University of Louisville, University of Mississippi, and Virginia Commonwealth University had no white basketball student-athletes in the period recorded.
4. The disparity figures were based on 54 teams due to the fact that the 14 teams listed above either had no white basketball student-athletes or African-American basketball student-athletes in the period reported.

The GSR was developed in 2005 in response to the demand for a more accurate measure of graduation performance of NCAA athletics programs. In order to calculate the GSR, the NCAA tracks student-athletes for six years following their entrance to an NCAA member institution to monitor the graduation rates of member institutions and their athletic programs. The GSR is used by the NCAA as a measuring device to signal performance of NCAA athletic programs while the APR is used to determine penalties for academically underperforming athletic programs.

The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport ("TIDES" or the "Institute") serves as a comprehensive resource for issues related to gender and race in amateur, collegiate and professional sport. The Institute researches and publishes a variety of studies, including annual studies of student-athlete graduation rates and racial attitudes in sport, as well as the internationally recognized Racial and Gender Report Card, an assessment of hiring practices in coaching and sport management in professional and college sport. Additionally, the Institute conducts diversity management training in conjunction with the National Consortium for Academics and Sports. The Institute also monitors some of the critical ethical issues in college and professional sport, including the potential for exploitation of student-athletes, gambling, performance-enhancing drugs and violence in sport.

The Institute is part of the DeVos Sport Business Management Graduate Program in the University of Central Florida's College of Business Administration. This landmark program focuses on business skills necessary for graduates to conduct successful careers in the rapidly changing and dynamic sport business and entertainment management industry while also emphasizing diversity, community service, and social issues in sport.

Graduation Rates for 2015 Women's Teams in the NCAA Division I Basketball Tournament					
School	APR	Overall WBB Student-Athlete	African-American WBB Student-Athlete	White WBB Student-Athlete	Overall Student-Athlete
Alabama State University	946	91	91	---	70
American University	975	100	100	100	94
Arizona State University	978	93	100	100	82
Baylor University	979	80	67	100	88
Boise State University	964	79	60	100	79
Brigham Young University (BYU)	980	86	50	100	73
California State University, Northridge	964	62	56	100	68
De Paul University	1000	100	100	100	92
Duke University	978	100	100	100	97
Florida Gulf Coast University	962	50	100	38	67
Florida State University	979	83	78	100	84
George Washington University	980	100	100	100	95
Gonzaga University	991	92	---	100	97
Iowa State University	979	100	100	100	77
James Madison University	966	83	78	100	81
Liberty University	987	86	75	89	78
Louisiana State University	966	92	92	100	81
Mississippi State University	959	95	90	100	84
New Mexico State University	956	63	46	100	73
Northwestern State University	941	87	82	100	68
Northwestern University	984	92	80	100	96
Ohio University	969	83	100	67	81
Oklahoma State University	952	63	63	100	70
Oregon State University	960	78	80	75	79
Princeton University	995	100	---	---	97
Quinnipiac University	988	100	100	100	83
Rutgers University	984	82	78	100	86
Savannah State University	853	50	50	---	46
Seton Hall University	990	93	86	100	93
South Dakota State University	1000	81	---	87	81
St. Francis College Brooklyn	967	87	67	100	86
Stanford University	1000	93	67	100	98
Syracuse University	991	83	83	75	88
Tennessee State University	977	83	83	---	59
Texas A&M University	974	75	69	100	76
The Ohio State University	976	92	89	100	89
Tulane University	995	100	100	100	90
University at Albany	977	85	78	100	80
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville	936	75	67	100	76
University of Arkansas, Little Rock	961	77	57	100	79
University of California, Berkeley	954	73	75	100	80
University of Connecticut	989	100	100	100	82
University of Dayton	995	100	100	100	95
University of Iowa	977	92	100	100	89
University of Kentucky	977	100	100	100	81
University of Louisville	958	89	83	100	80
University of Maryland, College Park	959	92	90	100	86
University of Miami (Florida)	960	90	83	100	92
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities	995	91	75	100	87
University of Montana	979	85	---	88	78
University of Nebraska-Lincoln	991	100	100	100	83
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	963	69	70	100	86
University of Notre Dame	968	100	100	100	99
University of Oklahoma	990	100	100	100	80
University of Pittsburgh	994	100	100	---	79
University of South Carolina, Columbia	990	83	78	100	85
University of South Florida	955	100	100	---	83
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	981	86	67	100	67
University of Tennessee, Knoxville	979	100	100	100	78
University of Texas at Austin	986	90	83	100	83
University of Washington	971	100	100	100	80
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay	1000	100	100	100	90
Western Kentucky University	961	75	78	50	80
Wichita State University	974	93	83	100	83
Average:	974	88	84	96	82

RICHARD E. LAPCHICK, DIRECTOR

C. KEITH HARRISON, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR • SCOTT BUKSTEIN, RESEARCH ASSOCIATE

Tel: 407-823-1516 or 407-823-4887 • Fax: 407-823-3771 • Web: www.tidesport.org

~MAKING WAVES OF CHANGE~

Graduation Rates for 2015 Men's Teams in the NCAA Division I Basketball Tournament					
School	APR	Overall Men's Basketball Student-Athlete	African-American Basketball Student-Athlete	White Basketball Student-Athlete	Overall Student-Athlete
Baylor University	954	92	90	100	88
Belmont University	1000	100	100	100	96
Boise State University	941	69	58	100	79
Brigham Young University	956	82	100	75	73
Butler University	985	100	100	100	87
Coastal Carolina University	910	80	75	80	83
Davidson College	990	100	---	100	98
Duke University	995	100	100	100	97
Eastern Washington University	958	73	67	100	68
Georgetown University	973	70	70	---	95
Georgia State University	950	77	77	---	86
Gonzaga University	979	91	100	100	97
Hampton University	948	67	64	---	64
Harvard University	963	100	100	100	98
Indiana University, Bloomington	1000	42	50	---	84
Iowa State University	948	64	20	100	77
Lafayette College	994	90	50	100	97
Louisiana State University	955	50	38	100	81
Manhattan College	956	73	73	100	91
Michigan State University	980	73	40	100	86
New Mexico State University	961	13	20	---	73
North Carolina State University	959	80	83	67	81
North Dakota State University	956	85	67	90	82
Northeastern University	984	100	100	100	91
Oklahoma State University	948	22	13	100	70
Providence College	947	67	67	50	90
Purdue University	985	73	57	100	82
Robert Morris University	938	54	44	100	77
San Diego State University	939	63	50	100	77
Southern Methodist University	939	75	57	100	82
St. John's University (New York)	942	83	83	---	89
Stephen F. Austin University	965	53	40	100	62
Texas Southern University	970	52	44	---	48
The Ohio State University	977	53	38	80	89
University at Albany	965	80	63	100	80
University at Buffalo	947	64	33	100	77
University of Alabama at Birmingham	983	53	50	---	75
University of Arizona	984	82	67	100	75
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville	937	55	50	100	76
University of California, Irvine	958	82	80	67	85
University of California, Los Angeles	969	60	67	67	87
University of Cincinnati	958	43	42	---	79
University of Dayton	985	100	100	100	95
University of Georgia	986	71	67	100	84
University of Iowa	971	100	100	100	89
University of Kansas	1000	100	100	100	85
University of Kentucky	989	89	83	100	81
University of Louisville	1000	58	50	---	80
University of Maryland, College Park	953	100	100	100	86
University of Mississippi (Ole Miss)	974	75	75	---	79
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	938	88	83	100	86
University of North Florida	959	56	40	75	80
University of Northern Iowa	995	60	33	67	82
University of Notre Dame	995	100	100	100	99
University of Oklahoma	960	77	80	100	80
University of Oregon	945	73	71	100	82
University of Texas at Austin	1000	100	100	100	83
University of Utah	979	88	100	67	81
University of Virginia	945	82	83	100	86
University of Wisconsin, Madison	975	40	-	67	84
University of Wyoming	941	64	40	100	77
Valparaiso University	980	90	100	100	89
Villanova University	983	100	100	100	96
Virginia Commonwealth University	970	87	82	---	76
West Virginia University	974	89	80	100	83
Wichita State University	961	64	67	67	83
Wofford College	961	91	83	100	94
Xavier University	958	89	88	100	94
Average	967	75	69	93	83

RICHARD E. LAPCHICK, DIRECTOR

C. KEITH HARRISON, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR • SCOTT BUKSTEIN, RESEARCH ASSOCIATE

Tel: 407-823-1516 or 407-823-4887 • Fax: 407-823-3771 • Web: www.tidesport.org

~MAKING WAVES OF CHANGE~