



Media Contact:

Jessica Bartter, (407) 823-4884

jbartter@bus.ucf.edu

Academic Progress/Graduation Success Rate Study of Division I NCAA Men's Basketball Tournament Teams

Orlando, FL...March 12, 2007 – The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport, at the University of Central Florida released its annual study, “Keeping Score When It Counts: Graduation Rates for 2007 NCAA Men’s Division I Basketball Tournament Teams” which is a comprehensive analysis of the graduation rates of NCAA Men’s Basketball Tournament-bound team. The study takes a look at Federal Graduation Rates (FGR), Graduation Success Rates (GSR), and the Academic Progress Rates (APR) for the tournament teams, as reported by the NCAA. The study compares graduation rates for all student-athletes to basketball student-athletes as well as African-American basketball student-athletes to white basketball student-athletes. Dr. Richard Lapchick, the primary author of the study, is director of the Institute and Eminent Scholar Chair of the DeVos Sport Business Management Graduate Program at UCF. The study was co-authored this year by Marina Bustamante.

Lapchick noted that “Like 2006, there is substantial good news for the tournament teams when we examine the Graduation Success Rates. The Academic Progress Rates, although still inconclusive, also are somewhat optimistic. The lingering bad news is the continuing disparity in the academic success between African-American and white men’s basketball student-athletes.”

Lapchick said that “the GSR, developed in late 2005, provides a more accurate picture of the success student-athletes have in the classroom at NCAA member institutions. Based on the GSR, 41 teams (64.1 percent, up from 64 percent in 2006)¹ of the total graduated at least 50 percent of its basketball student-athletes. That means that, 17.2 percent more tournament teams graduated at least 50 percent of basketball student-athletes under the GSR than the Federal Graduation Rate. In addition, 33 teams (51.6 percent, up from 45 percent in 2006) graduated at least 60 percent, while an amazing 24 teams (37.5 percent, up from 36 percent in 2006) graduated at least 70 percent. Only 12 teams or 18.8 percent graduated less than 40 percent. We are doing better than we had thought using the FGR. The GSR tells us far more than the Federal Graduation Rates or the new Academic Progress Rates. We are probably one year away from having enough data for the APRs to be most useful.”

Of the 65 Division I men’s basketball teams selected to participate in the 2007 NCAA Basketball Tournament, 30 teams or 46.9 percent² of the total graduated at least 50 percent of their basketball student-athletes based on FGRs. However, even that is an improvement. In the 2006 report, 35 men’s teams failed to reach the 50 percent mark.

The Institute has taken the position that Federal Graduation Rates (FGR) give an unfair depiction of a school because it does not account for transfer students. A student-athlete who transfers in good standing and graduates at another institution counts as a non-graduate at the initial school. The FGR also does not count a junior college student who transfers into a four-year college and graduates or a former student-athlete who returns and graduates more than six years after original enrollment. The Institute supports the NCAA's new Graduation Success Rates, developed in 2005, which accounts for these factors, as a better way to fairly measure the results.

In spite of all the general progress, Lapchick said, "I remain alarmed at the persistent gap between African-American and white basketball student-athletes."

Based on Graduation Success Rate data, problems emerging from the study include the following:

- **68.3 percent** (41) of the men's tournament teams graduated 70 percent or more of their white basketball student-athletes, **while only 30.2 percent** (19) graduated 70 percent or more of their African-American basketball student-athletes **creating a 38.1 percentage point gap.**
- **81.7 percent** (49) of the men's tournament teams graduated 60 percent or more of their white basketball student-athletes, **while only 46 percent** of schools (29) graduated 60 percent or more of their African-American basketball student-athletes **resulting in a 35.7 percentage point gap.**
- **95 percent** (57 schools) graduated 50 percent or more of their white basketball student-athletes, **but only 54 percent** (34 schools) graduated 50 percent or more of their African-American basketball student-athletes **creating a 41 percentage point gap.**
- At the lowest end of the GSR data, **only 1.7 percent** (one school) graduated 20 percent or less of their white basketball student-athletes **yet 12.7 percent** (8 schools) graduated 20 percent or less of their African-American basketball student-athletes

Lapchick noted, "The study we released last year (*Significant Progress for African-American Students*, April 2006) showed that African-American student-athletes are doing better historically. The graduation rate for all African-American student-athletes increased from 35 percent in the 1984 cohort to 52 percent in the 1998 cohort."

Lapchick noted "Nonetheless, we have to look at race as a continuing academic issue, reflected in the remaining huge gaps between graduation rates for white and African-American student-athletes shown above and in the sections that will follow here. Men's basketball has the worst record for graduation rates among all college sports in a sport where 62.6 percent of Division I male basketball student-athletes are African-American. GSR data indicates only 59 percent of male basketball student-athletes graduate in Division I compared to 70 percent of male student-athletes in general. Only 51 percent of African-American male basketball student-athletes graduate while white basketball student-athletes graduate at 76 percent. This 25 percentage point disparity is startling. It is the first time that the disparity is greater for between white and African-American basketball student-athletes than for white and African-American students as a whole. The 24 percentage point gap between the 60 percent graduation rate for white male students and the 36 percent of African-American male students who graduate remains a stark contrast but it is still less than the 25 percent gap in men's basketball.

However, it needs to be noted that African-American basketball players graduate at a higher rate than African-American males who are not student-athletes. The graduation rate for African-American male students is only 36 percent, versus the 51 percent of African-American male basketball student-athletes who graduate. One of the benefits of examining graduation rates is

that they focus light on the fact that too many of our predominantly white campuses are not welcoming places for students of color, whether or not they are athletes.”

More distressing results are:

- The GSR data shows **29 men’s tournament teams** (49.2 percent)³ have a 30 percentage point or greater gap between the graduation rates of white and African-American basketball student-athletes.
- **35 men’s teams** (59.3 percent) have a 20 percentage point or greater gap between the graduation rates of white and African-American basketball student-athletes.
- **40 men’s teams** (67.8 percent) had a 10 percentage point or higher gap between the graduation rates of white and African-American basketball student-athletes.

It does not get better when we look at all Division I teams. The disparity for GSR between whites and African-Americans is almost as troubling as there are 114 teams⁴ with at least a 30 percent difference; 148 teams (52.5 percent) with at least a 20 percent difference; and 180 teams (64 percent) with at least a 10 percentage point difference between white and African-American basketball student-athletes.

- **No tournament-bound schools** and eight overall Division I basketball teams did not graduate a single African-American basketball student-athlete during the period using the GSR. Using the Federal Graduation Rates, seven tournament-bound schools and 41 overall Division I basketball teams did not graduate a single African-American basketball student-athlete during the period.
- **One tournament-bound school (Eastern Kentucky)** and 21 overall Division I basketball teams did not graduate a single white basketball student-athlete during the period using GSR.
- **55 of the institutions** (85.9 percent) had GSRs for all student-athletes that were higher than those of basketball student-athletes.
- **Using the Graduation Success Rates for all Division I men’s teams, 225 teams**⁵ (70.8 percent) graduated 50 percent or more for male basketball student-athletes.
- While **35 of the teams** (12.3 percent) had lower than 50 percent GSR for white male basketball student-athletes, **132 teams** (41.7 percent) had lower than 50 percent GSR for African-American male basketball student-athletes.⁶

In examining the Academic Progress Rate (APR) scores of tournament-bound teams, only three teams (Florida A&M, New Mexico State, and Texas A&M) in the 2007 Men’s Basketball Tournament will be subject to contemporaneous penalties under the 925 “cut” score, which is an expected graduation rate of 50 percent of its student-athletes. Twenty-six (26) teams or 40 percent did not receive a score of 925 or more on the NCAA’s APR. Due to the fact that APR rates have not been yet been released for this year, the APR rates used in this study are the rates from last year.

There is currently a margin of error used in the calculation of the APR that provides protection to certain institutions which have a small sample size of data or some teams who would have been subject to penalties by their APR scores, but did not have to take any actual penalties because they did not have any students leave ineligible in the last year or received a waiver from penalties. These margins of error will be eliminated when a four-year rolling average APR can be determined.

The NCAA created the APR in 2004 as part of an academic reform package designed to more accurately measure student-athlete’s academic success as well as improve graduation rates at member institutions by providing sanctions in the form of lost scholarships when teams fail to meet the NCAA standard for academic performance. Lapchick concluded, “I believe the APR

reforms are more important than any previous attempt to help keep the student in the student-athlete.

The 2007 study shows continuing positive results of the initiative led by NCAA President Dr. Myles Brand to provide incentives for schools with high graduation rates and to impose penalties, such as losing scholarships; on schools that fail to make reasonable progress for graduation rates. I am confident it will get better each year. Nonetheless, we still need to make students of color across all areas of higher education – including sport - feel welcome on our campuses and make them confident that they can succeed.”

Lapchick concluded, “As always, there are schools that win big enough to be here in March *and* graduate their student-athletes at high rates. If we were to choose a Top Ten for Graduation Success Rates, these schools would be there: Butler, Davidson, Florida, Holy Cross, Michigan State, Notre Dame, Villanova, Virginia, Weber State and Wright State. The Final Four would include Davidson, Florida, Holy Cross and Weber State.”

NCAA statistics were used in the study. The Institute reviewed 1999 – 00 graduation (six-year) rates, with a four class average (freshman classes of 1996 – 97, 1997 – 98, 1998 – 99, and 1999 – 00).

The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport serves as a comprehensive resource for issues related to gender and race in amateur, collegiate and professional sports. The Institute researches and publishes a variety of studies, including annual studies of student-athlete graduation rates and racial attitudes in sports, 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 for Diversity and Ethics in Sport 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 sports industry while also emphasizing diversity, community service and sport and social issues.

Note: The men's percentages were calculated as follows:

- *Overall rates were based on 64 teams (Pennsylvania, like other Ivy League Schools, does not report graduation rates)*
- *Rates for African-American student-athletes were based on 63 teams (Gonzaga had no African-American basketball student-athletes in the NCAA from which the study's data was gathered).*
- *Rates for white student-athletes were based on 60 teams (Florida A&M, George Washington, Jackson State and Texas A&M Corpus Christi also had no white basketball student-athletes in the period under review).*

-
- ¹ Penn did not report a GSR so the number of schools eligible are 64.
 - ² Penn did not report FGRs so the number of schools eligible are 64.
 - ³ The statistical pool here was 59 schools, because 6 schools did not have data for either white or African-American student-athletes so they were omitted from the category.
 - ⁴ There are 45 schools that either didn't have an African-American or white student-athlete on their team in this period or do not report GSR rates, such as Ivy League Schools and Utah Valley State, which is a new DI member and does not have these figures yet, leaving 282 schools in the statistical pool.
 - ⁵ 9 teams did not report overall GSR for their respective teams. This changed the number in the statistical pool from 327 to 318.
 - ⁶ 43 teams did not have white players on their respective teams and 11 teams did not have African-American players on their respective teams or did not report GSR rates. Thus the statistical pool for total schools with white players was 284 ($327 - 43 = 284$) and 316 ($327 - 11 = 316$) for schools with African-American players.

###

School		Overall Basketball Student-Athlete	African-American Basketball Student-Athlete	White Basketball Student-Athlete	Overall Student-Athlete	APR
Albany	FGR	54	60	57	61	957
	GSR	58	50	67	66	
Arizona	FGR	36	13	80	57	929
	GSR	42	13	100	65	
Arkansas	FGR	40	40	25	46	979
	GSR	47	45	50	64	
Belmont	FGR	73	67	75	64	990
	GSR	73	67	75	83	
Boston College	FGR	50	50	75	87	917+
	GSR	73	80	75	96	
Butler	FGR	82	71	100	72	933
	GSR	87	86	86	87	
BYU	FGR	33	-	40	62	981
	GSR	58	50	71	77	
Central Connecticut State	FGR	62	57	100	58	900+
	GSR	63	56	75	64	
Creighton	FGR	78	50	100	76	980
	GSR	67	33	100	94	
Davidson	FGR	75	50	60	90	1000
	GSR	92	100	80	97	
Duke	FGR	50	40	67	90	978
	GSR	67	63	67	97	
Eastern Kentucky	FGR	0	0	0	48	938
	GSR	19	23	0	67	
Florida	FGR	67	63	75	59	903+
	GSR	100	100	100	92	
Florida A&M	FGR	0	0	-	32	856
	GSR	9	9	-	32	
Georgetown	FGR	47	38	100	91	963
	GSR	64	56	100	96	
George Washington	FGR	58	60	0	76	941
	GSR	70	60	-	93	
Georgia Tech	FGR	23	33	25	59	948
	GSR	42	43	50	69	
Gonzaga***	FGR	22	0	17	65	980
	GSR	44	-	33	85	
Holy Cross	FGR	86	100	78	85	981
	GSR	100	100	100	96	
Illinois	FGR	64	40	75	71	990
	GSR	80	60	100	88	
Indiana	FGR	67	33	75	63	922+
	GSR	82	50	100	81	
Jackson State	FGR	57	57	-	41	922+
	GSR	40	40	-	42	
Kansas	FGR	40	33	50	64	953
	GSR	45	33	50	70	

Academic Rates for 2007 Men's Teams in the NCAA Division I Basketball Tournament

School		Overall Basketball Student-Athlete	African-American Basketball Student-Athlete	White Basketball Student-Athlete	Overall Student-Athlete	APR
Kentucky	FGR	23	14	25	54	922+
	GSR	33	17	100	72	
Long Beach State	FGR	29	25	33	47	912+
	GSR	72	82	100	69	
Louisville	FGR	22	17	50	52	908+
	GSR	33	25	50	68	
Marquette	FGR	73	63	100	82	918+
	GSR	80	71	100	92	
Maryland	FGR	13	0	25	70	949
	GSR	18	11	50	76	
Memphis	FGR	25	29	0	45	902+
	GSR	36	30	100	64	
Miami (Ohio)	FGR	53	33	64	72	980
	GSR	61	33	69	84	
Michigan State	FGR	75	50	100	69	949
	GSR	91	80	100	81	
Nevada	FGR	33	25	50	52	917+
	GSR	24	8	100	65	
New Mexico State	FGR	44	0	60	53	756
	GSR	47	30	75	57	
Niagara	FGR	71	50	100	69	959
	GSR	83	67	100	90	
North Carolina	FGR	64	60	100	70	989
	GSR	70	60	100	81	
North Texas	FGR	25	25	25	55	920+
	GSR	38	33	100	65	
Notre Dame	FGR	53	50	60	89	977
	GSR	91	100	100	98	
Ohio State	FGR	10	14	0	65	911+
	GSR	38	40	100	80	
Old Dominion	FGR	63	57	100	60	990
	GSR	50	45	100	73	
Oral Roberts	FGR	23	0	75	60	943
	GSR	29	13	67	75	
Oregon	FGR	0	0	0	56	986
	GSR	50	43	67	72	
Penn*	FGR	-	-	-	0	984
	GSR	-	-	-	0	
Pittsburgh	FGR	38	38	50	61	905+
	GSR	57	60	100	77	
Purdue	FGR	50	50	50	70	913+
	GSR	64	67	100	79	
Southern Illinois	FGR	67	75	100	63	961
	GSR	69	67	100	78	
Stanford	FGR	69	71	60	88	954
	GSR	69	71	60	93	
Tennessee	FGR	8	8	-	55	918+
	GSR	18	11	100	73	

Academic Rates for 2007 Men's Teams in the NCAA Division I Basketball Tournament

School		Overall Basketball Student-Athlete	African-American Basketball Student-Athlete	White Basketball Student-Athlete	Overall Student-Athlete	APR
Texas	FGR	30	29	33	57	861
	GSR	44	38	100	75	
Texas A&M	FGR	15	13	0	61	850
	GSR	40	40	25	72	
Texas A&M, Corpus Christi**	FGR	25	100	0	53	930
	GSR	50	100	-	76	
Texas Tech	FGR	38	25	50	56	938
	GSR	55	38	100	76	
UCLA	FGR	38	14	100	62	915+
	GSR	44	30	100	71	
UNLV	FGR	10	17	0	44	841
	GSR	17	14	50	56	
USC	FGR	38	30	50	61	842
	GSR	44	33	75	66	
Vanderbilt	FGR	67	80	60	76	980
	GSR	82	83	75	93	
Villanova	FGR	64	60	100	78	1000
	GSR	90	86	100	94	
Virginia	FGR	62	56	100	78	941
	GSR	85	71	100	84	
Virginia Commonwealth	FGR	31	22	50	50	920+
	GSR	70	67	67	74	
Virginia Tech	FGR	17	25	0	68	930
	GSR	71	100	50	82	
Washington State	FGR	33	25	40	63	875+
	GSR	50	38	75	71	
Weber State	FGR	43	100	0	51	900+
	GSR	100	100	100	89	
Winthrop	FGR	57	75	50	68	952
	GSR	75	70	100	84	
Wisconsin	FGR	60	33	71	70	926
	GSR	64	25	86	79	
Wright State	FGR	33	33	29	61	934
	GSR	86	100	67	75	
Xavier	FGR	67	71	50	78	972
	GSR	83	90	50	93	

N/A - No Data Available

*Pennsylvania and U.S. Air Force do not report Federal Graduation Rates

**Syracuse, and Texas A&M, Corpus Christi had no white basketball student-athletes

***Gonzaga had no African-American basketball student-athletes