



Academic Progress/Graduation Rate Study of Division I NCAA Women's and Men's Basketball Tournament Teams Reveals Marked Improvement in Overall Graduation Rates But Large Continuing Disparities of the Success of Male and Female and White and African-American Student-athletes

Orlando, FL...March 15, 2006 – The University of Central Florida's Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport released its annual study, "Keeping Score When It Counts: Graduation Rates for 2006 NCAA Men's and Women's Division I Basketball Tournament Teams," which compares academic progress rates and graduation rates for Division I teams that have been selected for the men's and women's brackets of the 2006 NCAA Basketball Tournaments. The author of the study is Dr. Richard Lapchick, who is director of the Institute and of the DeVos Sport Business Management Graduate Program at UCF. The study was co-authored this year by Ryan Vandament.

The study examines the Graduation Success Rates (GSR) and the Academic Progress Rates (APR) for the tournament teams. The study compares the academic performance of male and female basketball student-athletes and of African-American and white basketball student-athletes. The study on the men's tournament teams was released on March 12th.

Lapchick emphasized that "there is considerable good news for the women's tournament teams when we examine the Graduation Success Rates and the Academic Progress Rates in particular. Women basketball student-athletes do much better academically than men and the gap between the academic success between African-American and white women's basketball student-athletes is smaller, although still significant, than between African-American and white men's basketball student-athletes."

Lapchick noted "the new 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, 60 women's teams or 95 percent (**For the women's teams, Dartmouth did not report a GSR so the number of schools eligible is 63; among the men, Penn did not report so the pool of teams was 64**) of the total graduated at least 50 percent of its basketball student-athletes. That compared to 41 or 64 percent of the men's teams."

In addition:

58 women's teams or 92 percent compared to 29 teams or 49 percent of the men's teams graduated at least 60 percent.

45 women's teams or 71 percent compared to 23 teams or 36 percent of the men's teams graduated at least 70 percent.

-More-

Only one team or 2 percent graduated less than 40 percent compared to **16** teams or **25** percent of the men's teams.

Lapchick said, "The GSR tells us far more than the new Academic Progress Rates. In two years we will have enough data for the APRs to be most useful. We are not there yet."

Only Middle Tennessee State in the 2006 Women's Basketball Tournament will be subject to contemporaneous penalties under the APR 925 "cut" score. Five women's teams (8 percent) did not receive a score of 925 or more on the NCAA's APR. Among the 65 men's teams, only Hampton and Kent State will be subject to contemporaneous penalties under the 925 "cut" score. Thirty (30) teams (46 percent) did not receive a score of 925 or more on the NCAA's APR. There is currently a margin of error used in the calculation 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 APR was created in 2004 as an integral piece of the extensive academic reform package developed to more accurately measure student-athletes' success in the classroom and encourage an increase of the 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 said, "I believe the APR reforms are more important than any previous attempt to help keep the student in the student-athlete."

In spite of all the general progress with GSR and APR data, Lapchick "remains alarmed at the persistent gap between African-American and white basketball student-athletes although it is far less severe among the women. The results for women stand in stark contrast to the men's teams."

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

82 percent (50 schools) of the women's tournament teams graduated 70 percent or more of their white basketball student-athletes, **while 63 percent** (37 schools) graduated 70 percent or more of their African-American basketball student-athletes **resulting in a 19 percent gap vs. a 33 percent gap for the men's teams.**

Among the men's teams **66 percent** (38 schools) of the men's tournament teams graduated 70 percent or more of their white basketball student-athletes, **while only 33 percent** (21 schools) graduated 70 percent or more of their African-American basketball student-athletes.

90 percent (55 schools) of the women's tournament teams graduated 60 percent or more of their white basketball student-athletes, **while 73 percent** of schools (43 schools) graduated 60 percent or more of their African-American basketball student-athletes **yielding a 17 percent gap compared to the 30 percent gap for men.**

Among the men's teams **74 percent** (43 schools) of the men's tournament teams graduated 60 percent or more of their white basketball student-athletes, **while only 44 percent** of schools (28 schools) graduated 60 percent or more of their African-American basketball student-athletes.

95 percent (58 schools) of the women's teams graduated 50 percent or more of their white basketball student-athletes, **and 88 percent** (52 schools) graduated 50 percent or

-More-

more of their African-American basketball student-athletes. **That left a 7 percent gap for women and a 31 percent gap for men.**

Among the men's teams **88 percent** (51 schools) graduated 50 percent or more of their white basketball student-athletes, **but only 57 percent** (36 schools) graduated 50 percent or more of their African-American basketball student-athletes.

97 percent (59 schools) of the women's teams graduated 40 percent or more of their white basketball student-athletes, **compared to the 93 percent** (55 schools) which graduated 40 percent or more of their African-American basketball student-athletes, **only a 4 percent gap for women compared to 28 percent for men.**

Among the men's teams **91 percent** (53 schools) graduated 40 percent or more of their white basketball student-athletes, **compared to the 63 percent** (40 schools) which graduated 40 percent or more of their African-American basketball student-athletes.

98 percent (60 schools) of the women's teams graduated 30 percent or more of their white basketball student-athletes, **and 97 percent** (57 schools) graduated 30 percent or more of their African-American basketball student-athletes. This left a **1 percent gap for women and a 20 percent gap among the men.**

Among the men's teams **95 percent** (55 schools) graduated 30 percent or more of their white basketball student-athletes, **while 75 percent** (47 schools) graduated 30 percent or more of their African-American basketball student-athletes.

At the lowest end of the GSR data, **only two percent** (1 school) graduated 20 percent or less of their white basketball student-athletes and only **three percent** (2 schools) graduated 20 percent or less of their African-American basketball student-athletes. This is in stark contrast to the **four times as many** white and African-American men's teams in the 2006 Division I Men's Tournament that graduated less than 20 percent.

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

Overall rates were based on 63 teams for women and 64 for men (Dartmouth and Penn, respectively, like other Ivy League Schools, do not report graduation rates).

Rates for white student-athletes were based on 61 women's teams (Southern University, and St. John's had no white basketball student-athletes in the period under review) and 58 men's teams (California, Georgetown, Hampton, Southern, Syracuse, and Texas also had no white basketball student-athletes in the period under review).

Rates for African-American student-athletes were based on 59 women's teams (Brigham Young, Liberty, Sacred Heart, and Utah had no African-American basketball student-athletes in the NCAA from which the study's data was gathered) and 63 men's teams (Utah State had no African-American basketball student-athletes in the NCAA from which the study's data was gathered).

Lapchick noted, "NCAA President Myles Brand has led the charge in recent years and the overall GSR shows that. African-American student-athletes are doing better historically. We will release a study on National Student-Athlete Day on April 6, 2006 on the substantial progress that has been made over the last 20 years."

Lapchick continued, "Race is an ongoing academic issue, reflected in the continued gap between graduation rates for white and African-American student-athletes. While rates for both groups have improved over the last few years, a significant disparity remains between graduation rates for white and African-American basketball student-athletes. Basketball is a sport in which 42.5 percent of Division I female basketball student-athletes and 60.7 percent of the Division I male basketball student-athletes are African-American. White male basketball

-More-

student-athletes graduate at 76 percent versus only 49 percent of African-American male basketball student-athletes. While white female basketball student-athletes graduate at 88 percent, only 71 percent of African-American female basketball student-athletes graduate. These 27 and 17 percent disparities are alarming.”

“However, African-American male and female basketball players graduate at a higher rate than African-American males and females who are not student-athletes. The graduation rate for African-American male students as a whole is only 35 percent, versus the overall rate of 59 percent for male white students, which is a horrible 24 percentage point gap. The graduation rate for African-American female students as a whole is only 46 percent, versus the overall rate of 64 percent for female white students, which is a scandalous 18 percentage point gap. 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 **16 women’s tournament teams** or 28 percent (**the statistical pool here was 57 schools, because 7 schools did not have data for either white or African-American student-athletes so they were omitted from the category**) have a 30 percentage point or greater gap between the graduation rates of white and African-American basketball student-athletes.

The GSR data shows **25 men’s tournament teams** (44 percent) (**the statistical pool here was 57 schools, because 8 schools did not have data for either white or African-American student-athletes so they were omitted from the category**) have a 30 percentage point or greater gap between the graduation rates of white and African-American basketball student-athletes.

20 women’s teams (35 percent) have a 20 percentage point or greater gap between the graduation rates of white and African-American basketball student-athletes.

31 men’s teams (54 percent) have a 20 percentage point or greater gap between the graduation rates of white and African-American basketball student-athletes.

28 women’s teams (49 percent) had a 10 percentage point or higher gap between the graduation rates of white and African-American basketball student-athletes.

37 men’s teams (65 percent) had a 10 percentage point or higher gap between the graduation rates of white and African-American basketball student-athletes.

Looking at all Division I teams, the disparity for GSR between whites and African-Americans is almost as troubling as there are 66 teams (25 percent - **there are 65 schools that either didn’t have an African-American or white student-athlete or did not report GSR rates on their team in this period leaving 260 schools in the statistical pool**) with at least a 30 percent difference; 93 teams (36 percent) with at least a 20 percent difference; and 126 teams (48 percent) with at least a 10 percent difference between white and African-American basketball student-athletes.

Looking at all Division I men’s teams, the disparity for GSR between whites and African-Americans is almost as troubling as there are 123 teams (43 percent - **there are 44 schools that either didn’t have an African-American or white student-athlete on their team in this period leaving 283 schools in the statistical pool**) with at least a

-More-

30 percent difference; 160 teams (57 percent) with at least a 20 percent difference; and 186 teams (66 percent) with at least a 10 percent difference between white and African-American basketball student-athletes.

1 tournament-bound school (Northern Arizona) and 14 overall Division I basketball teams did not graduate a single African-American female basketball student-athlete during the period using the GSR.

2 tournament-bound schools (Nevada and Northern Iowa) and 9 overall Division I basketball teams did not graduate a single African-American male basketball student-athlete during the period using the GSR.

Ryan Vandament, who co-authored the study, explained why the Institute issues the annual report. “The Institute publishes the graduation rates in order to give college basketball fans a realistic picture on how well colleges and universities are doing off the basketball court. Institutions of higher education promise all student-athletes a meaningful education. We try to see if they have met those promises.”

Lapchick added, “As with the men’s teams, we are seeing the positive results of the initiatives led by Myles Brand. Schools are responding. We still have to fix the gap between the success of white and African-American student-athletes, both males and females. I hope that will be a future factor included in the APR calculations. Admissions officers need to admit only students who can succeed academically. Schools are recruiting so many African-American basketball players from urban areas. Too many urban schools are under funded and cannot deliver the resources that would level the academic playing field. This makes it far more difficult for student-athletes and students in general to be successful. These schools cannot equip - or in some cases create - the computer labs, purchase library resources or get the best teachers to stay in our cities. These factors must change with public pressure to prioritize education in every American community. That would help our colleges more than any academic reform.”

Lapchick concluded, “As always, there are schools that win big enough to be here in March *and* graduate their student-athletes. Four men’s teams (Bucknell, Florida, Illinois and Villanova) graduated 100 percent of their players. For the women, nine schools had a 100 percent graduation rate. They included: Baylor, Duke, Florida, Notre Dame, Purdue, Sacred Heart, Temple, Tennessee, and Vanderbilt. Florida not only placed a men’s and women’s team in the tournament but also had a 100 percent graduation success rate for both teams. That should earn them high rankings for the NCAA’s incentives list.”

NCAA statistics were used in the study. The Institute reviewed 1998 – 99 graduation (six-year) rates, with a four class average (freshman classes of 1995 – 96, 1996 – 97, 1997 – 98, and 1998 – 99).

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.

-More-

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.

A copy of this report can be downloaded at http://www.ncasports.org/press_releases.htm.

###

Academic Rates for 2006 Women'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 |
|-------------------|------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------|
| Arizona State | FGR | 44 | 0 | 67 | 57 | N/A |
| | GSR | 79 | 50 | 100 | 69 | |
| Baylor | FGR | 86 | 88 | 80 | 67 | 966 |
| | GSR | 100 | 100 | 100 | 90 | |
| Boston College | FGR | 86 | 100 | 88 | 82 | 969 |
| | GSR | 93 | 100 | 100 | 93 | |
| Bowling Green | FGR | 54 | 0 | 64 | 69 | 956 |
| | GSR | 83 | 100 | 78 | 84 | |
| BYU*** | FGR | 89 | - | 89 | 55 | 957 |
| | GSR | 87 | - | 87 | 69 | |
| California | FGR | 56 | 44 | 100 | 67 | 966 |
| | GSR | 71 | 50 | 100 | 73 | |
| Chattanooga | FGR | 59 | 57 | 60 | 54 | 990 |
| | GSR | 64 | 70 | 55 | 53 | |
| Connecticut | FGR | 69 | 75 | 64 | 62 | 957 |
| | GSR | 87 | 80 | 88 | 76 | |
| Coppin State | FGR | 70 | 86 | 0 | 51 | 930 |
| | GSR | 80 | 100 | 0 | 70 | |
| Dartmouth | FGR | - | - | - | - | 1000 |
| | GSR | - | - | - | - | |
| DePaul | FGR | 86 | 50 | 100 | 65 | 1000 |
| | GSR | 81 | 60 | 100 | 85 | |
| Duke | FGR | 100 | 100 | 100 | 90 | 989 |
| | GSR | 100 | 100 | 100 | 96 | |
| Florida | FGR | 79 | 73 | 100 | 58 | 990 |
| | GSR | 100 | 100 | 100 | 91 | |
| Florida Atlantic | FGR | 33 | 33 | 33 | 55 | 991 |
| | GSR | 54 | 43 | 67 | 60 | |
| Florida State | FGR | 79 | 83 | 75 | 62 | 982 |
| | GSR | 93 | 100 | 100 | 78 | |
| George Washington | FGR | 69 | 67 | 50 | 71 | 974 |
| | GSR | 93 | 83 | 100 | 90 | |
| Georgia | FGR | 53 | 38 | 100 | 55 | 941 |
| | GSR | 69 | 50 | 100 | 65 | |
| Hartford | FGR | 73 | 71 | 83 | 60 | 972 |
| | GSR | 92 | 83 | 100 | 87 | |
| Iowa | FGR | 69 | 40 | 88 | 69 | 978 |
| | GSR | 69 | 40 | 88 | 75 | |
| Kentucky | FGR | 21 | 11 | 25 | 50 | 982 |
| | GSR | 45 | 38 | 50 | 69 | |
| Liberty*** | FGR | 63 | 0 | 70 | 55 | 991 |
| | GSR | 93 | - | 89 | 76 | |
| Louisiana State | FGR | 62 | 60 | 50 | 54 | 933 |
| | GSR | 67 | 75 | 33 | 67 | |
| Louisiana Tech | FGR | 40 | 33 | 67 | 56 | 881+ |
| | GSR | 79 | 73 | 100 | 67 | |

| School | | Overall | African-American | White | Overall | APR |
|------------------------|-----|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------|-----|
| | | Basketball | Basketball | Basketball | Student- | |
| | | Student-Athlete | Student-Athlete | Student-Athlete | Athlete | |
| Louisville | FGR | 71 | 80 | 67 | 50 | 990 |
| | GSR | 93 | 80 | 100 | 66 | |
| Marist | FGR | 60 | 33 | 67 | 74 | 991 |
| | GSR | 90 | 100 | 89 | 88 | |
| Maryland | FGR | 38 | 50 | 0 | 69 | 944 |
| | GSR | 58 | 56 | 100 | 76 | |
| Michigan State | FGR | 59 | 20 | 73 | 66 | 955 |
| | GSR | 63 | 20 | 80 | 76 | |
| Middle Tennessee State | FGR | 60 | 71 | 50 | 51 | 868 |
| | GSR | 69 | 71 | 67 | 62 | |
| Minnesota | FGR | 45 | 50 | 40 | 60 | 965 |
| | GSR | 64 | 56 | 75 | 67 | |
| Missouri | FGR | 77 | 80 | 71 | 62 | 982 |
| | GSR | 92 | 83 | 100 | 73 | |
| Missouri State | FGR | 47 | 0 | 55 | 57 | 973 |
| | GSR | 88 | 67 | 88 | 63 | |
| NC State | FGR | 62 | 63 | 60 | 54 | 992 |
| | GSR | 75 | 71 | 80 | 68 | |
| New Mexico | FGR | 75 | 80 | 75 | 47 | 975 |
| | GSR | 87 | 80 | 88 | 59 | |
| North Carolina | FGR | 64 | 57 | 75 | 70 | 982 |
| | GSR | 64 | 57 | 75 | 80 | |
| Northern Arizona | FGR | 63 | 0 | 62 | 50 | N/A |
| | GSR | 68 | 0 | 82 | 62 | |
| Notre Dame | FGR | 91 | 83 | 100 | 90 | 977 |
| | GSR | 100 | 100 | 100 | 98 | |
| Oakland | FGR | 23 | 50 | 20 | 53 | 962 |
| | GSR | 45 | 67 | 41 | 54 | |
| Ohio State | FGR | 63 | 43 | 75 | 62 | 996 |
| | GSR | 85 | 60 | 100 | 78 | |
| Oklahoma | FGR | 77 | 80 | 80 | 55 | 957 |
| | GSR | 87 | 67 | 100 | 62 | |
| Old Dominion | FGR | 62 | 57 | 50 | 58 | 963 |
| | GSR | 91 | 83 | 100 | 71 | |
| Pepperdine | FGR | 92 | 100 | 100 | 64 | 980 |
| | GSR | 93 | 100 | 88 | 79 | |
| Purdue | FGR | 73 | 60 | 78 | 72 | 944 |
| | GSR | 100 | 100 | 100 | 81 | |
| Rutgers | FGR | 67 | 67 | 50 | 65 | 946 |
| | GSR | 73 | 70 | 100 | 75 | |
| Sacred Heart*** | FGR | 86 | - | 86 | 76 | 980 |
| | GSR | 100 | - | 100 | 96 | |
| South Florida | FGR | 55 | 50 | 50 | 57 | 972 |
| | GSR | 69 | 50 | 80 | 71 | |
| SE Missouri State | FGR | 50 | 60 | 44 | 52 | 870 |
| | GSR | 77 | 75 | 75 | 66 | |
| Southern California | FGR | 86 | 100 | 50 | 61 | 966 |
| | GSR | 89 | 100 | 60 | 67 | |
| Southern University** | FGR | 46 | 46 | - | 53 | 926 |
| | GSR | 38 | 38 | - | 54 | |

| School | | Overall Basketball Student-Athlete | African-American Basketball Student-Athlete | White Basketball Student-Athlete | Overall Student- Athlete | APR |
|-----------------------|-----|--|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------|
| St. John's** | FGR | 57 | - | 0 | 66 | 981 |
| | GSR | 94 | 100 | - | 87 | |
| Stanford | FGR | 92 | 83 | 100 | 88 | 984 |
| | GSR | 92 | 83 | 100 | 94 | |
| Stephen F. Austin | FGR | 33 | 33 | 33 | 49 | 917+ |
| | GSR | 67 | 55 | 100 | 61 | |
| TCU | FGR | 85 | 0 | 90 | 67 | 943 |
| | GSR | 90 | 100 | 92 | 86 | |
| Temple | FGR | 92 | 100 | 100 | 63 | 923+ |
| | GSR | 100 | 100 | 100 | 73 | |
| Tennessee | FGR | 80 | 80 | 80 | 55 | 970 |
| | GSR | 100 | 100 | 100 | 71 | |
| Texas A&M | FGR | 77 | 71 | 83 | 63 | N/A |
| | GSR | 63 | 45 | 100 | 73 | |
| Tulsa | FGR | 50 | 100 | 42 | 56 | 950 |
| | GSR | 65 | 75 | 64 | 72 | |
| U.S. Military Academy | FGR | - | - | - | - | 1000 |
| | GSR | 99 | 100 | 98 | 95 | |
| UC Riverside | FGR | 67 | 80 | 40 | 67 | 957 |
| | GSR | 76 | 86 | 63 | 68 | |
| UCLA | FGR | 53 | 50 | 29 | 62 | 932 |
| | GSR | 80 | 86 | 50 | 70 | |
| Utah*** | FGR | 62 | 0 | 67 | 59 | 958 |
| | GSR | 77 | - | 80 | 78 | |
| Vanderbilt | FGR | 100 | 100 | 100 | 77 | 941 |
| | GSR | 100 | 100 | 100 | 93 | |
| Virginia Tech | FGR | 92 | 67 | 100 | 70 | 972 |
| | GSR | 93 | 67 | 100 | 83 | |
| Washington | FGR | 67 | 33 | 89 | 68 | 988 |
| | GSR | 80 | 50 | 100 | 84 | |
| Wisconsin, Milwaukee | FGR | 73 | 100 | 71 | 70 | 983 |
| | GSR | 93 | 100 | 93 | 81 | |

N/A - No Data Available

*Dartmouth and the U.S. Military do not report Federal Graduation Rates

**Southern University and St. John's had no white basketball student-athletes for GSR purposes

***BYU, Liberty, Sacred Heart, and Utah had no African-American basketball student-athletes for GSR purposes