



Athletic Study Center Review

March 20, 2015
Final Report

Table of Contents

Background and Introduction	4
Findings.....	6
Challenges.....	6
Recommendations.....	7
<i>ASC Scope of Work and Function</i>	7
<i>Staffing and Space</i>	9
<i>Budgeting</i>	10
<i>Connections Across Campus</i>	11
<i>To Examine Moving Forward</i>	12
Conclusion	12

Background and Introduction

The Review Committee convened January 25-27th, 2015 to conduct an external review of the Athletic Study Center (ASC), in order to make recommendations to the UC Berkeley campus about best directions moving forward.

The Review Committee was comprised of UC Berkeley faculty and staff, in addition to external reviewers from the University of Colorado, the University of Virginia, Stanford University, and UCLA.

The review was conducted in similar fashion to a departmental review, and was initiated with a charge from the Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost and the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education.

Our charge was to study “the mission of the Athletic Study Center, its programs and services, institutional support for the Center, the Center’s role in academic and degree programs, the accountability of the Center, and program review aspects of the Center.” More specifically, the committee considered the following key questions:

- What is the ASC responsible for?
- What is the ASC resourced to do?
- What is the ASC mission? What is and is not in the ASC charge? How much of what the ASC does is about supporting students’ intellectual life and academic goals? How much is about eligibility?
- What is the optimal relationship between ASC and the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics (IA) (Athletic Director, coaches, etc)?
- Should the ASC have a role in admissions of student-athletes? What should it be?
- What is the relationship between ASC advising and other advising on campus (Letters & Science (L&S) and in departments)?
- To what extent does the ASC help students integrate into the campus community?

The Review Committee engaged in a series of meetings and conversations to gather knowledge and hear from a variety of stakeholders. The committee met with the ASC Leadership team and staff, IA Leadership, student-athletes, L&S advising staff, athletic coaches, representatives from

the Berkeley Budget Office, and members of the Academic Senate. Some of these conversations were held with the full committee; others took place in smaller working groups. There were four working groups: Diversity, Resources, Financial, and Advising. Each group was concerned with a unique set of issues and concerns.

Diversity: What special issues face those student-athletes from marginalized groups and women? What role does the ASC have (or could the ASC have) in supporting these students?

Resources: What is the role of the ASC in helping students access campus resources? Has this been effective? What are the opportunities and constraints?

Financial: What is the financial structure of the ASC? What are the future financial projections? What supports and barriers are there for fundraising (e.g. development support)? How are IA and ASC linked financially? Is the current structure working? What gaps are there?

Advising: What role does the ASC play with respect to advising student-athletes? What is working well and/or less-well with respect to advising? What goal does the ASC have around student advising? Is it realistic for them to be able to serve all student-athletes with tutoring and advising needs? What is the relationship between ASC advising and the advising that students have access to elsewhere on campus?

The Review Committee was comprised of the following members:

Na’ilah Nasir, Professor, African American Studies (Chair), and the Graduate School of Education

Michael Casillas, Department of Athletics, UCLA

David Clough, Professor of Engineering and Faculty Athletic Representative, University of Colorado

Meg Conkey, Professor Emerita of Anthropology

Roseanne Fong, Director of Letters & Science Advising

Solomon Hughes, Academic Advising, Stanford University

Glynda Hull, Professor, Graduate School of Education, and Chair of the Committee on Educational Policy, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate

Robert Jacobsen, Interim Dean, L&S Undergraduate Studies, Faculty Athletic Representative

Jabiri Mahiri, Professor, Graduate School of Education

Rachel Most, Associate Dean and Professor, University of Virginia

Christian Teeter, Chief of Staff, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education, Staff to the Review Committee

H. Michael Williams, Interim Director of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics (IA)

Sheldon Zedeck, Professor Emeritus, Graduate School of Education, Consultant to the Review Committee

Support for the Review Committee was provided by Irene Yu of Vice Chancellor Koshland's Immediate Office.

Findings

Our findings indicate that the Athletic Study Center (ASC) is an effective organization that already meets a high standard. We are impressed with the scope and quality of the work being conducted by the ASC, including providing advising, tutoring, learning specialist support, and a variety of other services to student athletes from their freshman to senior years. This work is informed by social and learning theory, and is conducted by a diverse, educated, and dedicated staff.

Student-athletes with whom the committee met and who have access to the services feel well-supported by the Athletic Study Center, and report that the services they receive there are essential to their progress toward degree, and to their emotional and intellectual well-being.

Coaches also deeply value the work of the ASC, and see it as a “one-stop shop” for their student-athletes. They understandably appreciate the current model whereby advisors/learning specialists are assigned to an entire sports team (rather than an alternative model that would pair advisors with major interests across different sports).

The ASC staff is increasingly focused on holistic student development and see their role in expansive and encompassing ways, far beyond simply being “eligibility brokers.” Additionally, the data management system, shared by the ASC and Intercollegiate Athletics (IA), is viewed as an asset to both units and as instrumental in tracking the progress and needs of students, both with respect to academics and athletics.

Thus, our comments and recommendations are in the spirit of recognizing that the ASC is a strong unit and one that should be supported, the quality of its work preserved, and its future secured. This does not mean there are no changes to be made and re-assessments to be taken up. It is an important moment on our campus and issues around the support for and integration of student athletes are central, especially in the wake of the report from the Chancellor’s Task Force on Academics & Athletics. The ASC has a critical role to play in ensuring that the needs of student-athletes are met and that they are fully integrated into the Berkeley campus. Still, some precision as to what those roles are, especially within the resource constraints and the changes regarding the admissions policy, has yet to be worked out.

Challenges

Our findings reveal several key challenges facing the ASC at this point in time. In part because the unit has performed well, the ASC faces a perception by other units on campus (and within the ASC) that it can be everything to everyone. However, the ASC is stretched thin by trying to meet multiple kinds of needs without a clear sense of the boundaries of its mission and charge.

Learning Specialists in particular are overburdened and working very long hours; the geographic separations across campus among ASC staff as well as the size and scope of the ASC mean that it is difficult for the learning specialists themselves to be able to draw firmer boundaries on their time and services. Some ASC staff also feel disrespected in multiple ways, that their work is not valued by the broader campus, and that there are many misconceptions around what they do. They feel considerable pressure to attend to eligibility issues, often to an extent that they feel distracted from other important student development work, that, in turn opens them up to disrespect or displeasure from some of the coaches.

Many student-athletes seek support solely at the ASC, thus leaving a serious and major disconnect between the ASC and other places on campus where student-athletes can and should find support and advising. As noted below, there are important differences and some tension between ASC and L&S advisors. There are also financial and staff challenges, including insecure funding streams for key positions, and no increases in the ASC budget to support mandatory/deserved merit and cost of living increases for staff. The Director manages a wide range of responsibilities, including both inward-facing management and service tasks, and outward-facing fundraising and development tasks.

Recommendations

There are several clear high-level recommendations from the committee. Here we detail those recommendations, attending to issues of the scope and functions of the ASC, its staffing and space, budgeting, connections with the broader campus, and important issues to examine more closely moving forward. We have identified at least three (3) recommendations that we are highlighting as Consulting Recommendations. This is because there are several core issues that the Review Committee was not in a position to pursue with enough depth or detail that we could present very specified solutions here. Each of these three Consulting Recommendations are suggesting that very small groups two or three parties convene to generate viable alternatives or agreed-upon solutions.

ASC Scope of Work and Function

1) Consider how to redistribute functions related to academic monitoring. (Consulting Recommendation)

One important point of tension is the amount of time and energy ASC staff is spending on monitoring and tracking academic status (Academic Progress Rate, Graduation Success Rate, etc.). This work distracts from the Center's central student development mission in multiple ways. The ASC staff should not be responsible for tracking academic status. These functions should be located with the IA compliance office and the Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR).

We recommend that IA, the FAR, and the ASC come together to determine how best to move the bulk of the responsibility for tracking eligibility out of the ASC.

2) Consider new ways to integrate ASC and L&S advisors. (Consulting Recommendation)

As defined in the charge to the review committee and as part of the recommendation regarding the review from the Chancellor's Task Force, the relationship(s) and structure between advising in the ASC and Advising in Letters & Science (L&S) was to be of key consideration.

We have several comments on this issue, especially as we are on the verge of a major redefinition of the L&S advising program, but first we note that the structural relations and actual practices of the ASC advisors and those in L&S require they be vetted more deeply and even delicately.

On the one hand, the L&S Advising program has expanded and improved as all entering students since Fall 2014 are assigned a L&S Advisor. Integrating student-athletes into this program is planned, as the issue was raised by the Chancellor's Task Force. On the other hand, this situation presents both opportunities and challenges for the role and activities of the ASC.

An issue that has long been a point of discussion and source of contention between the L&S and ASC advisors is the difference in authority, accountability, and in training for the advisors. Currently, the ASC advisors complete two weeks of formal training and receive the remainder through on-the-job training. Furthermore, many advisors come from the Graduate School of Education program in the Cultural Studies of Sport in Education (overseen by the ASC Director Dr. Derek Van Rheenen) and thus come with strong backgrounds in pedagogical theory and method (itself a unique and valuable feature of the Berkeley ASC).

In contrast, L&S Advisors undergo a much longer period of training and hold more authority about student schedules. They are more accountable in official ways for the advice they provide to students. Specifically, these advisors go through a formal training program that lasts at least three months, has more than thirty individual training modules, and is then followed by another three months of shadowing and dual advising.

What should the role be for the ASC Advisors in relation to the new L&S system? We recommend that ASC advisors continue to report to the Division of Undergraduate Education, but strengthen their ties to L&S Advising. We further recommend that the ASC Director continue to have a significant role in the recruiting, hiring, and retention of advisors in any new structure that is devised by the campus.

The Review Committee does not presume to be able to work out this relationship and where or how advising should be carried out as the new system emerges. Rather, we urge a meeting (sooner rather than later) to discuss shared needs, core values, and the consideration of alternative models going forward. This need not involve more than the ASC Director and the Interim Dean of Undergraduates in L&S (who is also uniquely aware of the student-athlete issues as the current FAR), the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education, and the Division Chief of Staff. Additional discussion of this issue is in Recommendation 12 below.

As part of these discussions, the Review Committee recommends that the training format and modules for L&S advisors be reviewed as this new relationship between L&S Advising and the ASC is developed, such that the gap between the training provided to ASC advisors, vis-à-vis L&S advisors, can be addressed.

3) Consider ways to prioritize resources. (Consulting Recommendation)

The ASC tutoring program has grown exponentially in recent years, with a three-fold increase in client requests over the last decade. It is not feasible—nor within the scope and mission—for the ASC to provide tutoring for every class for every year of a student-athlete’s experience at Berkeley. Some tough decisions about how to focus tutoring resources are necessary.

Rather than prescribe how the ASC should focus its resources, we recommend that the ASC Director and staff (perhaps in consultation with IA) weigh various options (e.g. a focus on the first two years, or prioritizing certain courses, or prioritizing students with greater need) to decide how to scale back or hold steady the time and financial resources devoted to the tutoring program.

It will be especially important for any decisions in this area be communicated effectively to coaches, many of whom have assumed that the ASC can and will “take care of” any (and all) student-athlete(s) in need of a tutor for a class. Again, this is where the ASC must define its boundaries and prepare itself to make recommendations for alternative campus resources for student-athletes.

4) Maintain an important role for ASC Director & staff in admissions decisions.

Historically, the ASC Director and staff have played an important role in admissions decisions for many student athletes, supporting the coaching staff very early in the recruiting process to help them recognize which students are a good academic fit for Berkeley. This role is essential and should not be diminished in the implementation of the new admissions policy that was recently developed by the Academic Senate.

In this policy, which brings the student-athlete admissions processes into the wider campus admissions process, there is a focus on the role of faculty in the review of applications.

Given that, we recommend that Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education work with the Academic Senate to ensure a continuing role of the ASC in admission decisions early in the process. This is especially important because it has been made explicit by the Chancellor’s Task Force that one key to the success of the advising program (and thus to student-athlete academic success) is to make sure there is a balance between the numbers of student-athletes using/needing the ASC services and their ability to provide the advising.

Given the emphasis in the new policy on the role of faculty, this may involve recognizing that the ASC Director as a *de facto* member of the Academic Senate (as is the case with other administrative appointments on campus, such as the Athletic Director). The Review Committee did not reach consensus on this issue. We recommend leaving this matter to the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education for further review.

5) Expand support for the Degree Completion program.

In 2002, the ASC launched an ambitious degree completion program to support the re-matriculation and graduation of former UC Berkeley student athletes. A seed gift in honor of David P. Ross initiated a Fund Functioning as an Endowment (FFE) to support this important program. The annual payout of this FFE is nominal. As such, the ASC has partnered with the Office of Financial Aid and the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics on campus, as well as the NCAA, and professional sports leagues such as the NFL and MLB, in order to support the degree completion of former student athletes.

We applaud the work of the ASC in this endeavor and note that it is critical for the university to honor their commitment to student athletes beyond athletic eligibility. This is an area that would benefit from targeted and collaborative fundraising between IA and the Division of Undergraduate Education to further support the ASC’s Degree Completion Program. This should be a fundraising priority moving forward.

Staffing & Space

6) Conduct assessment of workload for all ASC staff.

The Review Committee received feedback from multiple ASC staff members regarding a heavy workload, especially for Learning Specialist positions. Through an assessment exercise, the workload of the Center should be reviewed and considered in light of current staffing configurations. The Director of the ASC is requested to provide a report on this assessment with findings and recommendations for next steps, if any, to the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education.

7) Hire an Associate Director.

In the last review of the ASC in 2007, a key recommendation was that an Associate Director be hired to support in the management of the day-to-day operations of the ASC. This recommendation was approved by campus and a search was authorized. However, before a hire could be made, the campus experienced the budget crisis of 2008 and the position was never filled.

Our review revealed the same dire need for an Associate Director as emerged in 2007, especially if there are no significant structural changes to the way the ASC operates. Additional staff has been hired in the years since the 2007 Review (especially Learning Specialists) and increases the need for coordination and assistance to a full-time Director. Specifically, this position would provide management on day-to-day operations, supervise staff, serve as support for staff in navigating sometimes challenging interactions with coaching staff, and serve as the point of contact for coordination with IA and FAR about eligibility issues, even if these are moved to other units. As was outlined in the 2007 review, we recommend that this be an Associate Director position within the Athletic Study Center, reporting to the ASC Director.

If an Associate Director is unfeasible given campus priorities and impending budget cuts, there may also be other solutions, such as promoting staff members from within and adding some managerial duties to their portfolio. This would involve a minor restructuring of the ASC to promote an existing staff member(s) to Assistant Director.

As well, since with Recommendation #2 (see above) we are asking that another small but focused consideration be taken up by just a few key individuals regarding the relationship between the ASC advisors and those in L&S,

whatever this solution comes out to be may redistribute some of the advising such that the managerial scope of the Director is also made more practicable.

8) Follow through on the Chancellor's Task Force recommendation for an Ombudsperson position.

Student-athletes and in particular African-American students and other students from under-represented minority (URM) groups feel that there is no one to talk to about sensitive issues and concerns involving coaches, political issues that they must navigate, or articulating other challenges or unmet needs. Currently, students find staff in units outside of the ASC and outside of IA to discuss such matters, or they remain silent. The recent concerns expressed of the Black Student Union underscore this issue (as do findings reported by the Chancellor's Task Force).

We restate the recommendation for the hiring of an Ombudsperson and advisor made by the Chancellor's Task Force, and we recommend that this be a person who is, in particular, able to build relationships with student-athletes (especially African-American athletes) and who could be regularly available to student-athletes. We note that the campus does have two individuals in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs who serve as Ombudspersons. One option would be to place an additional Ombudsperson position—one uniquely trained to address the needs of this particular population—in that office rather than in the ASC. This option might both reduce the demands on the ASC as well as emphasize the integration of student-athletes into the wider campus and its resources.

9) Permanently fund the Student-Athlete Development Coordinator position.

The ASC recently hired a Student-Athlete Development Coordinator at the recommendation of the Chancellor's Task Force. This is a recommendation was accepted and endorsed by the Chancellor. However, there has been no central campus funding nor permanent funding provided for this position, nor is it clear from where continued funding will come.

We recommend, in conjunction with the Chancellor's Task Force on Academics & Athletics recommendation approved by Chancellor Dirks, that there be funding for the salary and benefits for the Student-Athlete Development Coordinator, effective July 1, 2014. It is further recommended that

the compensation of the incumbent Student-Athlete Development Coordinator be reviewed in conjunction with the experience and education of the incumbent to ensure a competitive, market-rate level of salary and benefits. The Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education and Division Director of Development are encouraged to work with the Director of the Athletic Study Center to pursue endowment opportunities for this position.

10) Permanently fund the contract Learning Specialist position for Men's Basketball.

Currently, the ASC has six Learning Specialists. Five of these positions are funded by the campus, but a sixth is being supported by unit reserves. The sixth Learning Specialist position is a contract position, with the agreement ending in May 2015. Due to budget constraints and a long-term projected deficit in the ASC, the contract is not planned for renewal unless additional funding is provided by the campus. This Learning Specialist provides academic support to the Men's Basketball Varsity Program at Berkeley, a high-profile program. We recommend that this position be funded by the campus, effective July 1, 2014.

Learning Specialists were initially hired as contract employees within the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics. In 2013, central campus determined that these professional staff should report into the ASC rather than IA. All but one learning specialist has been converted to career employees. We believe that it is essential to permanently fund the Learning Specialist position for Men's Basketball as a career employee with the ASC.

The incumbent Learning Specialist provides intensive academic support for the student-athletes of the Men's Basketball sports team. Men's Basketball was one of only three teams for which the University had to create an NCAA Academic Improvement Plan based upon APR and graduation rates since the establishment of these academic reforms in 2004. Part of the institutional academic improvement plan called for individual attention regarding academic and personal support for student-athletes participating in this high-profile sport.

11) Assess total space for the Athletic Study Center vis-a-vis Pac-12 institutions providing such services.

Space issues arose in our review in two distinct ways. First, it is unclear whether or not the amount of physical space allotted to the ASC is commensurate with that in our Pac-12 peer institutions and commensurate with the number of student-athletes being served and the conditions under

which they can be served. Second, the current space is divided between space in the Chavez building, co-located with other student services organizations, and space in the High Performance Center, adjacent to the football stadium.

Student-athletes seem to utilize one of those spaces, but not both, and those that were more likely to utilize Chavez felt that they were more integrated with other parts of campus. However, students also appreciated the study space in the High Performance Center, yet there is a lack of clarity around space availability. Again, because of the geographical distance between the two primary areas, the management and oversight of services is a challenge. Furthermore, the open study space in Chavez defies any notion of what a suitable, reasonably quiet and supportive study space should be. A follow-up implementation team should examine the impact of the configuration of space on ASC usage, as well as help to develop a readily available list of alternative study spaces on campus.

Budgeting

12) Develop a Strategic Financial Plan for the Athletic Study Center, prior to the submission of the unit's FY16 Operating Budget to the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education to address the following issues:

- a. Elimination of budget deficit scheduled to take effect in FY17 or FY18, depending on status of possible budget requests;
- b. Develop comprehensive justification for equity increases of Learning Specialists staff that joined the ASC in FY13 and submit budget request to the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education for the increases for the FY16 Operating Budget;
- c. Include an assessment of the ASC organization and activities, with consideration, in lieu of a pending budget deficit, of activities that could be reduced and/or discontinued;
- d. Develop new strategy for fundraising activities with the Director of Development within the Division of Undergraduate Education; tie fundraising goals to specific outcomes. Articulate outcomes more broadly than a focus on eligibility. Focus on scholarship, achievement, and other activities to reinforce the mission of the ASC. One potential program worthy of fund-raising efforts might be the development and leadership of a program along the lines of "Beyond the Game" that prepares student-athletes for that time in their lives.

- e. The Strategic Financial Plan should include the location of financial resources for the Associate and/or Assistant Director position under consideration.

Connections Across Campus

13) Create more connections with other parts of campus.

Findings show that the ASC provides a space that student-athletes experience as supportive and essential to their well-being. However, it would be beneficial to provide information to student-athletes about the resources that exist outside of the ASC and to create professional networks whereby ASC staff and advisors share information and resources with and about other units on campus in a purposeful way, such as L&S and departmental advisors, and those running such programs as the Undergraduate Research Program. In addition, we recommend that student-athletes attend all sections of CALSO, and that any ASC sessions, trainings, or orientations be conducted separately from the CALSO schedule.

14) Re-evaluate the nature and form of the professional networks between ASC advisors and L&S advisors, as discussed above in Recommendation #2.

The issue of the disconnect and tension between ASC advisors and L&S advisors emerged as a pressing one. On one hand, ASC advisors have a great deal of specialized knowledge and multiple touch points with student-athletes. Student-athletes report finding the advising in the ASC to be more useful to them than L&S advisors, where they felt stigmatized and found the L&S advisors to be less knowledgeable about their unique circumstances.

Part of this seems to derive from the fact that by the time student-athletes engage with an L&S Advisor it is usually under the circumstances of near-dismissal or other problematic academic issues. On the other hand, L&S advisors have a wealth of knowledge and could benefit student-athletes with more frequent (and less purely transactional) contact. Some coaches did not know that such people as L&S advisors even existed.

Adding to the disconnect, the database used by ASC advisors is not accessible to L&S advisors, and the student database used by L&S advisors is not accessible to ASC advisors. Student-athletes reported receiving conflicting advice, which suggests that it could be beneficial to support the building of professional networks between ASC and L&S advisors. However, simply providing full cross-training is not feasible, given the resource-intensive training

that L&S advisors receive, and the specialized issues that ASC advisors are faced with. Thus, we endorse the Recommendation #2 as specified above.

Until a potentially different arrangement be worked out, we recommend that L&S continue the practice of placing an L&S advisor in the ASC to support proximity. We also recommend designating an L&S advisor (or advisors) to become knowledgeable in student-athlete issues, and have them participate in training and/or shadowing with ASC advisors. Finally, we recommend that ASC & L&S advising leadership create an annual joint professional development session to share updates, best practices, etc.

15) Create intentional connections between the ASC and the Multicultural Student Development (MSD) offices.

Student-athletes from URM groups report having little interaction with the multicultural student development offices (AASD, GENEQ, etc.) and yet some in these offices report a high demand once student-athletes “discover” their offices. Equity & Inclusion (E&I) staff report that students are sometimes overtly discouraged from seeking such support by some coaches, who may view this as political activity that may detract from their training. Despite physical proximity, there also seems to be little interaction between the MSD staff and the ASC staff.

We recommend that MSD staff have an annual meeting with ASC staff and IA (coaches primarily) to discuss the unique needs of URM students on the Berkeley campus, and to discuss ways to support them and provide an overview of the services that MSD provides. This is particularly compelling in light of the results of the Campus Climate Survey from last year.

16) Expand the Faculty Advisory Committee to the ASC to include one or two representatives from the staff of the Multicultural Student Development Center.

17) Find ways to encourage students to integrate with the broader campus and seek a wide range of resources.

Student-athletes are often unaware of the multitude of resources that exist for them on campus, including the Career Center, Departmental and L&S advisors, DeCal courses, Freshmen-Sophomore Seminars, the Undergraduate Research Apprentice Program, and other research and summer employment opportunities.

We endorse the Chancellor’s Task Force recommendation that the ASC create an inventory of such opportunities, ensure that the ASC staff (particularly advisors) are trained

in understanding these resources, and perhaps touring key sites and resources on campus. This resource should also be shared with coaches and IA staff (e.g. sport supervisors). This new resource material source would be added to any existing resource materials currently in use by ASC staff.

To Examine Moving Forward:

18) Clarify role of and best directions for student-athletes' participation in the Summer Bridge program.

There seems to be some contention around the nature and value of student-athletes' participation in Summer Bridge. By some accounts the combination of the academic and athletic scheduling demands are overwhelming (perhaps made more so by new rules that allow workouts in the summer). At times, low grades in Summer Bridge negatively affect student-athlete GPA's, and are experienced as an intense and perhaps harsh beginning to their student life at UC Berkeley. Some report that their Summer Bridge experience is too sequestered, with ASC sessions that take students away from integrated activities.

A set of recommendations in this area was out of the scope of our review, but we recommend this be taken up in the upcoming review of the Summer Bridge Program.

19) We recommend that the Athletic Study Center play a leadership role in coordination with the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics to review, study, and promote the Faculty Fellows Program.

20) We recommend that the Director of the Athletic Study Center, after receipt of this report and recommendations, lead a unit staff retreat to re-visit the Mission, Scope, Vision, and Values of the center; and that the outcomes of the retreat be discussed with the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education, the Faculty Athletic Representative and the Director of Intercollegiate Athletics for consultation prior to implementation.

21) We recommend that the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education develop an Implementation Team that will work with the ASC, IA, L&S advising and other stakeholders to ensure that these recommendations are tracked and monitored as they are adopted by the campus, as well as to support the review of the unit's Mission, Scope, Vision, and Values.

Conclusion

The Review Committee appreciates the hard work of the ASC team and Vice Chancellor Koshland for their oversight, diligence and focus on working to meet the academic needs of student-athletes. While the ASC performs at a high level, we have provided a comprehensive set of recommendations in this report that should move us toward an ASC that is more fully integrated with the Berkeley campus, re-focusing the energies of the ASC on student-athlete development more so than eligibility, bolstering its staff and management ranks, shoring up its finances, and ensuring that the ASC team has a comprehensive set of resources to assist student-athletes in navigating the often tricky waters of the large and often "siloed" Berkeley campus.

Undergraduate Education

Office of the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education