

**BFA Subcommittee on Intercollegiate Athletics  
Graduation Rates Survey**

We would like to see the following information: by sport, by gender, and in total — that is, one copy of this table for each sport, one for all male student-athletes, one for all female student-athletes, and one for *all* student-athletes.

Academic year	Entered four years prior (total/schol.)	Graduated after 6 years at CU
1993-94	120/80	78/53
1994-95		
1995-96		
1996-97		
1997-98		
1998-99		
1999-2000		
2000-2001		

The first number in each box is the *total* number of athletes; the second is the number of *scholarship* athletes. I made up some numbers — doubtless very far wrong — as an example. The interpretation is that 120 student-athletes, of whom 80 were on full or partial scholarships, entered CU in August 1989. Of the 80 scholarship athletes, 53 graduated within six years. Of the 120 total athletes, 78 graduated.

The last two rows of this table will necessarily be incomplete, as they involve people who entered less than six years prior (the NCAA standard window).

The numbers on each line need not sum evenly because people can transfer in, people who go pro can also graduate, and people can take more than 5 years to graduate.

More people transfer out than in, but both numbers are quite small: approximately 10 in and ?? out per year across all sports. Note that an outgoing transfer counts as a non-graduation, and hence hurts these rates. Moreover, there is some evidence that grad rate is lower among transfer student-athletes. This is more complicated than we initially thought, and it will require more thought. We will discuss it briefly in January and decide when and how to put it on the agenda. Until we do that, we will omit this column from the table.

Data about who went pro is even more problematic, as many of the players who leave to do so don't last through their first day or week of camp. We will omit this column as well, for now.

These two modifications make the last column superfluous.

For our 29 January meeting, Bob will be putting together numbers for two of these years. After we spend time digesting and discussing this information in the meeting, we will hopefully have a firmer idea of which numbers are useful and which are not. Bob will then go through and fill in the (redesigned) table for the other years.

It makes sense to compare this to the *general* CU numbers, in order to put it in context.

We will also discuss including some measure of the effects of the academic support programs.

The issue here is how to quantify each person's use of these services: number of visits to tutors? Time spent at study table? etc. Comparison is also an issue; someone can work extensively with tutors and still get 4 Ds. How to know whether this is an improvement?