

Student-Athletes

Why are we meeting?

Believe it extremely important that we work together in and open and cooperative fashion, to respond to your recruiting needs while at the same time protecting both the academic integrity of the University and the interests of these student-athletes.

Concerned that all too often the relationship between Admissions and the Athletic Department has been confrontational. Hence, we believe it important that both sides work to remove this friction and develop a process through which we can work together.

This was the reason for the "memorandum of understanding" drafted by Paul Gikas -- to provide clear mechanisms and channels for interaction.

Introductions and explanation of role:

Bob Holmes

Mary Ann Swain

Fundamental Principles:

0. The underlying principal of our admissions policies is...just as in other things we do at the University...excellence and achievement. But we are certainly aware that excellence is a multidimensional concept...it comes in many forms...in academic ability, athletic ability, artistic ability,...
For that reason, we do not insist on blind, one-dimensional standards for all students...
Rather, we seek diversity in our student body...and it is this search for diversity which justifies our commitment to building a successful intercollegiate athletics program.
1. Fundamental Concern: What is best for the kid?...
Does the student have the capacity to benefit from a Michigan education?
Do we have confidence that with sufficient support, the student has the ability to pursue meaningful studies at Michigan and graduate?
2. We must be able to come to a shared understanding of what is good for the student.
We must be able to jointly consider and discuss each of these "at risk" cases on an open, cooperative basis.
3. Image of the University
Michigan is not only one of the most visible, but also one of the most highly competitive institution in the nation.
We must be sensitive to the public reaction to admissions of students who depart significantly from our normal standards.
The burden will be on us to justify such admissions... and we can do so only if we are confident that the student will have a reasonable chance of success.
4. The Provost, as chief academic officer, has responsibility for the quality, standards, and success of the academic programs of the University. This includes:
Admissions
Academic Counseling
Academic Eligibility
Hence, the final decision point on admissions and academic standing will rest with the Provost...(not the President or the Regents).
In a sense, the Provost is responsible for the academics...
...just as the Athletic Director is responsible for intercollegiate athletics.

Details

1. The Office of Admissions must be kept informed about those individuals under consideration for tender offers...
While we understand that in many cases, complete records, are not available, the recruiting staff must provide Admissions with available information on any student they expect to make a tender offer to well in advance of tender date.
Athletics must also do all it can to encourage early test-taking by the students and early receipt of transcripts from the high schools.
We must avoid the anomalous situations in which students are committing to UM when Admissions knows nothing about them.
This is particularly important for "at risk" students.
2. Under no circumstances will tender offers be made without knowledge of the Office of Admissions.
NOTE: A tender offer without appropriate preliminary contact with the Office of Admissions will result in AUTOMATIC, nonreversible denial of admission to the student!
3. What do we expect for "at risk" students?
Rule 48?
No, not necessarily. We recognize that there may be factors beyond SATs and HSGPAs.
Evidence presented by the coaches?
Yes...if it includes information such as class attendance, attitudes, parental support, ...
A plan prepared by the academic counseling staff as to how each student will be supported during their "probation" period.
4. What will be our reaction this year?
We will ask you to deal with us in an open fashion on these cases (that is, kept the Admissions Office in the loop) and present what you clearly believe to be adequate evidence of the necessary academic strength,
On cases where we agree that there has been enough extra evidence to suggest a reasonable risk is worth taking, we will approve admission on an "at-risk" basis.
BUT in these "at risk" cases, we will insist on monitor the student's academic performance at our level.
More specifically, we intend to work with you to set up a reporting process to allow our monitoring of academic performance of athletes who are admitted in the at-risk category. (Not the Board in Control... but US...)
And, needless to say, the performance of these "at risk" students will have a major impact on the weight we give to your assessment in the future...
5. In future years:
By working together, I believe we can develop a sense of confidence and cooperation.
We intend to work toward the admissions policy guidelines outlined in the Gikas document.
Furthermore, we intend to become more involved not just in the admissions process, but also the monitoring of academic performance and the quality of academic support programs.

Reminder:

My turf is the quality of our academic programs...students, faculty, programs...
In particular, I take very seriously my responsibility for the academic

performance of our students.