Part I: Follow-Up on Last Year’s Assessment Report Recommendations

The 2016-2017 learning assessment examined the understanding student-athletes have of their privilege as a result of programs relating to department level outcomes in AAA. Four recommendations were made based off of the results of the assessment, and action items were created for each of the recommendations. All of the recommendations related to increasing opportunities for student-athletes to better understand privilege obtained by participating in NCAA Division I Athletics through service and service learning.

There are several new opportunities for understanding privilege through service that have been implemented by AAA over the past two years. DePaul and AAA provided a summer service immersion trip opportunity for student-athletes in 2017 and 2018 and has plans to take the trip annually starting in the summer of 2020. AAA and DePaul Athletics partnered on a community service competition between teams, the Community Service Cup, which will take place annually. AAA and DePaul athletics have expanded a partnership with University Ministry by formalizing the role of an athletics department chaplain who is charged with increasing and executing service opportunities for student-athletes. As communication methods with college students have changed, AAA went away from the idea to send a weekly service email to student-athletes; however, AAA did start a Twitter page and added digital signage to the office to enhance consistent messaging to student-athletes including highlighting activities on campus or in the community so that student-athletes are aware of service opportunities. The AAA student-athlete development program is continually implementing programming that is specific to the mission of DePaul and further opportunities for student-athletes to understand their privilege and use their advantages to serve throughout the community.

Part II: Report on This Year’s Assessment Project

I. Abstract

This benchmarking project examined peer institutions’ tutoring program and student-athlete development programs. An internally-developed survey collected quantitative and qualitative about number of student athletes, staff size, office space, student development & tutoring programs and funding. Data was collected via documented responses during phone interviews or independently via electronic surveys. Data was analyzed by calculating ratios, comparing totals,
and frequencies for binary survey questions. Results of the survey showed a lack of consistency in key areas. DePaul reported to be above average in some key areas (number of graduate tutors), average in others, and below average in several areas (amount of space – 1200sqft, total staff, graduate tutor pay, scheduling software and tutor feedback.). Recommendations include increasing AAA staffing and a specific budget for student-athlete development programming to maximize the effectiveness of the student-athlete development program at DePaul.

Assessment Question
What are the existing practices within University student-athlete tutoring programs and student-athlete development programs and how does DePaul compare?

II. Introduction & Context

Project Overview
This benchmarking assessment was performed in order to compare two specific programs, tutoring and student-athlete development, that operate not only within the department of Athletic Academic Advising (AAA) at DePaul, but also in most other college athletic departments throughout the BIG EAST Conference and the NCAA. In order to compare AAA’s programs to others, benchmarking interviews were performed with all 10 member schools in the BIG EAST Conference for student-athlete tutoring programs and nine of the 10 schools for student-athlete development programs. It should be noted that the full student-athlete development program survey was not answered by professionals from Institution 9 as they do not run the program and they do not act as liaisons to run the program in partnership with student-athlete development professionals. A survey was created and representatives from each school were asked the same questions. The data was then analyzed and comparisons to DePaul’s Athletic Academic Advising program were made.

Context for This Year’s Report
The goals of the 2018-2019 project was assessing two specific programs in AAA as they relate to best practices in comparison with like institutions. The tutoring program in AAA is provided to student-athletes in relation to AAA’s program area goal to support student-athlete academic success. The student-athlete development program in AAA is programming provided in relation to AAA’s program area goal to support holistic student-athlete development. The 2018-2019 assessment examined the existing practices within each program and compared them to programs at institutions similar to DePaul. By comparing to other institutions, AAA has been able to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of each program and benchmark areas of each program with the goal of addressing weaknesses with best practices that exist and using strengths to establish new best practices to be used by departments and programs similar to DePaul.

AAA programming is committed to achieving divisional and university goals. By evaluating the tutor and student-athlete development program, AAA is ensuring that the core functions of Student Affairs closely align with the program area goals for AAA. All Divisional goals for Student Affairs support the university mission, and the AAA programs that were evaluated relate specifically to the university goals to excel in preparing all students for global citizenship and success and elevate academic excellence and embrace a culture of creativity and diversity.
The 2018-2019 NCAA Division I Manual states that it is mandatory for member institutions to, “make general academic counseling and tutoring available to all students,” in bylaw 16.3.1.1. Also, bylaw 16.3.1.2, states that, “An institution shall be required to conduct a Life Skills Program on its campus” (NCAA, 2018). Not only are the tutoring and student-athlete development programs required for DePaul to be implemented by AAA, but they also serve the stated purpose of the NCAA which defines themselves as, “A member led organization dedicated to the wellbeing and lifelong success of college athletes” (“Who We Are”).

According to Kevin Blue and Ryan Craig in a piece on the HechingerReport.org (a new service covering innovation and inequality in education) titled Opinion: College athletics departments do a better job counseling students than career offices, “Out of 500,000 student-athletes competing at NCAA and NAIA schools, fewer than 1.5 percent of college football and basketball players make the transition to the pros” (Blue and Craig, 2019). This statistic holds true with some small variation across many of the revenue sports and Olympic sports throughout college athletics. Given this, the importance of focusing on academic success and making time for specific career preparation is supremely important for college athletes. Student-athletes need programming available to them specifically as their schedules are very demanding, and often times, they cannot use general university resources. Craig and Blue also cite a 2016 NCAA survey where student-athletes were asked what additional topics coaches and administrators should talk about more frequently. The results of the survey across NCAA divisions and genders showed that the most requested topics were related to academic success and job preparation (Blue and Craig, 2019). Tutoring and Career programming within the student-athlete development program in AAA are essential services provided in order to give student-athletes the best opportunity to be successful in and after earning their college degree.

In an article from Insider Higher Ed in January 2018, by Jake New, mental health and depression in college athletes were examined. Depression statistics from The Center for Epidemiological Studies showed that one in four college athletes show signs of depression (New, 2016). In addition, in a May 3, 2018 article in College AD titled The NCAA has Begun to Meet Mental Health Issues Head On, but which Schools are Ahead? stated that, “In response to a 2015 survey by the NCAA about 30% of college athletes self-reported that they had been ‘intractably overwhelmed’ during the past month.”(CollegeAD, 2018) Based on these statistics and several similar studies, it is clear that the need for quality health and wellness programming is essential to today’s student-athlete. By benchmarking with other institutions, AAA is searching for best practices and desires to establish itself as a leader in quality student-athlete development programming.

III. Data Collection & Methodology

Population and Sample
In NCAA Division I Athletics, Academic Support Services and Student-Athlete Development have become the norm to be provided by universities. The NCAA partners with The National Association of Academic and Student-Athlete Development Professionals (new name but still using old abbreviation N4A) to evaluate support programs and provide guidance and best
practices for NCAA rules as well as student-athlete academic, wellness and professional development. With such a large group of diversified universities and programs, it is important to seek out information about best practices within similar programs.

The broader population for this benchmarking assessment is all of the student-athlete tutoring and student-athlete development programs provided by the 347 NCAA Division I universities across 49 states. Most athletic department sports belong to one of 36 conferences with differing numbers of members. Athletic season competition is generally scheduled in three parts: a non-conference season where schools play schools from outside of their conference, a conference season leading to a championship within the conference, and post-season championships where schools can play any school who qualifies for the post-season tournament/championship.

Conferences have member schools that have generally similar profiles, making conference comparisons in terms of facilities, budget, and available services appropriate to compare. In this benchmarking assessment, the comparison of student-athlete tutoring and student-athlete development programs was used because most if not all of the NCAA Division I university athletic departments provide similar services. The goal in comparing DePaul’s programs to other Division I universities was to gather information about best practices being used within the industry and determine how competitive DePaul University programs were with other universities throughout the country.

The more specific population focused on in this project was the BIG EAST Conference. NCAA affiliated conferences provide good strata for sampling from the population. Sampling by conference could be considered a stratified random sample; however, the choice to sample within the BIG EAST was not random. The goal was to have all 10 schools in the BIG EAST participate in order to get the best possible comparison with close peer institutions while still being able to make more general comparisons to the total population on practices being used in programs in the total population. Given more time and resources, more “strata” could be sampled in order to make more specific inferences on the population, but the differences in budget and resources specifically make it difficult to compare schools between conferences.

All 10 BIG EAST schools invited to participate in a survey created by AAA agreed to participate. Since DePaul University is one of 10 universities in the conference, professionals for the student-athlete tutoring program and the student-athlete development program participated in the survey. Universities in the BIG EAST have similar profiles in terms of religious affiliation, student-population, athletic department participation in Division I sports not including Division I football, and a television contract for Men’s Basketball that provides large amounts of funding for athletic programs. All departments similar to DePaul’s Athletic Academic Advising in the BIG EAST except one (Institution 9’s office does not partner or participate in the student-athlete development program run by the athletic department) provide both student-athlete specific tutoring services and student-athlete development programs. Total student-population, number of sponsored Division I sports, and total number of student-athletes differ between each institution. Other similarities and differences in demographics exist; however, the BIG EAST Conference athletic departments compete directly with each other athletically, making the participant schools the best comparison for services provided. The participant universities and athletic departments have profiles similar enough to DePaul’s to make fair comparisons.
Data Collection
Data for this assessment came directly from professionals working at other BIG EAST institutions. A survey was created and sent to all member schools asking them to participate in the assessment by answering survey questions. Answers to survey questions were collected from most participants through a phone conversation where additional discussion took place. Collected answers were recorded by the assessment facilitator for AAA then sent back to institutions for confirmation of their answers to survey questions. Those who were unable to schedule a time for a phone call answered the survey questions in writing and sent them back to DePaul. The survey responses were the only data used for this assessment.

- Qualitative and quantitative data from the survey questionnaire was collected over the phone and answers were confirmed by schools in writing, or schools answered the questions in writing and sent them to DePaul (Appendix A).
- Survey was designed by Ben Gutman specifically for this assessment with questions focused on benchmarking schools’ tutoring and student-athlete development programs.
- Both the phone interviews and surveys provided information about: number of student-athletes, staff size, office space, student-athlete development & tutoring programs and funding.
- Once a representative from each school signed off on the answers, the data was added to the raw data for all schools. If schools filled out the survey questionnaire themselves without a phone interview, data was entered after follow-up questions were answered.

Data Analysis
After the survey was created, an invitation to participate and the survey questions were sent out via email to all 10 BIG EAST schools. The email was sent to academic professionals on the BIG EAST listserv. Volunteers emailed the facilitator, and a time was set up for a phone interview. The facilitator followed up at least once with a member of every potential school until all interviews were set or the volunteer school filled out the survey by themselves and sent it back to the facilitator. The facilitator transcribed the answers during the interview. Once transcribed, the facilitator sent a copy of the survey answers back to the participant school for approval. Answers to each question (raw data) were entered into a spreadsheet separated by question and participant school.

- General comparison between schools for quantitative and qualitative questions was the initial method used to analyze the data
- Quantitative answers to survey questions were used to answer several questions for both tutoring and student-athlete development programs:
  - What is the ratio of student-athletes to number of sports?
  - What is the ratio of student-athletes to total staff? Student-athlete to full-time staff? Student-athlete to graduate assistant(s)? Student-athlete to part-time staff?
  - What is the ratio of usable space in square feet per student-athlete?
  - What is the ratio of student-athletes to total tutors? Undergraduate? Graduate? Professional?
- Quantitative answers were also put into frequency graphs for comparison by school
- For yes/no questions, the percentage of participants who answered yes was calculated and it was noted whether or not DePaul also answered, “Yes”.
- The data was analyzed by DePaul staff members Ben Gutman and Richard Fugiel
• Quantitative comparison, frequencies and ratios as well as coding for Yes/No questions were the specific frameworks used to determine best practices. For Yes/No questions, answers of “Yes” were given a value of 1 and answers of “No” were given a value of 0.

Participant Consent
Participants for this assessment were asked to volunteer for an interview and/or fill out the survey for the respective program and return it to the assessment facilitator. The goal was to have all 10 schools agree to participate, and that goal was accomplished. Each volunteer was told that if they did participate, they would receive access to copies of the raw data and final assessment project. If a school chose not to participate, they would not receive a copy of the data or project. Before all of the raw data was sent out, each school received an individual copy of their own answers collected during the phone interview. No participant school saw results of any survey except their own until all data was compiled.

IV. Data & Findings

Response Rate and Demographics
Institutions in the BIG EAST are all private, religiously affiliated schools with differing student populations, and athletic teams in the BIG EAST compete against each other. Institution 1, Institution 5, Institution 6, Institution 8 and Institution 2 compete in sports not sponsored by the BIG EAST Conference (Fencing, Football, Ice Hockey, Rowing, and Sailing). Student-athletes who participate in sports not sponsored by the BIG EAST compete at the NCAA Division I level either as independents or in a conference that does sponsor their sport. Student-athletes who participate in those sports were included in the total number of student-athletes supported by tutoring and student-athlete development programs for their respective universities. Answers to survey questions were collected via telephone conversation for seven schools, and three schools emailed written answers back to DePaul. All 10 schools who were invited to participate completed a survey for a 100% response rate.

Key Findings
*Note: Analysis is found in Appendix B with corresponding graphs in subsequent Appendices (C-AJ)
The BIG EAST Conference has 10 member universities each with an athletic department whose teams participate in NCAA Division I competition. The number of student-athletes in BIG EAST athletic departments ranges from 215-750 with an average of 391 student-athletes. DePaul has the fewest student-athletes with 215. The number of NCAA Division I sports sponsored by each university ranges from 15-25 with an average of 17 sports. The minimum number of sponsored sports required by the NCAA to be a Division I athletic department is 15. DePaul University is one of three universities in the BIG EAST that sponsor the minimum number of sports. This results in a ratio of student-athletes per sport ranging from 15-30 with an average of and standard deviation of 4.94 student-athletes per sport. DePaul averages 14.33 student-athletes per sport which is the lowest ratio in the BIG EAST.
The usable space by student-athletes in athletic academic offices ranged from 800-4163 square feet with an average of approximately 2441 and standard deviation of 1133 square feet. DePaul’s usable space is below the average with approximately 1200 square feet available for student use (Note: Institution 5, Institution 9, and Institution 8 usable square footage was estimated by number of rooms and visual measurements taken during on-site visits). The total number of rooms designated for student-athlete use in each university’s office space ranged from 2-13 with an average of seven rooms. Three institutions have 10 rooms or more. DePaul has five rooms available for student use.

Thirty-three percent of the universities reported that their office space or the athletic department had a student-athlete lounge. DePaul does not have a student-athlete lounge. 55% of the schools including DePaul reported that they had computer labs and/or desktop computers available to student athletes. 77% provided either desktop computers or laptop computers for check out. DePaul has computer labs and laptop computers available for checkout. Of the five schools that have desktop computers available, the school with the least has four desktop computers and the school with the most has 20 with an average of 10 desktop computers available for student-athlete use. The range of available laptop computers for check out for the six schools that reported having laptop computers available for check out was 3-12 laptops with an average of seven laptop computers available for checkout per school. DePaul has 20 desktop computers and six laptop computers available for checkout. Two schools reported that they do not have computers available in their office space because all students in the student body receive a laptop as part of their tuition. Several schools reported that they give/issue laptop computers to specific teams.

Staffing at each BIG EAST institution varied at each school. The number of full and part-time professionals as well as graduate assistants/interns was surveyed. In the BIG EAST, the range for total number of staff members in the athletic academic office was 2-11 with an average of 6.30 staff members per institution. DePaul has six total staff members. The range for full-time staff members was 1-6 with an average of 3.60 and a standard deviation of 1.28. The range for part-time staff members went from 0-2 with an average of .70 and a standard deviation of 0.64, and the range for graduate assistants/interns went from 0-6 with an average of 2.10 and standard deviation of 2.12 per office. DePaul has three full-time staff, one part-time staff member and two graduate assistants. The ratio of student-athletes to total staff ranged from 27.27-250 student-athletes per staff member with an average of 61.11 and standard deviation of 61.03 student-athlete per staff member. The range of the ratio of student-athletes to full time staff was 50-500 with an average of 106.94 and standard deviation of 131.20 student-athletes per full time staff member. DePaul had a ratio of 35.83 student-athletes per staff member, and 71.67 student-athletes per full-time staff member. Ratios for student-athletes to part-time staff and to graduate assistant/interns were also calculated (Appendix A: Analysis). Institution 8 could be considered an outlier as there is only two staff members (one full-time) for 500 student-athletes.

Within the sample, two universities have a staff professional whose only responsibility was student-athlete development. These professionals do not have academic advising or tutoring responsibility. Institution 2’s student-athlete development coordinator is a staff member of the athletics compliance department. All other reporting schools have student-athlete development
coordinators or professionals who perform coordinating duties that also have roles as academic advisors within their department. DePaul does not have a staff member whose sole responsibilities lie in student-athlete development. DePaul does not have a specific student-athlete development budget, but 66.67% of schools reported having a budget designated to the program. Schools that said they did not have a specific budget for their program fund the program through the athletic department on a request/as needed basis. The range of the number of student-athlete development events supported by each BIG EAST school’s student-athlete development program ranged from 4-75 with an average of 29.4 and standard deviation of 20.45 student-athlete development supported events per year. DePaul supports 24 student-athlete development events per year. Student-athletes are informed, reminded and encouraged to attend events through a variety of methods including posters/flyers, digital signage, word of mouth through staff and coaching staff, email, text blast, scheduling/tracking software (Teamworks), social media, and Student-Athlete Advisory Council (SAAC) meetings. Institution 4 uses Teamworks online, emails, and digital signage as well as making all events part of a competition (The Spirit Cup) where attendance help teams score points. A $1000 reward for the team that has the most spirit cup points for academics, service and student-athlete development goes to the team’s yearly budget. DePaul uses Twitter, fliers, digital signage within the AAA office, weekly emails and text blasts to inform and encourage student-athletes to attend events. For answers given with a range of events, the higher number of events was analyzed. These events include career development, leadership academy, study skills, health and wellness, internship fair, community service, SAAC meetings, and outside speaker events. All reporting schools (9) partner with other university departments in the creation and implementation of student-athlete development events. Included in the specific student-athlete development programs supported by athletics/academic offices were several themes. Welcome and end of the year award events, etiquette dinners, service days, health and wellness events, sexual assault and alcohol abuse prevention, bystander training, speakers, career events, and leadership academies were all mentioned. DePaul puts on several health and wellness events as well as career events that are only sponsored by AAA. Other co-sponsored events include escalation training, orientation events including an etiquette dinner, and more career events. All schools reported having specific goals that align with the university/department mission and values. Institution 7 has very specific goals/pillars for their student-athlete development programs outlined on their website. All reporting schools also have certain mandatory student-athlete development events each year. 66.67% of schools, including DePaul, reported that events are mandatory by the student-athlete’s year in school. The range of the number mandatory events per year was from 3-14 with an average of 5.89 and standard deviation of 3.84 mandatory events per year. DePaul does not have a rewards/certificate program for student-athlete development completion; however, 33.3% of student-athlete development programs in the BIG EAST do have such a program. DePaul does not have a specific internship program for student athletes, but 20% of the 10 reporting schools do have a student-athlete internship program. DePaul and Institution 9 (20%) are the only schools in the BIG EAST that offer student-athlete development classes open only to student-athletes for university credit. DePaul is part of 66.67% of BIG EAST schools who have social media dedicated to student-athlete development. DePaul is not a part of the 66.67% of BIG EAST schools that have a leadership academy or leadership program. Funding for student-athlete development programs comes from different sources depending on the school with 78% of schools getting funding from only athletics and donations through athletics. DePaul and
Institution 1 get funding not only from athletics, but also Institution 1 receives funding from Academic Affairs and DePaul from Student Affairs.

Each BIG EAST school supports student-athletes with a tutoring program. Nine of the 10 schools have tutors specific to their athletics academic office, while Institution 6 shares tutors with the Tutoring Center and Writing center. The centers are a part of Academic Affairs which oversees the Institution 6 College office. All offices reported significant use of their tutor program, but only a few could give specific percentages of student-athletes who participate in the tutoring program. The lowest reported range was 2-3% at Institution 8 with 500 total student athletes, while the highest reported range was 74% at Institution 4 with 325 student-athletes. DePaul reported a specific percentage of 43% of the 215 student-athletes which was tracked through post-session surveys throughout the year. No schools reported having a staff member whose full time specific responsibilities were as a tutor coordinator while three schools (30%) reported having professionals on staff whose sole responsibilities were as a learning specialist. Tutor coordinators at each school also had advising/assistant director responsibilities in their respective office. Institution 9 reported having 3 professionals as learning specialists, but they are 1099 contracted employees and not a part of the academic office staff. Institution 5 has a learning specialist who splits duties between the athletic department and the University.

The total number of tutors available to student-athletes at each school ranged from 12-90 with an average of 40.4 and standard deviation of 21.24 tutors. DePaul employed 33 total tutors. The ratio of student-athletes to total number of tutors in each office ranged from 4.00-33.33 with an average of 12.94 student-athletes per tutor. DePaul reported a ratio of 6.52 student-athletes per tutor which is less than the BIG EAST average. Tutors were classified into three types: undergraduate, graduate and specialist tutors. Specialist tutors are designated as part time professionals and/or retired professors employed by the academic office. Most tutors employed by programs were undergraduate tutors with a range of 0-90 and an average of 33.1 and standard deviation of 24.73 undergraduate tutors per office. DePaul employed 13 undergraduate tutors. The range for graduate tutors was 0-19 for an average of 5.2 and standard deviation of 5.84 graduate tutors per office. DePaul employed the most graduate tutors in the conference with 19. The range of specialist tutors went from 0-12 with an average of 2.10 and standard deviation of 3.67, but only four schools, including DePaul with one, reported employing specialist tutors. Starting pay for undergraduate tutors ranged from $8.15 to $15.00 per hour for an average of $11.18 and standard deviation of $2.19 per hour. DePaul pays undergraduate tutors a starting rate of $13.00 per hour. The starting pay for graduate tutors ranged from $9.60 to $18.00 for an average of $13.39 and standard deviation of $3.08 per hour. DePaul pays graduate tutors a starting rate of $13.50 per hour. The range of specialist tutors starting pay goes from $10.00 to $75.00 per hour. The low number of schools that have specialist tutors could make this category an outlier. DePaul pays one specialist tutor $22.90 per hour, but the tutor has been with the program for several years and received raises each year. If that tutor were to leave DePaul, a replacement specialist tutor would not be hired.

Survey questions about the tutoring process asked about two types of tutoring offered by each athletics academic office in the BIG EAST. All schools were able to classify their tutoring process into these two types: Assignment Tutoring and Drop-In tutoring. With assignment tutoring, student-athletes are assigned tutors by either the tutoring coordinator, or student-
athletes self-select tutors on a website specifically geared to schedule tutors. Offices who have
drop-in tutoring hire tutors to work within the walls of their office during a specific shift.
Student-athletes who come to the office to study can request help from drop-in tutors at any time
during their shift. There is no scheduling of appointments with drop-in tutors as they operate on a
first-come/first-serve basis. 100% of schools reported using assignment tutoring, and 70% of
schools use drop-in tutoring. DePaul has both assignment and drop-in tutoring. 80% of schools
including DePaul require tutoring for at-risk student-athletes. 60% of schools use software to
schedule tutors and get feedback from sessions for tutoring reports. DePaul does not use software
for assignments or feedback from tutoring sessions. 90% of schools including DePaul have
supervised study hall, and 50% of schools including DePaul have some sort of separate
supervised study hall for specific teams. DePaul and Institution 5 (20%) have tutors that are
assigned to specific teams (MBB and WBB only). 30% of schools including DePaul hire/recruit
tutors through student-employment job boards and/or student-employment job fairs. The
majority of schools consult department chairs and learning centers to recruit and hire tutors. The
budget for the tutoring program is funded by the Athletic Department for 50% of schools,
Academic Affairs for 20% of schools and Student Affairs for 20% of schools. Institution 5 has
funding split from both Athletics and Student Affairs. DePaul’s tutoring program is funded by
Student Affairs.

The last question of both surveys asked what changes schools would make if funding and
staffing were not a factor. The overriding theme in answer to the question was specific staffing,
funding and space. Tutoring programs would add a tutor coordinator whose only job was to
coordinate tutoring and add at least one learning specialist as well as additional rooms/space
specific to tutoring. For student-athlete development, additional funding and a staff member in
charge of only student-athlete development was the most frequent answer.

V. Discussion & Interpretation of Findings

➢ The range for total number of staff members in the athletic academic office was 2-11
with an average of 6.30 and standard deviation of 2.61 staff members per institution. The
range for part-time staff members went from 0-2 with an average of .70, and the range for
graduate assistants/interns went from 0-6 with an average of 2.10 per office.
   o DePaul has six total staff members. The range for full-time staff members was 1-6
with an average of 3.60. DePaul has three full-time staff, one part-time staff
member and two graduate assistants. DePaul staffing is less than the BIG EAST
average but within one standard deviation for full-time staff and graduate
assistants. College athletics is a very competitive environment and being average
to below average is not necessarily the best position to be in when it comes to
recruiting and retaining student-athletes. Adding full-time staff would allow
advising from more full-time staff rather than graduate assistants. It would free-up
graduate assistants to help with the tutoring and student-athlete development
programs that are directed by full-time advisors. Also, hiring a full-time tutor
coordinator would make DePaul the leader in tutoring programs in the BIG EAST Conference

- The usable space by student-athletes in athletic academic offices ranged from 800-4163 square feet with an average of approximately 2441 and standard deviation of 1133.22 square feet. (Note: Institution 5, Institution 9, and Institution 8 usable square footage was estimated by number of rooms and visual measurements taken during on-site visits) In the BIG EAST, there is an average of 7.13 and a standard deviation of 3.86 square feet of usable space per student-athlete.

  - DePaul’s usable space is below the BIG EAST average with approximately 1200 square feet available for student use. However, DePaul has the lowest number of student-athletes in the Conference. But, DePaul has an average 5.58 sq. ft. per student athlete which is less than the average in the BIG EAST and slightly within one standard deviation. With less space than average for each student-athlete, a case for more usable space can be made. This, along with trying to remain highly competitive in recruiting and retention are reasons to improve and increase the space. Given the number of staff, tutors and student-athletes, DePaul should increase the amount of usable space to remain competitive with the rest of the BIG EAST.

- The total number of tutors available to student-athletes at each school ranged from 12-90 with an average of 40. The ratio of student-athletes to total number of tutors in each office ranged from 4.00-33.33 with an average of 12.85 student-athletes per tutor. DePaul reported a ratio of 6.52 student-athletes per tutor, which is less than the BIG EAST average, meaning there are more tutors available for DePaul student-athletes. Tutors were classified into three types: undergraduate, graduate and specialist tutors. Specialist tutors are designated as part-time professionals and/or retired professors employed by the academic office. Most tutors employed by programs were undergraduate tutors with a range of 0-90 and an average of 33.10 undergraduate tutors per office. The range for graduate tutors was 0-19 for an average of 5.20 graduate tutors per office. The range of specialist tutors went from 0-12 with an average of 2.10, but only four schools reported employing specialist tutors.

  - DePaul employs 33 total tutors, which is below the average but it is well within one standard deviation of the tutors in the BIG EAST. DePaul employs 13 undergraduate tutors. DePaul employs the most graduate tutors in the conference with 19. DePaul employs one specialist tutor who is a part-time employee with other office responsibilities. DePaul does a good job using graduate students as a resource for tutoring. The advantage with undergraduate tutors is that many have taken the exact classes they are tutoring. DePaul does not hire contracted tutors, while other schools utilize them. Though there are fewer undergraduate tutors, the tutoring program and pay seem to be competitive in the conference. The number of graduate vs. undergraduate tutors changes by year depending on the number of students who graduate. Having contracted tutors/learning specialists that can work even after graduation would provide more consistency and require less onboarding each year.
As far as staffing for the tutoring program goes, DePaul is above average in most categories. Space, however, for tutoring is limited compared to the rest of the BIG East. In survey categories that would indicate “best practices”, DePaul is on-par with the majority of the schools in the conference.

- DePaul provides resources that other schools did not report, such as drop-in tutoring and tutors or academic assistants assigned to specific teams.
- DePaul is in the minority of schools in the BIG EAST that does not use tutor scheduling and tracking/feedback software.
- DePaul’s tutor salary for undergraduate tutors is just above the average for the BIG EAST, but low salaries for graduate tutors at one school brings the average down. DePaul is in the lower half of salaries for graduate tutors.
- The ratio of student-athlete to tutors is below average in comparison to the BIG EAST.
- DePaul has the second lowest amount of usable space for tutoring.

The student-athlete development program at DePaul has some similarities to other BIG EAST institutions, but there are several differences as well. The professional who facilitates the program at DePaul is still building the curriculum, and the hope is it continues to improve and grow. DePaul fits with some “best practices” when compared to the BIG EAST, but programs throughout the country are growing rapidly leaving staffing, space and budget as big factors in a program’s ability to improve. DePaul is below average when it comes to space and staff, and there is no specific budget for the program.

- DePaul does not have a student-athlete development budget. It has been requested, and it is possible that there will be a specific budget soon. DePaul reported supporting a below average number of student-athlete development events each year, however, if there is a follow-up to this survey, a list of total events would be requested from each school.
- The number of mandatory student-athlete development events for DePaul student-athletes is right on the average number for those in the BIG EAST.
- Certificate and rewards programs as well as internship programs for athletes are starting to be done by a few schools in the BIG East, but DePaul is currently not doing similar programs. This is also true of leadership programs.
- DePaul is only one of two schools, however, to offer credit for student-athlete only classes.
- Funding for student-athlete development programs in 70% of BIG EAST schools comes from the athletics department. At DePaul, Student Affairs and the athletic department help fund the program, but DePaul runs a program that currently has minimal funding needs.
VI. Recommendations and Plans for Action

After gathering information on programs being executed within the BIG EAST Conference, the findings of the assessment suggest possible changes:

- Increase in the amount of space available for student-athlete use
  - AAA should advocate for and explore means of adding space for tutoring and student-athlete development events in either the Sullivan Athletic Center, newly constructed space or in an existing university space on the Lincoln Park campus like the student-center, Richardson Library or one of the academic buildings.
  - A newly constructed space would take 3-5 years, finding additional permanent space on the Lincoln Park campus may not be possible based on current usage, but establishing permanent space would take 6-12 months.
  - The lack of available space on campus, funding and land for new projects, and total usage of existing space serve as barriers to entry.

- Increase the full-time staff to AAA to increase competitiveness in recruiting and retention
  - Request the addition of a full time staff member that will have advising responsibility and responsibility in the facilitation of either the tutoring, student-athlete development program or both.
  - Reorganize office responsibilities to give the student-athlete development coordinator more time to work on student-athlete development programming.
  - Creation of a new position would take 6-12 months.
  - Funding for a new position or a decision opposing the need for additional AAA staff are barriers to entry.

- Increase Tutor salaries, advocate to allow hiring of contracted tutors (non-students) salaries and add scheduling and tracking/feedback software
  - Tutor coordinator needs to adjust the job postings and current employee salaries with DePaul’s Office of Student-Employment.
  - The process would take about one month.
  - Complex budgeting and funding for tutoring budget is a barrier to entry.
  - Research on best and most commonly used tutor software needs to be completed, and a recommendation with pricing needs to be given to the director of AAA for consideration.
  - The process would take about one month.
  - Budgeting, training and funding are barriers to entry.

- Create or fund a separate student-athlete development budget
  - Desired programming and costs need to be evaluated.
  - Athletics would fund the program through existing budget, NCAA Student-Athlete Opportunity fund, or a university donor.
  - The process for evaluation and funding would take 6-12 months.
  - Lack of funds, donors or a decision opposing the need for a specific budget for the program as well as changing student-athlete schedules and involvement would be barriers to entry.
Sharing the results

- Raw data from the survey as well as the analysis and graphs have already been shared with Participants
- Staff will participate in revision of the draft of the Assessment Project, and will attend the Assessment Symposium in the fall
- AAA’s director will evaluate the recommendations and share the information with the reporting line as necessary
- A final draft of the assessment project will be sent to participants from the BIG EAST Conference
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Benchmarking Assessment Survey: Tutor and Student-Athlete Development Programs

Tutoring
How many student-athletes does your department support?
How many full-time professionals do you have on staff? Part-Time? Graduate Assistants?
Approximately what percentage of students use the tutoring program?
How many rooms in your office space are designated for student-athlete use?
What is the square footage of the space available for student-athlete use in your offices?
How many computers does your office provide for student-athlete use? (separate desktop/laptop)
Does your office space have a student-athlete lounge?
How many tutors does your office employ that are available to student-athletes? (Grad? Undergrad?)
How do you recruit/hire tutors?
What is the starting salary for tutors? (Grad/Undergrad)
Do you assign tutors to student-athletes? Do you have drop-in tutoring? Both?
How do student-athletes request tutors? How do you assign/track tutoring sessions?
How do tutors and student-athletes provide feedback for their tutoring sessions?
Is tutoring mandatory for at-risk student-athletes?
Do you have supervised study halls? Is it separated by team?
Do you have tutors assigned to teams? All Teams? Specific Teams?
Do you have professionals on staff whose only responsibilities are as a tutor coordinator? How many?
Do you have professionals on staff whose only responsibilities are as a learning specialist? How many?
What is the source of funding for your department? (Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, Athletics, Other)
What changes would you make to your tutoring program if funding and staffing were not a factor?

Student-Athlete Development
How many student-athletes does your department support?
How many full-time professionals do you have on staff? Part-Part Time? Graduate Assistants?
Do you have professionals on staff whose only responsibilities are in student-athlete development? How many?
Does your student-athlete development program have a budget? (Range of dollar amounts will be asked for)
How many SA-Development events does your office support each year? Career? Health/Wellness? Other?
Do you partner with other university departments in the creation and implementation of any SA-Development events? Who?
What specific development programs do you provide to student-athletes?
Do you have defined goals set out for each program or the student-development program as a whole? Please describe.
In what ways do the goals of your program align with the department/university mission/vision/values?
Are some of the SA-Development events mandatory for student-athletes? How many? Which ones?
Are some of the SA-Development events mandatory to student-athletes by year in school?
What methods do you use to inform student-athletes of upcoming SA-Development events?
What methods do you use to encourage student-athletes to attend non-mandatory SA-Development events?
Does your office have a rewards/certificate program for SA-Development program completion?
Does your office or athletics have a specific internship program for student-athletes?
Do you offer SA-Development classes for university credit? Student-athletes only?
Do you have social media dedicated solely to SA-Development?
Do you have a Student-Athlete leadership academy or program?
What is the source of funding for your department? (Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, Athletics, Other)
Is your student-athlete development program sponsored by corporations or specific donors?
What changes would you make to your student-athlete development program if funding and staffing were not a factor?
Student Athletes per Staff Member

Average 8 3 DePaul 5 4 6 7 1 2 9

61.11 61.03 83.33 93.75 65.00 60.00 50.00 27.27 66.67 37.50
Average 8 3 DePaul 5 4 6 7 1 2 9
Student Athletes per Total Tutors

Average: 12.94
8: 33.33
3: 5.56
DePaul: 6.52
5: 21.43
4: 6.25
6: 4.00
7: 8.06
1: 8.57
2: 10.71
9: 25.00
Square Foot per Student Athlete

- Average: 8
- DePaul: 13.40
- 3: 7.13
- 9: 10.33
- 5: 5.58
- 4: 6.15
- 6: 2.22
- 8: 8.00
- 7: 13.33
- 1: 4.33
- 2: 10.33

Values are in square feet.
Specialist Tutor Salary

- Average: $39.48
- DePaul: $22.90
- $75.00
- $10.00
- $50.00

Bar chart showing the salary distribution.
Does your office space have a student-athlete lounge?

- Yes: 3
- No: 7
Does your office space have assignment tutoring?

Yes: 10
No: 0
Does your office space have drop In tutoring?

Yes: 7
No: 3
Is tutoring mandatory for at-risk student-athletes?

- Yes: 8
- No: 2
Do you have supervised study hall?

- Yes: 9
- No: 1
Do you have supervised study hall separated by team?

- Yes: 5
- No: 5
Do you have tutors assigned to teams?

Yes: 2
No: 8
Tutors assigned to all teams?
Tutors assigned to specific teams?

- Yes: 2
- No: 8
Do you have professionals on staff whose only responsibilities are as a tutor coordinator?
Do you have professionals on staff whose only responsibilities are as a learning specialist?

Yes: 3
No: 7
How many professionals on staff whose only responsibilities are as a learning specialist?
Do you have professionals on staff whose only responsibilities are in student-athlete development?
How many professionals on staff whose only responsibilities are in student-athlete development?
Does your student-athlete development program have a budget?
How many SA-Development events does your office support each year?
Do you partner with other university departments in the creation and implementation of any SA-Development events? Who?
Are some of the SA-Development events mandatory for student-athletes?
How many Mandatory events for student-athletes?
Are some of the SA-Development events mandatory to student-athletes by year in school?
Does your office have a rewards/certificate program for SA-Development program completion?

- Yes: 3
- No: 7
Does your office or athletics have a specific internship program for student-athletes?

- Yes: 2
- No: 8
Do you offer SA-Development classes for university credit?

Yes: 2
No: 8
Do you offer SA-Development classes for student-athletes only?

Yes: 2
No: 8
Do you have social media dedicated solely to SA-Development?
Do you have a Student-Athlete leadership academy or program?

6 Yes
4 No
Does funding for Student-Athlete Development come from only athletics?

- Yes: 7
- No: 3