

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics April 2018

Introduction

1.1 The Division Between Athletes and Non-Athletes

1.2 General Responses

- 1.2.1 Ask about integration, not balance.
- 1.2.2 Focus on activities more than on identities.
- 1.2.3 Clarify the meaning of athletic success.
- 1.2.4 Understand the relation between athletics and giving.

1.3 Specific Recommendations

- 1.3.1 Improve management of overall percentage of students participating in varsity athletics.
 - 1.3.1.1 Reduce the number of varsity teams.
 - 1.3.1.2 Reduce some teams' roster sizes incrementally.
 - 1.3.1.3 Increase the overall size of the student body.
- 1.3.2 Strengthen relations between faculty and coaches.
- 1.3.3 Strengthen the position of "Faculty Athletics Representative."
- 1.3.4 Increase support for the recruitment of diverse student athletes.
- 1.3.5 Improve understanding of academic clustering and thesis selection.
- 1.3.6 Deepen understanding of issues regarding student life.
 - 1.3.6.1 Replicate successes in athletics mentoring elsewhere on campus.
 - 1.3.6.2 Study ways in which gender and sexuality influence athletic participation and "the divide."
 - 1.3.6.3 Provide sensor-equipped helmets to students who play helmeted contact sports.
- 1.3.7 Promote engagement across the campus.

2.1 The Place of Athletics in Admissions

2.2 Specific Recommendations

- 2.2.1 Reduce the total number of "Athletic Factor" admits.
- 2.2.2 Make the integration of athletics and academics a priority for admissions.
- 2.2.3. Improve data collection about the place of athletics in admissions.
- 2.2.4 Introduce a humanities initiative into the admissions process.
- 2.2.5 Establish a Faculty Admissions Liaison.

3.1 Athletics and Student Time Commitment

3.2 Specific Recommendations

- 3.2.1 Improve understanding of athletics and student time commitment.
 - 3.2.1.1 Organize focus groups of students (both athletes and

- non-athletes) in order to explore their weekly time commitments.
- 3.2.1.2 Require more extensive reporting of time commitments.
- 3.2.2 Assess and reduce classes missed because of athletic competitions.
- 3.2.3 Identify a clear window for in-season practices.

Conclusion

- Appendix A: Guide to Acronyms and Shorthand References
- Appendix B: Charges of Relevant Standing Faculty Committees
- Appendix C: Varsity Athletics Win-Loss Records, 2001-2015
- Appendix D: Job Description of “Faculty Athletics Representative” (FAR)
- Appendix E: Team Time Information
- Appendix F: Captains’ Practices
- Appendix G: Percentage of Student-Athletes in NESCAC, 2011-2017

* * *

Introduction

In December of 2016, the Committee of Six endorsed the appointment of an ad hoc faculty committee to further explore the issues raised in the report of The Special Committee on the Place of Athletics at Amherst (hereafter “Diver II”), as well as during discussions at faculty meetings in the fall of 2016. These issues are complex and affect numerous aspects of the College beyond varsity athletics: admissions, the distribution of students across the curriculum, campus social life, the well being of all students, and alumni relations. Because these matters are so interrelated, it seemed best to consider them in an integrated fashion. To this end, the Dean of the Faculty invited the faculty members of the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid (FCAFA), the Committee on Education and Athletics (CEA), the College Council, and one member of the Committee of Six to serve on this ad hoc committee.

The committee was constituted with two primary goals in mind. First, Diver II included numerous recommendations that had to be assigned to relevant faculty committees. Bringing together the members of the CEA, the College Council, and FCAFA would enable the Ad Hoc Committee to eliminate duplicative work and to ensure that none of the recommendations ‘fell through the cracks.’ Second, the faculty expressed a desire to know about several issues that Diver II did not address. The Ad Hoc Committee tried to gather information about these issues. When information was not readily available, we suggested ways to gather such information in the future.

We pursued these aims by organizing a series of conversations with colleagues in Admissions, Advancement, Athletics, and Student Affairs about existing policies and practices. We also met with Andrea Savage, Executive Director of The New England Small College Athletic Conference (NESCAC). Our conversations allowed committee

members to develop a deeper understanding of the role of athletics in admissions policy, and of related issues surrounding academic choices and student life. In the spring of 2017, we produced an initial draft report and circulated it to the Departments of Admissions, Advancement, Athletics, and Student Affairs for their review. In the fall of 2017, we then met again with colleagues from Admissions, Advancement, Athletics, and Student Affairs to discuss their responses to our initial draft and to listen to their suggestions for our final draft. We also met last semester with the Board of Trustees and with a student group that requested a meeting with us (the Council of Amherst College Student-Athletes of Color [CACSAC]). In all of these meetings, we received very valuable suggestions, and we have made every effort to incorporate them into this report.

Our general position is that the College's overarching goal—an athletics program that is both successful and integrated into the College community more generally—is best pursued by means of many small changes that should be effected within improved mechanisms of shared governance. Stated negatively: we are not convinced that there is any one action that can be undertaken unilaterally by any single party at the College—whether administration or faculty—that would allow the College to achieve its goals. Our approach therefore is to recommend a menu of interdependent actions that together address the various interrelated phenomena identified in Diver II, and to consider new structures of governance that allow various parties on campus to continue to gather information and evaluate progress.

For ease of reference, we have organized this report into three broad sections. Each section corresponds to a challenge that was identified in Diver II, and that our constituent faculty committees will need to resolve in the coming years, working in close consultation with colleagues from Admissions, Advancement, Athletics, and Student Affairs. These are (1) the division between athletes and non-athletes; (2) the place of athletics in admissions; and (3) athletics and student time commitment. In each section we summarize the challenge, and then recommend a series of specific actions that standing faculty committees and/or administrative bodies could take to address that challenge.

Before moving forward, it is important to note that we are proceeding from the belief that athletic competition can play an important role within a liberal arts education. Athletic participation provides opportunities for students to develop skills related to leadership, teamwork, and communication. It provides opportunities to challenge oneself, to face adversity, to receive and respond to feedback, and to cope with instances of failure. Of course, athletics is not the only activity that can provide these opportunities, but for students who are passionate about playing a sport, there may be no better avenue for them to develop these skills. Given that we live in a society that values athletics and given that many of the most talented students in our applicant pool are committed to participating in athletics in college, a healthy and successful athletic program is of significant value to the institution.

1.1 The Division Between Athletes and Non-Athletes

In the fall of 2000, then-president Tom Gerety established a Special Committee on the Place of Athletics at Amherst, chaired by Trustee Colin Diver '65. The Committee's 2002 report, "The Place of Athletics at Amherst" (hereafter Diver I), called "the division between athletes and non-athletes...the 'great divide' on campus" (pg. 30, emphasis in original). Fifteen years later, the authors of Diver II concluded that "there is little sign that the divide has lessened" (pg. 6). If anything, it seems to have intensified. Diver I indicated that the divide between student-athletes and other students correlated with striking divisions in race, gender, and socioeconomic status.¹ Since 2002, varsity athletics has doubled its diversity (Diver II, pg. 9).² The College as a whole, however, has become even more diverse, and the differences are still keenly felt. In total numbers we have the most diverse athletics program in NESCAC, which is an important accomplishment, and we hope that Athletics will continue their efforts in this regard. At the same time, our student population is also the most diverse of any liberal arts college in the country, and this demographic disjunction only throws into relief the divisions among students. This is particularly true because athletic affiliation very often determines patterns of student life at Amherst, including housing choices, seating at Valentine, participation in other extracurricular activities, clustering into a small set of academic majors and courses, and low participation rates in Honors Theses (Diver II, pg. 13-16). Students across the campus have expressed ways in which this divide deeply affects their experience both in and out of the classroom. Student-athletes and coaches report feeling stigmatized and disrespected; other students report feeling marginalized by what they perceive as the dominance of social life and physical space by student-athletes. These dynamics were described with clarity and specificity by the authors of Diver I (cf. Diver

¹ The authors of Diver I stated that "[i]n recent times the varsity athletic program has contributed very little to the racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic diversity of the Amherst student body. For example, in the class that matriculated in 1999 (the class of 2003), only 12% of the athletes (here, defined as those who, as freshmen, were on a varsity roster) were minorities, and only 6% were admitted under the 'socioeconomic' category. The corresponding percentages among non-athletes were 38% minorities and 17% socioeconomic" (Diver I, pg. 33). Diver I also discusses gender inequities. Although the authors note progress in the areas of expenditures, coaching resources, and student participation, they also note that disparities remain. In the academic year 2000, they note, male varsity athletes represented 39.6% of the male enrollment in the College, while the corresponding percentage for female participants was 31.7% (Diver I, pg. 34).

² Currently, between 73% and 74% of varsity student-athletes at Amherst College are white, in contrast to the 47% of the student body that is white. The authors of Diver II note that "[t]his disparity is not uniform across all teams. Several sports teams deserve recognition for having a more diverse cadre of students. The men's soccer team, for example, has a roster in which students of color and white students are equally represented, and both men's and women's tennis teams are significantly more diverse than other teams (32% and 74% students of color, respectively)" (Diver II, pg. 9). In terms of gender, while the College did expand its offerings in women's track in the years between 2002 and 2016, this expansion did not lead to "greater gender equity among athletes," and thus did not accomplish the goal of bringing the College into closer alignment with Title IX requirements" (Diver II, pg. 8). Roughly 40% of student-athletes are women, which allows for the inference that 60% are men.

I, pgs. 28-9, 30-33), and do not seem to have changed significantly in the last fifteen years (cf. Diver II, pgs. 9-10). Some faculty have also expressed concerns about the effects of clustering on classroom dynamics and pedagogy, including effects on the evaluation of faculty performance, often in the case of underrepresented and untenured faculty.

These enduring levels of separation, mutual mistrust, disrespect, and misunderstanding are antithetical to the scholarly community we aspire to foster. We therefore support Diver II's recommendation that "every effort be taken by administrators and student leaders to ensure that student living environments, and community activity more broadly, provide for good and healthy mixing of students of every interest" (Diver II, pg. 23). Moreover, we believe that the faculty shares with other members of the community a responsibility to address these negative experiences and to foster institutions and cultures of appreciation, acknowledgment, and respect for the complexity and variety of individual identities and activities at the College.

1.2 General Responses

1.2.1 *Ask about integration, not balance.*

Beginning at least with Diver I, the College has framed discussions over varsity athletics largely in terms of "balance." The main question the College has posed to itself is the extent to which "Amherst has kept its athletic program in proper balance with its educational mission" (Diver I, pgs. 2-3; cf. Diver II, pgs. 1, 6, 17). We have come to believe that this question is no longer a useful way to articulate the opportunities and challenges of athletics at Amherst. To balance, in general, is to offset or counteract the value of one thing with the value of another. The aim of balancing, again in general, is to achieve an equal distribution of weight between two separate masses of equivalent measure. As such, it is perfectly possible to work in good faith to achieve balance between athletics and academics while also unintentionally creating the institutional conditions for interminable comparisons, envy, and conflict between two similarly situated and largely separate groups of students. Balance, in other words, is not a remedy for a campus divided between students who are varsity athletes and students who are not varsity athletes. Balance is an enabling condition for that division.

In the Faculty Meeting of February 7, 2017, several colleagues encouraged us to think about ways to integrate athletics and academics, and we have taken that counsel to heart. We think that integration, more than balance, is the right question to ask at this point in time about the relation between athletics and academics at the College. To integrate is, in general, to combine parts into a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts. It is also, in political terms, to bring people or groups into conditions of equal participation or membership within a given institution. Also, integration is the keyword of the most recent report issued by the American Association of University Professors on the topic of the role of the faculty in the governance of college athletics. "The goal of structural reform in the governance of college sports," write the authors, "should be more

fully to integrate athletics into the educational mission of the institution.”³

A majority of the members of our committee believe that the goal of integration should be formally included in the Amherst Faculty Handbook. This could be accomplished by a motion stating, first, that the faculty recognize that physical education in general, and intercollegiate athletics in particular, has an important and desirable role in a liberal arts college; and, second, that the faculty shares responsibility, with the Athletics Department and the Administration, for ensuring that intercollegiate athletics is a well-integrated part of the Amherst education. A motion of this sort has precedents not only in faculty reports from the years prior to Diver I but also in the policies of certain of our peers.⁴ Last, it would be an important statement at a time when current student-athletes continue to report the same experiences of stigma and demoralization they reported some fifteen years ago in 2002 (cf. Diver I, pgs. 28-9; Diver II, pg. 6). It would send a clear signal to all constituencies, inside the College and outside it as well, that any changes to athletics will be made on the basis of a purposive, college-wide affirmation of the value of athletics. It is important to note that this clause would not assign responsibility for integration exclusively or solely to the faculty. Rather, it would simply affirm that this responsibility is to be shared among faculty, the department of athletics, the College administration, and the student body.

1.2.2. Focus on activities more than on identities.

In general, we have found that our most productive conversations have occurred when our focus is centered more on activities (e.g., intercollegiate athletics and

³ Association of American University Professors, “The Role of the Faculty in the Governance of College Athletics” (October 2002), online at https://www.jstor.org/stable/40252251?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents (last checked April 16, 2018). Although it is true that the AAUP’s 2002 report focuses on issues that exist mostly in Division I athletics, it also states that these issues are present “at most institutions that engage in competitive intercollegiate athletics.” A more recent AAUP report, meanwhile, lends empirical support to the claim that Division III athletics are not immune from some of the dynamics that define Division I athletics. See Association of American University Professors, “Losing Focus: The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 2013-14” (March-April 2014), online at https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/files/2014%20salary%20report/zreport_0.pdf (last checked April 16, 2018).

⁴ Writing in 1999, The Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid stated that “[t]he ideal situation would be, of course, to have Amherst’s talented athletes fully integrated into the campus community both socially and academically” (“Admission to Amherst: A Report to the Faculty and Administration,” Submitted by The Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid, September 1999, pg. 23). The Middlebury College Faculty Handbook, meanwhile, contains a clause affirming athletics as a part of the liberal arts college, and directing faculty to share the responsibility of integrating it into the liberal arts education: “The College recognizes that intercollegiate athletics have an important and desirable role in a liberal arts college. The faculty is responsible for seeing that the intercollegiate athletic program is a well-integrated part of the entire educational endeavor. Through the Athletic Policy Committee, the faculty regulates various phases of the intercollegiate athletic program, including athletic schedules and class absences permitted for participation in intercollegiate athletics” (Section C.17. “Athletics Information for Faculty,” Middlebury College Faculty Handbook, online at <http://www.middlebury.edu/about/handbook/ug-college-policies/faculty/faculty-and-athletics> [last checked April 20, 2018]).

academics) than on identities (e.g., athletes and non-athletes). Hewing to this distinction, we have found, has allowed us to have discussions in which stigmatization is less likely, and in which there is consequently more light than heat. Shifting the question away from identity and toward activity also has allowed us to focus with greater clarity on the ways in which Amherst students in general struggle to allocate their time and energy between activities that compete with academics for their attention. That for a significant percentage of students the activity in question assumes the form of intercollegiate athletics does not, in and of itself, constitute a reason to refer to this group of students as “athletes.” Although in some instances it is clumsy and even obfuscatory to focus on activities rather than identities, we have tried to remember wherever possible that at Amherst all students are first and foremost students, and that we embrace invidious distinctions internal to the student body at our own peril.

1.2.3 Clarify the meaning of athletic success.

At the Faculty Meeting of February 7, 2017, colleagues asked us to think about the meaning of a successful athletics program. As we met with staff from athletics, admissions, advancement and student life in the Fall of 2017, as well as with the Trustees, we asked all parties for their thoughts on the meaning of athletic success. The answers we received were varied, but all pointed to a clear consensus. No one to whom we spoke expressed a desire for all of our athletics teams to win over all of their competitors all of the time.⁵ What we heard was not a desire for dominance but a desire for our teams to have a reasonable chance of winning whenever they compete within NESCAC. Stated differently, no one to whom we spoke expressed a desire for our teams to have losing records. Some colleagues warned that perpetually losing records would make it difficult to recruit students to Amherst who are able to successfully integrate athletics and academics.

From this we conclude that our aim should be to field teams that are sufficiently competitive so that teams have a reasonable chance of winning in our athletic conference (NESCAC); team morale does not suffer; and our coaches and teams can continue to attract prospective recruits of the highest academic ability. Above all, as one Trustee said, a successful athletics program would be one that fields teams that the whole College can support, whether or not those teams happen to win on a given day.

A successful athletics program, we therefore suggest, will have several aims: (a) it will provide an opportunity for students to develop important skills including leadership, collaboration, communication, and the ability to cope with adversity; (b) it will help recruit exceptional students and staff to the College; (c) it will help foster community and pride on campus, (d) it will remain competitive in NESCAC; and (e) it will reflect Amherst College’s commitment to diversity, inclusivity, academic inquiry, personal

⁵ Between 1991 and 2000, the overall won-lost record of Amherst’s varsity athletic teams was 2093-1093-53, at a collective winning percentage (ignoring ties) of 65.69% (Diver I, pg. 18). Between 2001 and 2015, this record was 3710-1651-146, at a collective winning percentage (also ignoring ties) of 69.2% (see Appendix C).

development, and service to community.

1.2.4 *Understand the relation between athletics and giving.*

As colleagues mentioned in the Faculty Meeting of February 7, 2017, we need to remain mindful about the implications that decisions about athletics may or may not have for alumni giving to the College. Amherst is unusual among its peers for the degree to which it relies on its endowment to support academic programming and need-blind admissions. Capital campaigns therefore remain essential components of Amherst's financial health, even if they should not be the determining factor in the articulation of our educational mission or admissions criteria. It is well-documented that alumni of the College who participate in varsity athletics participate in alumni activities at higher rates and contribute significantly larger sums to the College than alumni who do not. It is not clear what accounts for this wide divergence in rates of giving. Does it correlate to levels of income? Is it a symptom of feelings of connectedness with the College and overall happiness with their College experience (the 'happiness factor')? Might we view athletes' levels of giving as indications of success in their College experience? If so, might we then consider why alumni giving from other groups is, comparatively, much lower. Does this then also indicate lower levels of 'happiness'? Given the complexity of these matters, and also the need for confidentiality, we recommend that the Committee of Six invite C.J. Menard, the College's Chief Advancement Officer, to present to a Faculty Meeting on the topic of the upcoming capital campaign.

1.3 Specific Recommendations

In order for our athletics program to achieve the integration and success we have outlined above, we propose consideration of the following recommendations:

1.3.1 *Improve management of the percentage of students participating in varsity athletics.*

We believe that it would be desirable for the College to do a better job managing the percentage of students participating in varsity athletics relative to the student body as a whole. According to recent data made available by the NCAA, the average percentage of the student body that plays sports in Division III institutions is 21%.⁶ According to the most recent data from NESCAC, meanwhile, the average percentage is 27.5% (Appendix G: Percentage of Student-Athletes in NESCAC, 2011-2017). This number generally has been higher at Amherst. "Representing 35-38% of the student body," the authors of *Diver II* noted in October 2016, "varsity athletes constitute the largest group of students as defined by extracurricular interests, which means that the differences are highly visible and can become amplified in the minds of students and faculty alike. Moreover, there is a very real opportunity cost to the College in having such a large fraction of its student body engaged in a single pursuit - less breadth in the interests and passions that students

⁶ See "NCAA Recruiting Facts" (July 2016), online at <https://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/Recruiting%20Fact%20Sheet%20WEB.pdf> (last checked January 24, 2018).

bring to campus... It follows that one way, albeit controversial, to reduce both the opportunity cost and the divide is to reduce the number of students participating in varsity athletics” (Diver II, pg. 22). In our deliberations, we considered three different ways to implement that reduction in a manner that would pursue the aforementioned goals of athletic-academic integration and athletic success within existing frameworks of shared governance at the College.

1.3.1.1 *Reduce the number of varsity teams.*

The authors of Diver II proposed that one way to achieve this reduction would be for the College to “eliminate[] some sports, for example those that are chronically unsuccessful on the playing field, or problematic because of the frequency of injuries, or have difficulty attracting a roster of capable students inside the classroom or on the playing field, or contribute very little to engendering interest in or loyalty to the College” (Diver II, pg. 22). We have reservations about this policy. First, our discussions with Advancement lead us to believe that eliminating teams, particularly high-profile teams, could indeed have a negative effect on giving. Second, we think that it is important not to take any step of this sort without due consideration for the interests and rights of the affected coaches and students. Third, we note that similar decisions at Brown (which in the early 1990s demoted its women's gymnastics and volleyball teams from university-funded to donor-funded varsity status) and Swarthmore (which in 2000 eliminated its football program) occasioned considerable public controversy and (in the case of Brown) a successful Title IX lawsuit against the University (*Cohen v. Brown* [1996]). In short, while we agree with the authors of Diver II that implementing a measure of this sort should be discussed, we also think that there are many better ways than team elimination to achieve shared goals of athletic-academic integration and athletic success.

1.3.1.2 *Reduce some teams’ roster sizes incrementally.*

The second option proposed by the authors of Diver II was to reduce the roster sizes of some teams over a determinate period of time. “[S]ome team rosters may have become larger than is necessary for the team to be competitive, and could be reduced. That approach seems far preferable to reducing roster sizes across the board, which would threaten some teams’ long-term competitiveness. For a college that is committed to excellence in everything it chooses to do, it would be difficult to argue that in this one respect – athletic achievement – it would be acceptable to underperform” (Diver II, pg. 22). We understand that in light of this proposal, the Athletics Department has this year begun to impose limits to the number of admissions ‘slots’ that can be claimed for some teams, effectively imposing limits to the size of their rosters. We welcome this development, but we could not reach consensus on the question of how, if at all, future discussions over roster sizes should figure into structures of shared governance. Some of us thought that consideration of roster sizes should become a formal part of the Faculty’s continued discussions of admissions policy and the place of athletics at Amherst College. For these members of the Ad Hoc Committee, attention to overall roster sizes could easily be made one of the responsibilities of the strengthened Faculty Athletic Representative position that we recommend in Section 1.3.3 below. Others members of

the Ad Hoc Committee, however, thought that faculty should leave it to our colleagues in the Athletics Department to decide how best to utilize the resources that the College has made available to them. In the view of these members, Faculty lack the expertise to know how many players are needed for any given team and also lack any understanding of how to manage the trade-offs that such decisions inevitably entail. For these members, roster sizes are a matter that is best left to the staff of Athletics.

1.3.1.3 *Increase the overall size of the student body.*

A third way to manage the percentage of students participating in varsity athletics relative to the student body as a whole would be to increase the overall size of the student body. This strategy was suggested to us in our meeting with the Trustees in the fall of 2017. The College currently enrolls 1,849 students, 32% of whom currently participate in intercollegiate athletics. Assuming that current team roster sizes (~600 students) remain constant, every 5% increase in the size of the student body would correspond to a ~1% drop in the overall percentage of the student body who participates in intercollegiate athletics. So, for example, if the student body were to grow next year by 5% (~93 additional students), while also maintaining team rosters at their current sizes and numbers, the overall percentage of the student body who participates in intercollegiate athletics would drop from 32% to roughly 30.8%. It is important to note that it would take a sizable increase in the student body ($\approx 50\%$) to reduce the overall percentage of the student body participating in athletics down to a number close to the NCAA average. Given that increasing the student body by this amount is untenable in the short term, it is clear that any increases in the student body will have to be done in concert with other policy changes.

The main benefit of this approach is that it would maintain teams at their current sizes (and, presumably, at their current level of competitiveness), while also decreasing the extent to which varsity athletes constitute the largest group of students as defined by extracurricular interests, which might allow for greater integration of athletics into the life of the College more generally. This benefit, however, would need to be weighed together with a number of likely costs, ranging from increased faculty-to-student ratios, to additional stresses on facilities in the form of increased pressures on housing, dining, classrooms, and parking, to the annual budget (in the form of additional financial aid).

1.3.2 *Strengthen relations between faculty and coaches.*

Over the course of the last semester, we heard concerns about the limited contact between coaches and faculty, the increasing and changing demands that are being placed on coaches, and the way in which coaches are evaluated at the College. The current practice is for the Dean of Faculty alone to read and decide on these cases. In the past, retrospective letters were solicited from all team members at the time of a coach's reappointment; there were no annual evaluations. As of last academic year, annual/seasonal evaluations, as well as retrospective letters, are now solicited. A majority of us believe that including faculty as readers of these cases could be one among many

expanded avenues of more direct communication between coaches and faculty, enabling faculty to learn more about the contributions of coaches, and creating the conditions under which misunderstandings between faculty and coaches could be decreased and the pursuit of shared goals increased. And a majority of us believe that this role would be consistent with the charge of the Committee of Six to act in “a general advisory capacity to the president, and to the faculty as a whole, on all matters of college policy.” We therefore recommend that while decisions about coach reappointments remain with the Dean of the Faculty, members of the Committee of Six read reappointment files in a consultative capacity.⁷

In addition, we recommend that the Committee on Education and Athletics review existing practices and policies governing relations between faculty and coaches, seeking out opportunities to strengthen those relations wherever possible. Our commitment to increasing faculty/coach interactions derives from our belief that the campus as a whole would benefit if the faculty understood more clearly that the members of the Athletics Department are dedicated to supporting the educational mission of the College. Although coaches do not interact with students in an academic context, their principal goals are to help their students grow as people, develop character and integrity through participation in athletics, and ultimately, to help their students develop the skills and tools necessary to achieve their personal and professional goals post-Amherst. Just like Amherst College faculty members, who have chosen to work at a liberal arts college instead of a research university, the members of the Athletics Department at Amherst have consciously chosen to work at a Division III institution. They have done so because this setting aligns with their coaching philosophies. Many of our coaches have turned down opportunities to work for Division I programs because they prefer to work at a place where undergraduate education takes precedence and the role that athletics can play in supporting the educational mission of the College is acknowledged. Like faculty members, the members of the Athletics Department seek excellence and push their students to achieve this standard. Although participating in intercollegiate athletics requires a commitment of time and energy, the coaches consistently support their students’ efforts to navigate their commitment to academics and athletics – thus affirming that athletics serves the educational mission of the institution.

Currently, the Faculty Liaisons Program is probably the largest formal setting for faculty/coach interactions. The authors of *Diver II* noted that “the Faculty Liaisons Program is of significant benefit to Amherst College, and should be encouraged,

⁷ This recommendation is consistent with the college’s description of its current practices in its recent NEASC Reaccreditation Report: “Coaches are normally appointed for a three-year contract, renewable three times, with the approval of the president and the dean, and in consultation with the Committee of Six” (Amherst College, “Report to the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education” [March 1, 2018], pg. 69). The precedent for this practice dates to the 1982 Report that inaugurated the “Contract System” for coaches. This Report recommended that the Committee of Six be consulted in all reviews of coaches’ effectiveness, including—presumably as an additional procedural safeguard—reviews that result in the Department of Athletics recommending the non-renewal of a coach’s contract (see Ad Hoc Committee for the Reorganization of the Department of Physical Education and Athletics, “Recommendations for the Reorganization of the Department of Physical Education and Athletics at Amherst” [September 1982], pgs. 3-4).

supported and expanded” (pgs. 3, 24). The CEA does not have any official oversight over or responsibility for the Faculty Liaison program, but it does provide informal support for the program, and all members of the CEA agree that it serves the community – students, coaches, and faculty – well. Members of the CEA also report that faculty members who participate in the program seem to find the experience valuable, and that many faculty members have served in these positions for a decade or more. Presumably, they would not choose to do so if they did not find value in the experience. In thinking about the future of the program, we have tried to identify what liaisons do, and how and whether that mission could be expanded.

Currently, approximately 30 faculty members serve as liaisons to the 27 varsity teams at Amherst. A single faculty member serves most teams, although some teams are served by multiple liaisons due to either faculty interest or the size of the roster; also, some faculty members serve as liaisons for more than one team. To specify exactly what liaisons do is difficult, given that every team-liaison relationship is unique, determined by the faculty member, the coaching staff, and the team members. Some liaisons have little contact with their teams, whereas others attend athletic contests, participate in community service projects, organize and attend social events, organize and attend extracurricular intellectual activities, support students facing personal difficulties (academic and otherwise), and help teams manage academic conflicts (e.g., NCAA tournaments).

Increasing the number of Liaisons is favored by the Athletics Department, would help promote stronger working relationships between coaches and faculty members, and would foster the trust needed to sustain these relationships. In addition, working on the Ad Hoc Committee has educated our members regarding a number of misconceptions that we held about the athletics program; presumably many of these misconceptions are shared by the faculty at large. Increasing the number of Liaisons would give the faculty a clearer picture of how athletic teams operate and what the coaches and players value about intercollegiate athletics. This does not imply that more knowledge will eliminate faculty concerns, but it would allow us to focus on the problems that exist rather than ones we imagine, and it would furthermore give coaches and faculty members a shared set of experiences that would help us work together to solve the problems that exist. However, we also see an argument for maintaining the current size of the athletic liaison program and encouraging faculty to serve as liaisons for other extracurricular organizations (see Section 1.3.6.1).

Regardless of whether the faculty choose to invest more resources in the athletics liaison program, we are strongly in favor of developing other mechanisms that will increase interactions between faculty and the coaching staff. With this goal in mind, we make the following recommendations. First, we recommend that faculty and coaches commit to engaging in small group conversations with one another. As described earlier, getting to know one another will help us develop trust and the ability to work together to help students succeed. Second, we recommend that the faculty invite coaches to a faculty meeting once a year to discuss issues of concern (e.g., “How does recruiting work?”; “How are game schedules created?”; “How do coaches evaluate the success of their programs?”; “What is being done to protect students from injuries?”). In return, the

Athletics department could invite faculty members to participate in their meetings to help address questions they have about how the faculty work. Third, we recommend increasing the responsibilities of the Faculty Athletic Representative to promote more information flow between athletics and the faculty.

1.3.3 *Strengthen the position of “Faculty Athletics Representative” (FAR).*

Since Diver I, varsity athletics has changed in several ways that have escaped the awareness of the faculty. Some of these changes have been positive. For example, the number of Athletic Factors (AFs) admitted to the College has decreased by 33% (from approximately 90 per year to approximately 60 per year). Students with an academic reader rating (ARR) of 6 are no longer admitted to the College. As cited previously, changes to admissions policies have enabled us to double the diversity of the pool of athletes on campus (Diver II, pg. 9), while increasing the academic profile of student-athletes, and eliminating the academic underperformance of student-athletes reported in Diver I. The increased diversity of our athletics teams may have escaped the faculty’s notice because the change in diversity of the overall student population was even larger. These policies have also led to the uptick in the proportion of student athletes on campus, which many feel has contributed to the conditions on campus that have prompted the current round of discussions among the faculty. It is also possible that greater faculty awareness of the relevant developments as they were occurring might have yielded opportunities for small-scale interventions which, in turn, might have rendered our current discussions unnecessary.

Beyond short- or medium-term initiatives aimed at changing current conditions, we think that recent events require us to ask whether existing structures of shared governance over athletics are adequate. In 2002, Diver I identified specific measurable indicators to be monitored, and called for continuous oversight and periodic review by the administration and faculty (Diver I, pgs. 47-8). These recommendations seem to have been forgotten or neglected in the intervening years. Had these recommendations been robustly and consistently implemented, Diver II’s findings about the academic and social clustering of student-athletes might not have come as such a surprise.

In Section 1.2.1 above, we note that adopting a statement affirming the place of athletics within a liberal arts education would establish a policy framework for improved mechanisms of shared governance of athletics. Regardless of whether the Faculty decides to incorporate such language into our Faculty Handbook, we have reason to believe that our current governance structures are not up to the task of implementing the recommendations of Diver II, or the larger goal of integrating athletics and academics. For example, information concerning admissions policies that have been in place for many years should not have caught faculty unawares. Keeping track of our attempts to intervene in those conditions of campus life that we now regard as problematic will require a higher degree of sustained, collective attention than our existing governance structures have provided. As has been apparent in our work as a committee, many of these issues do not fall squarely within the charge of a standing committee, and others

intersect with the work of more than one committee. For example, the expansion in the number of athletes in the time between Diver I and Diver II may have been in part because there has been no clear mechanism of shared governance for determining a governing policy related to the overall size of athletics, and not because a particular committee that was tasked with doing so was negligent.

We doubt that these difficulties can be resolved by adding another responsibility to the charge of the CEA. We believe that the rotating membership structure of this Committee tends to inhibit the development of the deep and detailed knowledge about academics and athletics that is necessary for truly prudent governance of these matters. A more promising possibility, we believe, is to strengthen the position of our “Faculty Athletics Representative” (FAR). According to the NCAA’s 2017-2018 Division III Manual, every NCAA institution is required to have a FAR whose “duties...shall be determined by the member institution.”⁸ Amherst College has a FAR but this position has not been given many responsibilities or the resources to accomplish them. That could change. The responsibility of the faculty member who occupies this position would be (a) to ensure that the College establishes and maintains the appropriate integration of academics and intercollegiate athletics; (b) to serve as a liaison between the faculty and the athletics department; (c) to serve as a representative of the college in NESCAC and NCAA affairs; and (d) monitor the effectiveness of policies governing varsity athletics with regard to academic achievement, athletic competitiveness, Title IX implications, diversity, and campus culture. We imagine that the duration of the faculty member’s service in this role would be in the range of three to five years. (A full description of FAR responsibilities may be found in Appendix D: Job Description of “Faculty Athletics Representative.”) To offset the additional work this position will entail, we recommend that the President and Dean of the Faculty allow the faculty member who serves in this role be given two course releases for every year that they serve in this capacity.

1.3.4 *Increase support for the recruitment of diverse student-athletes.*

Both Diver I and Diver II strongly recommend increasing the diversity of student-athletes (cf. Diver I, pg. 46; Diver II, pg. 23). As we have mentioned, the Athletics Department has increased the diversity in its teams since 2002, accomplishing the greatest level of diversity of any NESCAC school. These gains are a clear success on the part of our Athletics Department, and should be a point of pride for Amherst. Even so, the increased diversity within varsity athletics has been outpaced by an even greater college-wide increase in diversity. The result is that the Athletic Department’s clear success in the context of NESCAC becomes largely undetectable in the context of the Amherst campus itself. Noting that NESCAC lifted athletic recruitment spending limits in 2016, we therefore recommend that the President and Dean of Faculty allocate whatever additional support is necessary for the Athletics Department to bring the diversity of teams more into line with the diversity of the student body as a whole. If a

⁸ NCAA 2017-2018 Division III Manual, pg. 43 (online at <http://www.ncaapublications.com/p-4513-2017-2018-ncaa-division-iii-manual-august-version-available-august-2017.aspx>) (last checked January 24, 2018).

successful athletics program would be one that fields teams that can be supported by the entire College, we think that it is necessary to increase the incentives for coaches to increase the diversity of their student-athletes even more. We say this with the recognition that, given the extent of socioeconomic and racial segregation of youth sports outside of Amherst, even significant additional support may not be sufficient to bring every sport fully in line with the diversity of the student body as a whole. Just as important for the diversity of athletics is for the Athletics Department to retain student-athletes of color once they matriculate at Amherst. When we met with students from CACSAC, we heard concerns about the disproportionate number of athletes of color who were leaving their teams. After subsequent review of more granular information provided to us by the Athletics Department, we concluded that it was beyond the scope of our committee to inquire into this question in any depth. We therefore recommend that this matter be included in the portfolio of the strengthened FAR position, and addressed on a more systematic and regular basis in consultation with the Athletics Department and the CEA.

1.3.5 Improve understanding of academic clustering and thesis selection.

The authors of Diver II recommended “that the Faculty Committee on Education and Athletics undertake a study to understand the underlying causes of the academic decisions that lead some student-athletes to concentrate in a small number of departments and to suggest remedies for any policies and practices that may discourage or deter student-athletes from experiencing the full benefit of an Amherst education” (Diver II, pgs. 23-4).

With respect to major clustering, the best data currently available can be drawn from student applications, which include a question about potential majors. Examining these data might help illuminate whether student-athletes come to Amherst with an intention of majoring in a small number of areas or whether the culture (e.g., advice of teammates; time commitment) pushes them in these directions. Interpreting these data is problematic because there is some question as to whether the data from these questionnaires reflect applicants’ actual intentions or whether they represent applicants’ best guesses about what will improve their admissions prospects. According to application data from the five-year period for which data were available (2012-2016), Economics was the only discipline for which there was a substantial discrepancy in intended majors between athletes and other students. Although these data suggest that the clustering of student-athletes into certain majors precedes their arrival on campus, it is still possible that aspects of the campus culture reinforce these predispositions. Figuring out ways to assess how campus cultural factors influence major decisions will be a difficult but important question for the Committee on Education and Athletics to pursue (more on this to follow).

Data from the same time period were used to evaluate several potential explanations for the discrepancies between student-athletes and other students in terms of thesis completion. A lack of intellectual engagement is a plausible explanation, but one

that is difficult to measure. Lack of time due to athletic commitments is also a plausible explanation, but it cannot provide a full explanation of the pattern because many student-athletes – $\approx 28\%$ – do complete thesis work (see Section 3.1). Still, this number lags far below the thesis rate for other students ($\approx 48\%$). Two other explanations can probably be ruled out at this point. First, differences in thesis participation cannot be explained by major clustering. That is, if student-athletes tend to major in departments that produce a small percentage of theses, one would expect a relatively small percentage of student-athletes overall to complete a thesis. Available data are inconsistent with this claim. Thesis rates for student-athletes are lower than thesis rates for other students for more than two-thirds of Amherst departments; the remaining one-third tend to have a very small number of student-athlete majors (< 4 per year), which means a small number of completed theses will have a very large effect on the percentage data. Second, differential thesis participation rates cannot be attributed to differences between student-athletes and other students in terms of Academic Reader Ratings (ARR). Regression analyses indicate that the thesis participation rate for student-athletes is lower than the rate for other students even when ARR and several other factors including major discipline are controlled for. Thus, although initial work has narrowed the field of potential explanations for the academic choices that student-athletes make, the CEA must examine other potential causes and solutions. Some hypotheses that should be considered include whether differential rates of thesis completion can be tied to other demographic variables such as gender, season (fall, winter, or spring) and/or type of sport (e.g., helmet sports). We also should consider the possibility of comparing Amherst data with data from other NESCAC institution(s) to determine if some of these issues are Amherst-specific. Of course, doing so would require cooperation between Amherst and at least one of our NESCAC partners. The Administration believes that our peers would be open to sharing this kind of data.

1.3.6 *Deepen understanding of issues regarding student life.*

The authors of Diver II recommend “that every effort be taken by administrators and student leaders to ensure that student living environments, and community activity more broadly, provide for good and healthy mixing of students of every interest” (Diver II, pg. 23). We agree. College Council has several student members who have spoken in committee about issues facing the campus that are related to this recommendation. Topics that have arisen include room draw, the campus party scene (and in particular the “mixers” that are organized by the “social chairs” of some teams), managing time commitments between academic and extracurricular activities, and the place of walk-ons in intercollegiate teams. Going forward, we recommend that the College Council continue to attend to these issues, in consultation as relevant with other student groups such as the Council of Amherst College Student-Athletes of Color (CACCSAC) and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC). The information obtained could be used for two purposes: first, to preserve memory of student positions on the relevant issues (via committee minutes), and second, to adjust or propose new policies related to student life.

1.3.6.1 *Replicate successes in athletics mentoring elsewhere on campus.*

At the February 7, 2017, Faculty Meeting, colleagues noted that in a college where students report high rates of loneliness and isolation, varsity athletes report the highest levels of happiness. Other colleagues noted, however, that some student-athletes seem to experience the strong bonds of team culture as an inhibition of their ability to engage in extra-athletic relationships and activities. We were asked to determine what factors contribute to varsity athletes' greater sense of happiness and commitment relative to the rest of the student body, and to develop strategies to enable the rest of the student body to experience comparable levels of happiness and commitment, while also remaining aware that, for some, team culture constrains more than it enables. Given the limited scope and provisional character of our committee, we were not able to engage in any systematic studies of this question. Even so, it is already clear that a large part of the answer to this question involves coaches, whose contributions to campus culture are widely praised and valued. Many varsity student-athletes benefit from the involvement of a coach in both their academic and personal lives, often even before they arrive at Amherst College. Tensions may arise because not all students have access to this level of mentoring. Similar experiences may be possible for other students, including low-income or first-generation students, via enhanced mentoring by faculty.

During the academic year 2016-17, the AAS trialed a program that assigned upperclass students to first-year students as peer mentors. We recommend that the College Council explore a revival and expansion of this program, as it would be likely to yield mentoring relationships between varsity athletes and non-athletes. As College Council explores this possibility, we suggest, it would be desirable for them to liaise with the Office of Student Affairs (regarding programs intended to help students who would particularly benefit from mentoring relationships) and with the Curriculum Committee (which may be making proposals that also address mentoring via advising). We also recommend that College Council explore increasing faculty mentoring of student organizations.

1.3.6.2 *Study ways in which gender and sexuality influence athletic participation and "the divide."*

Of particular concern to the College Council will be issues related to gender and sexuality. Over the course of the 2016-2017 academic year, it became apparent that one men's varsity athletic team had a team culture that was inconsistent with the College's [Statement on Respect for Persons](#). While it is important not to produce unfounded generalizations based on this painful episode, it also is important not to forgo the chance to learn from it. As President Martin wrote in her January 31, 2017, email to the campus community about Diver II, the recent events involving the men's cross country team "remind us that we must ensure the integrity of our athletics programs and the well-being of those who participate. These events also underscore the importance of accountability when individuals or team behaviors cause harm. The problems that have been revealed of

late, here and elsewhere, are not new; they are not limited to particular individuals, to athletics teams, or to colleges and universities. If they were, they would be much easier to uproot. They are deeply embedded, society-wide problems that we must approach on campus by exemplifying the habits of mind we teach in the classroom.” We recommend that, in the coming academic year, the College Council seeks to achieve greater understanding of the ways that norms of gender and sexuality operate not only in various team cultures but also in student life more generally.

It is worth noting in this context that there is a structural gender imbalance within the varsity athlete population. College statistics indicate that 40 percent of athletes are female, while 60 percent are male. What this means is that, as with racial and ethnic diversity, the difference must be made up in the rest of the student body, which must be about 55 percent female if parity between these two gender identities is to be maintained within the student body as a whole. The ultimate significance of this gender imbalance is not clear to us, and we think this is a subject that merits further consideration.

1.3.6.3 Provide sensor-equipped helmets to students who play helmeted contact sports.

Over the last decade, the American public has grown aware of a growing body of research into a neurodegenerative disease called Chronic Traumatic Encephalopathy (CTE). This research suggests that both concussive blows and repeated subconcussive blows can cause irreversible brain damage, as manifest in symptoms ranging from memory loss and aggression to depression and suicidality. It is important to note that repetitive subconcussive traumas are distinct from the major concussions that our athletic trainers currently monitor: the tests the College now uses to assess concussions in students cannot and do not measure the many subconcussive blows that students suffer as a matter of course in some contact sports. These blows are asymptomatic: they do not present the symptoms associated with Post-Concussion Syndrome (such as loss of consciousness, amnesia, confusion, mental foginess, and nausea). Given that the College has a special relationship with, and special obligations to, those among our students who may be at risk for this disease as a result of their participation in intercollegiate athletics, we recommend that the President and the Dean of the Faculty allocate funds to the Department of Athletics to begin measuring and tracking repetitive subconcussive trauma using ‘hit count’ metrics or biosensors in the helmets of students who play helmeted contact sports. We also recommend that the Department of Athletics explore monitoring options for non-helmeted sports that are known to involve higher rates of concussive and subconcussive hits. We finally recommend that these data be shared with the FAR and the CEA and evaluated regularly within the appropriate structures of shared governance on the basis of the best available research into CTE.

1.3.7 Promote engagement across the campus.

As outlined in the Diver II report and in the preceding sections of this report, student-athletes are less likely to undertake thesis work and tend to major in a

circumscribed set of disciplines. They also tend to cluster socially and residentially. It would be difficult and perhaps counterproductive to try to combat these tendencies by creating ‘rules’ about where student-athletes can live or with whom they can spend their time. We think it would be more effective to educate students as to the possibilities that are available and to try to reframe some cultural expectations that might have developed. Some work towards this end is currently underway. Last year Professor Vanessa Walker (History) and Coach E.J. Mills (Football) hosted a lunch with sophomores, juniors, and current senior thesis writers on the football team. A handful of faculty members also attended. The theme of the meeting was not “you *must* do a thesis” but rather “you *can* do a thesis” and “here are issues to consider when trying to make that decision.” We recommend that more teams host similar events, not only related to theses, but for other academic and extracurricular activities as well. Helping more student-athletes see that it is possible to engage in meaningful activities outside of athletics could help foster more interactions between athletes and nonathletes. One note of caution must be sounded: student-athletes are already subject to a number of mandatory meetings, including Amherst LEADS (a program emphasizing Leadership, Teamwork, Commitment, Dedication, about which we will have more to say later in the report) and workshops related to sexual respect, anti-hazing, and social media. These meetings are important because they affect team culture, and team culture is part of the evaluation of our coaches. Given these concerns about over-scheduling, we should think carefully about any unintended effects that adding additional meetings about theses and other extracurricular activities might have.

Just as we hope to engage athletes more fully into the community, we would also like to encourage non-athletes to participate more in the Athletics Department. We see several changes that might promote this end. For example, the architecture of the Alumni gym makes it difficult to navigate, especially for students who do not regularly use the space. Trying to find the pool or LeFrak from the main entrance requires a series of twists and turns and hard-to-find staircases. One small way to address this problem would be to allow students to enter the gym from what is currently the “back” of the building (the side that faces Memorial Hill). This entrance is more accessible to most of campus than the front of the building and is also located much closer to the parts of the gym that non-athletes would be likely to use (locker rooms and exercise equipment). The Athletics department is also thinking about ways to redesign spaces to feel more welcoming to the broader community.

Another way to bridge the divide between varsity athletes and the broader student population would be to provide more opportunities for students who were not specifically recruited to a varsity team to “walk on” after matriculation. At present there are very few such walk-ons on any of our varsity teams, and many of these walk-on students are students who were recruited to a different team. Anecdotally, some of us have witnessed students who are not recruited athletes expressing frustration with this state of affairs, as the world of Amherst varsity athletics is basically closed to students who were not recruited by a coach. We have learned that it is highly unlikely that Amherst will embrace a culture of walk-ons in varsity athletics. There are two reasons for this, as we

understand the situation. First, a team that is composed of a large number of walk-ons will not be competitive within NESCAC. Second, coaches use the lengthy recruitment process to get to know each prospective recruit. Because walk-on students are relatively unknown, coaches cannot be as confident that they will work well within the team and/or within the broader campus community.

Another way to get more students and faculty active in athletic department programs is to re-imagine intramurals and fitness classes. According to the Athletics Department, enrollments in fitness courses have decreased dramatically over the past several years. Perhaps we could conduct some research to figure out what kinds of classes might appeal to the current generation of college students and/or the current generation of faculty. Lastly, the Athletics Department could foster more engagement by hiring more non-athletes to perform tasks like scorekeeping or running the clock during games. To be clear, these jobs are currently filled by both athletes and non-athletes, but expanding the pool of non-athletes who work “in the gym” might make students feel more comfortable in and around the athletic facilities.

Finally, we have also considered whether “Amherst LEADS” could be used as a model for a program to help reduce divisions on our campus. Before explaining this idea more fully, a little background on the LEADS program will be provided. According to the Amherst website, “Amherst LEADS is a leadership development program that provides a comprehensive and educational view of leadership that can be used both during and after a student-athlete’s experience at Amherst.” The program engages all student-athletes in leadership training via outside speakers, workshops, and other activities. This type of program is fairly unique for a Division III athletics program, and many schools have approached Amherst to find out more about how LEADS works. In brief, LEADS consists of three major components: a program for captains (who are typically seniors); a program for first-year students, and a program for sophomore and juniors (called the Futures program). Although we have heard a great deal of praise for LEADS, two persistent questions have emerged. The first question is whether LEADS serves student-athletes well. This question was presented most forcefully by the members of CACSAC, who believe that messages from LEADS and from the athletic department, in general, should do a better job of addressing larger political factors both inside and outside the world of athletics. The second question is why the benefits of the LEADS program are restricted to student-athletes. It should be noted that in recent years, LEADS has responded to this concern by including non-athletes in some of their activities. Attendance at such events has been light, which likely reflects the divide that prompted the work of this committee.

Using a program like LEADS to improve campus culture would require expanding the program in two ways that are related to the two persistent criticisms of its current form. First, the mission of LEADS would have to be expanded to include skills such as community building, conflict resolution, and forming lasting relationships with people from different backgrounds and with different experiences. Second, LEADS would have to be expanded to involve a much broader segment of the student body.

There are, of course, problems associated with using LEADS as a model for a campus-wide program, the most obvious being scalability. LEADS works, in part, because it serves a relatively small population of students. The athletic department is currently conducting an internal review of LEADS; one of the issues of concern is the effectiveness of the Futures program, which tries to serve many more students than either the captains program or the first-year program. A second problem is that the LEADS name is so closely associated with athletics that non-athletes might be reluctant to participate. Thus, we recommend creating a new program to foster community building. Of course, it would be wise to include members of the Athletic Department in planning such an endeavor because they have experience in creating this kind of program. Doing so would have the added benefit of providing an opportunity for faculty, coaches, and administrators to work together, which would constitute a benefit in and of itself.

2.1 The Place of Athletics in Admissions

The 'Mission Statement of the Amherst College Office of Admission' reads as follows:

Amherst College looks, above all, for students of intellectual promise who have demonstrated qualities of mind and character that will enable them to take full advantage of our curriculum. We seek qualified applicants from different racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic backgrounds - students whose several perspectives might contribute significantly to a process of mutual education within and beyond the curriculum.

We aim to select from among the many qualified applicants those possessing the intellectual talent, discipline and imagination that will allow them most fully to benefit from our curriculum and contribute to the life of the College and society. Grades, standardized test scores, essays, recommendations independent work, the quality of the secondary school program and achievements outside the classroom are among the factors used to evaluate this promise, but no one of these measures is considered determinative. [Emphasis added. Voted by the Faculty in 1983]

Two related issues here bear emphasizing. First, the clear and unequivocal priority of identifying and admitting students *of intellectual promise*. Second, the clear and unequivocal goal of having students *benefit from our curriculum and contribute to the life of the college and society*. As an educational institution, Amherst College has long been devoted to furthering equity and social justice by admitting students *of intellectual promise*. Our diversity initiatives must be understood as a furtherance of these values - a continued dedication to intellectual promise, regardless of racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic background. Our curriculum remains the primary focus of all of our endeavors.

Extracurricular offerings are intended to enhance the quality of student life, and to

serve as bridges to bring our students, faculty, and staff together in ways that enhance the strength of our ties. It is important that we remain dedicated to these goals, to the centrality of our intellectual and social mission, and to ways in which the intellectual and social lives of our students, curricular and extra-curricular offerings, must interact and complement one another. We want to ensure that Admissions prioritize the admission of students of *intellectual promise*, students who will *benefit from our curriculum and contribute to the life of the College and society*. The current divide between our students, articulated as “the athletic divide,” negatively impacts our students’ ability to contribute to the mutual interaction and engagement central to the health of the community and the life of the College.

Admissions policy, both in the recruitment process and eventual selection of students, gives enormous weight to athletic ability. Varsity athletics is currently valued, in large measure through the admission process, as a crucial priority at Amherst College. We need to continue our efforts to ensure that our long-standing commitment to athletics remains consistent with our vision of the College as a premier educational institution with a diverse and well-integrated student body.

The recruitment process for varsity athletes differs significantly from the admissions recruitment process for non-athletes, resulting in considerable differences in the pre-matriculation experience of these two kinds of students. Coaches are permitted to contact prospective athletes as of July 1 following the student’s sophomore year of High School. Coaches and high school students of athletic promise are thus often in close contact for a year or more before the student is in a position to apply for admission to Amherst College; potential applicants benefit from advice and mentoring from coaches who are in direct and frequent conversation with Admissions staff, in order to build the best possible admission application.

The end result of this process is that students are either encouraged or discouraged from applying to the College, based on Admissions’ communication to the coaches of the likelihood of the student being accepted. Student-athletes who are encouraged to apply to the College do so in large numbers through Early Decision rather than regular admissions. For example, in the class of 2021 (‘2017 cohort’), 71.7% of all “Athletic Factor” matriculants were admitted through Early Decision. Early Decision has become a vehicle for assuring the filling of team rosters. Using Early Decision in this way also helps limit the number of Athletic Factors who are admitted to the College. This is understandable given the desirability for coaches to have greater levels of certainty in filling their team needs.

Currently, with very few exceptions, the College’s varsity team rosters are filled by students admitted under one of two headings: “Athletic Factor” (AF) and “Non-Athletic Factor” (NAF or “Coded Athlete”). The portfolios of both AF and NAF applicants enter the admissions process through the recruitment process described above. AF applicants are students who are admitted despite their relatively low ARRAs because athletic ability is something the College values. A majority of the committee believes

that athletic ability should not be enough to merit admission to an applicant at the bottom of the ARR scale. Applicants who either meet academic ARR minimum levels or satisfy at least one other established priority, such as contributing to diversity, being a SCIR (identified interest and experience with SCientific Research), legacy, Schupf or Arts rated student are classified as NAF applicants. NESCAC imposes an annual cap of 67 AF matriculants (calculated on a three-year rolling average), which amounts to about 14% of total matriculating students. The number of NAF matriculants has not been capped. This means that as many as 67 students per year are admitted for the express purpose of enhancing team competitiveness; it also means that since applicants who would contribute to diversity are classified as NAF, the AF category does not function as a vehicle for increasing the diversity of the student body. For the graduating classes of 2017-20 NAF matriculants have outnumbered AF matriculants by a ratio of roughly 3:2, and between 140-157 athletes each year, making up between 29.9%-32.7% of the entering classes, have matriculated through the athletic recruitment process.⁹

	#AF/ #matr	%AF	#NAF/ #matr	%NAF	#SCIR /#matr	%SCIR	#ARTS/ #matr	%ARTS	#Legacy/ #matr	%Legacy
Class of 2020	60/471	12.7%	93/471	19.7%	19/471	4%	28/471	5.9%	66/471	14%
Class of 2019	58/477	12.2%	99/477	20.8%	27/477	5.7%	20/477	4%	54/477	11%
Class of 2018	61/469	13%	79/469	16.8%	11/469	2.3%	19/469	4%	56/469	12%
Class of 2017	60/466	12.9%	89/466	19.1%	13/466	2.8%	30/466	6.4%	66/466	14%

It is our understanding that it is very rare that AF students meet other established admissions priorities, as the priority for these students is their athletic prowess. NAFs are those rated athletes with academic talent *and* additional attributes (athletic or other). Occasionally, an AF may meet another priority of the College, but the attribute is determined in that student's circumstance not to be weighty enough to merit admission without the athletic talent, hence the AF tag. This system was developed to encourage

⁹ This data in each row does not add up to 100% as not all students are admitted under one of these special categories (athlete, SCIR, Arts, Legacy) that we have chosen to discuss here.

coaches to recruit athletes with high levels of academic ability and athletes who meet diversity criteria by exempting such students from the “AF” category while still allowing them to be admitted via the athletic recruitment process. This has resulted in markedly improved academic performance among athletes since Diver I, and also in strong efforts made by the Athletics Department to diversify the athletic teams. Success in diversification, or lack thereof, is not a function of any lack of effort or willingness on the part of the Athletic Department, but rather reflects the general nation-wide diversity or lack of diversity that affects different sports differently. It is possible, however, that with the limits on coach recruitment funding lifted, coaches may be able to increase the diversity of their teams by being able to travel more widely.

The current recruiting process was instituted with the best of intentions, and has been successful in several notable ways. Amherst has, in the last fifteen years or so, been able to attract and matriculate highly rated athletes with higher reader ratings than in the past. These policies have managed to increase diversity at the same time as it has led to increased team competitiveness. At its best, this policy has created a virtuous circle between academic and athletic success. But we think that the current process also has had unintended side-effects. We have come to believe that one of the factors that promotes the perception that varsity athletes are a different kind of student than non-athletes is that the former enter the College through a different process than the latter. The recruiting process now produces varsity teams that are largely homogeneous in at least one respect, in that (with very few exceptions) all team members are recruited athletes. This means that athletes very rarely have teammates who were admitted to the College from the general admissions pool. And this in turn means that when teams become important networks of friendship, support, and personal development for their members, the initial distinction between recruited and non-recruited students does not fade in significance after matriculation (as it might if, say, varsity teams were a mix of recruited and “walk-on” athletes), but instead tends to persist as a distinction between *groups* of recruited and *groups* of non-recruited students.

2.2 Specific Recommendations

2.2.1 Reduce the total number of “Athletic Factor” admits.

NESCAC rules currently stipulate that our number of AF admits be no more than 67. In the past 5 years, we note, the actual number of AF admits has been well below the cap of 67, and the overall athletic winning rate has increased compared to when the cap was 75 at the time of Diver I. This suggests that the correlation between “AF” admits and athletic winning, let alone overall athletic success, is not a direct one. Although some members of the committee believe that further reductions in the number of AFs would not reduce competitiveness, some members believe that this conclusion is unwarranted because the effect of past reductions cannot be used to forecast the effect of future reductions. We are pleased that we have managed to stay below the NESCAC cap of 67 AF matriculants and encourage the Board of Trustees and the Administration to push our NESCAC colleagues to follow our lead and further reduce the official AF cap across the conference. It is our understanding that there are discussions underway within NESCAC

to consider a further reduction below the stipulated 67.

One possible advantage of reducing AFs would be to reduce acceptance of student-athletes with an ARR of 4 or 5 (or sometimes below - the cohort of 2017 included one athlete with a 5.33 ARR), thus bringing athletes to the College who are more representative of the academic qualifications of the larger student body. We also acknowledge that there is a substantial gender imbalance among AF admits, who are overwhelmingly male. While there might be reasons to seek a better gender balance among AF admits, achieving such a balance would not address the overall gender imbalance among athletes at Amherst, which is a function of team rosters, not admissions procedures.

It is not necessarily the case that an ongoing commitment to enrolling students of diverse backgrounds forces the College to choose athletes as opposed to students with other extracurricular interests, who will contribute to the College community in other ways, even if they are of similar ARR. In other words, athletic recruiting is not necessarily the only or even best way to attract diverse students to the College.

2.2.2 Make the diversification of varsity teams a priority, shared by the athletics and admissions departments, in athletic recruiting.

We think it highly desirable for varsity teams to be representative of the student body as a whole, to the extent that this is possible, with respect to three independent measures of diversity: race, socioeconomic status, and academic interests. Homogeneity within varsity teams on any of these measures is a barrier to the kinds of integration we have described above. Amherst has made considerable progress in diversifying its varsity teams with respect to race; it has also greatly mitigated the problem of academic underperformance by athletes that was a focus of Diver I. This progress is significant, laudable, and should be acknowledged and remembered as efforts at diversification continue. But there is further to go: the racial diversity of varsity athletes as a whole lags behind that of the student body as a whole, and different teams vary greatly with respect to levels of racial diversity. And discussions of socioeconomic diversity and diversity with respect to academic interests on varsity teams are much less developed than are discussions of racial diversity.

In order to promote both the overall goal of integration and the specific goal of the integration of athletics and academics, we recommend that during the athletic recruitment process as applied to both AF and NAF recruits, both the Athletics and the Admissions Departments work with the Office of Diversity and Inclusion to bring to the College varsity teams that are, to the greatest extent possible, representative of the overall student body with respect to racial and socioeconomic and diversity, and also with respect to the breadth of academic interests.

2.2.3. Improve data collection about the place of athletics in admissions.

FCAFA should immediately amend its charge to include yearly monitoring of certain specific issues and data. For FCAFA this would mean data about the following: first, the number of students admitted for whom athletics was one of the priorities; second, athletes admitted by various measures of diversity, gender, ARR, and sport. FCAFA also should consider issuing policy guidance specifying the type of communication between Athletics and Admissions that is allowed, in terms of content, numbers of applicants flagged, and number of points of contact.

2.2.4 Introduce a humanities initiative into the admissions process.

One of the consequences of athletes clustering in some disciplines (political science, psychology, economics) would seem to be the alienation of other disciplines and of students committed to other disciplines (art history, philosophy, languages, sociology, etc.). The athlete/non-athlete divide then seems to affect how the College organizes itself, including demand for FTEs and how many and what sorts of classes get offered. A new humanities initiative might be configured to work similarly to the successful SCIR initiative in the sciences, by identifying students with particular humanities interests, by adding Humanities to the existing list of “established priorities.” Introducing a humanities initiative, focused on recruiting students who show demonstrated emphasis in any humanities discipline (including a basic interest in reading and writing, or in a humanistic social science, such as political theory), as part of the admissions process would work to counter intensifying academic segregation.

2.2.5 Establish a Faculty Admissions Liaison.

In order to establish a permanent, effective mechanism for communication between the faculty and Admissions, we recommend establishing a Faculty Admissions Liaison, on the model of the faculty deans of students, where faculty members serve for an extended period of time, in return for reduced teaching load and/or other incentives. In order for the faculty to continue to be involved in the admissions process, a process which demands professionalization, a faculty member must be involved in the process throughout the year. It is simply not possible for FCAFA and CCAFA to carry out these responsibilities. A Faculty Admissions Liaison would be able to work with Admissions to develop specific and detailed mechanisms and policies that will more effectively manifest the Admission “priorities.” We envision the Admissions Liaison as simultaneously chairing FCAFA. Moreover, it would behoove the College to once again find a way of having faculty involvement and understanding of Admissions, to build trust and collaboration. Admissions is simply too complex for a rotating committee to understand the admissions process, let alone to be constructively and productively involved. Amherst needs to devote the resources, and have a faculty member devote their time and energy to this crucial part of our college community. We should note that in response to an earlier draft of this report, the College Administration voiced the concern that a position of this sort might compromise the role of the Dean of Admission and Financial Aid.

3.1 Athletics and Student Time Commitment

Once students have been admitted to Amherst, time becomes the coin of the realm. Students spend time on activities they value and do not spend time on those they do not. The NCAA stipulates that student-athletes who compete at Division III schools should spend no more than 20 hours per week on athletic activities. Our athletics department appears to be well within those limits, with most *formal* athletic activity occupying between 18 and 20 hours per week (see Appendix E: Team Time Information). And yet the amount of time spent on the *informal* demands of athletic participation is not recorded.¹⁰ Across the nation, the amount of time that Division III student-athletes spend on athletics appears to be increasing. A 2015 study by the NCAA indicates that students competing in Division III athletics spend a median number of 28.5 hours per week on athletics, well above the formal limit of 20 hours per week.¹¹ At Amherst, Captains' Practices in theory are governed by clear regulations (see Appendix F: Captains' Practices Information). In practice, however, these regulations are—like time regulations in collegiate athletics across the nation—unenforceable. We are told that we do not know the time commitment that “informal” training demands. Existing anecdotal evidence indicates it is not excessive. Other anecdotal evidence suggests otherwise.

The time that student-athletes devote to athletics was perhaps the most nettlesome issue that the Ad Hoc Committee addressed. Time was a focus of the committee because it is a potential explanation for some of the major concerns that have been raised by the faculty. Many student-athletes major in the natural sciences and/or humanities, maintain a diverse set of roommates and friends, participate in extracurricular activities beyond varsity athletics, and contribute to the community in myriad ways. However, the choices of these students does not imply that other student-athletes do not feel constrained in various ways by their athletic participation. What follows might be considered the ‘conventional wisdom’ regarding how time commitments to athletics affects the choices made by student-athletes. We present these hypotheses not because there are data to support them, but as a rhetorical device to help identify the kinds of information we

¹⁰ In providing information to the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics regarding the typical weekly time spent by each team (Appendix C), the Department of Athletics included the following language: “All teams follow the NCAA rule of no more than 20 hours in total that may be spent on athletic activity in a given week. A mandatory day off per week is enforced. Contests count as 3 hours of athletic activity regardless of the duration of the contest. Countable In-Season Team Activities: practice sessions, lifting, games, film review, and meetings. Non-Countable In-Season Team Activities: travel times to and from games or practice, time getting dressed, time spent with trainer, pre-game meal, post-game meal, tailgating with parents.”

¹¹ Quoted in Gurney, G., Sack, A., Lopiano, D., Meyer, J., Porto, B., Ridpath, D.B., Willingham, M., and Zimbalist, A. (2016) “The Drake Group Position Statement: Excessive Athletics Time Demands Undermine College Athletes’ Health and Education and Required Immediate Reform” (July, 2016), online at <https://drakegroupblog.files.wordpress.com/2016/09/position-statement-time-demands-8-1.pdf> (last checked February 11, 2018).

believe should be gathered to help us understand the relationship between athletic time commitments and academic, social, and extracurricular activities.

- Academic clustering – student-athletes *may be* reluctant to select courses or majors that require labs or film screenings, thus pushing student-athletes to major in the social sciences. Time *may* also explain why student-athletes lag behind their peers in terms of thesis projects.
- Social and residential clustering – student-athletes *may* spend so much time “in the gym” that is difficult for athletes and nonathletes to form and sustain relationships.
- Non-athletic contributions to the community – athletics *might* require so much time that athletes *might* not have the opportunity to participate in other extracurricular activities (a cappella groups; student government; newspaper).

A reasonable first step to address the ‘conventional wisdom’ might be to develop an understanding of how much time student-athletes devote to their sport. It might also make sense to examine how much time students devote to non-athletic extracurricular activities (e.g., club sports, arts groups, and the newspaper) to develop an understanding of the extracurricular commitments of non-athletes (see Section 3.2.1.1). Some methods for collecting data on our students struck us as intrusive, if not illegal, and might not lead to any clear solutions. However, that does not mean that we feel that time devoted to athletics (and other extracurricular activities) is unimportant, or that it should be ignored, or that all data collection is undesirable. In general, we think that although time devoted to athletics does not *prevent* students from engaging in other activities, it might be a “risk factor” that, when combined with other factors, inhibits students from making social and academic choices that could help unify the campus. Having corresponding data on nonathletes (i.e., time commitments, housing patterns, thesis participation, etc.) would enable us to address some valuable questions. For example, students who devote many hours to non-athletic, extracurricular activities may also be unlikely to complete honors theses; if so, it would suggest that reducing time spent on athletics could broaden the pool of athletes who complete theses. If time-consuming, non-athletic extracurricular activities do not affect thesis participation, we might conclude that time is *not* the factor that is interfering with students athletes thesis participation. Put more broadly, our first challenge is to evaluate the ‘conventional wisdom’ on time, to identify potential risk factors that exacerbate any effect of time, and then to develop policies and/or strategies to help students achieve their academic and extra-curricular goals.

Among the risk factors that we should consider in addition to time commitments are cultural factors operating either outside or inside of Amherst. For example, as described earlier, a disproportionate number of student-athletes indicate an interest in majoring in Economics even before they arrive on campus. This would seem to reflect factors at work outside of Amherst, a hypothesis that could be evaluated by comparing our own data with those from our NESCAC peers. If similar patterns were observed, it would implicate factors operating in the broader culture. If however, we learned that these

patterns were unique or more pronounced at Amherst, it would suggest that something about recruiting or campus culture contributed to academic clustering. Some student-athletes report feeling rejected by their peers or unwelcome in certain academic disciplines; this may drive them to seek out each other's company or to seek well-trodden academic paths. As difficult as it will be to assess on-campus issues, this may prove easier than trying to address issues related to the culture outside of Amherst. That is, we exert a little more control over the culture at Amherst than we do over the culture outside of Amherst. Some of the recommendations we make below are designed to address the possibility that student-athletes' choices are driven by cultural factors (e.g., the possibility that student-athletes do not pursue theses because they don't see many of their teammates doing so).

In closing this section, we feel it is important to note that many of our student-athletes turned down offers from Division I institutions (including Ivy League schools) to come to Amherst. Many of these students did so precisely because they did not want athletics to dominate their college experiences the way it would have if they had enrolled at a Division I university. This is to say that many varsity athletes come to Amherst because they want to have rich, diverse social and academic experiences here. It is not clear whether Amherst is failing to allow these experiences to occur or if students are opting not to pursue them, but we believe that it is incumbent upon us to work towards ensuring that all of our students (athlete or otherwise) have the *opportunity* to choose how to spend their time at Amherst. That means that if a student (athlete or otherwise) wishes to complete a thesis we should do everything we can to ensure that this opportunity is available. But, it also means that if a student (athlete or otherwise) chooses not to complete a thesis, we should accept this choice as well. The problem we face now is that it is unclear whether or not time pressures, or other aspects of Amherst culture, are interfering with the opportunity to make these important choices.

3.2 Specific Recommendations

3.2.1 Improve understanding of student time commitments to athletics.

There are a variety of ways to assess the amount of time that students spend on athletics. It is clear that we would like more information than we currently have from Athletics, and we have brainstormed several ways to proceed but have not necessarily settled on which should be pursued, or the details of how to implement them. In regards to this, we would like to stress that our priority is the well-being of our students. If the time spent on athletics exceeds what the faculty believe is reasonable for students at Amherst, we should work with our NESCAC colleagues to set new guidelines.

3.2.1.1 Organize focus groups of students (both athletes and non-athletes) in order to explore their weekly time commitments.

As mentioned above, we were asked to determine what factors contribute to varsity athletes' greater sense of happiness and commitment relative to the rest of the student body, and develop strategies to enable the rest of the student body to experience

comparable levels of happiness and commitment. The answer to this question, we believe, has much to do with the way that students manage time. All of our students, whether varsity athletes or not, seem to be perpetually busy. As a first step toward understanding the time commitments of varsity athletes, we feel that it would be useful to systematically study the time commitments of all students. We note that the authors of *Diver I* examined the rosters of *The Student*, the chorus, and the orchestra to compare time commitments of students who play sports and students who are involved in other extracurricular activities (*Diver I*, pg. 3). We might learn that student-athletes are not outliers in terms of the number of hours that they devote to a single extracurricular activity. We recommend that College Council organize a similar study in the next academic year. It may be a good exercise to encourage a selected group of students to track time for a week or two each semester, not as a vessel for judgement, but as a reflective exercise for them to better understand where their time is going. We want our students to be able to make informed decisions about their time management. It can be easier to “let go” of a commitment if you realize it is consuming six hours a week rather than the three you kept telling yourself it requires. This could be explored as a program and offered to students, with opportunities for discussion that faculty could participate in. Arranging such a program would require determining appropriate hosts, and faculty buy-in to support our students.

3.2.1.2 Require more extensive reporting of time commitments.

We think it would be useful for formal records of the time commitments of student-athletes to be compiled regularly, subjected to review by third parties, and retained. Such records should include both schedules drawn up by coaches and activities that fall outside the purview of coaches (i.e., Captains’ Practices), and should take into account travel time between the main campus and the location of athletic activities. We think it would be appropriate for the Committee on Education and Athletics to assume responsibility for determining how this data should be collected, periodically reviewing it, storing it in a manner accessible to the faculty, and calling attention to cases in which concerns arise regarding the time demands placed on student-athletes.

3.2.2 Assess and reduce classes missed because of athletic competitions.

The faculty has expressed concerns about the number of classes that are missed due to athletic conflicts. It is important to note that the athletic department has a clear policy regarding academic/athletic conflicts. Students are told that academic responsibilities *always* take priority. Students are told that they may request accommodations from a professor for a conflict involving a scheduled contest and that the professor’s decision regarding any accommodation is final. Student-athletes are also instructed that they are not to ask for any accommodations for any other athletic commitment including: weight lifting, Captains’ Practices, or practices of any kind. Students who ask for accommodations for these activities are knowingly violating athletic department policies. The coaches and the athletic director would like to be informed of such violations so that students can be reminded of the department’s policies.

Even if we were able to limit requests for accommodations, many faculty members would still be dissatisfied with the number of students who miss classes for athletic contests. We think that the first step to addressing this concern is by educating ourselves. We each teach a rather small subset of the student population, so it is unclear whether our own experiences are representative of the broader population. A professor who teaches primarily in the morning might conclude that there is no appreciable problem regarding athletic/academic conflicts. We recommend that the CEA regularly collect and report on athletic/academic conflicts to ascertain the magnitude of the problem and any patterns that might emerge in the data. Once that information is in hand, we can (we hope) propose solutions that address the problem in a more informed and ultimately more successful manner.

3.2.3 Identify a clear window for in-season practices.

In the Faculty Meeting of May 2, 2017, Professor Alexander George, Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee to Find a Community Period and Alternative Faculty Meeting Time, recommended that the Committee of Six constitute a Special Committee “to examine the course schedule from the ground up.” A Special Committee of this sort seems increasingly necessary given (a) the continuing need to find a new time for Faculty Meetings; and (b) the inefficiency and irrationality of the College’s weekly course schedule. If the Committee of Six does end up charging a Special Committee with the responsibility for rationalizing the College’s course schedule, we recommend that the Committee of Six include in the charge of that committee the responsibility to work with the Athletics Department to identify a clear window inside of which all in-season athletic practices would take place. We believe that rationalizing this specific part of the College’s weekly course schedule would help minimize time conflicts for students who not only play intercollegiate athletics but who also wish to enroll in more lab sciences and/or engage in other extracurricular activities.

Conclusion

To study athletics at Amherst is to arrive at an understanding of just how interdependent each of the parts of this institution is on one another. Going forward, it will be essential that the faculty deliberate together with colleagues in Athletics, Admissions, Student Affairs, and Advancement to select from this report the set of coordinated recommendations that best serves the College as a whole. As members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics, we appreciated the chance to learn more about Athletics at Amherst, broadly conceived. More importantly, we look forward to the faculty’s conversations about many of these issues, and welcome a chance to work together to better integrate all of our students into college life.

Daniel Barbezat (Fall 2017)
Ron Bashford (Spring 2017)

Sandra Burkett
Andrew Dole
Amanda Folsom
Rafeeq Hasan
Laure Katsaros (Fall 2017)
Christopher Kingston (Fall 2017)
Andrew Poe
Monica Ringer
Matthew Schulkind
Adam Sitze
Christopher van den Berg (Spring 2017)
Amy Wagaman

Appendix A: Acronyms and Shorthand References

AAS: Association of Amherst Students

AF: “Athletic Factor” athletic recruit; an AF applicant is unlikely to be admitted in the absence of athletic ability (see NAF)

Amherst LEADS: Athletics Department initiative that emphasizes Leadership, Teamwork, Commitment, Dedication

ARR: Academic Reader Rating

CACSAC: Council of Amherst College Student-Athletes of Color

CCAFA: College Committee on Admission and Financial Aid

CEA: Committee on Education and Athletics

CTE: Chronic Traumatic Encephalopathy

Diver I: “The Place of Athletics at Amherst,” Report by the Special Committee on the Place of Athletics at Amherst (2002)

Diver II: “The Place of Athletics at Amherst: Revisiting the Diver Report,” Report by The Special Committee on the Place of Athletics at Amherst (2016)

FAR: Faculty Athletics Representative

FCAFA: The Committee on Admission and Financial Aid

FTE: Full-Time Equivalent

NAF: Non-Athletic Factor athletic recruit (also “Coded Athlete”); a NAF applicant is one for whom athletic ability influences the admission decision but who might be admitted even in the absence of athletic ability (see AF)

NEASC: New England Association of Schools and Colleges

NESCAC: The New England Small College Athletic Conference (Athletic conference comprising Amherst College, Bates College, Bowdoin College, Colby College, Connecticut College, Hamilton College, Middlebury College, Tufts University, Trinity College, Wesleyan University, and Williams College).

SAAC: Student-Athlete Advisory Committee

SCIR: “SCIENTIFIC Research.” This is an Admissions “priority” that applies to applicants who have demonstrated intent to major in mathematics or the natural sciences, and furthermore express the intent to pursue a Ph.D. or a science career, as opposed to a career in Medicine.

Appendix B: Charges of Constituent Faculty Committees

College Council

Subject to the reserved powers of the president and the Amherst College Board of Trustees, the College Council is the body to approve and determine policy in three areas: extracurricular faculty-student relations, the review of recommendations involving the Statement of Intellectual Responsibility, and social regulations for student residential and social life.

In addition, the College Council possesses power to make recommendations concerning a wide range of subjects that touch the joint interests of students, faculty and administration.

The Committee on Education and Athletics

This committee is composed of the chair of the Department of Physical Education, two representatives selected by the Department of Physical Education, three members of the faculty chosen by the Committee of Six, two students (one man and one woman) elected by their peers from a slate consisting of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, and a third appointed by the Association of Amherst Students; and the chief student affairs officer or his or her designee, ex officio. A member of the faculty chairs the committee. The president and the dean of the faculty may meet with the committee. The purpose of this committee is to advise the college on the role and place of athletics in the educational enterprise of the college.

The Committee of Six

The executive committee of the faculty, called the Committee of Six, is composed of six members who serve two-year terms. The president of the college and the dean of the faculty serve on the committee, ex officio, each without vote. The president serves as chair of the committee, and the dean of the faculty serves as secretary of the committee.

The Committee of Six acts in a general advisory capacity to the president, and to the faculty as a whole, on all matters of college policy; considers matters of tenure and promotion, and in certain cases, of appointment and retirement; nominates or appoints members of other committees; prepares the agenda for faculty meetings; reviews recommendations of the Committee on Educational Policy and other committees; and, reviews exceptions to degree requirements.

The Committee on Admission and Financial Aid

The Committee on Admission and Financial Aid consists of four members of the faculty appointed by the Committee of Six for three-year terms, four students serving two-year terms to be chosen as described below and, as members, ex officio, the dean of admission

and financial aid (secretary of the committee), the dean of admission, the dean of financial aid, and the chief student affairs officer. One of the faculty members is appointed by the Committee of Six as chair, normally after a year of service. It is hoped that different areas of the curriculum will be represented by the faculty members on the committee. The president will meet with the committee either at its invitation or on his or her initiative.

The primary function of the committee is to enhance communication between the faculty and appropriate administrative offices and in so doing to aid the faculty in carrying out its responsibility to formulate standards and policy for admission and financial aid. To these ends, the committee should review on a regular basis, through observation and quantitative studies, how adequately policy and practice are meeting stated goals, should develop and maintain mechanisms for communicating faculty opinion on the quality of our students to the staff, and should report annually to the faculty on the committee's work. Members of the committee should be sufficiently engaged in the admission process to enable them to carry out their responsibilities effectively.

Appendix C: Varsity Athletics Win-Loss Records, 2001-2015

BASEBALL	YEAR	RECORD	POST-SEASON – NESCAC / NCAA	COACH
	2001 – 2002	19-15	No	Bill Thurston
	2002 – 2003	21-12	Yes - NESCAC	Bill Thurston
	2003 – 2004	19-18	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Bill Thurston
	2004 – 2005	23-9-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Bill Thurston
	2005 – 2006	22-9-1	No	Bill Thurston
	2006 – 2007	20-14	Yes - NESCAC	Bill Thurston
	2007 – 2008	24-12-1	Yes - NESCAC	Bill Thurston
	2008 – 2009	16-13	No	Bill Thurston
	2009 – 2010	21-11	No	Brian Hamm
	2010 – 2011	25-10	Yes - NESCAC	Brian Hamm
	2011 – 2012	23-10	Yes - NESCAC	Brian Hamm
	2012 – 2013	27-13	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Brian Hamm
	2013 – 2014	30-11	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Brian Hamm
	2014 – 2015	27-15	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Brian Hamm
MEN'S BASKETBALL	YEAR	RECORD	POST-SEASON – NESCAC / NCAA	COACH
	2001 – 2002	22-7	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	David Hixon
	2002 – 2003	24-5	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	David Hixon
	2003 – 2004	27-5	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	David Hixon
	2004 – 2005	26-2	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	David Hixon
	2005 – 2006	28-4	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	David Hixon
	2006 – 2007	30-2	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	David Hixon
	2007 – 2008	27-4	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	David Hixon
	2008 – 2009	21-7	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	David Hixon
	2009 – 2010	14-11	No	David Hixon
	2010 – 2011	25-4	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	David Hixon
	2011 – 2012	26-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	David Hixon
	2012 – 2013	30-2	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	David Hixon
	2013 – 2014	27-4	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	David Hixon
	2014 – 2015	21-8	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	David Hixon
FOOTBALL	YEAR	RECORD	POST-SEASON – NESCAC / NCAA	COACH
	2001 – 2002	7-1	N/A	E.J. Mills
	2002 – 2003	6-2	N/A	E.J. Mills
	2003 – 2004	4-4	N/A	E.J. Mills
	2004 – 2005	6-2	N/A	E.J. Mills
	2005 – 2006	5-3	N/A	E.J. Mills
	2006 – 2007	5-3	N/A	E.J. Mills
	2007 – 2008	4-4	N/A	E.J. Mills
	2008 – 2009	5-3	N/A	E.J. Mills
	2009 – 2010	8-0	N/A	E.J. Mills
	2010 – 2011	6-2	N/A	E.J. Mills
	2011 – 2012	8-0	N/A	E.J. Mills
	2012 – 2013	6-2	N/A	E.J. Mills
	2013 – 2014	7-1	N/A	E.J. Mills
	2014 – 2015	8-0	N/A	E.J. Mills
MEN'S ICE HOCKEY	YEAR	RECORD	POST-SEASON – NESCAC / NCAA	COACH
	2001 – 2002	6-14-5	No	Jack Arena
	2002 – 2003	7-13-5	No	Jack Arena
	2003 – 2004	11-11-3	No	Jack Arena
	2004 – 2005	13-10-2	No	Jack Arena
	2005 – 2006	12-12-1	No	Jack Arena
	2006 – 2007	14-10-1	No	Jack Arena
	2007 – 2008	14-9-3	No	Jack Arena
	2008 – 2009	22-5-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jack Arena
	2009 – 2010	16-5-4	No	Jack Arena
	2010 – 2011	12-9-4	No	Jack Arena
	2011 – 2012	24-4-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jack Arena
	2012 – 2013	15-7-3	No	Jack Arena
	2013 – 2014	16-8-3	No	Jack Arena
	2014 – 2015	22-5-2	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jack Arena

MEN'S LACROSSE	YEAR	RECORD	POST-SEASON – NESCAC / NCAA	COACH
	2001 – 2002	9-7	Yes - NESCAC	Tom Carmean
	2002 – 2003	10-5	Yes - NESCAC	Tom Carmean
	2003 – 2004	11-5	Yes - NESCAC	Tom Carmean
	2004 – 2005	11-4	Yes - NESCAC	Tom Carmean
	2005 – 2006	4-10	No	Tom Carmean
	2006 – 2007	7-8	Yes - NESCAC	Tom Carmean
	2007 – 2008	8-7	No	Tom Carmean
	2008 – 2009	6-8	Yes - NESCAC	Tom Carmean
	2009 – 2010	7-7	Yes - NESCAC	Tom Carmean
	2010 – 2011	15-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jon Thompson
	2011 – 2012	9-7	Yes - NESCAC	Jon Thompson
	2012 – 2013	5-10	No	Jon Thompson
	2013 – 2014	15-5	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jon Thompson
	2014 – 2015	18-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jon Thompson
MEN'S SOCCER	YEAR	RECORD	POST-SEASON – NESCAC / NCAA	COACH
	2001 – 2002	7-6-2	No	Peter Gooding/Milton Gooding
	2002 – 2003	13-5-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Peter Gooding/Milton Gooding
	2003 – 2004	10-3-2	Yes - NESCAC	Peter Gooding/Milton Gooding
	2004 – 2005	10-5	No	Peter Gooding/Milton Gooding
	2005 – 2006	9-5-3	Yes - NESCAC	Peter Gooding/Milton Gooding
	2006 – 2007	12-3-2	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Peter Gooding/Milton Gooding
	2007 – 2008	15-2-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Justin Serpone
	2008 – 2009	15-4-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Justin Serpone
	2009 – 2010	12-4-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Justin Serpone
	2010 – 2011	13-2-4	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Justin Serpone
	2011 – 2012	16-2-2	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Justin Serpone
	2012 – 2013	17-0-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Justin Serpone
	2013 – 2014	18-1-2	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Justin Serpone
	2014 – 2015	14-1-6	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Justin Serpone
MEN'S SQUASH	YEAR	RECORD	POST-SEASON – NESCAC / NCAA	COACH
	2001 – 2002	7-10	N/A	Peter Robson
	2002 – 2003	9-8	N/A	Peter Robson
	2003 – 2004	10-9	N/A	Peter Robson
	2004 – 2005	8-9	N/A	Peter Robson
	2005 – 2006	9-10	N/A	Peter Robson
	2006 – 2007	10-9	N/A	Peter Robson
	2007 – 2008	10-11	N/A	Peter Robson
	2008 – 2009	6-13	N/A	Peter Robson
	2009 – 2010	12-9	N/A	Peter Robson
	2010 – 2011	14-9	N/A	Peter Robson
	2011 – 2012	13-8	N/A	Peter Robson
	2012 – 2013	12-13	N/A	Peter Robson
	2013 – 2014	7-12	N/A	Peter Robson
	2014 – 2015	7-12	N/A	Peter Robson
MEN'S SWIMMING	YEAR	RECORD	POST-SEASON – NESCAC / NCAA	COACH
	2001 – 2002		Yes - NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2002 – 2003		Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2003 – 2004		Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2004 – 2005		Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2005 – 2006	8-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2006 – 2007		Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2007 – 2008	6-2	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2008 – 2009	7-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2009 – 2010	6-2	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2010 – 2011	8-0	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2011 – 2012	7-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2012 – 2013	6-2	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2013 – 2014	6-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2014 – 2015	5-2	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
MEN'S TENNIS	YEAR	RECORD	POST-SEASON – NESCAC / NCAA	COACH
	2001 – 2002	4-7	Yes - NESCAC	Peter Robson
	2002 – 2003	6-6	Yes - NESCAC	Peter Robson
	2003 – 2004	6-8	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Peter Robson
	2004 – 2005	10-6	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Rick Edelmann

	2005 – 2006	14-8	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Rick Edelmann
	2006 – 2007	14-6	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Rick Edelmann
	2007 – 2008	10-9	Yes - NESCAC	Chris Garner
	2008 – 2009	28-7	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Chris Garner
	2009 – 2010	27-11	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Chris Garner
	2010 – 2011	36-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Chris Garner
	2011 – 2012	30-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Chris Garner
	2012 – 2013	31-9	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Chris Garner
	2013 – 2014	36-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Chris Garner
	2014 – 2015	21-6	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Todd Doebler
WOMEN'S BASKETBALL	YEAR	RECORD	POST-SEASON – NESCAC / NCAA	COACH
	2001 – 2002	11-12	No	Billy McBride
	2002 – 2003	12-12	No	Billy McBride
	2003 – 2004	11-14	Yes - NESCAC	Billy McBride
	2004 – 2005	15-11	Yes - NESCAC	Billy McBride
	2005 – 2006	10-15	Yes - NESCAC	Billy McBride
	2006 – 2007	12-13	Yes - NESCAC	Billy McBride
	2007 – 2008	27-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	G.P. Gromacki
	2008 – 2009	29-4	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	G.P. Gromacki
	2009 – 2010	32-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	G.P. Gromacki
	2010 – 2011	32-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	G.P. Gromacki
	2011 – 2012	31-2	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	G.P. Gromacki
	2012 – 2013	30-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	G.P. Gromacki
	2013 – 2014	26-4	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	G.P. Gromacki
	2014 – 2015	25-4	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	G.P. Gromacki
FIELD HOCKEY	YEAR	RECORD	POST-SEASON – NESCAC / NCAA	COACH
	2001 – 2002	13-4	Yes - NESCAC	Chris Paradis/Carol Knerr
	2002 – 2003	7-8	Yes - NESCAC	Chris Paradis/Carol Knerr
	2003 – 2004	11-5	Yes - NESCAC	Carol Knerr
	2004 – 2005	5-8	No	Carol Knerr
	2005 – 2006	5-9	No	Carol Knerr
	2006 – 2007	8-8	Yes - NESCAC	Carol Knerr
	2007 – 2008	8-7	Yes - NESCAC	Carol Knerr
	2008 – 2009	10-5	Yes - NESCAC	Carol Knerr
	2009 – 2010	12-5	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Carol Knerr
	2010 – 2011	12-4	Yes - NESCAC	Carol Knerr
	2011 – 2012	15-4	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Carol Knerr
	2012 – 2013	11-5	Yes – NESCAC	Carol Knerr
	2013 – 2014	13-3	Yes - NESCAC	Carol Knerr
	2014 – 2015	12-4	Yes - NESCAC	Carol Knerr
WOMEN'S ICE HOCKEY	YEAR	RECORD	POST-SEASON – NESCAC / NCAA	COACH
	2001 – 2002	6-15-1	Yes - NESCAC	Kay Cowperthwait
	2002 – 2003	3-17-4	Yes - NESCAC	Kay Cowperthwait
	2003 – 2004	13-2	Yes - NESCAC	Jim Plumer
	2004 – 2005	8-12-5	Yes - NESCAC	Jim Plumer
	2005 – 2006	10-15	Yes - NESCAC	Jim Plumer
	2006 – 2007	20-7-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jim Plumer
	2007 – 2008	20-4-4	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jim Plumer
	2008 – 2009	24-5	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jim Plumer
	2009 – 2010	23-2-4	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jim Plumer
	2010 – 2011	19-6-2	Yes - NESCAC	Jim Plumer
	2011 – 2012	21-6-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jim Plumer
	2012 – 2013	13-11-1	Yes - NESCAC	Jeff Matthews
	2013 – 2014	13-7-5	Yes - NESCAC	Jeff Matthews
	2014 – 2015	17-5-4	Yes - NESCAC	Jeff Matthews
WOMEN'S LACROSSE	YEAR	RECORD	POST-SEASON – NESCAC / NCAA	COACH
	2001 – 2002	14-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Chris Paradis
	2002 – 2003	18-2	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Chris Paradis
	2003 – 2004	16-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Chris Paradis
	2004 – 2005	12-4	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Chris Paradis

	2005 – 2006	14-4	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Chris Paradis
	2006 – 2007	9-7	Yes - NESCAC	Chris Paradis
	2007 – 2008	15-4	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Chris Paradis
	2008 – 2009	6-8	Yes - NESCAC	Chris Paradis
	2009 – 2010	11-5	Yes - NESCAC	Chris Paradis
	2010 – 2011	9-6	Yes - NESCAC	Chris Paradis
	2011 – 2012	13-5	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Chris Paradis
	2012 – 2013	9-6	Yes – NESCAC	Chris Paradis
	2013 – 2014	19-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Chris Paradis
	2014 – 2015	9-7	Yes - NESCAC	Chris Paradis
WOMEN'S SOCCER	YEAR	RECORD	POST-SEASON – NESCAC / NCAA	COACH
	2001 – 2002	16-5-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Michelle Morgan
	2002 – 2003	8-6-2	Yes - NESCAC	Michelle Morgan
	2003 – 2004	12-4-4	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Michelle Morgan
	2004 – 2005	9-2-4	Yes - NESCAC	Jen Hughes
	2005 – 2006	8-3-3	Yes - NESCAC	Jen Hughes
	2006 – 2007	15-2-2	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jen Hughes
	2007 – 2008	5-6-4	Yes - NESCAC	Jen Hughes
	2008 – 2009	14-3-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jen Hughes
	2009 – 2010	13-4-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jen Hughes
	2010 – 2011	8-7-2	Yes - NESCAC	Jen Hughes
	2011 – 2012	20-1	Yes - NESCAC	Jen Hughes
	2012 – 2013	13-2-2	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jen Hughes
	2013 – 2014	10-4-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jen Hughes
	2014 – 2015	12-5-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jen Hughes
SOFTBALL	YEAR	RECORD	POST-SEASON – NESCAC / NCAA	COACH
	2001 – 2002	17-14	Yes – NESCAC	Sue Everden
	2002 – 2003	12-15	No	Sue Everden
	2003 – 2004	13-14	No	Sue Everden
	2004 – 2005	14-12-1	No	Sue Everden
	2005 – 2006	18-12	Yes – NESCAC	Lynn Hersey
	2006 – 2007	14-18	No	Sue Everden
	2007 – 2008	14-18	No	Sue Everden
	2008 – 2009	19-8	No	Sue Everden
	2009 – 2010	18-16	No	Sue Everden
	2010 – 2011	14-16	No	Sue Everden
	2011 – 2012	36-6	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Sue Everden
	2012 – 2013	24-12	No	Whitney Mollica Goldstein
	2013 – 2014	21-11	No	Shannon Doepking
	2014 – 2015	16-12	No	Jessica Johnson
WOMEN'S SQUASH	YEAR	RECORD	POST-SEASON – NESCAC / NCAA	COACH
	2001 – 2002	13-8	N/A	Jackie Bagwell
	2002 – 2003	13-11	N/A	Jackie Bagwell
	2003 – 2004	17-9	N/A	Jackie Bagwell
	2004 – 2005	12-8	N/A	Jackie Bagwell
	2005 – 2006	9-13	N/A	Tom Carmean/Peter Robson
	2006 – 2007	9-15	N/A	Tom Carmean
	2007 – 2008	12-14	N/A	Tom Carmean
	2008 – 2009	16-10	N/A	Tom Carmean
	2009 – 2010	13-8	N/A	Tom Carmean
	2010 – 2011	16-8	N/A	Peter Robson
	2011 – 2012	13-10	N/A	Peter Robson
	2012 – 2013	14-9	N/A	Peter Robson
	2013 – 2014	11-9	N/A	Peter Robson
	2014 – 2015	13-6	N/A	Peter Robson
WOMEN'S SWIMMING	YEAR	RECORD	POST-SEASON – NESCAC / NCAA	COACH
	2001 – 2002		Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2002 – 2003		Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2003 – 2004		Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2004 – 2005		Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2005 – 2006	8-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2006 – 2007		Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2007 – 2008	8-0	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2008 – 2009	7-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols

	2009 – 2010	7-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2010 – 2011	7-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2011 – 2012	6-2	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2012 – 2013	7-1	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2013 – 2014	5-2	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
	2014 – 2015	4-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Nick Nichols
WOMEN'S TENNIS	YEAR	RECORD	POST-SEASON – NESCAC / NCAA	COACH
	2001 – 2002	11-7	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jackie Bagwell
	2002 – 2003	15-5	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jackie Bagwell
	2003 – 2004	17-4	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jackie Bagwell
	2004 – 2005	12-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jackie Bagwell
	2005 – 2006	12-4	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jackie Bagwell
	2006 – 2007	18-5	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jackie Bagwell
	2007 – 2008	16-2	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jackie Bagwell
	2008 – 2009	21-2	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jackie Bagwell
	2009 – 2010	21-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jackie Bagwell
	2010 – 2011	20-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jackie Bagwell
	2011 – 2012	18-5	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jackie Bagwell
	2012 – 2013	21-3	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jackie Bagwell
	2013 – 2014	22-4	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jackie Bagwell
	2014 – 2015	17-5	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Jackie Bagwell
VOLLEYBALL	YEAR	RECORD	POST-SEASON – NESCAC / NCAA	COACH
	2001 – 2002	24-7	Yes - NESCAC	Sue Everden
	2002 – 2003	21-7	Yes - NESCAC	Sue Everden
	2003 – 2004	25-8	Yes - NESCAC	Sue Everden
	2004 – 2005	23-7	Yes - NESCAC	Sue Everden
	2005 – 2006	17-11	Yes - NESCAC	Sue Everden
	2006 – 2007	28-5	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Sue Everden
	2007 – 2008	30-5	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Sue Everden
	2008 – 2009	22-8	Yes - NESCAC	Sue Everden
	2009 – 2010	20-8	Yes - NESCAC	Sue Everden
	2010 – 2011	25-4	Yes – NESCAC, NCAA	Sue Everden
	2011 – 2012	20-7	Yes - NESCAC	Sue Everden
	2012 – 2013	14-9	Yes - NESCAC	Sue Everden
	2013 – 2014	20-8	Yes - NESCAC	Sue Everden
	2014 – 2015	21-7	Yes - NESCAC	Sue Everden

Appendix D: Job Description of “Faculty Athletics Representative” (FAR)

The role of Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) is to ensure that the academic institution establishes and maintains the appropriate integration between academics and intercollegiate athletics. He or she has been designated by the College to serve as a liaison between the institution and the athletics department, and also as a representative of the College in NESCAC and NCAA affairs.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Academic Integrity

- ❖ Ensure the academic integrity of Amherst College’s intercollegiate athletics program.
- ❖ Compare the admissions profiles of recruited student-athletes vs. all students who have been admitted into the College.
- ❖ Examine courses and academic programs selected by student-athletes.
- ❖ Review semester and cumulative records of academic performance of student-athletes. Attend all Committee on Academic Standing meetings.
- ❖ Periodically review appropriate records (for both individual student-athletes and for sports teams) to ensure that decisions related to admissions, academic advising, evaluation of academic performance, and the extent of academic support services are made in ways that are consistent with the primary academic mission of the College.
- ❖ Guarantee that Amherst College has in place effective mechanisms for evaluating whether student-athletes have met all of the academic eligibility requirements for practice, financial aid, and intercollegiate competition established by the NCAA, NESCAC, and Amherst College.
- ❖ Prepare (or request on the basis of FAR specifications) periodic reports on the academic preparation and performance of student-athletes and discuss such reports with the President, Dean of the Faculty, the faculty, and the athletics department.

Compliance

- ❖ Support the Associate Director of Compliance in ensuring compliance with NCAA and NESCAC policies.
- ❖ Participate in NCAA legislation discussions and serve as a delegate at the annual NCAA convention as needed.
- ❖ Assist with compliance-related activities undertaken within the athletics department and coordinate the compliance-related activities of campus units

located outside the athletics department including, but not limited to, rules education and staff training, and rules interpretations.

- ❖ Review the results of any periodic audits of the athletics department that may be conducted.
- ❖ Play a central role in any major institutional inquiry into alleged or suspected rules violations and in the preparation of any infractions reports submitted to the NCAA or to NESCAC.
- ❖ Play a major role in any NCAA athletics certification program reviews.
- ❖ In collaboration with athletics administration, ensure that the appropriate standards of student-athlete conduct are established (for both on- and off-campus behavior), clearly communicated, and consistently enforced.

Student-Athlete Experience

- ❖ Promote integration between academics, athletics, and the social lives of student-athletes, which affords them opportunities to enjoy the full range of collegiate experiences available to students generally.
- ❖ Participate in student-athlete exit interviews, facilitates student-athlete participation on athletics boards and committees, and inform student-athletes about their role as an independent source of counsel, assistance, and information.
- ❖ Encourage and facilitate interactions between student-athletes and mainstream of institutional activities. At the beginning of each academic year the FAR should address student-athletes as a group, or in individual team meetings, to emphasize the primacy of the academic mission of Amherst College and the responsibilities of student-athletes within that setting.
- ❖ Bring his/her experience as an educator and an understanding of faculty values to influence the delivery and effectiveness of services such as study skill development, academic advising, and other services designed to promote the academic achievement of student-athletes.
- ❖ Regularly attend SAAC, CACSAC, and other athletic related student group meetings.
- ❖ Serve as a source of support to help navigate and minimize issues with academic conflicts, missed class time, and class clustering. Lead discussions and promotion of thesis work.

Communication/Administration

- ❖ Work closely with the Director of Athletics and with his/her staff.
- ❖ Represent the faculty perspective in the governance of intercollegiate athletics and play a central role in discussions of matters related to intercollegiate athletics at athletics committee meetings and at faculty or institutional meetings.

- ❖ Provide periodic reports related to matters of academic integrity, academic preparation and performance of student-athletes, rules compliance or violations, and other matters related to the intercollegiate athletics program.
- ❖ Periodically attend the meetings of the head coaches and athletic department administration.
- ❖ Recognized as a key advisor on athletics-related matters by the President and others involved in the administration of intercollegiate athletics.
- ❖ Play a significant role in the shaping of institutional voting decisions within NCAA and NESCAC legislation.
- ❖ Participate in NCAA and NESCAC committees, councils, and in other capacities as appropriate.
- ❖ Hold a major role in institutional searches for key athletics department personnel.
- ❖ Help to oversee and lead discussions of the faculty liaison program.
- ❖ Serve as a member, or as chair, of the Committee on Education and Athletics.

Other

- ❖ Perform other duties assigned by the President and/or as appropriate under the NCAA and NESCAC rules.

QUALIFICATIONS

- ❖ Committed to supporting the well-being of student-athletes.
- ❖ Sincere interest in being a part of a robust and successful Division III intercollegiate program.
- ❖ Tenured faculty member rank of professor.
- ❖ Demonstrated commitment to academic integrity.
- ❖ Experience in faculty leadership and committee or administrative experience at the College.
- ❖ Member, or chair, of the Committee on Education and Athletics.

Appendix E: Team Time Information

THE NUMBER OF CONTESTS BY SPORT AND THE NUMBER OF MID-WEEK GAMES BY SPORT:

BASEBALL	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2001 – 2002	34	10	4 days spring break
	2002 – 2003	33	12	4 days spring break
	2003 – 2004	37	12	4 days spring break; 1 day post-season
	2004 – 2005	33	10	3 days spring break; 1 day post season
	2005 – 2006	32	9	5 days spring break
	2006 – 2007	34	9	4 days spring break
	2007 – 2008	37	11	6 days spring break
	2008 – 2009	29	10	5 days spring break
	2009 – 2010	32	9	3 days spring break
	2010 – 2011	35	7	3 days spring break
	2011 – 2012	33	10	3 days spring break
	2012 – 2013	40	13	4 days spring break; 2 days post-season
	2013 – 2014	41	11	4 days spring break; 1 day post-season
	2014 – 2015	42	11	4 Days spring break; 2 days post-season
MEN'S BASKETBALL	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2001 – 2002	29	11	5 days winter break
	2002 – 2003	29	8	4 days winter break
	2003 – 2004	32	10	4 days winter break
	2004 – 2005	28	8	3 days winter break
	2005 – 2006	32	9	4 days winter break
	2006 – 2007	32	8	4 days winter break
	2007 – 2008	31	7	3 days winter break
	2008 – 2009	28	9	4 days winter break
	2009 – 2010	25	8	2 days winter break
	2010 – 2011	29	9	3 days winter break
	2011 – 2012	29	8	2 days winter break
	2012 – 2013	32	9	2 days winter break
	2013 – 2014	31	10	4 days winter break
	2014 – 2015	29	10	4 days winter break
FOOTBALL	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2001 – 2002	8	0	
	2002 – 2003	8	0	
	2003 – 2004	8	0	
	2004 – 2005	8	0	
	2005 – 2006	8	0	
	2006 – 2007	8	0	
	2007 – 2008	8	0	
	2008 – 2009	8	0	
	2009 – 2010	8	0	
	2010 – 2011	8	0	
	2011 – 2012	8	0	
	2012 – 2013	8	0	
	2013 – 2014	8	0	
	2014 – 2015	8	0	
MEN'S ICE HOCKEY	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2001 – 2002	25	3	2 days winter break
	2002 – 2003	25	2	2 days winter break
	2003 – 2004	25	2	2 days winter break
	2004 – 2005	25	1	1 day winter break
	2005 – 2006	25	1	1 day winter break
	2006 – 2007	25	1	1 day winter break
	2007 – 2008	26	1	1 day winter break
	2008 – 2009	28	2	1 day winter break; 1 day post-season

	2009 – 2010	25	1	1 day winter break
	2010 – 2011	25	2	2 days winter break
	2011 – 2012	29	2	2 days winter break
	2012 – 2013	25	2	1 day winter break
	2013 – 2014	27	1	1 day winter break
	2014 – 2015	29	2	2 days winter break
MEN'S LACROSSE	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2001 – 2002	16	8	2 days spring break
	2002 – 2003	15	7	2 days spring break
	2003 – 2004	16	7	2 days spring break
	2004 – 2005	15	7	2 days spring break
	2005 – 2006	14	6	1 day spring break
	2006 – 2007	15	8	2 days spring break
	2007 – 2008	15	7	2 days spring break
	2008 – 2009	14	5	1 day spring break
	2009 – 2010	14	5	1 day spring break
	2010 – 2011	18	8	2 days spring break; 2 days post-season
	2011 – 2012	16	7	2 days spring break
	2012 – 2013	15	6	1 day spring break
	2013 – 2014	20	7	1 day spring break; 1 day post-season
	2014 – 2015	21	9	1 day spring break; 2 days post-season
MEN'S SOCCER	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2001 – 2002	15	6	
	2002 – 2003	19	7	1 day post-season
	2003 – 2004	15	5	
	2004 – 2005	15	5	
	2005 – 2006	17	5	
	2006 – 2007	17	4	
	2007 – 2008	18	4	
	2008 – 2009	22	4	
	2009 – 2010	17	5	
	2010 – 2011	19	3	
	2011 – 2012	20	4	
	2012 – 2013	20	4	
	2013 – 2014	21	4	
	2014 – 2015	21	6	
MEN'S SQUASH	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2001 – 2002	17	7	2 winter break days
	2002 – 2003	14	5	2 winter break days
	2003 – 2004	19	3	2 winter break days
	2004 – 2005	17	4	2 winter break days
	2005 – 2006	19	9	5 winter break days
	2006 – 2007	19	5	2 winter break days
	2007 – 2008	21	5	2 winter break days
	2008 – 2009	19	5	2 winter break days
	2009 – 2010	21	4	3 winter break days
	2010 – 2011	23	4	3 winter break days
	2011 – 2012	21	4	2 winter break days
	2012 – 2013	25	3	3 winter break days
MEN'S SQUASH	2013 – 2014	19	5	3 winter break days
	2014 – 2015	19	1	1 winter break days
MEN'S SWIMMING	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2001 – 2002	Info not avail	Info not avail	
	2002 – 2003	Info not avail	Info not avail	
	2003 – 2004	Info not avail	Info not avail	
	2004 – 2005	Info not avail	Info not avail	
	2005 – 2006	9	3	2 post-season days
	2006 – 2007	Info not avail	Info not avail	
	2007 – 2008	8	3	2 post season days
	2008 – 2009	8	3	2 post season days
	2009 – 2010	8	3	2 post season days
	2010 – 2011	8	3	2 post season days
	2011 – 2012	8	3	2 post season days
	2012 – 2013	8	3	2 post season days
	2013 – 2014	7	3	2 post season days

	2014 – 2015	7	3	2 post season days
MEN'S TENNIS	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2001 – 2002	11	3	
	2002 – 2003	12	6	
	2003 – 2004	14	9	1 day spring break
	2004 – 2005	16	5	2 days spring break
	2005 – 2006	22	7	2 days spring break
	2006 – 2007	20	5	3 days spring break
	2007 – 2008	19	4	3 days spring break
	2008 – 2009	35	14	8 games spring break; 3 days post-season
	2009 – 2010	38	15	9 games spring break; 3 days post-season
	2010 – 2011	37	15	11 games spring break; 3 days post-season
	2011 – 2012	33	13	12 games spring break; 1 day post-season
	2012 – 2013	40	14	11 games spring break; 3 days post-season
	2013 – 2014	39	13	10 games spring break; 3 days post-season
	2014 – 2015	27	10	7 games spring break; 2 days post-season

WOMEN'S BASKETBALL	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2001 – 2002	23	9	4 days winter break
	2002 – 2003	24	9	3 days winter break
	2003 – 2004	25	10	5 days winter break
	2004 – 2005	26	9	3 days winter break
	2005 – 2006	25	7	1 day winter break
	2006 – 2007	25	8	4 days winter break
	2007 – 2008	30	8	3 days winter break
	2008 – 2009	33	7	4 days winter break
	2009 – 2010	33	10	4 days winter break
	2010 – 2011	33	8	3 days winter break
	2011 – 2012	33	11	5 days winter break
	2012 – 2013	33	9	3 days winter break
	2013 – 2014	30	10	3 days winter break
	2014 – 2015	29	11	6 days winter break
FIELD HOCKEY	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2001 – 2002	17	7	
	2002 – 2003	15	6	
	2003 – 2004	16	6	
	2004 – 2005	13	4	
	2005 – 2006	14	7	
	2006 – 2007	16	6	
	2007 – 2008	15	6	
FIELD HOCKEY	2008 – 2009	15	5	
	2009 – 2010	17	6	1 day post-season
	2010 – 2011	16	5	
	2011 – 2012	19	7	1 day post-season
	2012 – 2013	16	5	
	2013 – 2014	16	6	
	2014 – 2015	16	7	
WOMEN'S ICE HOCKEY	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2001 – 2002	22	5	1 day winter break
	2002 – 2003	24	7	4 days winter break
	2003 – 2004	25	8	3 days winter break
	2004 – 2005	25	5	2 days winter break
	2005 – 2006	25	3	2 days winter break
	2006 – 2007	30	4	2 days winter break
	2007 – 2008	28	1	1 day winter break
	2008 – 2009	29	2	
	2009 – 2010	29	4	2 days winter break
	2010 – 2011	27	4	2 days winter break
	2011 – 2012	28	4	3 days winter break
	2012 – 2013	25	4	1 day winter break
	2013 – 2014	25	4	2 days winter break
	2014 – 2015	26	3	1 day winter break

WOMEN'S LACROSSE	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2001 – 2002	17	5	1 day spring break
	2002 – 2003	20	5	1 day spring break
	2003 – 2004	19	6	1 day spring break
	2004 – 2005	16	6	1 day spring break
	2005 – 2006	18	6	1 day spring break
	2006 – 2007	16	7	2 days spring break
	2007 – 2008	19	8	2 days spring break; 1 day post-season
	2008 – 2009	14	6	1 day spring break
	2009 – 2010	16	7	2 days spring break
	2010 – 2011	15	6	1 day spring break
	2011 – 2012	18	8	2 days spring break
	2012 – 2013	15	7	2 days spring break
	2013 – 2014	22	9	2 days spring break
	2014 – 2015	16	8	2 days spring break
WOMEN'S SOCCER	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2001 – 2002	22	7	
	2002 – 2003	16	5	
	2003 – 2004	20	6	
	2004 – 2005	15	6	
	2005 – 2006	14	5	
	2006 – 2007	19	6	
	2007 – 2008	15	5	
	2008 – 2009	20	4	
	2009 – 2010	18	4	
	2010 – 2011	17	5	
	2011 – 2012	21	6	
	2012 – 2013	17	6	
	2013 – 2014	17	7	
	2014 – 2015	18	6	
SOFTBALL	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2001 – 2002	31	13	6 games spring break
	2002 – 2003	31	13	7 games spring break
	2003 – 2004	27	12	6 games spring break
	2004 – 2005	27	11	5 games spring break
	2005 – 2006	27	10	4 games spring break
SOFTBALL	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2006 – 2007	30	14	5 games spring break
	2007 – 2008	32	12	6 games spring break
	2008 – 2009	27	13	6 games spring break
	2009 – 2010	34	16	6 games spring break
	2010 – 2011	30	10	6 games spring break
	2011 – 2012	42	12	6 games spring break
	2012 – 2013	36	11	6 games spring break
	2013 – 2014	32	12	6 games spring break
	2014 – 2015	28	8	6 games spring break
WOMEN'S SQUASH	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2001 – 2002	21	7	2 days winter break
	2002 – 2003	24	8	3 days winter break
	2003 – 2004	26	6	2 days winter break
	2004 – 2005	20	6	2 days winter break
	2005 – 2006	22	9	3 days winter break
	2006 – 2007	24	5	2 days winter break
	2007 – 2008	21	5	2 days winter break
	2008 – 2009	26	5	3 days winter break
	2009 – 2010	21	4	1 day winter break
	2010 – 2011	24	3	1 day winter break
	2011 – 2012	23	3	2 days winter break
	2012 – 2013	23	5	3 days winter break
	2013 – 2014	20	4	2 days winter break
	2014 – 2015	19	1	
WOMEN'S SWIMMING	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2001 – 2002	Info not avail	Info not avail	
	2002 – 2003	Info not avail	Info not avail	
	2003 – 2004	Info not avail	Info not avail	
	2004 – 2005	Info not avail	Info not avail	

	2005 – 2006	9	3	2 post-season days
	2006 – 2007	Info not avail	Info not avail	
	2007 – 2008	8	3	2 post-season days
	2008 – 2009	8	3	2 post-season days
	2009 – 2010	8	3	2 post-season days
	2010 – 2011	8	3	2 post-season days
	2011 – 2012	8	3	2 post-season days
	2012 – 2013	8	3	2 post-season days
	2013 – 2014	7	3	2 post-season days
	2014 – 2015	7	3	2 post-season days
WOMEN'S TENNIS	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2001 – 2002	18	4	2 games spring break
	2002 – 2003	20	6	2 games spring break; 2 days post-season
	2003 – 2004	21	5	2 games spring break; 2 days post-season
	2004 – 2005	15	5	1 game spring break; 2 days post-season
	2005 – 2006	16	5	1 game spring break; 1 day post-season
	2006 – 2007	23	8	2 games spring break; 3 days post-season
	2007 – 2008	18	5	3 games spring break
	2008 – 2009	23	9	4 games spring break; 3 days post-season
	2009 – 2010	24	7	3 games spring break; 3 days post-season
	2010 – 2011	23	7	2 games spring break; 3 days post-season
	2011 – 2012	23	7	2 games spring break; 3 days post-season
	2012 – 2013	24	8	2 games spring break; 3 days post-season
	2013 – 2014	26	7	3 games spring break; 3 days post-season
	2014 – 2015	22	9	3 games spring break; 4 days post-season
VOLLEYBALL	YEAR	CONTESTS	MID-WEEK GAMES	NOTES
	2001 – 2002	31	5	
	2002 – 2003	28	4	
	2003 – 2004	33	4	
VOLLEYBALL	2004 – 2005	30	2	
	2005 – 2006	28	5	
	2006 – 2007	33	7	
	2007 – 2008	35	8	
	2008 – 2009	30	5	
	2009 – 2010	28	5	
	2010 – 2011	29	6	
	2011 – 2012	27	6	
	2012 – 2013	23	5	
	2013 – 2014	28	3	
	2014 – 2015	28	1	

LENGTH OF SEASON BY SPORT, INCLUDING PRE AND POST-SEASON PLAY:

SEASON - FALL	NCAA LENGTH OF REGULAR SEASON W/OUT TOURNAMENT	NESCAC LENGTH OF COMPLETE SEASON W/TOURNAMENT	PRE-SEASON START DATES	POST-SEASON END DATES
CROSS COUNTRY	Maximum 18 weeks	12 weeks	Count back 13 practice opportunities from the Saturday after Labor Day	Weekend prior to Thanksgiving
FIELD HOCKEY	Maximum 18 weeks	12 weeks	Count back 13 practice opportunities from the Saturday after Labor Day	Weekend prior to Thanksgiving
FOOTBALL	Maximum 18 weeks	11 weeks	23 practice opportunities prior to first scheduled intercollegiate game	No post-season opportunity; Usually ends second weekend of November
GOLF	Maximum 19 weeks	5 weeks	September 7 or the first day of classes, whichever is earlier	No post-season opportunity in fall; Usually ends second weekend of October

SOCCER	Maximum 18 weeks	14 weeks	Count back 13 practice opportunities from the Saturday after Labor Day	One weekend after Thanksgiving
TENNIS	Maximum 19 weeks	5 weeks	September 7 or the first day of classes, whichever is earlier	No post-season opportunity in fall Usually ends mid-October
VOLLEYBALL	Maximum 18 weeks	14 weeks	Count back 13 practice opportunities from the Saturday after Labor Day	Weekend prior to Thanksgiving
NOTE: A practice opportunity consists of two for each day prior to the first day of classes and one day after, excluding Sundays. Golf, Tennis, and Track/Field are two-season sports and the maximum number of weeks would include both seasons.				
SEASON - WINTER				
	NCAA LENGTH OF REGULAR SEASON	NESCAC LENGTH OF COMPLETE SEASON	PRE-SEASON START DATES	COMPLETION OF SEASON
BASKETBALL	Maximum 19 weeks	19 weeks	November 1	Third Weekend of March {Friday – Saturday}
ICE HOCKEY	Maximum 19 weeks	19 weeks	November 1	Fourth full weekend of March - Men Third full weekend of March - Women
SEASON - SPRING				
	NCAA LENGTH OF REGULAR SEASON	NESCAC LENGTH OF COMPLETE SEASON	PRE-SEASON START DATES	COMPLETION OF SEASON
INDOOR TRACK/FIELD	Maximum 24 weeks	16 weeks	November 1	Second weekend of March {Friday – Saturday}
SQUASH	N/A		November 1	N/A
SWIMMING	Maximum 19 weeks	19 weeks	November 1	Third Wednesday through Saturday of March
BASEBALL	Maximum 19 weeks	15 weeks	February 15	Friday prior to Memorial Day through Tuesday
GOLF	Maximum 19 weeks	13 weeks	February 15	Second Tuesday through Friday in May
LACROSSE	Maximum 19 weeks	15 weeks	February 15	Sunday of Memorial Day weekend
OUTDOOR TRACK/FIELD	Maximum 24 weeks	14 weeks	February 15	Last full weekend in May prior to Memorial Day
SOFTBALL	Maximum 19 weeks	15 weeks	February 15	Thursday prior to Memorial Day through Tuesday {Thursday – Saturday}
TENNIS	Maximum 19 weeks	15 weeks	February 15	Week prior to Memorial Day Team Finals – Monday – Wednesday Singles/Doubles Finals – Thursday - Saturday

The chart above details the NCAA allowed maximum number of weeks for each sport's traditional season not including the NCAA Tournament as well as the total number of weeks of play for each sport including pre-season and post-season. Again, the sports of golf, tennis and track & field are 2 season sports and the maximum number of weeks would include both seasons.

Appendix F: Captains' Practices

NESCAC institutions support all students in their desire to engage in activities that promote health and fitness. Students at NESCAC schools who participate in varsity athletics will often look to engage in athletic activity out-of-season. Most have played year-round before coming to college; therefore, it is natural and healthy for them to remain physically active. At the same time, our schools offer a wonderful array of opportunities and those on teams deserve the chance to explore new and different options. Activity out-of-season is viewed positively so long as it abides by NESCAC regulations and one's participation is never seen as a condition for making a team.

NESCAC rules state that all out-of-season activities must be **STRICTLY VOLUNTARY** and should never conflict with any academic obligation.

The following guidelines have been developed to assist member institutions in the implementation and application of the Conference policy governing out-of-season activities:

- There can be no scripting of activity, no attendance taken, no reporting back to the coaching staff, no implication that participation can never be a condition of making a team, and no involvement of any kind by any member of the coaching staff.
- Team captains and members may not coach or direct practices on or off campus. These activities are to be structured in as a “free play” environment. They are not to duplicate a practice that would be led by a coach. If a pick-up game is open to the rest of the student body, team members may participate.
- Facilities may not be reserved for a team activity out-of-season. In a multipurpose facility (i.e. field house) this rule would not preclude scheduling of activity limitations for safety reasons. In such instance, however, the activity may not be restricted to varsity candidates and must be open to all members of the student body. Procedures established for the general college community must be followed in the scheduling of such facilities.
- Off-campus facilities may not be rented or reserved for a varsity team activity, however, an institution may arrange for off-campus space for recreational activities.
- Students may not use or be issued college-owned apparel or equipment out-of-season, unless it is available to the College community in general.
- Voluntary strength and conditioning programs are permitted. Coaches may design voluntary workout programs for their players. Sport coaches are not permitted to require, direct, or supervise these activities out-of-season. Strength and conditioning personnel may monitor voluntary individual workouts for safety purposes.
- There are to be no contests or scrimmages by teams against outside competition out-of-season.
- Insurance policies written to provide coverage for accidents occurring from intercollegiate athletics may only cover accidents that occur when students

participate in events that are permitted as an in-season activity under NESCAC guidelines. Also, students injured in out-of-season activities will not be covered by NCAA catastrophic injury insurance.

- Permissible out-of-season activities include team community service activities, educational programming including leadership, alcohol and hazing education. Students may volunteer to work in sport-based clinics provided clinics are conducted when classes are not in session and clinics are conducted more than twice in any given sport in an academic year.

SPORT	DATES CAPTAINS' PRACTICE	DATES LIFTS	TYPICAL SCHEDULE
BASEBALL	Sept. 14 – Oct. 23; Jan. 25 – Feb. 14	Sept. 7 – Nov. 30; Jan. 11 – Feb. 14	3 days per week for 1.5 hours - 2 days are held mid-week and 3 rd day is held on weekend; Lifting 3 – 4 days per week 45 minutes – 1.25 hours
MEN'S BASKETBALL	Early Sept. – Oct. 31	Early Sept. – Oct. 31	2 – 3 days per week "open" play for 1.5 – 2. Hours; Lifting 3 days per week 45 minutes
MEN'S CROSS COUNTRY	N/A		
FOOTBALL	After spring break – end of April	Mid-Nov. – reading week;	Sundays after spring break for 1.5 hours on the field; Lifting 5 days per week for 1.5 hours.
MEN'S GOLF	N/A		
MEN'S ICE HOCKEY	Sept. 9 – Oct. 31	Sept. 9 – Oct. 31	1 day per week through Sept. for 50 minutes, 2 days per week first 2 weeks of Oct. for 50 minutes, 3 – 4 days per week mid-Oct. – Oct. 31; Lifting 3 days per week for 1.5 hours.
MEN'S LACROSSE	Second week of first semester – reading period	Second week of first semester – reading period	2 days per week for 2 hours; Lifting 3 days per week for 1.25 hours.
MEN'S SOCCER	Feb. 1 – May 1	Feb. 1 – May 1	2 days per week for 1.5 hours; Lifting 3 days per week for 1 hour.
MEN'S SQUASH	Early Sept. – Oct 31	Early Sept. – Oct. 31	2 days per week for 2 hours; Lifting 2 days per week for 1 hour.
MEN'S SWIMMING	Early Sept. – Oct. 31	Early Sept. – Oct. 31	3 days per week for 1.5 hours; Lifting 3 days per week for 1.5 hours
MEN'S TENNIS	Jan. 26 – Feb. 14	Jan 26 – Feb. 14	4 days per week for 1.5 hours; Lifting 2 days per week for 1 hour.
MEN'S TRACK/FIELD	Second week of Sept. – Oct. 31	Second week of Sept. – Oct. 31	Lifting 3 days per week for 1 hour.
WOMEN'S BASKETBALL	Second week of Sept. – Oct. 31	Second week of Sept. – Oct. 31	3 days per week for 1.5 – 2 hours; Lifting 3 days per week for 1 hour.
WOMEN'S CROSS COUNTRY	N/A		
FIELD HOCKEY	No Captains' Practices	Second semester	Lifting 3 days per week for 45 minutes – 1 hour.
WOMEN'S GOLF	Weekend prior to start of classes and after the fall season ends	Nov. – Feb.	1 or 2 weekend prior to the start of classes and 1 or 2 after the fall season ends; Lifting 2 days per week for 1 – 1.5 hours and 1 day circuit lift for 1 – 1.5 hours.
SPORT	DATES CAPTAINS' PRACTICE	DATES LIFTS	TYPICAL SCHEDULE
WOMEN'S ICE HOCKEY	Second week of Sept. – Oct. 31	Second week of Sep. – Oct. 24; After spring break – May 1	2 days per week for 1 hour; lifting 2 days per week 1 – 1.5 hours, 1 day week circuit training.
WOMEN'S LACROSSE	Second week of semester – reading period; Mid-Jan. – Feb. 14	Second week of semester – reading period; Mid-Jan. – Feb. 14	3 days per week for 1.25 – 1.5 hours; Lifting 3 days per week 1 – 1.5 hours.
WOMEN'S SOCCER	First week of second semester – reading period	First week of second semester – reading period	2 days per week for 1 – 1.5 hours; Lifting 3 days per week for 1 hour.
SOFTBALL	Sept. 15 – Mid-Nov.	Sept. 15 – Mid-Nov.	2 days per week for 2 hours; Lifting 2 days per week for 1.5 hours; Cardio 2 days per week for 1 hour.
WOMEN'S SQUASH	Early Sept. – Oct 31	Early Sept. – Oct. 31	2 days per week for 2 hours; Lifting 2 days per week for 1 hour.
WOMEN'S SWIMMING	Early Sept. – Oct. 31	Early Sept. – Oct. 31	3 days per week for 1.5 hours; Lifting 3 days per week for 1.5 hours
WOMEN'S TENNIS	Nov. 1 – Feb 14	Nov. 1 – Feb. 14	Players are on their own to hit an play according to their schedule; Lifting 3 days per week for 1 hour.

WOMEN'S TRACK/FIELD	Sept. 10 – Nov. 15	Sept. 10 – Nov. 15	1 – day per week for 1 hour; Lifting 2 days per week for 1 hour.
VOLLEYBALL	Feb. 9 – April 30	Feb. 9 – April 30	2 days per week for 1.5 hours; Lifting 3 days per week 1 – 1.5 hours.

PROVIDE WEEKLY NUMBER OF HOURS TEAMS SPEND ON ATHLETIC ACTIVITY DURING THEIR SEASON.

All teams follow the NCAA rule of no more than 20 hours in total that may be spent on athletic activity in a given week. A mandatory day off per week is enforced. Games count as 3 hours of athletic activity regardless of the duration of the game.

Practice sessions, lifting, games, and meetings are considered to be athletic activity.

Travel times to away contests are based on academic conflicts, the location of the contest, and the time of the contest.

Appendix G: Percentage of Student-Athletes in NESCAC, 2011-2017

2016 - 2017

Men's Teams	Amherst	Bates	Bowdoin	Colby	ConnColl	Hamilton	Middlebury	Trinity	Tufts	Wesleyan	Williams	Total
Baseball	31	35	30	29		31	32	32	36	36	29	321
Basketball	19	18	13	17	15	14	13	17	15	17	16	174
Football	76	68	74	66		76	76	81	76	76	66	735
Golf	15	15	12	12		10	13	16	13	15	14	135
Ice Hockey	24		35	29	33	27	43	30	28	28	26	303
Lacrosse	47	51	47	41	45	46	44	46	52	50	37	506
Rowing		32		32	6	25		35	44	37	43	254
Rugby		11										11
Sailing			18		6				23			47
Skiing		9	12	23			18				19	81
Soccer	29	24	26	28	25	32	49	28	26	28	31	326
Squash	13	14	13	13	14	14	14	25	14	13	18	165
Swim & Dive	25	28	23	21	50	24	34	18	43	18	30	314
Tennis	17	15	10	13	9	13	11	16	14	11	12	141
Track & Field, Indoors				45	27	30		51			61	214
Track & Field, Outdoors				54	27	29		54			57	221
Track & Field, XC	98	151	120	31	14	16	22	70	152	72	49	795
Water Polo					17							17
Wrestling								23		19	21	63
Men's Participation	394	471	433	454	288	387	474	437	536	420	529	4823
Unduplicated Count	334	394	358	364	215	327	384	403	415	363	427	3984
Male Undergraduates	921	881	901	894	673	906	1204	1104	2694	1340	1052	12570
% Male Student-Athletes	36%	45%	40%	41%	32%	36%	32%	37%	15%	27%	41%	32%
Women's Teams	Amherst	Bates	Bowdoin	Colby	ConnColl	Hamilton	Middlebury	Trinity	Tufts	Wesleyan	Williams	Total
Basketball	14	14	16	13	15	13	12	16	14	11	13	151
Fencing								18				18
Field Hockey	23	23	21	24	26	23	24	23	28	23	26	264
Golf	9	5	7			9	8				9	47
Ice Hockey	24		19	24	28	25	22	23		25	23	213
Lacrosse	28	26	27	31	25	29	52	30	35	27	23	333
Rowing		36		42	42	31		34	30	33	44	292
Rugby		10	36									46
Sailing			12		20				42			74
Skiing		10	6	18			17				21	72
Soccer	26	23	28	24	34	26	47	24	28	27	29	316
Softball	16	12	14	15		18	14	18	26	15	16	164
Squash	13	12	11	12	12	13	15	14	13	12	11	138
Swim & Dive	29	19	24	24	54	26	38	18	35	21	32	320
Tennis	18	11	8	8	14	7	10	13	12	8	11	120
Track & Field, Indoors				39	40	36	50				47	212
Track & Field, Outdoors				39	39	28	52				48	206
Track & Field, XC	105	122	102	27	18	19	22	83	165	78	38	779
Volleyball	15	16	12	17	13	14	15	12	15	19	12	160
Water Polo					14							14
Women's Participation	320	339	343	357	394	317	398	308	461	299	403	3939
Unduplicated Count	253	283	277	296	306	252	314	261	326	241	317	3126
Female Undergraduates	925	899	897	985	1145	960	1292	1028	2720	1572	992	13415
% Female Student-Athletes	27%	31%	31%	30%	27%	26%	24%	25%	12%	15%	32%	23%
Total Participation	714	810	776	811	682	704	872	745	997	719	932	8762
Total Unduplicated Count	587	677	635	660	521	579	698	664	741	604	744	7110
Total Undergraduates	1846	1780	1798	1879	1818	1866	2496	2132	5414	2912	2044	25985
Total % Student-Athletes	32%	38%	35%	35%	29%	31%	28%	31%	14%	21%	36%	27%

2015 - 2016

Men's Teams	Amherst	Bates	Bowdoin	Colby	ConnColl	Hamilton	Middlebury	Trinity	Tufts	Wesleyan	Williams	Total
Baseball	33	36	32	34		31	30	34	27	31	27	315
Basketball	17	18	14	19	16	15	13	19	15	16	15	177
Football	76	66	76	76		75	76	76	76	76	76	749
Golf	7	13	14	12		15	12	15	7	10	16	121
Ice Hockey	24		33	27	31	25	51	28	28	29	24	300
Lacrosse	46	43	49	46	37	46	44	43	54	51	37	496
Rowing		40		28	5	30		45	34	36	39	257
Rugby		9										9
Sailing			17		8				15			40
Skiing		10	7	20			19				16	72
Soccer	28	25	28	33	26	31	45	30	28	43	27	344
Squash	15	16	13	13	14	14	12	24	15	13	18	167
Swim & Dive	27	25	26	16	46	25	32	16	48	24	33	318
Tennis	16	15	9	14	10	11	11	22	12	13	15	148
Track & Field, Indoors				48	30	32	48					64
Track & Field, Outdoors				47	24	28	46					65
Track & Field, XC	98	112	125	36	17	17	19	83	123	64	40	734
Water Polo					18							18
Wrestling								19		18	22	59
Men's Participation	387	428	443	469	282	395	458	454	482	424	534	4756
Unduplicated Count	321	371	360	369	209	336	376	424	376	369	421	3932
Male Undergraduates	891	884	902	887	694	908	1184	1124	2595	1297	1015	12381
% Male Student-Athletes	36%	42%	40%	42%	30%	37%	32%	38%	14%	28%	41%	32%

Women's Teams	Amherst	Bates	Bowdoin	Colby	ConnColl	Hamilton	Middlebury	Trinity	Tufts	Wesleyan	Williams	Total
Basketball	12	16	15	14	12	14	14	17	15	12	12	153
Fencing									18			18
Field Hockey	22	24	22	25	23	20	20	21	28	21	25	251
Golf	9	7	6			7	8				9	46
Ice Hockey	22		20	24	23	25	24	23		22	23	206
Lacrosse	26	32	25	30	22	30	55	32	32	25	24	333
Rowing		53		41	30	31		47	34	41	40	317
Rugby		12	37									49
Sailing			15		16				32			63
Skiing		6	6	16			16				23	67
Soccer	25	29	26	26	26	23	42	26	28	24	28	303
Softball	19	16	16	18		18	18	14	24	16	19	178
Squash	15	13	11	10	10	15	15	14	15	11	14	143
Swim & Dive	28	23	27	24	42	31	36	12	48	20	30	321
Tennis	19	12	8	9	11	10	9	9	12	8	13	120
Track & Field, Indoors				54	43	26	45					53
Track & Field, Outdoors				45	37	25	43					51
Track & Field, XC	90	143	96	32	25	22	23	73	123	69	40	736
Volleyball	15	17	15	16	15	12	13	20	17	14	13	167
Water Polo					17							17
Women's Participation	302	403	345	384	352	309	381	308	426	283	417	3910
Unduplicated Count	242	311	284	295	248	256	303	281	346	235	326	3127
Female Undergraduates	904	908	891	970	1158	953	1318	1013	2601	1517	1055	13288
% Female Student-Athletes	27%	34%	32%	30%	21%	27%	23%	28%	13%	15%	31%	24%

Total Participation	689	831	788	853	634	704	839	762	908	707	951	8666
Total Unduplicated Count	563	682	644	664	457	592	679	705	722	604	747	7059
Total Undergraduates	1795	1792	1793	1857	1852	1861	2502	2137	5196	2814	2070	25669
Total % Student-Athletes	31%	38%	36%	36%	25%	32%	27%	33%	14%	21%	36%	28%

2014 - 2015

Men's Teams	Amherst	Bates	Bowdoin	Colby	ConnColl	Hamilton	Middlebury	Trinity	Tufts	Wesleyan	Williams	Total
Baseball	34	35	36	30		28	26	37	27	38	25	316
Basketball	16	17	13	16	19	15	15	18	15	13	14	171
Football	76	74	76	75		75	76	76	76	76	75	755
Golf	10	10	9	12		13	11	15	7	11	16	114
Ice Hockey	24		34	26	33	26	49	29	28	23	26	298
Lacrosse	45	44	44	44	40	50	46	45	49	48	42	497
Rowing		31		29	10	24		38	34	38	47	251
Rugby		12										12
Sailing			12		10				31			53
Skiing		9	7	21				18			19	74
Soccer	30	32	26	27	28	35	50	33	27	31	29	348
Squash	15	16	10	15	15	18	15	25	15	13	16	173
Swim & Dive	24	32	27	19	30	22	34	11	45	21	36	301
Tennis	15	12	8	14	14	11	12	29	12	12	11	150
Track & Field, Indoors				50	21	34	46				61	212
Track & Field, Outdoors				51	22	32	44				59	208
Track & Field, XC	106	166	139	34	15	14	20	94	123	73	36	820
Water Polo					19							19
Wrestling								11		23	19	53
Men's Participation	395	490	441	463	276	397	462	461	489	420	531	4825
Unduplicated Count	326	389	345	363	253	339	383	409	391	355	422	3975
Male Undergraduates	927	879	900	869	717	918	1204	1139	2528	1385	994	12460
% Male Student-Athletes	35%	44%	38%	42%	35%	37%	32%	36%	15%	26%	42%	32%

Women's Teams	Amherst	Bates	Bowdoin	Colby	ConnColl	Hamilton	Middlebury	Trinity	Tufts	Wesleyan	Williams	Total
Basketball	15	16	13	11	12	12	14	15	15	13	12	148
Fencing									16			16
Field Hockey	20	20	23	22	19	17	24	19	26	22	26	238
Golf	10	8	6			11	8				10	53
Ice Hockey	21		21	23	25	23	27	23		25	25	213
Lacrosse	28	27	28	29	26	27	50	30	32	25	30	332
Rowing		56		34	25	30		35	34	48	52	314
Rugby		14										48
Sailing			14		18				38			70
Skiing		5	8	18				19			19	69
Soccer	23	30	25	24	26	24	46	28	27	24	30	307
Softball	16	15	17	17		14	16	18	22	12	17	164
Squash	16	14	15	13	14	17	17	15	15	12	14	162
Swim & Dive	16	31	25	25	24	25	34	13	45	19	31	288
Tennis	16	12	7	9	11	10	10	10	12	10	11	118
Track & Field, Indoors				53	33	27	45				48	206
Track & Field, Outdoors				46	33	23	44				46	192
Track & Field, XC	99	124	87	29	31	20	21	85	123	76	39	734
Volleyball	14	16	12	12	14	14	14	16	17	17	13	159
Water Polo					17							17
Women's Participation	294	388	335	365	328	294	389	307	422	303	423	3848
Unduplicated Count	226	305	279	276	284	243	293	261	342	252	335	3096
Female Undergraduates	865	894	897	978	1154	972	1271	1028	2580	1517	1025	13181
% Female Student-Athletes	26%	34%	31%	28%	25%	25%	23%	25%	13%	16%	33%	23%

Total Participation	689	878	776	828	604	691	851	768	911	723	954	8673
Total Unduplicated Count	552	694	624	639	537	582	676	670	733	607	757	7071
Total Undergraduates	1792	1773	1797	1847	1871	1890	2475	2167	5108	2902	2019	25641
Total % Student-Athletes	31%	39%	35%	35%	29%	31%	27%	31%	14%	21%	37%	28%

2013 - 2014

Men's Teams	Amherst	Bates	Bowdoin	Colby	ConnColl	Hamilton	Middlebury	Trinity	Tufts	Wesleyan	Williams	Total
Baseball	33	34	36	28		29	29	32	37	28	27	313
Basketball	19	18	13	16	19	15	18	16	13	15	14	176
Football	76	73	76	71		65	75	75	76	76	75	738
Golf	9	7	13	12		9	13	12	12	10	19	116
Ice Hockey	25		32	25	30	27	50	29	29	24	23	294
Lacrosse	46	50	38	40	47	43	49	42	49	43	32	479
Rowing		43		27	13	29		44	31	41	47	275
Rugby		12										12
Sailing			13		10				23			46
Skiing		10	6	19			19				19	73
Soccer	28	29	24	27	28	33	47	30	26	38	26	336
Squash	19	15	11	19	15	16	15	20	12	16	17	175
Swim & Dive	32	28	31	20	44	22	32	17	45		36	307
Tennis	22	15	10	14	13	11	13	24	17	11	10	160
Track & Field, Indoors				52	25	36	48				44	205
Track & Field, Outdoors				41	25	27	49				44	186
Track & Field, XC	77	154	146	28	20	15	18	72	145	50	45	770
Water Polo					14							14
Wrestling								12		16	16	44
Men's Participation	386	488	449	439	303	377	475	425	515	368	494	4719
Unduplicated Count	330	387	350	345	246	317	390	391	426	335	422	3939
Male Undergraduates	900	890	901	874	742	926	1204	1099	2531	1396	997	12460
% Male Student-Athletes	37%	43%	39%	39%	33%	34%	32%	36%	17%	24%	42%	32%
Women's Teams	Amherst	Bates	Bowdoin	Colby	ConnColl	Hamilton	Middlebury	Trinity	Tufts	Wesleyan	Williams	Total
Basketball	12	12	16	12	12	13	13	16	15	14	11	146
Fencing									16			16
Field Hockey	21	19	22	24	21	20	27	24	22	20	29	249
Golf	10	8	6			8	6				8	46
Ice Hockey	21		19	22	25	22	24	24		25	23	205
Lacrosse	30	32	24	30	21	23	47	27	22	32	26	314
Rowing		51		44	33	34		43	45	51	41	342
Rugby		12		38								50
Sailing			16		13				34			63
Skiing		7	7	19			19				16	68
Soccer	28	23	25	27	27	23	51	25	25	26	27	307
Softball	16	14	16	17		14	19	17	21	14	15	163
Squash	15	13	14	10	14	14	13	14	13	11	13	144
Swim & Dive	23	32	26	27	21	27	36	18	40	20	29	299
Tennis	21	14	10	9	9	11	10	12	10	11	11	128
Track & Field, Indoors				59	40	32	44				42	217
Track & Field, Outdoors				59	40	22	42				42	205
Track & Field, XC	96	140	121	24	22	20	21	79	130	61	42	756
Volleyball	10	14	15	13	16	11	13	15	15	15	13	150
Water Polo					11							11
Women's Participation	303	391	375	396	325	294	385	314	408	300	388	3879
Unduplicated Count	234	292	301	290	267	248	300	267	329	254	322	3104
Female Undergraduates	885	901	887	946	1131	978	1252	1040	2587	1492	1054	13153
% Female Student-Athletes	26%	32%	34%	31%	24%	25%	24%	26%	13%	17%	31%	24%
Total Participation	689	879	824	835	628	671	860	739	923	668	882	8598
Total Unduplicated Count	564	679	651	635	513	565	690	658	755	589	744	7043
Total Undergraduates	1785	1791	1788	1820	1873	1904	2456	2139	5118	2888	2051	25613
Total % Student-Athletes	32%	38%	36%	35%	27%	30%	28%	31%	15%	20%	36%	27%

2012 - 2013

Men's Teams	Amherst	Bates	Bowdoin	Colby	ConnColl	Hamilton	Middlebury	Trinity	Tufts	Wesleyan	Williams	Total
Baseball	32	35	38	32		28	28	38	38	31	30	330
Basketball	19	16	14	18	19	15	16	16	15	18	13	179
Football	76	70	76	66		65	76	75	76	76	76	732
Golf	10	9	14	9		11	9	15	11	11	19	118
Ice Hockey	30		33	25	34	26	64	27	28	28	23	318
Lacrosse	41	46	36	44	48	44	50	43	51	47	41	491
Rowing		40		29	14	27		45	37	51	46	289
Rugby		9										9
Sailing			9		16				22			47
Skiing		12	8	17			17				17	71
Soccer	30	29	24	27	27	35	42	28	25	39	26	332
Squash	17	14	12	15	21	15	14	23	12	16	17	176
Swim & Dive	34	23	27	19	23	23	34	13	39	19	40	294
Tennis	25	14	10	12	12	10	17	23	16	14	15	168
Track & Field, Indoors				46	33	29	52				45	205
Track & Field, Outdoors				45	34	29	59				44	211
Track & Field, XC	88	158	145	29	20	15	19	63	156	76	41	810
Water Polo					17							17
Wrestling								19		26	17	62
Men's Participation	402	475	446	433	318	372	497	428	526	452	510	4859
Unduplicated Count	343	369	353	340	274	319	410	396	410	386	430	4030
Male Undergraduates	931	831	920	845	736	908	1204	1111	2532	1410	968	12396
% Male Student-Athletes	37%	44%	38%	40%	37%	35%	34%	36%	16%	27%	46%	33%

Women's Teams	Amherst	Bates	Bowdoin	Colby	ConnColl	Hamilton	Middlebury	Trinity	Tufts	Wesleyan	Williams	Total
Basketball	10	14	14	14	15	14	14	16	15	13	14	153
Fencing									17			17
Field Hockey	19	22	21	24	22	19	23	21	22	21	26	240
Golf	8	6	5			9	6				9	43
Ice Hockey	18		20	22	24	23	24	25		22	22	200
Lacrosse	26	29	24	30	26	24	59	26	22	25	26	317
Rowing		49		31	31	37		38	56	53	47	342
Rugby		14		30								44
Sailing			22		19				32			73
Skiing		7	10	19			22				21	79
Soccer	28	23	25	28	30	22	45	22	24	22	29	298
Softball	14	14	16	15		16	18	15	16	16	17	157
Squash	14	14	18	11	15	16	14	13	11	15	13	154
Swim & Dive	30	36	24	25	21	26	42	26	46	22	26	324
Tennis	19	13	8	11	8	12	13	16	8	15	11	134
Track & Field, Indoors				58	34	30	38				32	192
Track & Field, Outdoors				57	35	32	39				33	196
Track & Field, XC	97	151	108	24	22	16	15	59	162	83	34	771
Volleyball	11	15	14	17	16	13	15	13	16	15	14	159
Water Polo					17							17
Women's Participation	294	407	359	386	335	309	387	290	447	322	374	3910
Unduplicated Count	223	299	285	285	292	257	315	255	349	262	315	3137
Female Undergraduates	886	922	910	1018	1076	958	1270	1026	2634	1514	1049	13263
% Female Student-Athletes	25%	32%	31%	28%	27%	27%	25%	25%	13%	17%	30%	24%

Total Participation	696	882	805	819	653	681	884	718	973	774	884	8769
Total Unduplicated Count	566	668	638	625	566	576	725	651	759	648	745	7167
Total Undergraduates	1817	1753	1830	1863	1812	1866	2474	2137	5166	2924	2017	25659
Total % Student-Athletes	31%	38%	35%	34%	31%	31%	29%	30%	15%	22%	37%	28%

2011 - 2012

Men's Teams	Amherst	Bates	Bowdoin	Colby	ConnColl	Hamilton	Middlebury	Trinity	Tufts	Wesleyan	Williams	Total
Baseball	31	34	36	28		28	30	34	28	31	29	309
Basketball	20	21	16	19	15	14	16	15	14	17	15	182
Football	75	69	68	70		57	76	76	75	76	81	723
Golf	10	9	10	15		11	9	16	9	11	16	116
Ice Hockey	28		37	28	31	26	54	28	27	28	23	310
Lacrosse	42	39	42	37	41	43	46	40	47	52	42	471
Rowing		42		30	25	23		47	35	41	38	281
Rugby		10										10
Sailing			8		28				22			58
Skiing		13	12	17			19				21	82
Soccer	28	24	25	26	26	38	48	36	27	37	28	343
Squash	14	15	11	23	17	14	18	21	13	14	17	177
Swim & Dive	28	26	23	15	19	21	28	19	38	15	36	268
Tennis	25	22	12	13	10	12	15	19	13	12	22	175
Track & Field, Indoors				44	38	26	50				50	208
Track & Field, Outdoors				44	35	24	52				44	199
Track & Field, XC	78	130	71	28	20	15	20	22	157	82	42	665
Water Polo					18							18
Wrestling								17		26	13	56
Men's Participation	379	454	371	437	323	352	481	390	505	442	517	4651
Unduplicated Count	325	339	346	359	286	310	391	384	400	382	416	3938
Male Undergraduates	922	836	899	854	694	865	1214	1103	2513	1403	980	12283
% Male Student-Athletes	35%	41%	38%	42%	41%	36%	32%	35%	16%	27%	42%	32%

Women's Teams	Amherst	Bates	Bowdoin	Colby	ConnColl	Hamilton	Middlebury	Trinity	Tufts	Wesleyan	Williams	Total
Basketball	14	14	14	11	16	13	15	14	11	13	16	151
Fencing									23			23
Field Hockey	20	22	22	23	21	23	45	21	22	19	23	261
Golf	9	5	6				8				10	38
Ice Hockey	21		22	22	26	20	25	26		24	23	209
Lacrosse	22	23	28	29	24	24	46	23	25	25	31	300
Rowing		55		25	60	39		40	50	47	45	361
Rugby		11	33									44
Sailing			14		36				35			85
Skiing		9	7	17			17				18	68
Soccer	28	27	24	27	22	23	46	23	25	22	24	291
Softball	12	15	16	12		19	15	15	19	19	14	156
Squash	15	14	13	15	12	17	13	23	18	17	14	171
Swim & Dive	26	36	25	24	20	22	36	19	48	25	29	310
Tennis	17	20	8	12	19	14	14	14	9	10	11	148
Track & Field, Indoors				54	30	33	45				41	203
Track & Field, Outdoors				60	25	32	46				38	201
Track & Field, XC	99	130	49	29	20	18	19	23	161	86	41	675
Volleyball	14	15	13	11	14	14	14	15	15	14	12	151
Water Polo					13							13
Women's Participation	297	396	294	371	358	311	404	256	461	321	390	3859
Unduplicated Count	226	271	260	287	319	254	316	244	357	257	309	3100
Female Undergraduates	869	933	873	961	1081	976	1244	1043	2588	1467	1034	13069
% Female Student-Athletes	26%	29%	30%	30%	30%	26%	25%	23%	14%	18%	30%	24%

Total Participation	676	850	665	808	681	663	885	646	966	763	907	8510
Total Unduplicated Count	551	610	606	646	605	564	707	628	757	639	725	7038
Total Undergraduates	1791	1769	1772	1815	1775	1841	2458	2146	5101	2870	2014	25352
Total % Student-Athletes	31%	34%	34%	36%	34%	31%	29%	29%	15%	22%	36%	28%