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End of Year Report
University Evaluation Committee
Fall 2014-Spring 2015

When did you meet?
The committee met twice during the spring semester.

What issues are you working on?
The committee continued to collect the evaluation policy from all of the departments. All department chairs were sent the information received from the deans, to confirm that it was what was taking place. The committee also collected any standardized peer evaluation forms that were used. The committee also discussed ways to increase student response rate to eSPOTS.

How can the Senate assist?
Clarification on the charges for the committee and the continual work on ensuring that there is not overlap between the University Evaluation Committee and the Faculty Senate Educational Evaluation Committee.

What would you like the Senate to know about your work?
The faculty evaluation methods have been compiled, but it is not clear throughout who is evaluated with these methods or how the information is used. The committee would like to survey faculty and determine if they are aware of the evaluation methods and if they are satisfied with them. The committee also discussed creating a standardized peer evaluation form to be used throughout either colleges or the university.
Report: International Students Committee (ISC)

1. Introduction

Our main goal is to assess whether this committee can play a role in the future of TCU or we need to terminate its very existence.

As a Chair, I had a meeting with the staff of the International Student Center (John Singleton, Lizbeth Branch and James English) on November 11, 2014. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the original goals of this committee and develop an agenda for our future meeting.

The current ISC goals, which will be discussed in our meeting, are:

- To give assistance to students from other lands,
- To make recommendations on policies relating to such students,
- To support the International Student Advisor

Issues to be discussed in our meeting:

- Are the listed goals (all or some) still falling within the scope of ISC?
- Can the listed goals (all or some) be successfully carried out by the ISC?
- Can we identify other goals/directions?

The final objective of this meeting is to make a recommendation to the Committee on Committees (COC) about the continuation or termination of the ISC.

The ISC met on February 13, 2015. The topics discussed in these meeting are reported in the following section.

2. ISC Meeting (February 13, 2015)

The International Students Committee (ISC) members (Onofrio Annunziata, Nathanael O’Reilly, David Ferrell, Khia I. Adams, Isuru Perera, Lizbeth Branch and James English on behalf of John Singleton) met on February 13, 2015. The objective of this meeting was to assess whether this committee can play a role in the future of TCU.

As part of this meeting, we discussed the current goals of this committee. The ISC goals as they appear in the 2014 TCU Faculty and Staff handbook (pag 123) are:

1. Gives assistance to students from other lands,
2. Makes recommendations on policies relating to such students,
3. Supports the International Student Advisor.

In relation to goal 1, the staff of the International Student Services (Lizbeth Branch and James English) explained that one goal of the ISC was to promote the host family program to TCU
personnel and international students. Members of the ISC committee themselves were often also members of the host families engaged in these interactions. Since the host-family program at TCU no longer exists or is needed, these ISC activities ceased to exist. Another past role of the ISC was to identify and implement strategies (e.g., presentations) aimed at informing students from other lands about TCU degree plans and American higher education in general. However, this task has lost its importance in the recent years due to worldwide spreading of technology, internet, globalization of communication media and social networking.

In relation to goals 2 and 3, the staff of the International Student Services stated that there should not be separate TCU policies for domestic and international students. Thus, policies specifically for international students, with the exception of immigration regulations, are no longer pertinent. The main function of the International Student Services is to give assistance to international students on immigration laws. While this office does assist international students with academic concerns and personal problems, as a part of their advising, they refer international students to TCU resources that exist for all students, like Campus Life, the Counseling Center, and the Writing Center.

The committee members have also explored possible roles of the ISC in fostering interactions between TCU Faculty/Staff and International Students. On this topic, the spokesman of the TCU International Student Association (Isuru Perera) informed the ISC on existing opportunities for such interactions at TCU. Specifically, the “Beyond Borders at TCU” organization was mentioned. As described in its Facebook page, this is a “mentorship organization at TCU specially designed for International Students and Faculty/Staff with lots of cultural, leadership events.” There are other programs that engage TCU Faculty/Staff with international students such as, International Orientation, KinoMonda, and Cultural Cuisine to name a few.

Finally because the ISC has not met in more than two years, both the staff of the International Student Services and the spokesman of the TCU International Student Association feel that the ISC is no longer needed. Before this committee makes its final recommendation on the ISC continuation or termination to the Committee on Committees, it was decided that, based on the topics discussed in this meeting, individual ISC members should convey their assessments on whether they are in favor of ISC continuation. The final recommendation should gain approval in the form of individual recommendations.

John Singleton, who did not attend the ISC meeting, wrote an email on February 26, 2015. An excerpt of his email is reported below:

“The existence of an International Student Committee made sense in the days when the international office was one person, the Office of Inclusiveness and Intercultural Services did not exist, the Division of Culture, Community and International Services did not exist and TCU did not have a Diversity Committee to look at the overarching cultural experience of all students. Now our students have a variety of programs and organizations to provide and find leadership, at least 6 banquets per year to provide cultural access and entertainment, a start-up retreat with other students to look at diversity, leadership and engagement and a program specifically dedicated to connecting faculty and international students. Unlike when I began this job in 1999, our students are now Frog Camp Advisors, Chancellor’s Scholars, Residence Hall Assistants, Orientation Leaders and generally show up in large numbers for awards in various schools and departments.
We are not opposed to the committee’s continued existence, but given that it hasn’t met in over two years—believe there are other structures already in place, with funding, achieving outcomes suited to the integration, academic and cultural success of these students at TCU. Over the last two years we were contacted on several occasions—including Onofrio and Jesus Castro Balbi—asking if we felt the need for the committee. We answered that we honestly did not, mostly based upon the duplication of efforts, but are not opposed in either direction.

The committee provided great friendship for our students but now student leadership has created a platform for that as well through the program Isuru mentioned—Beyond Borders. So I will offer now my vote that there need not be an “International Student Committee.” If there are faculty who feel strongly that they would still like formal access to conversations regarding international students, we invite you to assist us with the International Orientation, which takes place between August 11th-August 15th each Fall Semester.”

3. Final recommendation

We have continued our debate on the ISC role at TCU by email. The following fourteen (14) ISC members recommended in favor of ISC termination:

Onofrio Annunziata, John Singleton, Lizbeth Branch, Nathanael O’Reilly, David Ferrell, Isuru Perera, Khia Adams, Babette Bohn, Misha Galaganov, Jodie Weatherly, Angela Kaufman, Kent Mire, Kathryn Schruba and Anh Mai Pham.

Four (4) ISC members did not provide a recommendation: Kinsey A. Budagher, C. Luke Erwin, LaQwen D. Nichols and Mohamed A. Sharaf. Jane Kucko did not participate to our debates.

My opinion as a chair of the ISC is that there is no longer a need for this committee. The international office is well organized and, currently, most international students tend to adapt quickly (or they are already adapted) to American education and life style. However, in the absence of ISC, initiatives that foster the interactions between international students and domestic students, Faculty and Staff at TCU should be always strongly encouraged.

Final recommendation: To terminate the International Student Committee.

Onofrio Annunziata, Chair of the International Students Committee
Associate Professor
Department of Chemistry
College of Science and Engineering
Texas Christian University
End of Year Report of the
Academic Appeals Committee
Spring 2015

As of April 17, 2015, the Provost’s office has not forwarded any academic appeals to the committee. As such, we have not met this semester.

Claudia Camp, Chair
Academic Appeals Committee
Committee membership: Giridhar Akkaraju (Chair), John Fanchi, Youngha Ryu, Dean Williams, Linda Freed and Phil Hartman

The IBC did not meet during the period under consideration.

1. Training: The Chair of the Biosafety Committee attended a training for Biosafety committee members conducted by the University of North Texas Health Science Center in Fort Worth. The training was given by Dr. Robert Emery, VP for Safety, Health, Environment and Risk Management at the UT Health Science Center in Houston.

2. Reviews: Dr. Mike Chumley’s application for an upgrade of his lab to a Biosafety Level 2 was reviewed and approved by the committee.

3. Reviews: The chair of the committee conducted a preliminary review of a Pathogen Safety Plan involving the use of *Yersinia ruckeri*, submitted by Dr. Marlo Jeffries of the Department of Biology.

4. A meeting of the IBC was convened to discuss the expansion of the role of the IBC to cover work done with blood borne pathogens at TCU. It was decided to include the Harris College of Health and Human Sciences under our purview. It was also decided to invite a representative from that college to serve as a committee member. The meeting was held on January 15th, 2015 and was attended by Giri Akkaraju, Linda Freed, Youngha Ryu, and Dean Williams.

If you have any additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,
Giri Akkaraju

Giridhar Akkaraju
Associate Professor
Department of Biology.
The Library Committee was provide with the following update:

James Lutz, Director of Library Administrative Services, indicated that library is expected to be ready for the start of the fall semester 2015, with the project turnover to the library scheduled for August 1. The committee was informed that rain caused some construction problems and damage to some library materials (which are being treated by a freeze-dried process).

Jeff Bond, Science Librarian, provided information about the possibility of the library providing funding to TCU authors of “Open Access” online publications. The committee, which expressed interest in seeing this idea move forward, did raise questions concerning “Open Access” publications in regard to tenure and their evaluation.

Dean June Koelker described a fundraiser planned for 2016, which would bolster the library’s international holdings. Dr. Koelker also informed the committee that the library is increasingly engaging with faculty in various projects and is considering digitalizing the Skiff, yearbook, and other TCU publications. She indicated that all library off-campus materials are now located in the annex on W. Bolt Street. Information about library security at night, as well night time accessibility to Rees-Jones Hall was presented. In answer to a question about a book return slot for the library’s front desk, Dr. Koelker indicated that one would soon be in place.
Budget Advisory Committee

Report

for the Spring Semester, 2015

Submitted by E. E. Michaelides

The Budget Advisory Committee met on May 1, 2015, with the main item in the agenda to discuss any developments following the Board of Trustees meeting. Messrs Brian Gutierrez and Megan Soyer made a presentation on the current budget of the University and future projections. The Committee came to the conclusion that the budget of the University is in good shape and no difficulties or surprises are expected in the next few years. Among the approved budget highlights for next year are:

1. Salary raises 3%
2. Tuition increase 5.5%.

It was mentioned that tuition increases are expected to be reduced to a level closer to 3%, while faculty and staff salary increases will remain at current levels. A report with the title: "Financial Update" was distributed to the committee members. This report will be made available electronically by Ms. Megan Soyer to all the members of the Senate.

Our committee basically meets only one time per year to review requests for Instructional Development Grants. Nonetheless, there is a substantial amount of time involved in reviewing the grants before the meeting. As in the past, the committee members were conscientious in their reviews of the proposals and the deliberations over the proposals were thoughtful. As reflected in the table below, we received 21 applications for grants and requests totaling $68,417. Of these 14 were awarded.

Here is a breakdown by college:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th># applied</th>
<th># awarded</th>
<th>% awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AddRan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neeley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schieffer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sci&amp;Engr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here is a list of applicants who were recommended for grants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Recommended Funding</th>
<th>College or School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bailey, Stephanie</td>
<td>$3,543.80</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callaghan/Mead</td>
<td>$3,600.00</td>
<td>Neeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diel, Lori</td>
<td>$2,050.00</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekas, Naomi</td>
<td>$3,471.06</td>
<td>Sci &amp; Engr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flahive/Hennington</td>
<td>$3,551.55</td>
<td>Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fung, Adam B</td>
<td>$3,335.00</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaul, Theresa</td>
<td>$3,472.04</td>
<td>Univ. Prog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, D Lynn</td>
<td>$3,472.04</td>
<td>Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Sohyun</td>
<td>$3,600.00</td>
<td>Add Ran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livedalen, Rachel</td>
<td>$3,250.00</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGettigan, Joan</td>
<td>$1,126.67</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritsch, Margaret</td>
<td>$1,730.00</td>
<td>Schieffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryu, Jay</td>
<td>$3,600.00</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker/Sherrod</td>
<td>$3,527.40</td>
<td>Harris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following up on a decision made last year, we changed the schedule for grant applications. Calls for application were distributed in September, the application deadline was December 12, and the committee met to make recommendations on the proposals on January 28. These changes enabled grant recipients to have more lead-time, such as for making travel arrangements.

We are also made recommendations for changes to the guidelines that will be used next year. There is a requirement that grant recipients must file a one-page project report with the Associate Provost by 90 days after
the end of the grant. We are recommending that this report should also be submitted to the Instructional Development Grant Committee for feedback purposes. The committee also made some minor procedural recommendations for the guidelines for proposals. These include highlighting requirements to (1) include signatures of the approving department chair and dean on the form itself instead of submitting signature sheets separately, (2) follow the exact format specified by the guidelines (including length), (3) include the scoring sheet with the proposal, and (4) include past accomplishments from previous instructional development grants in the proposal. We also recommended that the Director of the Center for International Studies always be invited to the committee’s proposal review meeting as such input is invaluable.

Members of the committee are listed on the following page. Links to the guidelines, forms, committee composition, and past recipients are noted below:

- **IDG Guidelines and Application Form (to be updated)**

  This page also links to a fill-in budget form, the evaluation form to be used in assessing applications, and sample applications completed by former recipients of the award.

- **Recipients of Last Year’s Awards (to be updated)**
INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE · 2014-2015
Dr. Nowell Donovan, Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Administrative Oversight
(3-year terms Faculty)

Faculty (8 members)

**Dr. Charles R. (Bob) Greer, Chair**
Dept. of Management, Entrepreneurship & Leadership
c.greer@tcu.edu
2017

Professor David Begnoche
School of Music
d.begnoche@tcu.edu
2016

Dr. Naomi Ekas
Department of Psychology
naomi.ekas@tcu.edu
2015

Dr. Amber Esping
College of Education
a.esping@tcu.edu
2017

Dr. Max Krochmal
Department of History & Geography
m.krochmal@tcu.edu
2017

Dr. Robert H. Neilson
Department of Chemistry
r.neilson@tcu.edu
2017

Dr. Hylda Nugent
Harris College of Nursing & Health Sciences
h.nugent@tcu.edu
2016

Dr. Santiago Pinon
Department of Religion
s.pinon@tcu.edu
2015

Liaison (2 members)

Dr. Jane Kucko
Director
Center for International Studies
j.kucko@tcu.edu

Dr. Bonnie Melhart
Assoc. Provost & Dean of University Programs
b.melhart@tcu.edu

Ex Officio (1 member)

Mr. Larry E. Kitchens
Director
Center for Instructional Services
l.kitchens@tcu.edu

Students (3 members)

Mr. Sam S. Baxter
s.baxter@tcu.edu

Mr. Alex P. Cohen
a.p.cohen@tcu.edu

Ms. Joanna M. Schmidt (grad student)
joanna.schmidt@tcu.edu
Interoffice Memo

To: Jesus Castro-Balbi, Committee on Committees Chair
From: Gregory K. Stephens, Chair, University Mediator’s Committee
Date: 10 April 2015
RE: 2015 year-end committee report

The University Mediator’s Committee has not had occasion to meet as a group during this academic year. Virtually all of our work is done as individuals (assisting with the preparation of grievance documents) or partners (mediating disputes), and there were no disputes for which we were called upon to help. Therefore we saw little reason to meet as a group. For that reason, there are also no meeting minutes to be filed.

If you have any questions regarding my report, please feel free to contact me.

Best regards,

Gregory K. Stephens, Ph.D.
Chair, University Mediator’s Committee
(817) 257-7548
24 April 2015

Jesus Castro-Balbi
Chair, Committee on Committees

Re: Research and Creative Activities Committee Annual Report

Dear Committee on Committees:

The Research and Creative Activities Committee is responsible for reviewing and recommending funding of Research and Creative Activities Fund (RCAF) and Junior Faculty Summer Research Program (JFSRP) proposals. The proposals are solicited in the fall and are reviewed early in the spring semester.

During the fall semester of 2014, we made several changes to Guidelines for proposals and updated the website. In addition, a workshop was held (by me, Linda Freed, and Jean-Luc Montchamp) for RCAF/JFSRP grant applicants on 12 December 2014. There were approximately 30 participants.

This year, we received 56 proposals on 29 January 2015. Each Committee member was assigned half of the proposals (28) to review. This is a very labor intensive process that requires several weeks during the spring semester. We were able to fund 27 RCAF proposals for a total of $98,792. We funded 17 JFSRP proposals, for a total of $102,000.

In the future, the Research and Creative Activities Committee would benefit from additional committee members to help ease the burden of proposal review and to better represent the departments and colleges from which we receive proposals. The Committee discussed improvements to the process, a request for additional RCAF funds from the Administration, and a request to increase the total funding per project to $6000 in future funding cycles.

Respectfully submitted,

John D. Horner for

The Research and Creative Activities Committee:
John Horner, Chair
Marinda Allender
Amber Finn
Anne Frey

Michael Heil
San-Ky Kim
Suzy Lockwood
Jean-Luc Montchamp

Carol Thompson
Bill Wempe
Linda Freed, liaison
Bonnie Melhart, liaison
Student Media Committee Report

The Student Media Committee met once in the Fall and once in the Spring. The director of student media, Kent Chapline, provided our committee with a summative report on the state of TCU media that was approved by the committee both times. Since our committee was not charged with hearing any complaints against student media this year, this was the only business our committee had to attend to.

Tricia Jenkins
Dr. Tricia Jenkins
Associate Professor and Book Reviews Editor for the Journal of Popular Culture
Dept. of Film, TV, and Digital Media
Texas Christian University
TCU Box 298030
Fort Worth, TX 76129
817.257.7630
COMMITTEE CHAIR END-OF-YEAR REPORT 2014-15

Committee: Student Organizations
Chair: Susan B. Kleiser

The Student Organizations Committee (SOC) did not meet formally as a committee this year. No appeals requiring the review of the SOC were made this year. No additional progress was made with Brett Phillips (Director of Student Activities) regarding how the SOC expand its role and be of greater service to the Student Activities office.

 Regards,

Susan B. Kleiser
The Technology Committee met once during the Fall Semester of the 2014-2015 Academic Year. That meeting occurred on November 14, 2014.

Two agenda items were discussed in this meeting.
1. Reporting Student Absence Via PeopleSoft
2. Emergency Access to Faculty Digital Information Due to Extended Illness or Termination of Employment

The first item was old business first introduced to the committee during the 2013-2014 Academic Year. The second item was new business.

After much discussion about “Reporting Student Absence Via PeopleSoft” the committee voted to ask the Information Technology Department to develop the software to implement this change to PeopleSoft. Both Bryan Lucas and Josh Harmon have agreed to this effort. Josh Harmon is the IT representative who is in charge of the effort to develop the software to implement the “Reporting Student Absence Via PeopleSoft” and he has discussed this with some of his developers and plans to start work during the next semester. This development effort probably will require delivery of the product in phases with delivery the first phase to possibly occur in early to mid 2016.

Nobody offered a motion to proceed with the item “Emergency Access to Faculty Digital Information Due to Extended Illness or Termination of Employment” even though the committee explored multiple possible ways to practically implement this item. The consensus of the committee, after discussing this item at length, is that valid forms of access to the digital data of faculty who terminate employment, for any reason, can continue to occur as it presently does without the need to formalize this access with a new policy.

The meeting was attended by a majority of the Faculty and Staff members of the committee and two of the Liaisons to the committee. The Student committee members were unable to attend. Members present included: Billy Farmer, Richard Gipson, Jill Havens, Igor Prokhorenkov, Charles Dewar, Darlene Housewright, Alysha Sapp, Kerry Bouchard, and Josh Harmon. The chair met with Bryan Lucas before the committee meeting and Romana Hughes after the committee meeting.

Josh Harmon hosted a meeting with the committee chair, developers, and other interested parties on February 6, 2015. At that meeting the chair was asked to obtain Faculty Senate support for this project before development would begin. The March meeting of the Faculty Senate was canceled due to inclement weather. A resolution was in support of this development project was passed at the April 30, 2015 meeting of the Faculty Senate. A copy of the resolution has been sent to Josh Harmon and he has been asked to proceed with development.
Traffic Regulations and Appeals Committee
Report for the 2014-2015 academic year
Prepared by Scott Nollet, Committee Chair

Most the work of the traffic appeals committee consists of listening to or reading student appeals for traffic and parking tickets, deciding guilt and whether to reduce the fine. Each subcommittee (hearing personal appeals or reading written appeals) consists of at least two faculty members and usually one student representative. The police reserve a room at the BLUU for the hearings at 4 pm on Tuesday or Wednesday. This past year the hearings were held on September 1, 16, 24, 30 October 8, 21, 29, November 4, 12, 18, December 3, 9 in the Fall and January 14, 20, 28, February 3, 11, 17, 25, March 3, 18, 24 and April 1, 7, 15, 21, 29 this spring.

The Committee consisted of 10 faculty, 6 staff, and 5 students for a total of 21 total members. This seems to be about the right number for the committee, as each person heard (or read) appeals 3-4 times per semester. Participation was excellent, with the exception of a few student absences. Our protocol was more robust this year because the police had access to both the schedule and addresses of the entire committee, giving a back-up plan when communications break down.

We had a year-end meeting with the police for the first time in two years, which resulted in the following proposed improvements for next year: (a) having complete citation history of students, including previous years, (b) better patrolling of UCC lot, (c) request dedicated parking area for construction workers, (d) Mark fire lanes more clearly and (e) improve shuttle service.

To give an idea of what we did, the police gave out a total of 12,328 citations over the 2014-2015 academic year. The police can handle many grievances at the station immediately, but when the students are not satisfied they appeal to us. We heard 509 cases this year, of which 482 were determined to be guilty and in 173 of these cases we reduced the fine, depending on the offense and circumstances provided.
Year-End Report  
Admissions/Retention Committee  
Chair – Anne VanBeber  
May 1, 2015

- On what dates did you meet?
  1. November 7, 2014
  2. March 6, 2015
  3. April 28, 2015

- Did you keep minutes? If so, have you submitted them to the Faculty Senate Secretary?
  1. Yes – minutes were kept and sent to David Begnoche

- When is the bulk of your work conducted?
  1. The bulk of the work is done during the meetings. It mainly consists of reporting statistics regarding admissions, retention, and related matters.

- Do you have enough/too many members?
  1. The number of members is just right.

- Did faculty attend and participate appropriately?
  1. Attendance was good. Good participation. Breakfast meetings seem to be the best time to meet.
  2. Faculty who attend always have appropriate and timely comments and suggestions.

- Did staff attend and participate appropriately?
  1. Faculty and staff interacted well with each other.
  2. The members who make this committee happen are the staff members – Ray Brown, Mike Scott. Trung Nguyen also is a valuable contributor regarding freshman orientation and frog camp.

- Did students attend and participate appropriately?
  1. Yes – there are three students on this committee. The students are great contributors to conversation. Their input is solicited each time
  2. There was good attendance by the three students this year.

- What were the notable accomplishments and highlights of the year?
  1. Applications continue to be submitted at a high rate. Efforts to attract students of color and males continue.
  2. Retention efforts continue to improve retention rate from freshman to sophomore year.
  3. Financial Aid office continues to seek more aid for students.
The University Compensation Advisory Committee
Annual Report and Recommendations
December 3, 2014

Introduction
In 2014, the University Compensation Advisory Committee welcomed new voting members, as a result of recommendations presented to the Chancellor’s Cabinet by the 2013 UCAC committee. With the addition of the new voting members whose expertise helped reinforce a sense of history and continuity, UCAC became a committee of thirty members. To enhance this sense of continuity and provide transparency in our work, UCAC committed to the practice of compiling the minutes of the six meetings held between January and November 2014. We request that the Chairs of Faculty Senate and Staff Assembly post these minutes on their websites.

It has been a privilege to work in collaboration with the TCU administrators and Human Resource leaders to continue to foster the very unique work culture of TCU and be able to debate openly the ongoing issues that concern all of us. UCAC is grateful for many important achievements.

UCAC wishes to commend the administration for seeking to equalize pay in initial hiring procedures and allowing a 3% merit pool. Such efforts resulted in TCU setting its hiring rate at 80% of market median and succeeding to offer 100% of the market median or higher for staff positions. In 2014, TCU was selected once more as one of the Great Colleges to Work For by the Chronicle of Higher Education.

UCAC Work and Actions
In the first half of 2014, the University Compensation Advisory Committee met on March 6, April 16, and May 22. During the fall 2014, the committee met on September 20, October 21, and November 19. The committee’s work has been focused on two crucial tasks:

1. Examining the changes in TCU Retirees’ Health care benefits
2. Gathering data on overall compensation of staff and faculty and examining gender and salary equity for staff and faculty.

1. Changes in the Retirees’ Health Care Benefits:
The committee’s review and discussion of the changes that had occurred in the retirees’ health care benefits in 2012 resulted in the following motion:

The University Compensation Advisory Committee supports a quick and comprehensive review by Human Resources and the Administration of the retirees' health care benefits in Medicare Part D with a clear process and timeline. The current retirees' survey results as of fall 13 should be taken into consideration.
To strengthen and maintain a line of communication with the TCU Retirees' Association, the committee invited the staff in Human Resources and our administrators to provide retirees with a constant flow of information, advice, and health insurance products. Faith Perkins and Karen Baker repeatedly offered reports on total compensations.

UCAC formed an ad-hoc committee to investigate the possible creation of an emergency compensation fund to help current employees and retirees cope with catastrophic situations and conditions. The members of this ad hoc committee are Chris Sawyer, Robin Williamson, and Jean Walbridge.

2. **Gender Salary Equity**
Upon UCAC's requests Susan Campbell, Dindy Robinson, and Rachelle Blackwell provided extensive reports on the current situation pertaining to gender salary equity and ethnicity salary equity among staff and faculty. With the approval of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Bob Vigeland shared with UCAC the report of the Faculty Senate Task Force on the TCU Promise, providing additional data on salary equity.

Based on these discussions, the University Compensation Advisory Committee offers the following recommendations for the Cabinet's consideration:

**Recommendation #1: Annual Merit Increase**
UCAC recommends that a merit pool of 3% be made available to faculty and staff that totals $4,435,668 in salary and $5,300,624 with benefits.

**Recommendation #2: Salary Adjustments To Reach Gender Equity**
UCAC recommends that TCU begin to adjust staff and faculty salaries to establish and maintain gender salary equity. Furthermore, UCAC recommends that HR and the Provost Office provide UCAC with an update on adjustments made to move toward salary gender equity every fall for faculty and Staff.

**Recommendation #3: New Faculty Lines Salary Calculations**
Given equal qualifications, equal experience, equal rank, positions should be compensated with relative parity. Therefore, UCAC recommends that deans and department chairs request salaries for new faculty lines that signal the essential nature of these positions within the disciplines. Furthermore, UCAC recommends that TCU begin to reduce the gap between salaries in the Humanities and salaries in Business, Science and Engineering regardless of market tendencies.

**Recommendation #4: Yearly Increase of Retirees' Benefits**
UCAC recommends that TCU increase the retirees' benefits yearly, taking into consideration the continuously rising cost of medical services and prescription drugs.
Recommendation # 5: Funding of the Camp Fire Child Care Program
UCAC recommends funding the Camp Fire Child Care Program ($10,000 per year) with the stipulation that the program’s use and effectiveness be reviewed in 2015.

Future Considerations:
UCAC believes that the following areas need to be discussed and reviewed:
- Explore the feasibility of an emergency fund to provide assistance to current and retired TCU employees facing sudden and catastrophic conditions, establish the application process, and identify qualifying circumstances
- Continue yearly study of gender and ethnicity salary equity for staff and faculty
- Continue efforts to meet the 80% market average target
-- Continue to review exempt and non-exempt jobs classifications and determine budgetary impact
- Evaluate adjunct faculty compensations regularly
- Explore the feasibility of an on-campus childcare program and facility

UCAC is grateful for the unique culture that unites all members of the TCU community. In order to continue to value the people who make TCU a great place of work, UCAC respectfully submits these recommendations.

Aisha Torrey-Sawyer and Marie Schein, 2014 UCAC Co-Chairs
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Yuan Lu
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Retirees
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Manfred Reinecke
Jean Walbridge
Advisory Liaison
Susan Campbell
Sandra Waters (SP14)
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Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee
IACUC Report for the Academic year 2014-15
Prepared by: Magnus Rittby, IACUC Chair

CHARGE

Institutional Animal Care and Use develops standards and reviews proposed projects to insure compliance with Federal and University policies to the humane care and use of laboratory animals in research.

SUMMARY

The TCU IACUC is well functioning with committee members dedicated to addressing the charge to the committee. The committee has a sufficient number of members allowing for compliance with federal regulations of IACUC operations (see below).

ACTIVITIES

The committee investigated a vivarium incident, which was subsequently communicated to OLAW (Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare). The IACUC is presently involved in discussions with animal researchers regarding a modest expansion of the vivarium as well as the purchase and installation of a new cage washing system.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

The IACUC met on the following dates to review Animal Use Protocol Applications:

September 2, 2014
January 26, 2015
May 4, 2015

The IACUC met on the following dates to perform a program review and animal facilities inspection:

September 2, 2014
January 26, 2015
2014-15 COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Magnus Rittby (Chair)  Nonscientist (Physics and Astronomy)
Ron Burns  Nonscientist (Criminal Justice)
Michael Katovich  Nonscientist (Sociology)
Sarah Quebec Fuentes  Nonscientist (Education)
Robin Wright  Nonscientist (Modern Languages)
Brent Cooper (Spring 2015)  Scientist; Animal Researcher (Psychology)
Amanda Hale  Scientist; Animal Researcher (Biology)
Ken Leising (Fall 2014)  Scientist; Animal Researcher (Psychology)
Chris Watts  Scientist; Animal Researcher (Communication Sciences & Disorders)
Egenee Daniels  Veterinarian; ex officio
Matthew Riegel  Veterinarian (alternate); ex officio
Todd Boling  Non-scientist (Center for Ethical Leadership & Responsible Citizenship); ex officio
Bo Söderbergh  Non-affiliated; ex officio
Teresa Hendrix  Liaison to TCU Research

ADMINISTRATIVE OVERSIGHT
Bonnie Melhart  Administrative oversight
NOTES ON COMMITTEE CONSTITUTION

Procedure for Chair Selection

The Chair is appointed by the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, who is the institutional officer who bares the reporting responsibility to the Federal Government regarding animal use issues.

Membership Criteria including but not limited to the following:
- Minimum and/or maximum years of service
- Composition of committee including number of faculty, staff and students
- Skills or expertise required if applicable
- Balance of discipline, college, tenured vs. non-tenured, and other demographic considerations

The IACUC has to fulfill the federal mandates with respect to its constitution. The IACUC must have a minimum of five members, including people with the following backgrounds:

- A veterinarian with experience in laboratory animal science and medicine, who has direct or delegated authority and responsibility for activities involving animals at the institution.
- A practicing scientist experienced in research with animals.
- A person whose primary concerns are in a nonscientific area, e.g. and ethicist, lawyer, or member of the clergy.
- A person not affiliated with the institution who represents community interests and who is not a laboratory animal user.
Year end report for IRB Committee

The IRB committee (9 Faculty, 2 Ex Officio, 2 Prisoner Advocates, 1 liaison) reviews protocols for research involving human subjects as participants. The committee's charge is to protect the rights and welfare of participants according to Federal Regulations that serve as the basis for committee decisions.

Since 1 August the Committee and or the Committee Chair has reviewed, corrected, and approved 124 Protocol Requests. The requests are further broken down into 14 Continuing Reviews; 44 Amendments to original proposals; and 66 New Protocols.

Dan Southard, IRB Co-Chair
Submitted via email to JCB, April 29, 2015
It was a quiet year for the Intellectual Property Review Committee. One of the committee's primary responsibilities is to make recommendations on whether the University should pursue legal protection for and commercialization of intellectual property developed by University personnel. It does this in response to disclosures provided to the committee by the developer of the intellectual property. There were only two such disclosures this year. For the first disclosure, the committee determined the research was at too early a stage for legal protection to be sought. The second disclosure is currently being evaluated. It is unclear as of this time whether committee action will be required on the disclosure.

The committee also made some effort this year to educate the university community about the potential for university assistance with intellectual property protection and commercialization for intellectual property developed at TCU. Particular attention was paid to the College of Science and Engineering, where the type of intellectual property that the University might seek to protect and commercialize is most likely to originate.

The committee consists of seven faculty members and one student, which seem to be an appropriate number of members for the committee's work. Many of the committee members attended meetings and participated appropriately. A liaison from the Office of Sponsored Programs regularly attends and participates in committee meetings. The committee reports to, and frequently meets with, the Associate Provost for Research.

Joel Timmer
Chair, IPRC
Dear Provost Donovan,

I am pleased to present you with the 2014-15 year-end report for the Scholarships and Financial Aid Committee. I appreciate your patience in waiting for this document. The majority of our activities occur over the summer, after the May 1st deadline for year-end reports.

The Committee met once during the fall, on October 30th, 2014, and twice over the summer, on June 10th, 2015 and August 7th, 2015. Bridget Ledesma compiled minutes for these meetings, and these have been sent to the appropriate contacts.

In the October meeting, we met with Jolene Alonso from the Admissions Office to discuss ways in which we might improve the scholarship appeals system. Currently, students are responsible for submitting information that we often already have on file. If we are able to populate student appeals forms in-house with information that is already available, this will save the students time and will streamline the appeals process on both ends. The software solutions to accomplish this will take some time to develop, but I am eager to continue the discussion and hope to be able to implement a new system within the next two appeals cycles.

In our summer meetings we considered 169 appeals in total. 83 were denied, 47 approved, and 37 provisionally approved; none required more information or had other circumstances which affected the outcome. On the following page, you will find tables detailing the results from each meeting as well as the total for all summer appeals this year.

Despite the inherent difficulties of organizing meetings over the summer, I believe we have had adequate faculty and staff participation to achieve our charges. In each meeting, the committee functioned well, established broad consensus, and held to fair and consistent guidelines for addressing student appeals. While we do have student members of the committee, due to the sensitive and confidential nature of scholarship appeals, they do not typically attend these meetings. The student members are, however, welcome to attend any meetings during the semester in which we discuss general policies and procedures, rather than specific student issues.

One lingering issue for the committee is the term of service for committee members. Since one of the primary charges of the Scholarships and Financial Aid Committee is to read and decide on student appeals, and since the vast majority of these arrive during the summer months, it would be helpful to clarify the responsibilities of committee members by stipulating a full calendar year of service. Currently, members are assigned to a nine-month term of service (August through May), which does not cover the active summer months. This issue has already been raised through the Committee on Committees to the Faculty Senate in the April 2014 meeting, but action was deferred due to a number of issues that were raised, including asking faculty on nine-month contracts to serve for twelve months, additional summer-month compensation, and how summer-month service would count towards tenure and promotion. The Scholarship and Financial Aid Committee has functioned well for many years despite this logistical fog, but I welcome any clarity that the Faculty Senate and administration can provide on this issue.
Thank you for the opportunity to serve the university community. I look forward to continuing my role as Committee Chair in the 2015-16 academic year.

Martin Blessinger  
Associate Professor of Music  
Committee Chair, Scholarships and Financial Aid

**Appeals Summary, 2014-15**

**June 10, 2015**

118 Appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denied:</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisionally approved:</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**August 7, 2015**

49 Appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denied:</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisionally approved:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2014-15 Total**

167 Appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denied:</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisionally approved:</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This committee is one formal means of communication between the athletic department, the faculty, the student body, and the administration. The Committee's primary focus is on academic matters and student-athlete well-being. The Committee will seek information from appropriate officials regarding current developments related to student-athletes' academic concerns and well-being including financial responsibility/budget allocation, facilities, resources, and compliance with NCAA rules and regulations. The Committee will provide an oversight role as well as an advocacy role as a voice for student athletes if questions are raised by the Faculty Senate or Student Affairs. The Committee will make recommendations to the appropriate University unit regarding suggested changes in policies or programs.

Faculty and staff provide a sounding board to the department through service on the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee.

**Athletic Academics**

**Academics**

The TCU athletic department continues to lead the Big 12 Conference in academics.

*(Attached is the 2014 NCAA APR Report)*

**Athlete Advising**

There was a problem within the advising unit for athletics. The problem has been resolved due to his acceptance of a similar position at another university.
Buildings

All of the building projects within the Athletic Department are on time and are funded with Athletic Department Donor funds. There will not be any institutional funds used to develop any Athletic Buildings or Projects.

NCAA Effects from Legislation

Ed O'Bannon Case

The Ed O'Bannon case returns to court March 17 -- interestingly, the first day of the NCAA Tournament -- for oral arguments in the NCAA's appeal of a federal judge's decision to allow football and men's basketball players to be compensated beyond the value of their scholarship.

In a San Francisco federal courtroom, across the San Francisco Bay from where the NCAA lost the trial in Oakland last summer, NCAA and O'Bannon lawyers will argue their points before the United States Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit. Each side will be allotted 30 minutes -- the longest available time under the court's guidelines -- before a three-judge panel that previously handed a former NCAA co-defendant a defeat in a similar case. Arguments have already been filed in briefs.

Some questions and answers about the NCAA's appeal of O'Bannon:

What decision is being appealed?

The O'Bannon case, now more than five years old, deals with the commercialized use of names, images and likenesses (NILs) for FBS football and Division I men's basketball players. Last August, US District Judge Claudia Wilken determined that the NCAA's rules "unreasonably
restrain trade in the market for certain educational and athletic opportunities offered by Division I schools.”

Wilken's injunction would allow scholarships to cover for football and men's basketball players the full cost of attending college and permit deferred payments to players for use of their NILs for every year the athlete remains academically eligible. The NCAA has flexibility to cap the deferred payment at no less than $5,000 per year in 2014 dollars.

In its appeal, the NCAA placed the dollar amount of Wilken's injunction at “roughly $30,000 each over four years,” or $7,500 per year. It's based on the $5,000 NIL cap number outlined by Wilken and the gap of about $2,500 for an extra stipend to cover the full cost of attendance.

What are the NCAA's key arguments in the appeal?

The NCAA relies heavily on the argument that Wilken erred by not applying a 1984 Supreme Court ruling that the NCAA says protects amateurism in college sports. The 1984 Oklahoma v. Board of Regents case that ended the NCAA's monopoly on television contracts includes this passage from the Supreme Court: “in order to preserve the character and quality of the (NCAA's) ‘product,’ athletes must not be paid, must be required to attend class and the like.”

The NCAA has successfully used this passage in court cases for decades. The O'Bannon plaintiffs say the NCAA inconsistently applies amateurism and there's new evidence since 1984 that the commercialism of football and men's basketball “has eroded and undermined the relationship between athletics and academics.” The plaintiffs argue that Board of Regents doesn't establish the antitrust immunity that the NCAA seeks, but rather instructed lower courts to a “Rule of Reason” analysis and that Wilken examined “an exhaustive factual record” that demonstrates not paying athletes is anticompetitive.
During the O'Bannon case, Wilken dismissed the impact of the Supreme Court language in part because “the college sports industry has changed substantially” in the 30 years since Board of Regents. The NCAA claims Wilken did not explain what precisely has changed; she's still bound by the 1984 Supreme Court ruling; and she “yearned for what never was: commercialism and amateurism coexisted at the time of the Board of Regents just as they do today.” In fact, the NCAA says, “the amateurism rules prevent college sports from being professionalized in the face of commercial pressures.”

The NCAA is also arguing that the O'Bannon plaintiffs lack antitrust injury due to the First Amendment and Copyright Act. The NCAA says no state recognizes payments for use of NILs in telecasts of games or other non-commercial uses and the First Amendment and the Copyright Act would prevent enforcement of such right anyway.

The plaintiffs say there is no requirement to examine each state's right-of-publicity laws in relation to live game broadcasts. “In fact, a substantial majority of states recognize a broad (right of publicity), whether by statute or under the common law,” the plaintiffs wrote. “Of those states, only eight exempt sports broadcasts. The number of states not exempting sports broadcasts is all the more significant given the NCAA's observation that '[t]eam sports have been broadcast for almost a century.'"

**Why did Oliver Luck make it into the O'Bannon appeal?**

In theory, the O'Bannon appeal is supposed to be based on the cases past court record. That didn't stop both sides from invoking some current events to the appeal. For the O'Bannon plaintiffs, they devoted a small part of their appeal to recent comments by new NCAA executive vice
president Oliver Luck in an attempt to show Wilken did not commit "judicial micromangement" with her ruling.

Since Wilken's decision, the NCAA hired Luck as one of its top executives. Luck has said college players have a "fundamental right" to be paid for use of their NILs. In her ruling, Wilken credited testimony from a plaintiffs' expert that NIL provisions in TV contracts within the NBA are "common and that they have economic value to the television networks." The NCAA has tried to discredit that testimony and the plaintiffs countered with the words of a new top NCAA executive.

What's the oddest new argument by the NCAA?

In disagreeing with Wilken's ruling that would allow some payments for players, the NCAA wrote, "The court's alternative would blur the line between amateur college sports and their professional counterparts and thereby deprive athletes of a genuine choice between the two endeavors."

"That sentence bears re-reading," lawyers for the Shawne Alston cost-of-attendance plaintiffs wrote in a friend-of-the-court brief. "In (the NCAA's) view, it is the athletes that are going to be harmed because of the district court's ruling. That contention likely does not pass the laugh-test, let alone provide a bulwark against antitrust liability."

College athletes, of course, could "refuse the 'minor' payment at issue should they find it unpalatable (as unlikely as that may be)," the Alston plaintiffs wrote. Why college athletes, if given a choice, would turn down money is a head scratcher. The interest by the Alston and Martin Jenkins plaintiffs reflect other court cases in process that could be helped by favorable rulings for O'Bannon. The Jenkins plaintiffs seek a free market for players to be paid.
What happens if the NCAA loses the appeal?

The NCAA has said it's preserving one aspect of its argument for a full-panel review by the 9th Circuit or the Supreme Court. An important NCAA attorney now on the case is Seth Waxman, a former US solicitor general who has argued more than 65 times before the Supreme Court. Waxman was hired in 2013 by the NCAA, which eyed the appeal process throughout the O'Bannon trial.

Whether O'Bannon would rise to the level of the Supreme Court remains to be seen. Typically, the Supreme Court takes on cases if there's a significant issue at stake. Examples could include correcting a difference in opinion between the courts of appeals, resolving an issue that confused lower courts, or addressing a case the court believes is too significant to ignore.

The 9th Circuit, with its more liberal judges, has often been the most reversed appellate court by the Supreme Court. In the October 2013 term, the Supreme Court reviewed 12 decisions from the 9th Circuit and reversed 11 of them, according to SCOTUS blog.

When will the 9th Circuit's opinion come?

Officially, there are no time constraints on when an opinion is issued. Unofficially, expect it sooner rather than later and well before August. The NCAA got the appeal moving in an expedited manner and the hearing is occurring even sooner than the NCAA's request.

Why the urgency? Because even though the new benefits from the O'Bannon ruling for incoming and returning players don't start until the 2016-17 academic year, the offers can begin on Aug. 1 of this year. If Wilken's injunction remains in place, the NCAA will have to create a new rule that accounts for deferred payments to players.
It's important to note: Schools wouldn't have to offer the deferred money, but they could be at a competitive disadvantage if they don't provide extra money and a competitor does. Gender-equity issues would undoubtedly be in play if football and men's basketball players get paid and perhaps result in some female athletes being compensated as well.

Pending appeal, the clock is ticking to the day when coaches will offer some players about $5,000 extra each year to play in college

**Compensation for Full Cost and Partial**

The power conferences — ACC, Big 12, Big Ten, Pac-12 and SEC — are expected to gain autonomy from the rest of Division I. Essentially, this means that those conferences will be able to approve rules that only apply to themselves.

Athletic scholarships don’t cover the full cost of attending a university. NCAA president Mark Emmert tried to address this by proposing $2,000 stipends for athletes. However, the proposal was shot down by smaller schools, which claim they don’t have the money to do it. Autonomy for the Big 5 should be the solution. Former Minnesota football player Kendall Gregory-McGhee recently filed a lawsuit against the NCAA and the five major conferences for capping the amount of assistance provided in a scholarship.

TCU will pay full cost student athletes an amount that is yet to be determined. It is based on a formula which includes cost of attendance adjustments.

**Four-year scholarships**

The NCAA does not require its membership to give incoming freshmen four-year scholarships. Many schools do, but the ones that renew scholarships from year-to-year can give
athletes the boot before they finish their eligibility and their degrees. The union movement
describes this as a major concern; athletes’ scholarships are at the mercy of the schools. It
appears that larger schools will be able to vote on whether their members will be required to
offer four-year scholarships, along with other things like changes in "eligibility for aid, period of
award, reduction or cancellation, renewals or non-renewals."

TCU will award 4 Year Scholarships, the only means for revocation will be through the
SA misconduct.
2013 - 2014 NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate
Public Report

Institution: Texas Christian University
Date of Report: 05/26/2015

This report is based on NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) data submitted by the institution for the 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14 academic years.

[Note: All information contained in this report is for four academic years. Some squads may still have small sample sizes within certain sport groups. In accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act’s (FERPA’s) interpretation of federal privacy regulations, data cells containing three or fewer student-athletes have been suppressed and are indicated by an * symbol. The information in this report does not reflect any changes to data made after this date.]

The following chart represents by-sport APR averages for noted subgroups. National aggregates are based on all squads that have certified their academic data as final.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport (N)</th>
<th>Multiyear APR</th>
<th>2013-2014 APR</th>
<th>Percentile Rank within Sport</th>
<th>Percentile Rank within All Sports</th>
<th>All Division I</th>
<th>Public Institutions</th>
<th>Private Institutions</th>
<th>Football Subdivision</th>
<th>Bowl Subdivision</th>
<th>Football Subdivision</th>
<th>Championship</th>
<th>Division I (Non-Football)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball (300)</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>30th-40th</td>
<td>20th-30th</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball (350)</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>10th-20th</td>
<td>1st-10th</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country (315)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>90th-100th</td>
<td>90th-100th</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football (249)</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>10th-20th</td>
<td>1st-10th</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes data representing three or fewer student-athletes. In accordance with FERPA's interpretation of federal privacy regulations, institutions should not disclose statistical data contained in this report in cells made up of three or fewer students without student consent.

N/A = No APR or not applicable.

N = Number of teams represented.

1 Denotes APR that does not subject the team to ineligibility for postseason competition based on institutional, athletics and student resources and the team's Graduation Success Rate.

2 Denotes APR that does not subject the team to ineligibility for postseason competition due to the team's demonstrated academic improvement.

3 Denotes APR that does not subject the team to ineligibility for postseason competition due to the team's demonstrated academic improvement. The "upper confidence boundary" of a team's APR must be below 930 for that team to be subject to ineligibility for postseason competition. Squad-size adjustment does not apply to teams with four years of APR data and a multiyear cohort of 30 or more student-athletes.

4 Denotes APR that does not subject the team to penalties due to the team's demonstrated academic improvement. The "upper confidence boundary" of a team's APR must be below 930 for that team to be subject to penalties. The squad-size adjustment does not apply to teams with four years of APR data and a multiyear cohort of 30 or more student-athletes.

5 Denotes APR based on a one year cohort, not subject to ineligibility for postseason competition and/or any penalties.

6 Denotes APR based on a two year cohort, not subject to ineligibility for postseason competition and/or any penalties.

7 Denotes that team is not subject to ineligibility for postseason competition and/or penalties based on institutional resources.

8 Denotes that team's APR data is under review.

9 Denotes that team's APR data is under review.
# 2013 - 2014 NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate

**Public Report**

**Institution:** Texas Christian University  
**Date of Report:** 05/26/2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport (N)</th>
<th>Multiyear APR</th>
<th>2013-2014 APR</th>
<th>Percentile Rank within Sport</th>
<th>Percentile Rank within Sports</th>
<th>All Division I</th>
<th>Public Institutions</th>
<th>Private Institutions</th>
<th>Football Subdivision</th>
<th>Bowl I Subdivision</th>
<th>Football Championship</th>
<th>Division I (Non-Football)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fencing (18)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf (302)</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>60th-70th</td>
<td>70th-80th</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics (15)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey (59)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse (67)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing (11)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer (203)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming (135)</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>70th-80th</td>
<td>70th-80th</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis (261)</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>50th-60th</td>
<td>50th-60th</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track, Indoor</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>20th-30th</td>
<td>10th-20th</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(259)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track, Outdoor</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>20th-30th</td>
<td>10th-20th</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(280)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball (22)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Polo (22)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling (77)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Denotes data representing three or fewer student-athletes. In accordance with FERPA's interpretation of federal privacy regulations, institutions should not disclose statistical data contained in this report in cells made up of three or fewer students without student consent.

N/A = No APR or not applicable.

N = Number of teams represented.

1 Denotes APR that does not subject the team to ineligibility for postseason competition based on institutional, athletics and student resources and the team's Graduation Success Rate.

2 Denotes APR that does not subject the team to ineligibility for postseason competition due to the team's demonstrated academic improvement.

3 Denotes APR that does not subject the team to ineligibility for postseason competition due to the team's demonstrated academic improvement. The "upper confidence boundary" of a team's APR must be below 930 for that team to be subject to ineligibility for postseason competition. Squad-size adjustment does not apply to teams with four years of APR data and a multiyear cohort of 30 or more student-athletes.

4 Denotes APR that does not subject the team to penalties due to the team's demonstrated academic improvement.

5 Denotes APR that does not subject the team to penalties due to the squad-size adjustment. The "upper confidence boundary" of a team's APR must be below 930 for that team to be subject to penalties. The squad-size adjustment does not apply to teams with four years of APR data and a multiyear cohort of 30 or more student-athletes.

6 Denotes APR based on a one year cohort, not subject to ineligibility for postseason competition and/or any penalties.

7 Denotes APR based on a two year cohort, not subject to ineligibility for post-season competition and/or any penalties.

8 Denotes that team is not subject to ineligibility for postseason competition and/or penalties based on institutional resources.

9 Denotes that team's APR data is under review.
# 2013 - 2014 NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate Public Report

## Institution: Texas Christian University

## Date of Report: 05/26/2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport (N)</th>
<th>Multiyear APR</th>
<th>2013-2014 APR</th>
<th>Percentile Rank within Sport</th>
<th>Percentile Rank within All</th>
<th>All Division I</th>
<th>Public Institutions</th>
<th>Private Institutions</th>
<th>Football Subdivision</th>
<th>Bowl Subdivision</th>
<th>Football Championship Subdivision</th>
<th>Division I (Non-Football)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball (348)</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>1st-10th</td>
<td>10th-20th</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling (32)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country (346)</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>20th-30th</td>
<td>40th-50th</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing (22)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey (78)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf (263)</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>40th-50th</td>
<td>60th-70th</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics (61)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey (35)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse (103)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing (87)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing (12)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer (329)</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>40th-50th</td>
<td>50th-60th</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball (293)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming (197)</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>10th-20th</td>
<td>30th-40th</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis (322)</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>30th-40th</td>
<td>50th-60th</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes data representing three or fewer student-athletes. In accordance with FERPA's interpretation of federal privacy regulations, institutions should not disclose statistical data contained in this report in cells made up of three or fewer students without student consent.

N/A = No APR or not applicable.

N = Number of teams represented.

1 Denotes APR that does not subject the team to ineligibility for postseason competition based on institutional, athletics and student resources and the team's Graduation Success Rate.

2 Denotes APR that does not subject the team to ineligibility for postseason competition due to the team's demonstrated academic improvement.

3 Denotes APR that does not subject the team to ineligibility for postseason competition due to the squad-size adjustment. The "upper confidence boundary" of a team's APR must be below 930 for that team to be subject to ineligibility for postseason competition. Squad-size adjustment does not apply to teams with four years of APR data and a multiyear cohort of 30 or more student-athletes.

4 Denotes APR that does not subject the team to penalties due to the team's demonstrated academic improvement.

5 Denotes APR that does not subject the team to penalties due to the squad-size adjustment. The "upper confidence boundary" of a team's APR must be below 930 for that team to be subject to penalties. The squad-size adjustment does not apply to teams with four years of APR data and a multiyear cohort of 30 or more student-athletes.

6 Denotes APR based on a one year cohort, not subject to ineligibility for postseason competition and/or any penalties.

7 Denotes APR based on a two year cohort, not subject to ineligibility for postseason competition and/or any penalties.

8 Denotes that team is not subject to ineligibility for postseason competition and/or penalties based on institutional resources.

9 Denotes that team's APR data is under review.
### 2013 - 2014 NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate

**Public Report**

#### Institution: Texas Christian University

#### Date of Report: 05/26/2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport (N)</th>
<th>Multyear APR</th>
<th>2013-2014 APR</th>
<th>Percentile Rank within Sport</th>
<th>Percentile Rank within Sports</th>
<th>All Division I</th>
<th>Public Institutions</th>
<th>Private Institutions</th>
<th>Football Subdivision</th>
<th>Bowl Subdivision</th>
<th>Football Championship Subdivision</th>
<th>Division I (Non-Football)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track, Indoor</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>20th-30th</td>
<td>30th-40th</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track, Outdoor</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>20th-30th</td>
<td>30th-40th</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball (333)</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>30th-40th</td>
<td>40th-50th</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Polo (32)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Rifle (22)        | 1000         | 1000           | 90th-100th                 | 90th-100th                  | 980            | 978                  | 1000                 | 979                  | 981              | NA                               |

* Denotes data representing three or fewer student-athletes. In accordance with FERPA's interpretation of federal privacy regulations, institutions should not disclose statistical data contained in this report in cells made up of three or fewer students without student consent.

N/A = No APR or not applicable.

N = Number of teams represented.

1 Denotes APR that does not subject the team to ineligibility for postseason competition based on institutional, athletics and student resources and the team's Graduation Success Rate.

2 Denotes APR that does not subject the team to ineligibility for postseason competition due to the team's demonstrated academic improvement.

3 Denotes APR that does not subject the team to ineligibility for postseason competition due to the squad-size adjustment. The "upper confidence boundary" of a team's APR must be below 930 for that team to be subject to ineligibility for postseason competition. Squad-size adjustment does not apply to teams with four years of APR data and a multiyear cohort of 30 or more student-athletes.

4 Denotes APR that does not subject the team to penalties due to the team's demonstrated academic improvement.

5 Denotes APR that does not subject the team to penalties due to the squad-size adjustment. The "upper confidence boundary" of a team's APR must be below 930 for that team to be subject to penalties. The squad-size adjustment does not apply to teams with four years of APR data and a multiyear cohort of 30 or more student-athletes.

6 Denotes APR based on a one year cohort, not subject to ineligibility for postseason competition and/or any penalties.

7 Denotes APR based on a two year cohort, not subject to ineligibility for postseason competition and/or any penalties.

8 Denotes that team is not subject to ineligibility for postseason competition and/or penalties based on institutional resources.

9 Denotes that team's APR data is under review.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA Ranking</th>
<th>CFP Ranking</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>GSR</th>
<th>Male Overall Federal Grad Rate</th>
<th>Football Federal Grad Rate</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Score without Bonus</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>TCU</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>78.40520658</td>
<td>81.40520658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65.43196153</td>
<td>77.43196153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>76.65163048</td>
<td>76.65163048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>68.41074588</td>
<td>75.41074588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Arizona State</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58.33470865</td>
<td>67.33470865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.88787343</td>
<td>64.88787343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63.85645307</td>
<td>63.85645307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kansas State</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62.65163048</td>
<td>62.65163048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.82261281</td>
<td>60.82261281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59.85645307</td>
<td>59.85645307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mississippi State</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57.49630169</td>
<td>57.49630169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56.01920223</td>
<td>56.01920223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55.19890113</td>
<td>55.19890113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Baylor</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49.43196153</td>
<td>50.43196153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41.96745547</td>
<td>49.96745547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>LSU</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49.88787343</td>
<td>49.88787343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Michigan State*</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42.01434305</td>
<td>48.01434305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.50675846</td>
<td>45.50675846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.52647576</td>
<td>43.52647576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Florida State</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39.49478663</td>
<td>41.49478663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Boise State</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>28.74371261</td>
<td>28.74371261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ole Miss</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.52647576</td>
<td>23.52647576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>USC</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-1.437733772</td>
<td>10.56226623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>