

Journal of Issues in **Intercollegiate Athletics**

High Impact Educational Practices and the Student Athlete Experience: The Implementation and Barriers of HIPs in the Student Athlete Support Setting

Farah J. Ishaq

State University of New York College at Cortland

Jordan Bass

University of Kansas

The purpose of this study was to examine the implementation of higher education high impact practices (HIPs) in the student athlete academic setting and the barriers to their implementation on the administrative and student athlete level according to student athlete support services staff. High impact educational practices are a set of ten practices, including internships, undergraduate research, global learning, and learning communities, to name a few, that illustrate beneficial outcomes for diverse student populations. The researchers also determined how athletic academic staff were involved in the process and explored how higher education theory was utilized within student athlete academics. Through semi-structured, phenomenological interviews with 11 student athlete support staff members from six Division I NCAA institutions, the researchers were able to further understand high-impact educational practices as a phenomenon in the student athlete setting. Barriers to implementation that were discovered included university control of HIPs, differences in attitudes between coaches and academic staff, lack of funding or resources, and student athlete time commitment. Administrators, both in athletics and on campus, can learn to establish relationships for their students on campus and create a comfortable climate and connection between athletics academics and on-campus resources.

If we examine academics as a separate entity away from intercollegiate athletics, certain high-impact educational practices (HIPs) have been identified as effective in providing positive educational results for students from diverse backgrounds across several institutions (Kuh, 2008). High-impact educational practices consist of the following ten practices: (1) First-Year Seminars and Experiences, (2) Common Intellectual Experiences, (3) Learning Communities, (4) Writing-Intensive Courses, (5) Collaborative Assignments and Projects, (6) Undergraduate Research, (7) Diversity/Global Learning, (8) Service Learning, Community-Based Learning, (9) Internships, and (10) Capstone Courses and Projects (Kuh, 2008). According to Kuh (2008), “Deep approaches to learning are important because students who use these approaches tend to earn higher grades and retain, integrate, and transfer information at higher rates” (p. 14). Overall, students who attribute such behaviors typically are more engaged within the high-impact practice offerings at the institution (Kuh, 2008).

Although the overall impact on each individual student may vary, Kuh (2008) posits that high-impact educational practices are particularly effective because a significant amount of time and effort is required, the practices demand faculty and peer interactions, students are more exposed to diversity, students receive frequent feedback on performance, and the practices are able to be applied in diverse settings (Kuh, 2008). Whereas Kuh (2008) recommends participation in at least two of these high-impact practices throughout the students’ academic career, these practices must be done well in order to provide positive outcomes. This includes building up the practices and ensuring students are able to participate in these opportunities – at least one available to every student every year (Kuh, 2008). The primary contributors to effective utilization of these practices are university faculty. According to Kuh (2008),

What faculty think and value does not necessarily impel students to take part in high-impact activities or engage in other educationally purposeful practices. Rather, when large numbers of faculty and staff at an institution endorse the worth of an activity, members of the campus community are more likely to agree to devote their own time and energy to it, as well as provide other resources to support it—all of which increases the likelihood that the activities will be available to large numbers of students and that the campus culture will encourage student participation in the activities (p. 22).

Past research has found high-impact educational practices to be beneficial to students from a wide-array of backgrounds (Kuh, 2008; Kilgo, Sheets, & Pascarella, 2014; Soria & Johnson, 2017). These HIPs lead to greater student engagement and outcomes, while opening pathways to critical thinking, cognition, intercultural effectiveness, and overall student success (Kilgo et al., 2014). Past studies have shown the effectiveness of these practices; however, barriers to the implementation of such practices within the student athlete academic setting has not been explored.

Several studies have illustrated the overall importance of participation in intercollegiate athletics as a way to increase academic success, involvement, engagement, and retention for the student athletes (Duggan & Pickering, 2008; Gayles & Hu, 2009; LeCrom, Warren, Clark, Marolla, & Gerber, 2009; Comeaux, Speer, Taustine, & Harrison, 2011; Evans, Werdine, & Seifried, 2017; Huml, Svensson, & Hancock, 2017). Furthermore, Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) have suggested that participation in these types of engagement practices for first-year student athletes can create similar benefits as seen with non-athlete students. Similarly, overall engagement in high impact educational practices has been found to create a positive impact on college outcomes for student athletes (Gatson-Gayles & Hu, 2009; Umbach, Palmer, Kuh, & Hannah, 2006). However, situations may exist in which, “negative stereotypes toward student-

athletes may in fact hinder the quality of their engagement in educationally purposeful activities” (Comeaux, Speer, Taustine, & Harrison, 2011, p. 47) while also making it difficult to establish positive relationships with the campus community.

Furthermore, recommendations have been established to consider interventions that are acclimatized to the specific environments and student in which they are serving (Patton, Renn, Guido, & Quaye, 2016). Therefore, the study of higher education interventions, or in this case, high impact practices, must still be studied in a way that would be most effective for implementation within the student athlete environment. Although the outcomes of intercollegiate athletics participation have been studied, educators, or more specifically student athlete support staff, must strive to identify barriers to the implementation of high impact educational practices, while encouraging administration, coaching staffs, and individuals across athletic departments to apply a theory-to-practice connection using these HIPs (Comeaux et al., 2011; Patton et al., 2016). As academic literature has continued to examine the relationship between higher education and intercollegiate athletics, this area of study has become particularly important due to the continued negative media attention related to academic fraud and scandals at National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) level institutions and their athletic departments, including the University of Missouri, University of Notre Dame, and University of North Carolina (Associated Press, 2016; Palmer, 2016; Tracy, 2017). Whereas constant media attention was placed on these programs during the time of scandal, little media attention is placed on strong academic performances and practices that are or can be implemented in the student athlete environment.

Although high impact educational practices may be available outside the provided athletic academic support services, student athletes and athletic administration provide unique barriers to the implementation of such high-impact educational practices. The researchers helped fill the gap within the literature by determining how these practices can be applied effectively within the student athlete setting. The purpose of this study was to examine the implementation of higher education high impact practices in the student athlete academic setting and the barriers to their implementation on the administrative and student athlete level according to student athlete support services staff. These high-impacts practices have been widely tested and have contributed to positive outcomes for students of a variety of backgrounds. Moreover, the implementation of such active learning practices has allowed institutions to evaluate practices that contribute to students’ collective learning (Kuh, 2008). However, according to Kuh (2008), "utilization of active learning practices is unsystematic, to the detriment of student learning" (p. 9). The researchers also aimed to identify barriers to their implementation at the administrative and student athlete level, how academic advisors are involved in the process, and how higher education theory is utilized within student athlete academics.

Intercollegiate athletics continues to play a significant role in the overall culture of U.S. higher education. Furthermore, intercollegiate athletic programs play a significant role in establishing universities as organizations through the generation of necessary resources that would otherwise not be available to them. This is important to note within the context of this study because Beyer and Hannah (2000) illustrate, “the danger of this situation is that athletic programs will lose their educational focus and become just another form of big business” (p. 118). Unfortunately, if this becomes the case, overall student athlete support services could be affected, resulting in greater need to utilize on-campus resources and academic personnel at the institutions.

Literature Review

I-E-O Model and the College Environment

Academic literature has identified the impact college has on student outcomes, including the impact on life-styles, behaviors, personalities, values, types of institutions and programs (Astin, 1993; Pascarella, & Terenzini, 2005; Seifer, Gilling, Hanson, Pascarella, & Blaich, 2014). The Input-Environment-Output, or I-E-O, model was developed by Astin (1993) in an effort to assess the overall impact the college environment has on determining whether students change or grow under unique environmental conditions. Furthermore, this model is of importance as it, “provides educators, students, and policy makers with a better basis of knowing how to achieve desired educational outcomes” (Astin, 1993, p. 7). In order to understand the I-E-O model, it is important to illustrate the differences in each stage of the model. Inputs are described as initial individualities present within the students prior to their entry into the institution. Environments comprise of the programs or people that the students are exposed to while at the institution, including “policies, faculty, peers, and educational experiences”, and, lastly, outcomes are the characteristics that emerge for the students after they have been exposed to the environment (Astin, 1993, p. 7). Specifically, high-impact or educationally purposeful practices fall within the environment stage of this model.

Due to its role on student retention, it is vital to study the college environment within the I-E-O model. Past research has indicated that students enter college with multifaceted individual characteristics in which they input into their college experience. As students begin to develop an interface within their unique institutional environments, “psychological processes take place that...result in positive self-efficacy, reduced stress, increased efficacy, and internal locus of control. Each of these processes increased a student’s scholarly motivation. These internal processes are reciprocal and iterative with continuous feedback and adjustment” (Bean & Eaton, 2000, p. 58). Internal aspects play a critical role for positive student outcomes for students from different genders diverse cultures that perceive the world differently. Psychological processes combined with the initial characteristics affected by institutional environment, allow students to react to new academic and social interactions. These academic and social interactions must be positive in order for the, “students [to] begin to perceive that they are in control of their academic and social destiny and be motivated to take action consistent with perception. The result of these intermediate attitudes and behavioral choices are the intermediate outcomes of social and academic integration and, hopefully, academic success” (Bean & Eaton, 2000, p. 58).

Specifically, certain factors contribute to overall student-athlete retention and academic success as well. Factors including scholarship support, gender, and sport-type have been determined to be significant predictors of retention for student athletes (Le Crom, Warren, Clark, Marolla, & Gerber, 2009). Furthermore, relationships established outside of teammates, including faculty and peers, have been shown to be directly related to academic success (Comeaux & Harrison, 2011). Similarly, interorganizational relationships within student athlete academic centers help increase overall effectiveness of academic support services (Evans, Werdine, & Seifried, 2017). Adler and Adler (1985) suggest additional academic support through role models and advisors outside of athletics to avoid the “athletic personnel masquerade[ing] as academic advisors” (p. 249). While positive engagements within the college environment provides a strong predictor for student retention, it is important to further investigate specific high-impact educational practices and how they apply within the student athlete setting.

High-Impact Educational Practices

Overall, high-impact educational practices take unique forms based on the characteristics, priorities, and contexts of the universities utilizing such practices (Kuh, 2008). While these practices have been widely tested and have illustrated beneficial outcomes for diverse college students, the practices remain unsystematic at the institutional level (Kuh, 2008). For the following practices, educational research has suggested an increase in student retention and student engagement upon implementation and participation (Kuh, 2008). As previously mentioned, these high-impact educational practices include: (1) first-year seminars and experiences, (2) common intellectual experiences, (3) learning communities, (4) writing-intensive courses, (5) collaborative assignments and projects, (6) undergraduate research, (7) diversity/global learning, (8) service learning, community-based learning, (9) internships, and (10) capstone courses and projects. Table 1 provides a brief overview of each practice exerted from Kuh (2008).

Involvement, Engagement, Integration and High-Impact Educational Practices

When establishing best educational practices, involvement, engagement, and integration all provide substantial opportunities to enhance institutional environment and educational outcomes; however, there are several critiques and issues related to race, ethnicity and beyond when studying these aspects.

Involvement, engagement, and integration all differ in their definitions and how they are measured. Involvement is the psychological and physical energy that is exerted and devoted by a student within their academic or social experiences (Astin, 2003). In this case, involvement is measured by both time and energy as well as the quality and quantity that is exerted (Astin, 2003). Engagement involves more of a collaborative effort and involves both what the student does and what the institution does in creating and fostering educationally purposeful activities (Kuh, 2009). The National Survey of Student Engagement (2001) captures several levels of engagement through their five provided benchmarks of effective educational practice including academic challenge, active and collaborative learning, student-faculty interaction, enriching educational experiences, and supportive campus environment. Tinto (1997) defines integration as the sharing of attitudes and beliefs among the students and their peers and faculty. Additionally, the institutional rules and policies of the institutions are shared within the student themselves as well. It is important to note that integration is not only found on the academic level, but also on the social level as well. Integration is a vital aspect for institutions to understand because it is predictive of voluntary departure from the institution (Tinto, 1997). When establishing best educational practices, involvement, engagement, and integration all provide substantial opportunities to enhance institutional environment and, ultimately, outcomes.

In-class learning and out-of-class learning. Learning in college takes place both in-class and out-of-class. Seifert, Gillig, Hanson, Pascarella, & Blaich (2014) noted a list of principles of good practice in undergraduate education. These principles include student faculty contact, cooperation among students, active learning, prompt feedback to students, time on task, high expectation, and a respect for diverse students and diverse ways of knowing have been significantly and positively, “linked to desired aspects of cognitive growth during college” (Pascarella et al., 2006, p. 254).

Educational programing that helps supplement and empower students through enriching their overall academic experience are known as high impact practices because of their positive effect on cumulative student learning and overall development throughout their higher education careers (McCormick, Gonyea, & Kinzie, 2013). These high impact practices, such as learning communities, service learning, research with a faculty member, study abroad, internship, and culminating senior experiences, and

help provide these enriching educational opportunities (McCormick, Gonyea, & Kinzie, 2013). According to NSSE (2013), although considerable time and effort is required to participate in several of these educational opportunities, the overall interaction and engagement provided through these opportunities can be often described by students as life changing.

Student Athlete Academics

Past research has illustrated the positive outcomes associated with high impact educational practices; however, college student athletes still exhibit unique characteristics and experiences associated with their overall academic experience at universities. The academic expectations of student athletes primarily begin with a set of optimism and idealism about the idea of graduating and achieving high academic performance (Adler & Adler, 1985). As student athletes enter the college environment, purposeful engagement, or in this case, high impact educational practices, begin to illustrate similar roles as with their non-athlete student peers. According to Comeaux et al. (2011), engagement in educational purposeful activities, like developing relationships with nonathletes and communicating regularly with professors, by student athletes contribute to overall positive impact on college outcomes similar to their non-athlete peers. Furthermore, Gayles and Hu (2009) expand on this idea by illustrating the importance of interaction with non-athlete peers as a way to promote communication skills, learning skills, and even cultural attitudes.

Fortunately, literature has continued to establish engagement as a powerful source of positive college outcomes for both student athletes and non-athlete students (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Gayes & Hu, 2009). Particularly, past research has suggested, “student athletes regardless of race/ethnicity, academic major, and profile level of sport participation are equally as likely to engage in educationally purposeful activities and should be encouraged to do so” (Gayles & Hu, 2009, p. 329-330). Even with higher levels of athletic identity, student athletes are still not less likely to participate and engage in educationally purposeful activities outside of the classroom, particularly community service. Interestingly, athletic identity also did not show any significant differences in academic performance (Huml, Hancock, & Hums, 2019). Whereas this is the case, it is important to note that scholarship support alone in the student athlete setting is not enough to contribute to overall retention (LeCrom et al., 2009). This leads the researchers to believe that additional student athlete support is necessary to help drive overall student athlete success and retention.

One commonality in research is the continued importance of student athlete support services, athletics academic centers, and athletics academic personnel in encouraging and promoting participation in these educational purposeful activities and high impact practices (Rubin & Moses, 2017; Burns, Jasinski, Dunn, & Fletcher, 2013; Huml, Hancock, & Bergman, 2014; Berg & Warner, 2019; Evan et al., 2017)

Student Athlete Support Services

Intercollegiate athletics programs spend a significant amount of resources to provide additional personnel support relative to their non-athlete student peers (Huml et al., 2017). Specifically, personnel including academic advisors, tutors, and coaches all contribute to the student athlete academic experience; however, this additional support extends greater than the staff available for the general student population and, ultimately, results in a sense of dependence on resources prevalent within their respective athletic departments versus utilizing outside resources for their academic development (Huml et al., 2017).

Although a greater dependence on athletic department staff is imminent, staff housed within athletic academic centers on campus play a vital role in the development of their student athletes. For example, past research has noted the importance of academic centers as “an integral role in building a positive team academic subculture” where, “student-athletes prefer to study...with reduc[ed] outside distractions” (Rubin

& Moses, 2017, p. 326). Furthermore, career decision making self-efficacy, which refers to how confident a student athlete might be in their overall career decision making process, was higher for those student athletes that were more satisfied in their department's academic support services (Burns et al., 2013). Whereas academic centers provide the necessary space for student athletes, issues continue to surround the idea of access to university opportunities, particularly high impact educational practices. Specifically, non-athlete students indicated a greater access to university opportunities versus their student-athlete peers (Weight, Navarro, Huffman, & Smith-Ryan, 2014).

Lack of access combined with the growing concern of hostile campus climates and isolation of student athletes from other areas of campus can have an adverse effect on the overall participation in educationally purposeful activities outside of their respective athletic departments (Adler & Adler, 1991; Comeaux et al., 2011; Huml et al., 2014). This raises an area of concern, indicating a need for further support and promotion of educationally purposeful activities within the student athlete setting. This is where the importance of the role of athletic support staff in this study comes into play and should be further explored.

The Role of Athletic Support Staff

Literature on student athlete support has continued to demonstrate the vital role of athletic staff to provide further direction and promotion of high impact educational practices or other educationally purposeful activities. It all begins with the need to understand the diverse group of student athlete demographics and needs on campus. Comeaux and Harrison (2011) indicate, "because student-athletes enter college with varying attributes and lived experiences, student affairs leaders might...work closely with these students to scrupulously understand their cultural backgrounds and to identify factors that might impede or facilitate their learning and personal development" (p. 242). As student athletes grow academically and socially within their college environments, student athletes begin to view staff members in the athletic department and their sport organizations as a part of their family, particularly filling a void from the comforts of home and their past traditional support systems. Many times, athletic advisors are the first step in any issues the student athletes encounter (Huml et al., 2014; Berg & Warner, 2019).

Building upon this phenomenon, athletic academic staff and coaches are put in a unique position to assist student athletes in creating positive learning environments, strengthening their connection or relationships with resources, faculty and staff across campus, and increasing overall academic accountability (Comeaux et al., 2011; Rubin & Moses, 2017). Of most importance, is committing student athletes to engage in high impact educational practices and maximizing meaningful relationships outside of athletics in an effort to obtain "positive gains in general academic self-concept for student-athletes" and "gains in learning" (Comeaux et al., 2011, p. 48), ultimately leading to greater graduation and retention rates among student athletes (Rubin & Moses, 2017).

Student athletes have often indicated overall satisfaction with their academic support, athletic advisors, and educational opportunities; however, athletic academic support staff must continue to promote and "assess program delivery models to ensure student-athletes are able to purposefully engage not only in athletics and educational endeavors, but also as holistic human beings" and "are not just becoming involved, but actively engaging in meaningful activities throughout the higher education experience" (Weight et al., 2014, p. 400-401).

By understanding the significance of high impact educational practices and their impact on overall positive student outcomes, it is important to connect these practices specifically within the student athlete setting. Particularly, Patton et al. (2016) suggests interventions be attuned to specific environments, while

also encouraging a theory-to-practice connection. In order to help exemplify the purpose of the study, the following research questions were proposed:

- 1) How are high impact educational practices be implemented into the student athlete academic setting?
- 2) According to student athlete academic support staff, what administrative barriers exist in the implementation of high impact educational practices into the student athlete academic setting?
- 3) According to student athlete academic support staff, what student athlete barriers exist in the implementation of high impact educational practices into the student athlete academic setting?

Methods

Participants

The research utilized a phenomenological approach in order to “seek to explore, describe, and analyze the meaning of individual lived experience” (Marshall & Rossman, 2016, p. 17). In this particular study, athletic academic staff explained high-impact educational practices as a phenomenon in the student athlete setting. Semi-structured, phenomenological interviews were conducted with 11 athletic academic advisors or athletic directors in academics and student support across six NCAA Division I institutions in the Midwest and South. Semi-structured structured interviews were utilized for data collection because this method provides an advantage in assessing the original questions asked within the study, but also allows the researchers to dig deeper through unexpected findings and data that are likely to transpire throughout the individual’s interview process (Gillham, 2000). All interviews were conducted over telecommunications after initially contacting athletic directors to request access to academic advisors for the purpose of this study. An interview guide was used in the process to help direct the conversation toward the topics and issues the researchers are interested in (Johnson & Christensen, 2008). Each interview included 15 questions related to high-impact educational practices and the barriers to implementation and lasted 30-40 minutes. Example prompts are included in Appendix A.

A convenience sampling was utilized based on the responses received by the institution’s administration. The universities ranged from large, public universities to smaller, private institutions in order to ensure a more diverse understanding of the utilization of high-impact educational practices in the student athlete academic setting. NCAA Division I institutions were used due to the significant amount of resources presented within student athlete support services and the access for the researchers. This study obtained approval through the researchers’ university Institutional Review Board.

Procedures

According to Guillemin and Gillam (2004), developing a sound proposal involves not only providing a cogent and persuasive argument, but must also demonstrate sensitivity to everyday ethical issues. While “the principles of ethical management of role, access, data collection, storage, and reporting serve as essential reminders” (Marshall & Rossman, 2016, p. 52), the researchers utilized the following procedures to help combat any ethical concerns. Besides the oral consent form, the researchers strongly emphasized that participation in the study is voluntary via email. The participants had the option to end the interview at any point in time.

Once the participants completed the interviews, the audio files were uploaded to a password protected computer and deleted once the transcription process and open coding process occurred and the

study has concluded. If requested, a report (with no individual identifying information) of the relevant findings will be compiled and sent to the participants at their request. Subjects were given the option to withdraw at any time. The researchers are the only one who has access to this information. Once the interviews were transcribed, the transcriptions were also kept on the same password protected computer. After the study has been completed, the data will be destroyed. The researchers utilized pseudonyms for specific personal identifying information. Because of these identifiers, the interview recordings and physical transcriptions were kept on a password locked computer. The researchers used pseudonyms in the transcription process for direct identifiers such as a name. Email was also utilized to recruit participants and if the participants express interest in seeing our results. With that said, the researchers did not control what was said during the interview. Because the researchers utilized semi-structured interviews, the participants were allowed to speak freely regarding the topic. The open-ended questions allowed participants to form answers based on previous experience and personal thoughts. The researchers used open-coding to analyze the interviews after data saturation occurred. Confidentiality was maintained because the researchers were the only ones who have access to the interview recordings and transcribed data. It is possible, however, with Internet communications, that through intent or accident someone other than the intended recipient may see the responses. However, the researchers did everything in his power to prevent this from occurring.

Trustworthiness

According to Marshall and Rossman (2016), “articulating the elements of sound design for trustworthiness has been critical for the development of qualitative methodologies” (p. 44). Fortunately, Lincoln and Guba (1985) address central questions that help determine trust and capture concerns of validity, reliability, objectivity, and generalizability. Addressing central concerns helps researchers stray away from just calling themselves reliable, but rather, researchers move to, “distinguish[ing] the traits that make use personally ‘credible’ and ensure that our interpretations of the data are ‘trustworthy’” (Marshall & Rossman, 2016, p. 44). Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) procedures to help ensure standards of trustworthiness and were used in this study include: being in the setting for a long period of time (prolonged engagement), sharing data and interpretations with participants (member checking), and discussing emergent findings with colleagues (peer debriefing).

In order to account for validity, the researchers followed strategies presented by Marshall and Rossman (2016) including, searching for alternate explanations, searching for discrepant evidence and negative cases, triangulation, soliciting feedback, member checks, rich data, and comparison. While the researchers recognize research bias may be present, these Marshall and Rossman’s (2016) strategies also help minimize such occurrences. Furthermore, Morse, Barrett, Mayan, Olson, and Spiers (2002) present five verification strategies for research that add to Marshall and Rossman’s (2012) strategies, including having an appropriate sample and thinking theoretically. According to Morse and Richards (2002), it is important to maintain validity and reliability as a primary goal within qualitative research.

Analysis

The results were analyzed by the researchers using the interview transcriptions of the audio interviews. As results will be originally presented in audio format, transcription is necessary. The open-ended survey responses were analyzed using open coding to identify emergent themes. Both deductive and inductive reasoning were used during open coding analysis (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Responses were coded independently by the researchers based on priori themes from existing literature and theoretical frameworks. Furthermore, postpiori themes were developed through observation of prompt responses.

Once themes were analyzed, representative quotes were chosen to display appropriate justification for themes and results. These representative quotes were presented verbatim using pseudonyms selected by the researchers and applied to discussion and previous literature. Table 2 illustrates an example of the data coding process.

The researchers acknowledge personal interest in the research subject matter and brings background knowledge on the issue. The researchers have a prolonged engagement in student athlete support services at a large, Division I university. Prolonged engagement combined with the personal interest in the examination of this context and setting provides ample opportunity for the researchers to relate to participants in an effort to dig deeper throughout the process.

Results and Discussion

The analysis of the qualitative data led to the emergence of several themes relating to the implementation of high impact educational practices in the student athlete setting along with possible barriers that exist. These themes included university control of implementation of HIPs, differences in attitudes of coaches versus athletic directors, lack of funding or resources, and athletics-campus relationships. The following discussion will take a deeper look into the student responses through the summary of results and representative quotes in order to truly understand the use of high impact educational practices in the student athlete setting as well as identify barriers to their implementation due to the unique environment present within athletics academics. The use of high impact educational practices was well defined within the interpretation of the qualitative data collected. Past literature has suggested the importance of the programs within the college environment and the positive outcomes associated with HIPs, however, little has been applied to the student athlete setting barriers that exist (Bean & Eaton, 2000; Kuh, 2008). While the implementation of HIPs in the student athlete setting have been illustrated, themes regarding the barriers to implementation on both the administrative and student-athlete side will be discussed.

Implementation of High Impact Educational Practices

The analysis of the semi-structured interview data regarding administrative barriers led to the identification of themes relating to university control of HIPs, differences in attitudes, lack of resources, and athletics-campus relationships. Past literature primarily suggests that the HIPs garner positive outcomes with appropriate implementations and offerings for the students (Kuh, 2008; Kilgo, Sheets, & Pascarella, 2014; Soria & Johnson, 2017); however, these results attempted to apply such practices within the student athlete setting and determine what barriers exist to their implementation. The following discussion will take a deeper look into the athletics academic staff responses through the summary of results and representative quotes in order to help understand themes from the implementation of HIPs and what barriers exist in the implementation of HIPs on both the administrative and student athlete side. This will lead to further implications for athletics academic staff in optimizing the HIPs that are available for student athletes and working with both athletics staff and campus administration to increase overall access to their students by helping limit barriers to implementation.

Administrative Barriers to Implementation of HIPs

University control of implementation of HIPs. Through the exploration and analysis of the semi-structured interview data, it became clear that several HIPs were controlled through the university without

taking into account academic programming from athletics. For example, in reference to first year experiences, an athletic director stated the following:

The university does now have one for international students. So, you have a college one, you have—if you're international you're in that one and if you're an athlete you're in ours, so those are three of them that somebody's requiring you to be in. Two of them are mandated by the University. Ours would be mandated by athletics if you are an athlete to do that.

According to Kuh (2008), institutions at least offer some programming that qualifies as each of the HIPs described within the study; however, “at too many institutions, only small numbers of students are involved. The time has come for colleges and universities to make participating in high-impact activities a reality—and a priority—for every student” (p. 43). With university control over a significant number of HIPs, their understanding of athletics academics and the programming occurring within that environment is essential. One institution, for example, had to go through the university for approval of first year programming courses for the student athletes. The athletic director stated, “We probably started our first-year experience course that’s offered in the Fall. We have four sections of it and we had to work hard to just get it accepted by the university.” The athletic director helps illustrate the power of the universities as facilitators of HIPs with continued opportunity to, “foster students’ development of leadership and multicultural competence” (Soria & Johnson, 2017, p. 112).

Participants noted practices like learning communities and writing intensive courses as “totally driven by the university,” while others “require every freshman to take an entry level university studies class through their program.” Interestingly, some internship programming is done within the athletic program itself, but many athletic academic staff rely on specific programs or departments on campus for student athlete internship opportunities. For example, at one institution, some majors, “like sport management [and] exercise science, is a required piece of your major, so that becomes a part of it. For other majors that don’t require the internship, it is maybe not talked about as much.” Ultimately, collegiate athletic departments do not have control over many HIPs; however, they can still work as advocates to the implementation of such programming and work on providing the appropriate resources necessary for their study athletes to be able to make participation in these practices possible as indicated by past research (Comeaux et al., 2011; Rubin & Moses, 2017).

However, it is likely that universities have concerns regarding athletics control over such programming due to controversies and scandals that have previously surrounded athletic departments. Particularly, with cases that have encompassed universities like University of Missouri, University of North Carolina, and University of Notre Dame, it is unlikely universities will extend control to athletic departments (Associated Press, 2016; Palmer, 2016; Tracy, 2017). These scandals combined with strong media attention on intercollegiate athletic department scandals make for difficult decisions across institutions in how they handle academic programming among athletic departments.

Differences in attitudes of coaches and academic staff. Through continued analysis of interview data, one theme that emerged involved the attitudes of coaching and academic staff when it comes to the implementation of HIPs. Unfortunately, it became clear that academic staff were much more concerned with the HIP opportunities than their coaches, who can ultimately have the final say on HIP participation. While the attitudes of the academic staff typically exhibit that of helpfulness and support, the coaching attitude became apparent. An athletic director noted this dynamic and said:

It's a really hard thing to do because these coaches want them training at all times and if the kids are going to do an eight-week overseas program in Spain, I'll be honest, I don't think many coaches are excited to hear that their kid's going to be not training for eight weeks.

Coaches can certainly contribute to overall lack of participation in HIPs, like study abroad, that require a time commitment. This can be especially difficult when, “90% of the time, student athletes approach me interested in study abroad opportunities” and student athletes begin to ask questions like, “So-and-so was able to do it, so why can't I?” Unfortunately, academic staff members are forced to rely on the coach's decision as illustrated by this statement from an athletic director:

You know, I want to tell them like, shit, do anything you want. If you want to you want to enrich your education go for it, but then I got to kind of bite my tongue and just, but I don't really bite my tongue, I would say, but you need to talk to coach about what they feel your summer obligations are.

Although academic staff is encouraged to promote HIPs available to the student athletes through various areas, it becomes difficult when there are conflicting attitudes on the opportunities and resources available to their students from an academic staff standpoint versus a coaching standpoint. This remains concerning as coaches are often seen as “quasi-family” to student athletes that have potential to help foster greater learning and engagement of high impact practices on campus (Berg & Warner, 2019, p. 101). Similar issues regarding the implementation of HIPs are discussed in the description of administrative and student athlete barriers that follow.

Lack of funding or resources. While the NCAA continues to net record revenues through television deals and championships, “In ten years, 48 athletic departments in college sports' wealthiest conferences saw earnings surge by nearly \$2 billion and spent it almost as quickly as it came in. Many programs still need student fees and school money to pay their bills” (Hobson & Rich, 2015, para. 7). However, only 24 FBS schools generated more money than was spent within their athletic programs (Burnsed, 2015). Unfortunately, when athletic departments are operating in the red, this trickles down to all sorts of programming, including academic resources. An athletic director noted:

We're cuts off the bone right now from our state funding and that's been pretty well documented by our Provost and our President or say, our Chancellor. Our appropriation should be around \$12 million, but we get somewhere around four or five [million].

When funding becomes an issue, the resources prevalent to be able to enforce and advocate for the implementation of HIPs can be limited, especially when additional staffing is involved. Unfortunately, some schools, for example, are unable to hire academic coordinators or study abroad coordinators, while some are more fortunate. An academic advisor described that, “I see a lot of financial barriers and getting resources. Being a Power 5 institution, we're fortunate enough to be able to afford the resources to have someone like a study abroad coordinator.” This, however, helps illustrate Kuh's (2008) point on the unsystematic implementation of HIPs across all campuses. When HIPs are unsystematic, it becomes very difficult to reap the positive outcomes associated with their implementation. Furthermore, Kuh (2008) notes that in order for HIPs to be successful, campus administrators and members of the campus community must understand that a devotion of time and energy, and more importantly, resources to support it are vital in an attempt to increase overall participation of HIPs and the associated programming. Similarly, the commitment from

student athlete support staff is also imperative to the overall positive learning environments and educationally purposeful activities for student athletes (Comeaux et al., 2011). This also plays a role in the overall relationships that are prevalent between the athletic departments and the campus administration.

Athletics-campus relationships. The relationship between athletics academics and the campus administration plays a vital role in determining whether or not HIPs are implemented in the student athlete setting. Kuh (2008) illustrates this importance of such a relationship by stating that university faculty are vital in the implementation of HIPs and must endorse the programming intended to create positive outcomes for the students. The implementation of HIPs requires time, energy, and resources in order to provide appropriate activities that will be available to as many students as possible and encourage their overall participation (Kuh, 2008). Ultimately, the college environment associated with the athletics-campus relationships help lead to positive psychological impacts for the students (Bean & Eaton, 2000), while creating a greater degree of involvement, integration, and engagement across the student body (Astin, 2003).

An athletic director helped illustrate this point and said, "It's been helpful here because I report to the Provost, so I give more of what we see as challenges with our student athletes and trying to be sure that they have all the experiences that the regular population has." Similar sentiments were expressed at another institution that stated, "We have a Connections Program where it's a mentorship program. We enlist the support of faculty and staff on a campus. Members of the community try to engage our student athletes on one-on-one. So, it may be an academic relationship." Similarly, an athletic director explained, "[We] have established really great relationships with people on campus as a whole. So, we're able to have meetings with them. They share what's going on. So, in that way, we can help promote it here."

However, this is certainly not always the case. With the increased amount of negative attention on academic scandals within the realm of collegiate athletics, campus administration is becoming more and more hesitant. This was described by an athletic director that said:

I think it is sorting out like how to collaborate between your main campus and your athletic department. And then like that everything that has happened like with North Carolina, and how some main campuses are very hesitant to want to collaborate with an athletic department. And because of the fact that there could be perceived that somehow, something gray or terrible is happening on, but that's not at all.

Even if the athletics-campus relationship is not as prevalent at an institution, athletics academic staff must continue to push their students to establish individual campus relationships as well as a key to success (Comeaux et al., 2011; Rubin & Moses, 2017). An athletic director noted that, "One of the key[s] to success in any college institution it's all about your relationship. Relationship you can have with your academic advisor, the relationship you have with your instructor. Anybody that can provide assistance to you on a campus." Ultimately, if appropriate measures are not taken to, "get the student athletes to the position where they develop these relationships," there can be difficulties in the implementation of HIPs through the disconnect between athletics and campus. While administrative barriers exist in this context, student athlete barriers also play a role in the overall implementation of HIPs in the athletics setting.

Student Athlete Barriers to Implementation of HIPs

Student athlete time commitment. One of the most mentioned barriers included the time commitment associated with being a student athlete. Although Kuh (2008) recommends participation in at

least two HIPs during the student's undergraduate program, the participation in such programming becomes much more difficult due to the role time plays in the overall academic environment of student athletes. Many participants stated that "the biggest obstacle for most student athletes when we're talking about programs like that is usually time;" however, some insisted that "not everything's possible, but there's more things I think that are possible for students to do that it's going to take a little time management to be able to understand when you can do it." Furthermore, one academic advisor stated, "there are creative ways for student athletes to get some of these experiences that don't have to stretch them in terms of a time demand standpoint."

Kuh (2008) already posited that high-impact educational practices require a significant amount of time and effort, which is further affected by the lack of time available to thousands of students participating in collegiate athletics. An academic advisor said, "There's only certain times in which a student athlete can do that in terms of being in or out of season and training. It's really hard to find these opportunities that work well with both the student athletes and the professors." Even within the athletic department specifically, time plays a role in the organization of first year seminars and experiences. For example, an athletic director stated:

I think also it just comes back to time. I mean even when we try to schedule all student-athlete meetings and things like that, the amount of time and energy that goes into finding one day for two hours that we can capture close to 500 students is near impossible.

Although scheduling becomes near impossible when considering the schedules of 500 student athletes, one way to combat such an issue is through alternative scheduling. An athletic director said, "At a time when they do have these time constraints, you know, our departments like career service, they'll do a really good job with saying, 'We'll hold the event a second time for those that could not attend the first.'" Similarly, in the case of a HIP like diversity/global learning, study abroad participation is not the only option for student athletes. Participation in study abroad programming can be difficult due to time constraints; however, more reasonable alternatives exist. For example, "being able to still provide an environment or atmosphere that promotes global learning like even just having flags in the hallway and the RISE program, I think those can still promote an environment of inclusivity." However, these alternatives may not be an option for the implementation of all HIPs. Ultimately, putting in extra time is the biggest issue that administrators, coaches, and student athletes must learn to navigate. Although:

Student athletes [have] X amount of hours that the NCAA allows student athletes to work out in and off season, we try to help students navigate those things. Also, try to help the coaches navigate those things whenever possible when trying to assist a student athlete.

In order to assist in the implementation of HIPs, this mindset must be prevalent for administrators to help minimize barriers on all levels, particularly time. Interestingly, some institutions are considering consolidating such programming for their student athletes as an athletic director noted "If you're an international and you're an athlete, you got three of these you got to go to your freshmen fall," referring to the international student first year seminar, student athlete seminar, and the freshman orientation programs. While time plays a large role in the prevention of HIP opportunities, coaches also contribute the overall issue at hand.

Coaches. One of the biggest influences within the student athlete experience are their coaches. Whether its practice times, playing times, lifting times, meetings, or even academically, coaches contribute

to the overall academic and athletic experiences of their student athletes. Unfortunately, through the analysis of interview data, coaches were primarily seen as a negative influence and barrier to the implementation of HIPs within the student athlete setting. For example, an athletic director noted the role coaches might have if students will be missing time and said:

Then of course there is going to be a discussion with the coach. Do you expect them to be in study abroad in the summer? Do you expect them be here all summer or do you expect them to be just for second summer?

McCormick, Gonyea, and Kinzie (2013) illustrate the importance of participation in opportunities like a study abroad trip to Spain and its effect on overall positive student development. By understanding coaches as barriers to the implementation of HIPs, administrators must work with both the coaches and student athletes to ensure that there is ample opportunity for participation in HIPs, including study abroad. While study abroad during the season might not be attainable, administrators, athletes, and coaches must be able to offer flexibility and an understanding of student athlete schedule and eligibility to ensure resources are available if athletes are truly interested in participation.

This certainly differs from sport to sport as well. One athletic director said, "The study abroad stuff. We definitely like to encourage that, but honestly, I'll be frank with the kid and say, I just hope your coach is okay with you not being here from June to beginning of August; however, some sports would be perfectly fine with it." Some of the sports that the participant included were swimming, where training did not take place over the summer versus sports like basketball, soccer, and volleyball where "coaches might get a little bit more involved in that decision because they want them here in July getting ready for the Fall season." As this may be the case for many student athletes, one academic advisor illustrated the importance of "making students athletes aware of the expectations of the coaches and academic department." While it is important to understand this ahead of time, one participant established the importance of holding coaches accountable as well and said:

We believe that coaches are part of the education experience, not separate from it. So, our job is to provide the resources, the coaches job is to provide the accountability to make sure that the student athletes are taking full advantage of the resources that are available to them.

Unfortunately, although resources regarding study abroad and undergraduate research may be available to them, the student does not always have the opportunity to participate based on practice and training demands put on by coaches and sport participation. Although, "coaches were students themselves and they understand the importance of these things, a student athlete views a certain obligation to your sport." One athletic director recommending having shorter study abroad program options to help "the university find ways to accommodate our special population." Overall, coaches are talked about as barriers to the implementation on HIPs, especially for opportunities like study abroad. Unfortunately, student athletes should be aware of their obligations to their sport; however, the relationship between sport and academic opportunities becomes difficult when things like study abroad and other HIPs are shown to have overall positive outcomes for students and help in the involvement, engagement, and integration processes (Astin, 2003).

Implications and Directions for Future Research

As intercollegiate athletics continue to grow and more attention is placed on these programs, it is important to understand the role that higher education plays. With increased media attention portraying the negative academic scandals prevalent across intercollegiate athletics, there remains an opportunity to identify the positive outcomes associated with student athlete academic programming and the barriers to their implementation. Kuh's (2008) past research has continuously identified the ten HIPs, which are all a part of the college environment, as beneficial to students from a variety of backgrounds. Similarly, Bean and Eaton identified outcomes associated with academic success and integration (Bean & Eaton, 2000). The successful implementation of these practices led to substantial opportunities associated with involvement, engagement, and integration within the college environment (Astin, 2003).

Past research has identified the best practices within the academic communities; however, little has been applied to the barriers within the student athlete setting. With this in mind, the study identified what barriers to their implementation existed. The participation of academic staff members helped contribute to the purpose of this study and can help administrators understand how higher education theory and HIPs can be used in the decision-making process within the student athlete academic setting. Furthermore, with the identification of barriers to implementation, the results presented are likely of importance to college administrators interested in understanding how to develop an understanding of ways to minimize barriers in the utilization of high-impact educational practices. For example, administrators, both in athletics and on campus, can learn to establish relationships for their students on campus and create a comfortable climate and connection between athletics academics and on-campus resources. Furthermore, academic staff can identify opportunities to work with the coaches in order to shape an understanding for their students on the opportunities available and how to make them plausible around their schedules.

Whereas this research provided an illustration of the issues associated with the implementation of HIPs in the student athlete setting, it is vital to continue this research in a direction that continues to benefit student athletes and administrators in the academic setting. Moving forward, it will be important to compare NSSE data of student athletes vs. non-student athletes in order to identify if these high-impact educational practices are as effective for student athletes. By understanding the data between student athlete and non-student athletes, future research can help identify whether student athlete specific high impact educational practices can be created. Similarly, research has noted the benefits of being a student athlete and participating in sports; however, can being a student athlete be classified as a high impact practice in itself using standards set by Kuh's (2008) research. Also, this study did not look at the student athlete's specifically. Moving forward, it will be necessary to identify the thoughts of student athletes on the HIPs in their academic setting and what they think is plausible for their implementation based on their barriers. To end, Kuh (2008) illustrates the overall importance of HIPs and their effective implementation. This study is the step in the right direction in an effort to help, "faculty and staff [make] these and other effective educational activities commonly available to every student" and, ultimately, "helping students compensate for shortcomings in academic preparation and create a culture that fosters student success" (Kuh, 2008, p. 20).

Limitations

While this study presents insight on HIPs in the student athlete setting and barriers to their implementation, limitations exist in the context of the study. Although important information was provided through the use of athletics academic staff interviews, the data did not include insight from student athletes. Although the student athlete environment is important in this study, the researchers utilized academic staff to

obtain data rather than the student athletes themselves. With this administrative approach to the data collection, the opinions and experiences of the student athletes were not taken into account. Ultimately, to further the understanding of the topic and to build on the current implications of the study, it will be essential to bring in additional insight through student athlete interviews. Furthermore, considering the qualitative nature of the study and its application in the NCAA Division I, the data results cannot be generalized across division levels, or even institutions. Each institution is likely to present unique characteristics, while students' outcomes also vary in their environment present at each institution (Astin, 1993).

Furthermore, not all academic staff members interviewed were aware of what high-impact educational practices were. Some participants were much more knowledgeable in the subject area than others, which can result in more limited data from participants that were first hearing about these HIPs in the interview process. Similarly, the data could be limited based on the geographic location of the institutions utilized within this study. While primarily Midwestern and Southern Division I institutions participated in the study, participation was limited in other areas of the country. Particularly, several west coast universities were unable to participate due to research limitations set to their own specific conferences only. Unfortunately, the researchers are unable to tell if any differences would have resulted with a more diverse institution base.

The study focused on high impact educational practices at the institution; however, other factors outside of the aforementioned barriers may have played a role. Student athletes could be interviewed to help alleviate this limitation. Lastly, the presence of an outside researcher when talking about academics in collegiate athletic departments could have limited the amount of information shared due to fear of losing a job or saying something that would damage the athletic department. This could particularly be the case in response to specific athletic academic scandals seen throughout the media.

References

- Adler, P., & Adler, P. A. (1985). From idealism to pragmatic detachment: The academic performance of college athletes. *Sociology of Education*, 58(4), 241-250.
- Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1991). *Backboards & blackboards: College athletes and role engulfment*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Associated Press. (2016). Notre Dame football punished for cheating scandal. *New York Post*. Retrieved from <https://nypost.com/2016/11/22/notre-dame-football-punished-for-cheating-scandal/>.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. (2003). Involvement in learning revisited: lessons we have learned. In Stage, F.K., Carter, D.F., Hossler, D., & St. John, E.P. (Eds.). *Theoretical Perspectives on College Students*. Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Bean, J. P., & Eaton, S. B. (2000). A psychological model of college student retention. In Braxton, J. M. (Ed.), *Reworking the Student Departure Puzzle*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Berg, B. K., & Warner, S. (2019). Advancing college athlete development via social support. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 12, 87-113.
- Beyer, J. M., & Hannah, D. R. (2000). The cultural significance of athletics in U.S. higher education. *Journal of Sport Management*, 14(2), 105-132.
- Burns, G. N., Jasinski, D., Dunn, S., & Fletcher, D. (2013). Academic support services and career decision-making self-efficacy in student athletes. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 61, 161-167.
- Burnsed, B. (2015). Athletics departments that make more than they spend still a minority. *NCAA*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/media-center/news/athletics-departments-make-more-they-spend-still-minority>.
- Comeaux, E., & Harrison, K. C. (2011). A conceptual model of academic success for student athletes. *Educational Researcher*, 40(5), 235-245.
- Comeaux, E., Speer, L., Taustine, M., & Harrison, C. K. (2011). Purposeful engagement of first year Division I student-athletes. *Journal of The First-Year Experiences & Students in Transition*, 23(1), 35-52.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Duggan, M. H., & Pickering, J. W. (2008). Barriers to transfer student academic success and retention. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 9(4), 437-459.
- Evans, J. O., Werdine, A. E., & Seifried, C. S. (2017). The role of interorganizational relationships in the effectiveness of student-athlete academic support services. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 10, 35-56.
- Gayles, J. G., & Hu, S. (2009). The influence of student engagement and sport participation on college outcomes among Division I student athletes. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80(3), 315-333.
- Gillham, B. (2000). *The Research Interview*. London, UK: Continuum.

- Guillemin, M., & Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, reflexivity, and “ethically important moments” in research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *10*(2), 261-280.
- Hobson, W., & Rich, S. (November 23, 2015). Playing in the red. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/sf/sports/wp/2015/11/23/running-up-the-bills/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.252fd8fa7f79.
- Huml, M. R., Hancock, M. G., & Bergman, M. J. (2014). Additional support or extravagant cost?: Student-athletes’ perceptions on athletic academic centers. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, *7*, 410-430.
- Huml, M. R., Hancock, M. G., & Hums, M. A. (2019). Athletics and academics: The relationship between athletic identity sub-constructs and educational outcomes. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, *12*, 46-62.
- Huml, M., Svensson, P., & Hancock, M. (2017). Community service in intercollegiate athletics: A student involvement approach to college athlete engagement. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, *10*, 101-121.
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2008). *Educational research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kilgo, C. A., Ezell Sheets, J. K., & Pascarella, E. T. (2015). The link between high-impact practices and student learning: some longitudinal evidence. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, *69*(4), 509-525.
- Kuh, G. D. (2009). What student affairs professionals need to know about student engagement. *Journal of College Student Development*, *50*(6), 683-706.
- Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- LeCrom, C., Warren, B. J., Clark, H. T., Marolla, J., & Gerber, P. (2009). Factors contributing to student athlete retention. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 14-24.
- Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2016). *Designing qualitative research (6th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage.
- McCormick, A. C., Gonyea, R. M. & Kinzie, J. (2013). Refreshing engagement: NSSE at 13. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, May/June, 6-13.
- Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2008). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *1*(2), 13-22.
- Morse, J. M., & Richards, L. (2002). *README FIRST for a user’s guide to qualitative methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Palmer, T. (2016). Major violations found in Missouri men’s basketball program, one-year postseason ban self-imposed. *The Kansas City Star*. Retrieved from <http://www.kansascity.com/sports/college/sec/university-of-missouri/article54508110.html>.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students*, Volume 2. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Patton, L. D., Renn, K. A., Guido-DiBrito, F., & Quaye, S. J. (2016). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Brand.

- Rubin, L. M., & Moses, R. A. (2017). Athletic subculture within student-athlete academic centers. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 34, 317-328.
- Seifer, T. A., Gillig, B., Hanson, J. M., Pascarella, E.T., & Blaich, C.F. (2014). The conditional nature of high impact/good practices on student learning outcomes. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 85(4), 531-564.
- Soria, K. M., & Johnson, M. (2017). High-impact educational practices and the development of college students' pluralistic outcomes. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 35(2), 100-116.
- Tinto, V. (1997). Colleges as communities: Exploring the educational character of student persistence. *Journal of Higher Education*, 68, 599-623.
- Tracy, M. (2017). N.C.A.A: North Carolina will not be punished for academic scandal. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/13/sports/unc-north-carolina-ncaa.html>.
- Umbach, P. D., Palmer, M. M., Kuh, G. D., & Hannah, S. J. (2006). Intercollegiate athletes and effective educational practices: Winning combination or losing effort? *Research in Higher Education*, 47(6), p. 709-733.
- Weight, E., Navarro, K., Huffman, L., & Smith-Ryan, A. (2014). Quantifying the psychological benefits of intercollegiate athletics participation. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 7, 390-409.

Appendix A

Student Athlete High Impact Educational Practices Interview Guide

- The documentary series, “Last Chance U”, describes athletic academic advisors as “eligibility specialists.” In what do you see the term “eligibility specialist” as accurate or inaccurate?
- Is being called an “eligibility specialist” an offensive term to you? Why or why not?
- What do you think the public perception of your position as an athletic academic advisor is?
- What are your job responsibilities as an athletic academic advisor? What role do you play with the athletes?
- Does higher education theory drive your decision making in the student athletic academic setting?
- What have you heard about higher education high-impact practices (HIPs)?
 - Briefly go over high-impact educational practices
- How do you think the athletic administration has control over such practices or do you think these practices are only applicable to higher education administrators?
- How are these HIPs utilized or promoted in the student athlete academic settings? How does athletics help with this?
- A whole body of literature exists showing the importance and impact of HIPs. How do you think these HIPs can be implemented in a student athlete setting?
- If implemented, how do you think these HIPs would or would not have the same effect on student athletes as they do with the non-student athlete population?
- A collegiate athletic department provides a unique education environment to student athletes versus non-student athletes. What are the obstacles/barriers to applying HIPs on the administrative level and how can they be dealt with?
- A collegiate athletic department provides a unique education environment to student athletes versus non-student athletes. What are the obstacles/barriers to applying HIPs on the student athlete level and how can they be dealt with?
- How do student athlete schedules affect the use of high-impact practices in their academic setting?

- Pointing to the multiple educational benefits of high-impact practices, Kuh (2008) recommends that each institution take action to ensure that all students participate in at least two of the mentioned HIPs. Which HIPs do you think would be most realistic to implement in the student athlete setting and why?
- Which HIPs do you think would be the most difficult to implement and why?
- According to Kuh (2008), what faculty think and value what faculty think and value does not necessarily impel students to take part in high-impact activities or engage in other educationally purposeful practices. Rather, when large numbers of faculty and staff at an institution endorse the worth of an activity, members of the campus community are more likely to agree to devote their own time and energy to it, as well as provide other resources to support it—all of which increases the likelihood that the activities will be available to large numbers of students and that the campus culture will encourage student participation in the activities. As a staff member involved in student athlete academics, how can you utilize such an approach in the athletic department environment?

Appendix B

Table 1: High-impact Educational Practices and Descriptions

(Kuh, 2008, p. 9-11), as excerpted below:

High-impact Educational Practice	Description
<i>First-year seminars and experiences</i>	Many schools now build into the curriculum first-year seminars or other programs that bring small groups of students together with faculty or staff on a regular basis. The highest-quality first-year experiences place a strong emphasis on critical inquiry, frequent writing, information literacy, collaborative learning, and other skills that develop students' intellectual and practical competencies. First-year seminars can also involve students with cutting-edge questions in scholarship and with faculty members' own research (Kuh, 2008, p. 9).
<i>Common intellectual experiences</i>	The older idea of a "core" curriculum has evolved into a variety of modern forms, such as a set of required common courses or a vertically organized general education program that includes advanced integrative studies and/or required participation in a learning community. These programs often combine broad themes—e.g., technology and society, global interdependence—with a variety of curricular and cocurricular options for students (Kuh, 2008, p. 9)
<i>Learning communities</i>	The key goals for learning communities are to encourage integration of learning across courses and to involve students with "big questions" that matter beyond the classroom. Students take two or more linked courses as a group and work closely with one another and with their professors. Many learning communities explore a common topic and/or common readings through the lenses of different disciplines. Some deliberately link "liberal arts" and "professional courses"; others feature service learning (Kuh, 2008, p. 10).

Writing-intensive courses

These courses emphasize writing at all levels of instruction and across the curriculum, including final-year projects. Students are encouraged to produce and revise various forms of writing for different audiences in different disciplines. The effectiveness of this repeated practice “across the curriculum” has led to parallel efforts in such areas as quantitative reasoning, oral communication, information literacy, and, on some campuses, ethical inquiry (Kuh, 2008, p. 10).

Collaborative assignments and projects

Collaborative learning combines two key goals: learning to work and solve problems in the company of others, and sharpening one’s own understanding by listening seriously to the insights of others, especially those with different backgrounds and life experiences. Approaches range from study groups within a course, to team-based assignments and writing, to cooperative projects and research (Kuh, 2008, p. 10).

Undergraduate research

Many colleges and universities are now providing research experiences for students in all disciplines. Undergraduate research, however, has been most prominently used in science disciplines. With strong support from the National Science Foundation and the research community, scientists are reshaping their courses to connect key concepts and questions with students’ early and active involvement in systematic investigation and research. The goal is to involve students with actively contested questions, empirical observation, cutting-edge technologies, and the sense of excitement that comes from working to answer important questions (Kuh, 2008, p. 10).

Diversity/global learning

Many colleges and universities now emphasize courses and programs that help students explore cultures, life experiences, and worldviews different from their own. These studies—which may address US diversity, world cultures, or both—often

explore “difficult differences” such as racial, ethnic, and gender inequality, or continuing struggles around the globe for human rights, freedom, and power. Frequently, intercultural studies are augmented by experiential learning in the community and/or by study abroad (Kuh, 2008, p. 10).

Service learning, community-based learning

In these programs, field-based “experiential learning” with community partners is an instructional strategy—and often a required part of the course. The idea is to give students direct experience with issues they are studying in the curriculum and with ongoing efforts to analyze and solve problems in the community. A key element in these programs is the opportunity students have to both apply what they are learning in real-world settings and reflect in a classroom setting on their service experiences. These programs model the idea that giving something back to the community is an important college outcome, and that working with community partners is good preparation for citizenship, work, and life (Kuh, 2008, p. 11).

Internships

Internships are another increasingly common form of experiential learning. The idea is to provide students with direct experience in a work setting—usually related to their career interests—and to give them the benefit of supervision and coaching from professionals in the field. If the internship is taken for course credit, students complete a project or paper that is approved by a faculty member (Kuh, 2008, p. 11).

Capstone courses and projects

Whether they’re called “senior capstones” or some other name, these culminating experiences require students nearing the end of their college years to create a project of some sort that integrates and applies what they’ve learned. The project might be a research paper, a performance, a portfolio of “best work,” or an exhibit of artwork. Capstones are offered both in departmental

programs and, increasingly, in general education as well (Kuh, 2008, p. 11).

Appendix C

Table 2: Qualitative Raw Interview Data Coding Example

Raw Data	Preliminary Codes	Final Code
Then of course there is going to be a discussion with the coach. Do you expect them to be in study abroad in the summer? Do you expect them be here all summer or do you expect them to be just for second summer?	Study Abroad Time Restrictions Coaching/Coaches	Coaches Barrier
Student athletes [have] X amount of hours that the NCAA allows student athletes to work out in and off season, we try to help students navigate those things. Also, try to help the coaches navigate those things when trying to assist a student athlete.	Time Restrictions Coaching/Coaches NCAA Restrictions	Student Athlete Time Commitment Barrier