



NCAA DIVISION I COUNCIL  
AD HOC FINANCIAL AID ISSUES WORKING GROUP

CONCEPTS FOR NCAA DIVISION I MEMBERS  
AND CONSTITUENTS:  
FEEDBACK ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF FINANCIAL AID  
UP TO THE COST OF ATTENDANCE

PREPARED BY:

JUSTIN SELL, SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY, THE SUMMIT LEAGUE  
CHAIR OF THE AD HOC FINANCIAL AID ISSUES WORKING GROUP AND  
VICE CHAIR OF NCAA DIVISION I STUDENT-ATHLETE EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE

MATT MAHER, NCAA ACADEMIC AND MEMBERSHIP AFFAIRS

National Collegiate Athletic Association

*Supporting student-athlete success on the field, in the classroom and for life*

Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

## Table of Contents

		Page
1.	Executive Summary .....	1
2.	Background/History .....	2-4
3.	Charge and Scope of the NCAA Division I Council Ad Hoc Financial Aid Issues Working Group .....	4-6
4.	Concepts available for membership feedback specific to the charge of the working group.	
a.	Maintain the current legislation, gather data and monitor over the next two to three years .....	4-5
b.	Allow the provision of other expenses related to attendance at the institution up to cost of attendance established pursuant to NCAA Bylaws 15.02.2 and 15.02.2.1, only in proportion to a student-athlete's equivalence. Further, exclude the elements from the recipient's numerator and denominator when calculating the student-athlete's equivalency .....	5-6
5.	Request for membership feedback.	
•	NCAA Proposal No. 2015-67: Financial Aid – Maximum Limits on Financial Aid – Team Limits – Nonathletically Related Institutional Financial Aid.....	6-8
6.	Concepts discussed but not supported by the working group.	
a.	Implement additional requirements for equivalency sports.....	8
b.	Eliminate equivalencies and establish a head-count value for each sport .....	8
c.	*Revisit Proposal No. 2014-13-3: Autonomy Proposal – Financial Aid – Maximum Limit on Financial Aid – Full Grant-in-Aid – Other Expenses Related to Attendance Up To Cost of Attendance – Proportionality.....	8-9
d.	*Allow for provision of cost-of-attendance elements, other than previous full grant-in-aid, without impacting equivalency numerator and denominator.....	9
7.	Attachments A and B .....	10-11

\*These two concepts were not recommended for further review and discussion as stand alone items. Rather, they were combined because, as stand alone items, the concepts were determined not to resolve the concerns raised by the membership.

**NCAA Division I Council Ad Hoc Financial Aid Issues Working Group  
Concepts for NCAA Division I Members and Constituents:  
Feedback on the Implementation of Financial Aid Up To the Cost of Attendance**

**Executive Summary**

This report was commissioned by the NCAA Division I Council at the request of the NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Experience Committee, to analyze the current impact of cost-of-attendance legislation for equivalency sports. The NCAA Division I Council Ad Hoc Financial Aid Issues Working Group was formed to conduct a comprehensive review and develop a concept document for membership feedback to address one fundamental question:

- Is the issue of roster expansion a concern to NCAA Division I Bylaw 20.9.1.3 (The Commitment to Fair Competition) that needs to be addressed proactively based on the information available; OR, should additional time be taken to collect data about cost of attendance provided to student-athletes in equivalency sports?

Throughout the review, the working group used several resources to assist in forming concepts including: Equivalency Sports and NCAA Championship Squad Size Demographics (Attachment A) and Equivalency Sports Funding Information (Attachment B).

**The working group also discussed at length six different concepts, ultimately supporting the following two concepts for membership feedback:**

1. Maintain the current legislation, gather data and monitor over the next two to three years.
2. Allow the provision of other expenses, related to attendance at the institution, up to cost of attendance established pursuant to Bylaws 15.02.2 and 15.02.2.1, only in proportion to a student-athlete's equivalency. Further, exclude the elements from the recipient's numerator and denominator when calculating the student-athlete's equivalency.

The working group also thought it would be prudent to engage in a feedback gathering exercise with the membership regarding current NCAA Division I Proposal No. 2015-67. This proposal specifies that nonathletically related institutional financial aid shall not count toward maximum institutional grant-in-aid limitations and will be acted on by the Council in April 2016.

**In conclusion, the working group requests your review of the concepts document, as well as the two Excel charts (Attachments A and B), in anticipation of responding to a short survey which will follow this report in the upcoming week.**

The working group is committed to meeting its charge and providing a final report to the Council by April 2016, and in doing so, will incorporate your responses as part of its continuing discussions.

### **Background/History**

During the 2015 NCAA Convention, autonomy conferences and schools adopted Proposal No. 2014-13 (Autonomy Proposal – Financial Aid – Maximum Limit on Financial Aid – Full Grant-In-Aid – Other Expenses Related to Attendance up to Cost of Attendance), expanding the definition of full grant-in-aid to include tuition and fees, room and board, books and other expenses related to college attendance, up to the full cost of attendance. The effective date for the amended legislation was August 1, 2015, and was required for autonomy conferences; however, it was optional for nonautonomy conferences, subject to conference discretion.

After the rule was changed, many institutions impacted by the legislation began to consider whether unintended consequences existed and should be addressed. Specifically, the expansion of the legislation intended to provide student-athletes with additional funds to cover cost of attendance; however, as written, the legislation allows schools to provide additional funds to student-athletes who previously did not receive athletically related financial aid. Therefore, if a school uses the additional cost-of-attendance funds to provide athletics aid to other student-athletes, an increase in roster sizes may result, or at least an increase in the number of counters within the roster. Recognizing this, the Council, at the request of the Student-Athlete Experience Committee, formed the Ad Hoc Financial Aid Issues Working Group to conduct an extensive review of the amended legislation and its impact on equivalency sports.

While each concept the working group considered will be outlined in greater detail later, this report will first explain the impetus behind the review and the reasons why this initiative is critical to the future of Division I.

### **Maintaining Division I Commitments and Core Values.**

A group of 17 individuals from member schools and conferences, including directors of athletics, senior woman administrators, conference representatives, financial aid officers, a student-athlete and a coach worked collaboratively over the past four months to conduct a comprehensive review of the application of cost-of-attendance legislation. The group met via teleconference on 10 occasions; four calls as a full group and six calls of smaller subgroups to discuss potential concepts for membership outreach. The group's diversity ensured all Division I perspectives were represented. The Division I Commitments, located in Bylaw 20.9.1, guided the group, specifically a commitment to value-based legislation, fair competition and student-athlete well-being. The working group members also took direction from the NCAA's core values, including a shared belief in and commitment to respect for institutional autonomy and philosophical differences.

### **A Well Vetted Approach.**

The working group worked quickly to form recommendations in time for the 2016-17 legislative cycle, should a proposal be necessary. The working group put together a timeline consistent with its charge to provide a final report to the Council by April 2016.

Throughout the review, the working group used several resources to assist it in forming concepts. For example, the working group reviewed the current cost-of-attendance legislation, as well as other legislative proposals, which were either defeated or withdrawn, in the area of cost of attendance. The working group also reviewed multiyear agreement legislation and a PowerPoint presentation specific to autonomy legislation related to financial aid. Further, the working group studied two documents created specifically for them: Equivalency Sports and NCAA Championship Squad Size Demographics (Attachment A) and Equivalency Sports Funding Information (Attachment B).

The working group seeks feedback from the following organizations:

- Collegiate Commissioners Association Compliance Administrators;
- Division 1A-Athletic Directors;
- Division 1A-Faculty Athletic Representatives;
- Equivalency sports' coaches associations;
- Faculty Athletic Representatives Association;
- Gender Equity Task Force;
- NCAA Committee on Women's Athletics;
- NCAA Division I Conference Commissioners Association;
- NCAA Division I Board of Directors;
- NCAA Division I Institutions;
- NCAA Division I Presidential Forum;
- NCAA Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee; and
- National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators.

### **A Call to Action.**

The greatest concern voiced after the adoption of cost-of-attendance legislation was that it will result in "roster creep"; a practice that some schools use to "stockpile" talented student-athletes who would otherwise choose to attend and participate at a different school. The concern over stockpiling is that it adversely affects Bylaw 20.9.1.3 (The Commitment to Fair Competition). However, "roster creep" is a misnomer because all equivalency sports except baseball are allowed to have unlimited participants. Therefore, the concern is more about "counter creep", because the application of cost of attendance increases the base figure of a scholarship (denominator). That increase allows schools to provide some athletics aid to student-athletes

who previously did not receive any. **This concern led to one overarching question, resulting in the concepts development:**

- Is the issue of roster expansion a concern to Bylaw 20.9.1.3 (The Commitment to Fair Competition) that needs to be addressed proactively based on the information available; OR, should additional time be taken to collect data about cost of attendance provided to student-athletes in equivalency sports?

### **Charge and Scope**

At the direction of the Council and Student-Athlete Experience Committee, the Ad Hoc Financial Aid Issues Working Group was established to conduct a comprehensive review of financial aid issues related to cost of attendance and squad limits in equivalency sports. As specified in the proposal, the intent was to address comprehensively the educational costs of the student-athlete. For equivalency sports, the Council charged the working group with making recommendations that align with this intent.

### **Concepts Available for Membership Feedback Specific to the Charge of the Working Group.**

The working group supported the following two concepts for membership feedback.

**1. Maintain the current legislation, gather data and monitor over the next two to three years.**

Intent: Collect data to see whether trends in how athletics aid is awarded in equivalency sports are inconsistent with Bylaw 20.9.1.3 (The Commitment to Fair Competition).

***Points to Consider:***

- a. The cost-of-attendance legislation went into effect August 1, 2015. Therefore, maintaining the current legislation while establishing a few specific data points to monitor, will allow the collection of data over the next several years to inform whether a true concern exists in Division I, and/or specific sport(s), related to Bylaw 20.9.1.3 (The Commitment to Fair Competition).
- b. Data collection over time may provide additional insight to ensure all unintended consequences of existing legislation relative to fair competition are appropriately addressed.

- c. This option provides schools the opportunity to educate (and provide certainty to) prospective student-athletes and their families on financial aid packages based on current legislation.
- d. Maintaining current legislation allows the Division I membership to reinforce that the intent of cost-of-attendance legislation was to more comprehensively address the educational costs of student-athletes.
- e. Additional time may diminish the concern about “counter expansion” based on the multiyear agreement legislation.
- f. Will it be more difficult to change the legislation in a couple of years if there is a “counter expansion” issue that is negatively impacting fair competition?

**2. In response to concerns about counter expansion and its impact on fair competition: Allow the provision of other expenses related to attendance at the institution, up to cost of attendance established pursuant to Bylaws 15.02.2 and 15.02.2.1, only in proportion to a student-athlete’s equivalency. Further, exclude the elements from the recipient’s numerator and denominator when calculating the student-athlete’s equivalency.**

Intent: Permit additional athletics financial aid to be provided to a student-athlete in an equivalency sport to cover cost of attendance. However, only tuition and fees, room and board, and required course related books would be used to calculate equivalencies (e.g., similar to a state mandated tuition waiver).

Points to Consider:

- a. The working group determined the combination of two previous concepts was necessary as neither proportionality alone nor zero impact on numerator and denominator alone meets the charge of the working group.
  - (1) Proportionality alone allows for use of additional funds to be awarded to new counters.
  - (2) Exempting elements other than previous full grant-in-aid alone allows for additional equivalencies through full coverage of those other elements while limiting countable equivalency elements.
- b. May minimize how a school expands its roster as the proportionality requirement would only allow an institution to award cost-of-attendance dollars up to the proportion of a student-athlete’s scholarship.

- Athletics aid may not be used to fund only cost-of-attendance elements as that money would not be in proportion to the zero-percent equivalency attributed to the additional student-athletes.
- c. With the cost-of-attendance legislation going into effect August 1, 2015, would allowing the development of data better inform the decision regarding the scope of the issue and what other financial aid elements, if any, to exempt?

Case Study.

An equivalency sport is at its team financial aid limit based on previous full grant-in-aid elements (i.e., tuition and fees, room and board, and required course related books). The school has funded additional dollars to cover cost-of-attendance elements for the sport. However, the head coach has decided not to use the money for student-athletes on the team's roster. Instead, the money will be used to provide athletics aid to additional student-athletes (e.g., incoming students, transfers). Can the head coach use the money to provide athletics aid to additional student-athletes under this concept?

- No. Even though the school has additional funds it is prepared to spend, the concept excludes all cost-of-attendance elements from equivalency computations. Therefore, the team remains at its financial aid limit and, thus, cannot award any additional athletics aid for tuition and fees, room and board, and required course related books. Any cost-of-attendance elements awarded to student-athletes on grant-in-aid are proportion to the student-athlete's equivalency and remain exempt from the team's financial aid limit.

**Requests for Membership Feedback.**

The following proposal, if adopted, will have a direct effect on the charge of the working group. Therefore, the working group thought it would be prudent to engage in a feedback gathering exercise with the membership regarding the proposal.

- **Adopt NCAA Proposal No. 2015-67: Financial Aid – Maximum Limits on Financial Aid – Team Limits – Nonathletically Related Institutional Financial Aid.**

Intent: To specify that nonathletically related institutional financial aid shall not count toward maximum institutional grant-in-aid limitations.

Points to Consider.

- a. This proposal will be acted on by the Council in April 2016, notwithstanding its application to the work of the ad hoc working group. Including this as part of the



- b. feedback exercise informs the Council's decision with real time feedback from the membership and Division I constituents (e.g., coaches associations).
- c. The exclusion of such awards from team limits rewards academic excellence and is responsive to student-athletes' needs.
- d. Student-athletes will have an opportunity to receive nonathletically related institutional financial aid without it counting toward the team's overall equivalency limit.
- e. Depending on a school's budget, this proposal may allow student-athletes to receive more athletically related financial aid while still maintaining equivalency and/or counter limits.
- f. It also may allow student-athletes to receive athletically related financial aid for the first time while still maintaining equivalency and/or counter limits.
- g. Schools that award significant amounts of nonathletically related financial aid could have the opportunity to expand their team rosters if awarding nonathletics aid gives them more room within their team equivalency limits.
  - (1) If this occurs, it may foster a concern that schools are "stockpiling" the best talent and jeopardizing Bylaw 20.9.1.3 (The Commitment to Fair Competition).
  - (2) However, if all schools have the ability to maximize institutional nonathletics and athletics financial aid without impacting team equivalency limits, the result could be few practical opportunities for other schools to impact current roster make-ups.
- h. If there is a concern of "stockpiling", does the proposal, if adopted, lend itself to roster-limit discussions to ensure fair competition?
  - If yes, what are the effects with respect to gender equity?
- i. How does the proposal interact with Bylaw 15.3.4.2.5 (Release of Obligation to Provide Athletically Related Financial Aid – One-Year Award)?
  - Currently, before becoming a counter for an academic year pursuant to a one year grant-in-aid, a student-athlete may release the school of its obligation to provide athletically related financial aid when they receive

institutional financial aid unrelated to athletics that is of equal or greater value than their athletics aid.

- j. Bylaw 15.3.4.2.5 is specific to a one year grant-in-aid. Therefore, how does the proposal affect multiyear agreements?
- Proposal No. 2015-23 would extend the application to multiyear agreements.

### **Concepts Discussed but Not Supported by the Working Group.**

The following four concepts were discussed by the working group prior to making the decision that further discussion was not warranted.

1. Implement additional requirements for equivalency sports.
  - Rationale for no further discussion: The working group and content experts divided themselves into smaller pods to review each equivalency sport and how additional requirements (e.g., roster limits) may mitigate the concerns with how schools are applying the cost-of-attendance legislation. After in-depth discussions, the working group determined that additional requirements are not in the best interest of the impacted sports as data demonstrates schools are not awarding the maximum amount allowed in equivalency sports. Therefore, implementing additional limitations may result in over regulation. Further, the rationale for implementing additional restrictions in the sport of baseball was academically based, not athletically related financial aid based.
2. Eliminate equivalencies and establish a head-count value for each sport.
  - Rationale for no further discussion: The working group also discussed transitioning all equivalency sports into head-count sports. While the group determined there would be an ease of understanding counter numbers, there was concern over a potential increase in these sports' budgets, as well as concern related to gender equity. Therefore, the working group decided not to recommend this concept for membership outreach.
3. Revisit Proposal No. 2014-13-3: Autonomy Proposal – Financial Aid – Maximum Limit on Financial Aid – Full Grant-In-Aid – Other Expenses Related to Attendance Up To Cost of Attendance – Proportionality.
  - Rationale for no further discussion: This concept is not recommended for further review and discussion as a stand alone item. However, it has been combined with

another concept and is noted above. As a stand alone item, this concept was determined not to solve the concerns raised by the membership.

4. Allow for provision of cost-of-attendance elements, other than previous full grant-in-aid, without impacting equivalency numerator and denominator.
  - Rationale for no further discussion: Similarly, this concept is not being recommended for further review and discussion as a stand alone item. It has been combined with another concept and is noted above. As a stand alone item, this concept was determined not to solve the concerns raised by the membership.

Equivalency Sports and NCAA Championship Squad Size Demographics

ATTACHMENT A

Championships	Gender*	Equivalency Limit*	Division I Average Equivalencies	Autonomy Average Equivalencies	Non-Autonomy Average Equivalencies	Division I Average Equivalency Percentage Received per Counter	Autonomy Average Equivalency Percentage Received per Counter	Non-Autonomy Average Equivalency Percentage Received per Counter	Counter Limit*	Division I Average Counters	Autonomy Average Counters	Non-Autonomy Average Counters	Division I Average Roster Squad Size	Autonomy Average Roster Squad Size	Non-Autonomy Average Roster Squad Size	Championship Squad Size*	Additional Information
Baseball	M	11.7	10.46	11.59	10.15	0.43	0.48	0.42	27	24.3	24.7	24.2	35.24	37.18	34.74	27	Each counter must receive at least 25% of full scholarship; roster limit of 35
Beach Volleyball	W	6, 8	1.35	1.23	1.41	0.56	0.61	0.54	14	2.8	2	3.1				TBD	6.0 is for schools that also sponsor indoor WVB. If school does not sponsor indoor WVB, the equivalency ratio increases to 8.0. For all schools, the maximum number of counters in beach WVB is 14.
Bowling	W	5	3.61	4.37	3.56	0.54	0.63	0.54		7	8	7	8.79	12	8.59	10	
Cross Country / Track	M	12.6	8.2	11.41	7.41	0.41	0.47	0.39		21.7	29.38	19.81	41.57	48.58	39.65		If a school sponsors cross country but not indoor or outdoor track and field, it is allowed 5.0 scholarship equivalents
Cross Country / Track	W	18	12.64	16.67	11.66	0.49	0.56	0.48		26.41	33.55	24.67	40.73	48.87	38.73		
Fencing	M	4.5	2	1.83	2.2	0.37	0.33	0.42		6	7	6	19.15	24.43	16.31		
Fencing	W	5	2.55	2.71	2.38	0.44	0.56	0.32		9	10	7	16.54	20.13	14.75		
Field Hockey	W	12	9.36	11.58	8.59	0.51	0.63	0.47		19	19	19	22.49	23.56	22.17	24	
Football (FCS)	M	63	59.4			0.58			85; 30 initial counters per year	77.6			103.1			70	
Golf	M	4.5	3.43	4.28	3.19	0.43	0.49	0.42		8	9	8	9.92	10.55	9.76		
Golf	W	6	4.59	5.64	4.27	0.64	0.78	0.6		7	8	7	8.38	8.92	8.22		
Gymnastics	M	6.3	4.9	5.9	1.6	0.45	0.44	0.47		13	15	4	20.27	20.2	20.4		
Ice Hockey	M	18	16.2	18	15.5	0.75	0.78	0.73	30	22	23.6	21.3	27.76	27.25	27.84	27	
Ice Hockey	W	18	16.1	17.5	15.4	0.85	0.84	0.85	30	19.2	22	17.8	24.17	25.33	23.93	24	
Lacrosse	M	12.6	9.37	11.8	8.82	0.32	0.31			30	36	29	45.72	48.6	45.22	32	
Lacrosse	W	12	8.86	11.1	8.22	0.36	0.41	0.35		25	28	24	29.92	34.67	28.75	32	
Rowing	W	20	11.32	17.41	7.3	0.43	0.5	0.37		26	37	19	64.41	80.55	55.63	25	
Skating	M	6.3	4.68	4.2	4.93	0.55	0.62	0.53		9	7	10	14.09	11	15.25		
Skating	W	7	5.51	4.63	5.95	0.62	0.65	0.62		9	8	10	14.58	11.67	15.56		
Soccer	M	9.9	8.7	9.59	8.54	0.47	0.49	0.47		20	21	19	28.69	29.41	28.57	21	
Soccer	W	14	12.11	13.87	11.67	0.54	0.6	0.52		23	25	23	27.49	28.75	27.19	22	
Softball	W	12	10.25	11.92	9.85	0.59	0.69	0.56		18	19	18	20.91	21.7	20.73	20	
Swimming & Diving	M	9.9	6.36	9.07	5	0.37	0.42	0.34		18	24	15	28.65	33.46	26.53		
Swimming & Diving	W	14	9.72	12.81	8.5	0.46	0.53	0.44		21	26	19	27.66	30.62	26.58		
Tennis	M	4.5	3.57	4.38	3.35	0.49	0.54	0.47		8	9	7	10.38	10.79	10.28		
Volleyball	M	4.5	3.75	4.47	3.5	0.36	0.3	0.38		12	16	11	19.29	18.8	19.44	15	
Water Polo	M	4.5	3.2	4.45	2.81	0.38	0.35	0.39		10	15	9	25.73	30.5	24.67	16	
Water Polo	W	8	5.52	7.96	4.71	0.38	0.5	0.34		15	18	14	21.06	23.57	20.36	16	
Wrestling	M	9.9	8.46	9.21	7.87	0.45	0.48			20	21	20	33.16	35.54	31.77		

ORANGE = Gender Information (Indication of Male vs. Female Participants)  
 BLUE = Equivalency Information (Amount of athletically related financial aid provided to SAs)  
 GREEN = Counter Information (Number of SAs receiving athletically related financial aid)  
 RED = Roster Squad Size Information (Number of SAs on roster, including those not receiving athletics aid)  
 GRAY = Championship Squad Size Information (SAs eligible to dress and compete)  
 \* = Legislation and/or Championship Requirements

Equivalency Sports Funding Information

Championships	Gender*	Percentage of Division I Teams Funded...				Percentage of Autonomy Teams Funded...				Percentage of Non-Autonomy Teams Funded...				Percentage of Division I Student-Athletes Funded...				Percentage of Autonomy Student-Athletes Funded...				Percentage of Non-Autonomy Student-Athletes Funded...				Additional Information
		At least 90%	Between 75% - 90%	Between 50% - 75%	Below 50%	At least 90%	Between 75% - 90%	Between 50% - 75%	Below 50%	At least 90%	Between 75% - 90%	Between 50% - 75%	Below 50%	At least 90%	Between 75% - 90%	Between 50% - 75%	Below 50%	At least 90%	Between 75% - 90%	Between 50% - 75%	Below 50%	At least 90%	Between 75% - 90%	Between 50% - 75%	Below 50%	
Baseball	M	72.4	13.4	7.8	6.4	96.7	3.3			65.8	16.2	9.9	8.1	1.8	4.2	27.9	66.1	3.8	6.5	35.5	54.2	1.3	3.6	25.8	69.3	Each counter must receive at least 25% of full scholarship; roster limit of 35
Beach Volleyball	W		22.2	22.2	55.6		20	20	60		23.1	23.1	53.8	19.3	8.8	10.5	61.4	15.4		23.1	61.5	20.5	11.4	6.8	61.4	6.0 is for schools that also sponsor indoor WV. If school does not sponsor indoor WV, the equivalency ratio increases to 8.0. For all schools, the maximum number of counters in beach WV is 14.
Bowling	W	26.5	26.5	32.4	14.7	50	50			25	25	34.4	15.6	11.7	6.3	22.6	59.4	11.8	23.5	17.6	47.1	11.7	5	23	60.4	
Cross Country / Track	M	35.5	14.3	19.3	30.9	84.5	8.6	6.9		23.9	15.6	22.2	38.3	XC = 5.5 Indoor = 10.4 Outdoor = 11.3	XC = 3.4 Indoor = 5.3 Outdoor = 6	XC = 13.7 Indoor = 16.1 Outdoor = 16.5	XC = 77.4 Indoor = 68.1 Outdoor = 66.2	XC = 20 Indoor = 17.1 Outdoor = 17.1	XC = 7.7 Indoor = 7 Outdoor = 9.1	XC = 15.4 Indoor = 17.5 Outdoor = 18.1	XC = 56.9 Indoor = 55.6 Outdoor = 55.6	XC = 4.4 Indoor = 9.3 Outdoor = 8.9	XC = 3.1 Indoor = 5 Outdoor = 4.7	XC = 13.6 Indoor = 15.9 Outdoor = 15.8	XC = 78.9 Indoor = 69.8 Outdoor = 70.6	If a school sponsors cross country but not indoor or outdoor track and field, it is allowed 5.0 scholarship equivalents
Cross Country / Track	W	38.6	17	17.9	26.4	81.3	12.5	4.7	1.6	28.3	18.1	21.1	32.5	XC = 10.6 Indoor = 16.3 Outdoor = 18.7	XC = 6.1 Indoor = 7.9 Outdoor = 8.3	XC = 18.2 Indoor = 19.5 Outdoor = 19.5	XC = 65.1 Indoor = 56.4 Outdoor = 53.5	XC = 22.7 Indoor = 32.1 Outdoor = 28.6	XC = 13.5 Indoor = 7.5 Outdoor = 10.3	XC = 11.3 Indoor = 14.7 Outdoor = 17.9	XC = 52.5 Indoor = 45.7 Outdoor = 43.3	XC = 8.9 Indoor = 14 Outdoor = 15.2	XC = 5.1 Indoor = 7.9 Outdoor = 7.6	XC = 19.2 Indoor = 20.1 Outdoor = 20.1	XC = 66.8 Indoor = 57.9 Outdoor = 57.2	If a school sponsors cross country but not indoor or outdoor track and field, it is allowed 6.0 scholarship equivalents
Fencing	M	37.5	12.5	37.5	12.5	50	25		25	25		75		5.6	18.5	5.6	70.4	8.3	29.2	12.5	50	3.3	10		86.7	
Fencing	W	38.5	7.7	15.4	38.5	50	16.7		33.3	28.6		28.6	42.9	11.1	13.1	11.1	64.6	19.1	14.9	6.4	59.6	3.8	11.5	15.4	69.2	
Field Hockey	W	50	12.9	22.9	14.3	88.9	5.6	5.6		36.5	15.4	28.8	19.2	18.6	9.4	22.8	49.1	35.1	13.1	24.7	27.1	13.3	8.3	22.2	56.3	
Football (FCS)	M									80.9	10.5	5.6	3.1									48.4	11.1	20.7	19.8	
Golf	M	47.8	18.1	18.8	15.2	86.9	8.2	3.3	1.6	36.7	20.9	23.3	19.1	5.1	6.9	25.3	62.7	10.6	10.4	26.2	52.9	3.4	5.7	25	65.9	
Golf	W	48	15.7	21.8	14.5	88.1	6.8	5.1		35.4	18.5	27	19	27.1	12.8	23.3	36.8	48	11.3	17.5	23.3	20.7	13.3	25.1	40.9	
Gymnastics	M	69.2			30.8	90			10				100	12.3	10.3	23.9	53.5	12.9	11.5	22.3	53.2	6.3		37.5	56.3	
Ice Hockey	M	75	3.6	17.9	3.6	100				65	5	25	5	46.4	13.8	16.5	23.4	58.6	11.7	9.9	19.8	41.3	14.6	19.2	24.9	
Ice Hockey	W	84.2	5.3		10.5	83.3	16.7			84.6	15.4			64	8.6	16.4	11	65.2	9.8	11.4	13.6	63.3	7.9	19.2	9.6	
Lacrosse	M	45.3	15.1	20.8	18.9	80	10	10		37.2	16.3	23.3	23.3	2.8	3	15.3	78.9	3.6	4.2	20.8	71.5	2.6	2.6	13.6	81.1	
Lacrosse	W	38.9	21.1	14.7	25.3	81	9.5		9.5	27	24.3	18.9	29.7	3.5	4.6	18.5	73.4	5	8.6	26.4	60	3.1	3.3	15.8	77.8	
Rowing	W	40	11.4	11.4	37.1	64.5	19.4	9.7	6.5	20.5	5.1	12.8	61.5	14.9	8.4	17.3	59.5	20.1	9	16.9	54.1	8.5	7.5	17.9	66.1	
Skiing	M	50	25	12.5	12.5	100				33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7	14	12.8	25.6	47.7	28	12	20	40	8.2	13.1	22.9	50.8	
Skiing	W	62.5	25	12.5		100				50	33.3	16.7		11.1	32.1	22.2	34.6	31.6	26.3	31.6	10.5	4.8	39.9	19.4	41.9	
Soccer	M	60.4	25.1	10.2	4.3	93.1	3.4	3.4		54.4	29.1	11.4	5.1	9.6	8.4	21.3	60.7	12.4	11.8	18	57.8	9.1	7.7	21.9	61.2	
Soccer	W	60	20.6	14.8	4.5	100				49.8	25.9	18.6	5.7	14.4	10.7	26.5	48.4	25.2	15.5	22.1	37.3	11.7	9.5	27.7	51.2	
Softball	W	55.7	19.6	18.6	6.1	100				45.1	24.3	23	7.5	17.5	14.3	28.8	39.4	36.8	17	19.6	26.6	13.2	13.7	30.8	42.3	
Swimming & Diving	M	45.9	10.8	17.1	26.1	87.5	7.5		5	22.5	12.7	26.8	38	6.9	6.7	14.6	71.7	9.8	8.8	16.9	64.4	4.5	5	12.7	77.7	
Swimming & Diving	W	45.5	9	16.9	28.7	86.3	3.9	7.8	2	29.1	11	20.5	39.4	14.2	8.5	19.8	57.6	19.5	12.2	19.5	48.7	11.5	6.6	19.9	62	
Tennis	M	55.7	19	13.9	11.4	94.1	5.9			45.2	22.6	17.7	14.5	6.8	12.7	28	52.6	11.3	18	27	43.8	5.4	11.1	28.2	55.2	
Volleyball	M	50	15	30	5	100				33.3	20	40	6.7	4.1	4.6	13.9	77.3	4	6	20	70	4.2	4.2	11.8	79.9	
Water Polo	M	43.8	25	6.3	25	100				25	33.3	8.3	33.3	4.5	9.7	9.7	76	5.3	26.3	5.3	63.2	4.3	4.3	11.2	80.2	
Water Polo	W	42.9	14.3	10.7	32.1	100				23.8	19	14.3	42.9	11.7	3.4	16.1	68.8	23.4	5.3	18.1	53.2	7.9	2.7	15.5	73.9	
Wrestling	M	61.3	19.4	12.9	6.5	92.6	3.7		3.7	37.1	31.4	22.9	8.6	9.3	9.3	18.9	62.4	13.3	12.7	18.9	55.2	6.3	6.9	19	67.7	

ORANGE = Gender Information (Indication of Male vs. Female Participants)  
 PURPLE = Team Funding Information (Percentage of teams funded within a specific range) - Note: NCAA recognizes a team is "Fully Funded" at 90% or greater  
 GREEN = Student-Athlete Funding Information (Percentage of student-athletes funded within a specific range) - Note: NCAA recognizes a student-athlete is "Fully Funded" at 90% or greater