Perception of the Effectiveness of a One-Person Compliance Department in Small College Athletics: Division II Compliance Operations

Kelly Elliott and Amanda Siegrist

There is a wide scope to the responsibilities reported by compliance officers working in the NCAA Division II landscape. With the varying responsibilities, it is crucial for administrators working at Division II institutions to understand the entire scope of the tasks assigned to the individual hired into the compliance officer role. Therefore, the purpose of this exploratory research is to examine the current scope of job responsibilities for compliance positions at NCAA Division II member institutions and identify best practices that should be included on job descriptions soliciting compliance professionals. This is a two-part study. Part I of the study includes a content analysis of current Division II compliance officer backgrounds reported on staff directory pages of athletic department websites. Data from Part I of the study informed the survey instrument that was sent to Division II compliance officers in a sample of five athletic conferences to provide their perceptions of roles and tasks assigned to Division II compliance officers. The results of this study indicate that compliance professionals feel supported in their role, but it is not effective to have a one-person compliance operation. Participants in this study offer suggestions to improve current compliance operations on Division II campuses. Recommendations include using resources such as The National Association for Athletics Compliance (NAAC) and conference office staff. Additionally, it was recommended to limit roles and responsibilities for compliance personnel that fall outside the scope of compliance tasks.

Keywords: NCAA, compliance, staffing, athletics, Division II

Kelly Elliott, PhD, is an assistant professor of recreation and sport management in the Conway Medical Center College of Health and Human Performance at Coastal Carolina University. Her research interests focus on intercollegiate athletics specifically addressing organizational behavior, policy, and leadership. Email: kelliott@coastal.edu

Amanda Siegrist, JD, is an assistant professor of recreation and sport management in the Conway Medical Center College of Health and Human Performance at Coastal Carolina University. Her research interests fall in the general field of both constitutional and contract law, with an application to interscholastic, intercollegiate, and professional athletics. Email: asiegrist@coastal.edu

Introduction

From processing National Letter of Intent documents, to discussing eligibility requirements with prospective student-athletes, to planning education resources for coaches' meetings, compliance officers on National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) member institution campuses are kept quite busy. Compliance officers are typically involved in day-to-day operations on an NCAA member institution's campus. They are consulted when there is an unknown regarding a student-athlete's or coach's participation in a fundraiser and they are contacted when a potential violation is discovered. With the constantly changing rules and regulations legislated by the NCAA membership, it is important for institutional compliance professionals to stay up to date with NCAA legislation and the impact on their campuses.

However, as it relates specifically to NCAA Division II (DII) institutions, many athletic departments operate with a one-person compliance staff. More-over, the individual assigned to the role may also be responsible for tasks that fall outside the scope of compliance. For example, according to the biography listed on the athletic staff directory page for DII Albany State University athletics, the individual in the compliance role serves all compliance functions, serves the institution as the Senior Women's Administrator, and serves as a sport supervisor for women's volleyball, cross country, track and field, softball, and tennis.

The wide breadth of responsibilities on campus for DII compliance profes-sionals can differ greatly from their peers who work in the Division I landscape. At the Division I level, compliance officers may have a narrower focus to the area of compliance, with some compliance officers only having oversight over one or two bylaws or assigned to a specific sport. For example, the University of Georgia lists two staff members on their athletic staff directory page that specifically focus on Academics and Eligibility. Additionally, the University of Georgia lists a staff member responsible for football compliance. At the University of Utah, one staff member is listed for Athletics Financial Aid while another is a Senior Associate Registrar for athletics. While the workload may be comparable between these positions at varying divisions, the scope of the work contrasts greatly.

While it would be ideal to hire a staff of multiple compliance professionals for an athletic department or to designate a staff member solely to compliance operations, some institutions, specifically smaller DII institutions, do not have the resources or funds to do so. The NCAA Finances of Intercollegiate Database (2022) indicates DII institutions generate a median of $0.77 million dollars com-pared to Division I FCS institutions, which generate a median of $4.3 million, and Division I FBS institutions, which generate a median $102.58 million. This data indicates that DII institutions most likely have fewer resources to spend on staffing compared to their Division I institutions. The limited funds could result

in Division II athletic department employees wearing multiple hats, including the compliance professional.

The athletic directors faced with hiring employees for these roles might be unaware of the specific responsibilities and procedures the compliance officer will need to do on campus. For example, Kirkpatric (2018) found 54% of all athletic directors that work in a Power Five Conference come from a fundraising background. With the background in fundraising, these individuals might not know the intricacies of a compliance position might include collecting monthly sport participation logs or checking to ensure prospective student-athletes are completing the proper paperwork prior to participating in an on-campus tryout. With these unknowns, it can prove difficult for an athletic director or other senior staff members to understand the demands of compliance work prior to assigning additional tasks such as serving as a sport supervisor, Title IX coordinator, or game-day operations.

According to Chelladurai (2014), a job description should be specific enough for the candidate to understand the complexity of the position. However, with such a commonly wide scope of responsibilities for a compliance officer at DII schools, the specific job details might not be accurately advertised in the job description. Per the Model Athletic Department document (2005) published on the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics (NACDA) website, the following is expected for institutions to follow in terms of compliance:

> Compliance. A model Division II athletics program shall feature a full-time compliance coordinator whose primary responsibilities are the oversight of the institution's compliance system, the coordination of the institution's rules education and the monitoring of rules compliance. The compliance officer should not be a coach and should not be the director of athletics. (Division II Model Athletic Department Document, p. 6)

The description in the model compliance department outlined indicates that one full-time hire can do the job in a way that could be considered ideal in the Division II membership. However, the description does not outline exact duties of the individual, or even if the duties need to be performed by the designated institution compliance officer. Pierce et al. (2011) analyzed student workers in the compliance office and their research suggests institutions are using student workers in their compliance operations. The use of student workers may support the one-person compliance office operation.

There has been limited study into the actual work responsibilities and desired work responsibilities for compliance officers, especially at the DII level. Parsons (2013) found compliance officers working at the DII level appeared satisfied when given autonomy in the position. However, additional research suggests compliance officers are stressed in their role and have indicated they

were not certain of the source of the majority of their stress (Bolton & Rosselli, 2017; Kaltenbaugh & Parsons, 2013). This indicates that the role of a compliance office might not be defined enough to ensure compliance professionals have the support for their roles and responsibilities. Additionally, previous research indicates compliance officers in the Division I membership have reported feeling as though they do not have support in their current position from the senior athletic staff (Bolton & Rosselli, 2017).

Therefore, the purpose of this exploratory research is to examine the current scope of job responsibilities for compliance positions at NCAA Division II member institutions and identify best practices that should be included on job descriptions soliciting compliance professionals. There is a lack of current research investigating whether qualified compliance professionals can fulfill the tasks involved in a Division II compliance position, as required tasks may fall outside of the scope of compliance, such as operations or academic advising roles. The research presented in this article includes an analysis of the perceptions of current compliance officer roles and responsibilities on Division II campuses, in addition to offering solutions based on the discussion provided by participants.

Method

With the exploratory nature of this study, the researchers conducted a two-part study. Two-part studies are reportedly valuable when research topic questions remain unanswered (Morse, 2010). Additionally, two-part studies can add depth to the research as the researchers could use the data from part one of the research to inform the second part of the study. In the first part of the study, the researchers conducted content analysis by collecting data from NCAA Division II athletic department website staff directory pages. Content analysis allows the researcher to collect information with less bias compared to questionnaires and surveys, in addition to being able to collect large amounts of data (Kim & Kuljis, 2010). However, it should be noted that although website content analysis benefits research and large amounts of data can be examined, the research is limited by the data updated by the institution. From the staff directory pages, data were collected on each compliance professional's education, experiences, and job responsibilities. The process for coding the empirical material followed a data-driven coding process, as this process allowed the researcher to begin the coding process without codes and find nuances in the experience stated on each biography (Brinkmann, 2013).

The researchers then used the findings from the content analysis to inform questions for a survey that was sent out to all senior level compliance officers in institutions from a sample of five NCAA DII conferences. With the open-ended structured survey, the participants were able to provide more in-depth responses

to the survey questions, thus fewer participants were necessary for the study (Taylor, et al., 2016). An electronic survey was distributed to 63 DII compliance officers. Email addresses for the compliance officers were obtained from member institutions, and each compliance officer was sent an email invitation containing information about the study and a hyperlink to the online survey. The study consisted of 16 questions containing open-ended items that were framed by the data found during part one of this study. The survey items are listed in Appendix A.

A qualitative approach was used as this study is exploratory looking into unknown variables (Ajagbe et al., 2015; Sofaer, 1999). Following data collection, researchers used triangulation to look for consistency in responses provided by participants (Mertens, 2020). Researchers analyzed the qualitative responses to identify themes and patterns within the data. With the exploratory nature of this study, the researchers used a data-driven coding process to ensure predetermined codes were brought into the coding process (Brinkmann, 2013). To support interpretive validity, empirical material from the survey responses are reported entirely in the form of verbatims (Johnson & Christensen, 2016). Common themes from participant responses are discussed in the next section.

Results

Part I

In total, the researchers analyzed senior compliance administrators' biographies at 389 NCAA Division II institutions. Of the 204 biographies that included the academic background of the compliance administrator, 40 compliance administrators completed degrees in sport management and 39 compliance administrators completed degrees in business. Additionally, of the 176 biographies that indicated the compliance administrator earned a master's degree, 80 compliance administrators completed the master's degree in sport administration. Twenty-one biographies indicated the compliance administrator received a terminal degree, with 16 of these earning a juris doctorate degree. Table 1 includes the common titles compliance officers included in this study hold at their institution.

There were 349 biographies that included the title of the compliance administrator. Common titles for the compliance administrator included assistant athletic director (*n* = 108), associate athletic director (*n* = 90), and coordinator (*n* = 34). From the biographies that mentioned previous employment of the compliance administrator (*n* = 253), 124 were previously employed at a Division II institution and 74 were previously employed at a Division I institution. Seven biographies indicated the current position was the first position for the compliance administrator. Information regarding the previous background for participants is listed in Table 2.

Table 1. Titles Held by Participants

Title	Count
Assistant Athletic Director	108
Associate Athletic Director	90
Coordinator	34
Director	34
Senior Associate Athletic Director	18
Assistant Director	12
Assistant	11
Officer	9
Graduate Assistant	8
Athletic Director	3
FAR	3
Specialist	3
Student	3
Advisor	2
Deputy AD	2
Accountant	1
Administrative Assistant	1
Assistant Coordinator	1
Assistant to the Athletic Director	1
Executive Associate Athletic Director	1
Head Coach	1
Intern	1
Senior Assistant Athletic Director	1
Senior Executive Associate Athletic Director	1

Table 2. Previous Institution

Previous Institution	Count
Division II Institution	124
Division I Institution	74
Outside Organization	19
Division III Institution	16
First Job	7
NAIA	3
NJCCA	3
D I Conference Office	2
D II Conference Office	2
NCAA Office	2
NAIA Office	1

Of the compliance administrator biographies analyzed in this study, 109 indicated prior experience in compliance. Forty-nine biographies indicated the compliance administrator was a former head coach. Twenty-five biographies indicated the compliance administrators had prior experience working with student-athlete academics and 19 were former senior woman administrators (SWAs).

The analysis into previous work experience indicated some compliance administrators had experience in other areas of higher education outside of the athletic department. Ten compliance administrators had prior experience working in admissions and eight had previous experience in the student activities department. Previous experience also included work outside of higher education. Twenty-one biographies indicated the compliance administrator was a previous high school coach, eight were high school teachers, and seven were managers of an outside organization. Table 3 includes the top reported previous work experience analyzed from the biographies.

Table 3. Previous Work Experience

Previous Work Experience	Count
Compliance	109
Assistant Coach	49
Head Coach	49
Academics	25
Sport Information	21
Senior Woman Administrator	19
Student-Athlete Services	14
Marketing	9
Athletic Training	8
Internal Operations	7
Business	6
Administration	6
Tickets	5
Title IX	5
Manger	4
Media Relations	4
Basketball Operations	4
Student-Athlete Development	4
Promotions	4

Table 4. Current Responsibilities

Current Responsibilities	Count
Rules education	30
Eligibility	32
SAAC	23
Academics	20
Sport supervisor	19
Financial aid	12
National Letter of Intent/ Grant-In-Aid documents	11
Title IX	11
Recruiting	9
Department liaison	8
Student-athlete services	7
Game administration	7
Fundraising	6
Faculty	6
Student-athlete success	4
Budgeting	4

After an analysis of the compliance administrator biographies, the researchers identified 58 biographies that indicated the compliance administrator is responsible for all compliance responsibilities in the athletic department. Twenty-three compliance administrator biographies indicated the individual is also responsible for overseeing the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC), 20 oversee student-athlete academics, and 19 act as a sport supervisor for at least one sport program on campus. Eleven compliance administrators' responsibilities also included serving in a Title IX capacity on campus. Table 4 includes the top responsibilities analyzed from the biographies.

Part II

After the completion of content analysis, a survey was sent to senior-level compliance administrators. In total, 15 individuals responded to all open-ended

items on the electronic survey. Appendix B includes the current title, years of experience, and highest reported degree earned by each compliance officer.

Overall, respondents reported feeling supported in their current role, with 80% of respondents reporting they felt supported in their current role ($n = 12$). For those who responded that they did not feel supported in their current role as a senior compliance administrator, ($n = 3$), the compliance officers reported they felt a lack of support due to a lack of support software, the number of responsibilities outside of compliance operations, and their pay versus title and reported job responsibilities. In the participant's discussion of feeling a lack of support from the administration at his/her institution, one participant indicated:

> Technology is helpful because of the one-person department and I must do a lot of things through Google forms, docs, and sheets which can get muddled. It would be easier to have one place that all student-athletes and coaches could access to organize compliance forms and information. Unfortunately, the software is too expensive to justify per my athletic director.

Another participant stated he or she is "viewed and treated by my university as the #2, however my title and pay do not reflect that in a way," leading to the feeling of not being supported on campus. A third participant indicated, "Other tasks are always assigned to me on top of my compliance responsibilities."

Despite the majority of participants feeling supported in their role, 80% of respondents reported they felt overworked in their current role ($n = 12$). The participants reported feeling overworked due to the following: responsibilities outside compliance operations, small full-time staff, having to be "on-call" at all times due to being the only compliance officer, and stress related to decision-making on the job. Of the respondents, 10 indicated they had no assistants helping them with compliance operations on campus. However, no participant indicated having a full-time assistant.

The participants were then asked if they believed it is effective to have a "one-person" compliance operation on a NCAA Division II campus, and only one participant responded "yes" to the question. The majority of respondents indicated the job of a DII compliance officer is too demanding for one individual. One participant indicated, "No. There should always be checks and balances in this position. The legislative interpretations, the data reporting, etc., should all be monitored by multiple parties. We have a responsibility to our institutions, departments, and most importantly our student athletes, to protect them and inform them. This cannot be done by one person alone." Although respondents previously indicated operating a "one-person" compliance shop at their institution, participants indicated that beyond needing more than one person for a

second set of eyes, a second person is needed to share the workload. For example, one participant indicated, "Our system is effective, but it's one person working extra hours to make it effective." Participants indicated working a "one-person" compliance operation leads to a demanding work environment with information falling through cracks and the individual only able to accomplish the basic requirements. One participant provided understanding:

> As our rosters continue to grow, a one-person compliance operation is not truly effective. It is only effective for making sure that the minimum to moderate information and regulations are met. I would happily welcome at least someone part time to help with simple things such as Eligibility Center updates, checking transfer evaluations, monitoring CARA, etc.

Although issues with the "one-person" compliance operation were noted by participants, not all participants believe the position should have minimum education and experience requirements. Eight participants indicated they believe there should be minimum education and experience requirements for individuals applying for positions in DII compliance offices. Other participants indicated that they did not believe there should be minimum requirements, but there should be professional development. One participant stated, "I don't think the minimum is realistic, but I think each school needs to provide professional development and training, as well as the NCAA training provided." Other participants indicated relying on compliance colleagues at other institutions to learn. For example, one participant stated,

> I came into compliance from coaching, so I thought I knew a little about compliance. I ended up learning 'on the fly,' so to speak. We have a great compliance officer in our conference who has been very beneficial. I also lean on other compliance officers within the conference for help when needed.

When asked what requirements should be required (if the participant believed there should be requirements), the participants indicated experience was important. One participant thought there should be formal training through The National Association for Athletics Compliance (NAAC), stating, "NCAA/NAAC should have a certification program that is required of all compliance administrators."

The participants concluded their surveys with recommendations for NCAA Division II compliance administrators. A summary of these recommendations is included in Table 5.

Table 5. Recommendations for NCAA Division II Compliance Administrators

Ensure regular and timely communication with coaches.
Build a good relationship with coaches.
Use resources such as The National Association for Athletic Compliance (NAAC) and conference office staff.
Attend regional and national conferences for compliance administrators (e.g., Regional Rules).
Use compliance software.
Have a reporting structure with the compliance officer having access to a direct report outside of athletics.
Don't try to reinvent the wheel. Use your colleagues as resources.
Try to limit job responsibilities outside of compliance operations.

Discussion

It is critical for athletic administrators hiring compliance officers to consider the entire scope of responsibilities and tasks a compliance officer will be assigned. During the hiring phase, it is important for athletic directors to consider both how the individual meets the requirements of the job description and the context of the job (Chelladurai, 2014). Simultaneously, DII institutions must consider and support a realistic workload, effective resources, and job training for compliance officers so as to set them up for success. For example, assigning a compliance officer to oversee the student-athlete advisory committee is not an effective use of resources if the person hired to the position does not have the necessary leadership skills to work with student-athletes. The following sections discuss suggestions for innovative practice that can help athletic directors hire compliance officers to fit the wide range of responsibilities that are necessary for a DII compliance officer, those responsibilities that go outside the focus of compliance operations.

Reimagining the Education/Training/Certification of Compliance Officers

When selecting a candidate to a position in a one-person compliance department, education and experience seem crucial, as there does not appear to be a mentor

available on staff to help teach the compliance administrator general NCAA reporting policies and best practices. The data analyzed in Part I of this study indicated 98 compliance professionals working in DII previously worked as a head or assistant coach. Although these individuals may have learned basic compliance through their time working as a coach, they may not be prepared to serve in a role without a mentor and/or more formal training to handle day-to-day operations. With the limited knowledge of compliance policies and procedures in a small staff DII institution, it may be advantageous for athletic directors in Division II to work with the National Association for Athletic Compliance (NAAC). According to the NAAC website, their mission is "to develop and advance strategic leaders who promote integrity, ethics and fairness in college athletics and higher education" (2022). Results of this study indicated there should be more involvement from NAAC with regard to training compliance officers. A push from NACDA for NAAC leaders to develop programming for newly hired or even prospective employees may be advantageous and can even add value in an institution purchasing an NAAC membership. One suggestion could be for institutions to push for the NAAC to create modules similar to existing modules developed for NCAA coach recruiting certification. Currently, coaches are required to take modules yearly in order to recruit the following year. According to the NCAA website (2022), these modules must include the following:

1. The Division II certification procedures shall involve the selection of required educational modules by the Legislation Committee for all Division II coaches.
2. The educational modules shall include health and safety related content and content relating to NCAA Division II Bylaws 10 through 17.
3. All questions must be answered correctly to achieve a passing score on an educational module. Individuals who complete an educational module successfully will receive a certificate of completion in their Division II University account.
4. The reproduction of any portion of any Division II University educational module is prohibited.

A similar certification program should be created for member institutions to use during the hiring process to ensure compliance officers have the knowledge and experience to serve in a compliance role. In addition to modules directly relating to compliance tasks and education on campus, modules should also include topics related to other common tasks assigned to compliance officers. The data provided in this survey indicated 74 compliance officers previously worked at a Division I institution. These compliance officers may have a strong

background in compliance but could use training on some of the additional tasks required of a compliance officer on a DII campus that fall outside the scope of compliance. For example, a module on serving as an effective liaison to the Student Athlete Advisory Committee, how to best serve the student-athletes as an academic advisor, or how to work with coaches in the role of a sport supervisor may be beneficial, as these functions were frequently reported in this study. Additionally, yearly education modules should be developed as an opportunity for professional development. The yearly education modules should include content related to compliance, but also extend to leadership and management, as these skills seem a requirement for the many hats worn by compliance officers working on DII campuses.

Using the Conference Office as Resource

Although the norm of a one-person compliance shop may provide a cost-saving strategy, it may not be the most effective practice moving forward. Data suggests the need for an additional set of eyes on institutional compliance practices. A cost-saving strategy for institutions could be to utilize conference office staff to aid in on-campus compliance. For example, a strategy to provide a checks-and-balance system could be to give the compliance liaison at the conference office more responsibility when it comes to checking the work of compliance officers on campus to include a formal review of eligibility checklists and participation reports. One affordable suggestion could be for an athletic department to create internship or externship positions within the compliance office to give the compliance officer a second set of eyes on deliverables, including eligibility checklists, interpretation requests, and financial aid reports, while simultaneously developing more qualified personnel for the line of work.

One-Person Model

The results of this study refute the effectiveness of a one-person compliance shop and support the concerns raised in previous research regarding increased job turnover due to burnout and low pay. When an office relies too heavily on one person to have an understanding of their own databases, worksheets, contacts, and more, it is quite a detriment to lose that person and have them replaced. With their departure will also go their knowledge. Thus, even if the model is a one-person structure, having more than one staff member with a working knowledge of the office and/or software that stores important data in an organized and understandable way for an outside party is critical. Likely too, an employee who is overworked and completing tasks that fall in a broad range of skills could see the position as a stepping-stone to gain experience, rather than

a long-term fit. Despite the perception reported in this study, most DII athletic departments reportedly run one-person compliance operations. Even so, if a one-person compliance operation is the only option for an institution, then person-organization fit may be a critical analysis to ensure an athletic director hires invested employees who are a good fit for the organization environment.

Best practices should be developed and shared when seeking a candidate, perhaps as simple as asking pointed interview questions that cause the candidate to reflect on if the organization is a fit for them as well (e.g., "What about this institution is appealing to you? What do you think would be your biggest challenges in this role?) Further, to help ensure a strong candidate in this position, a personality test may be useful for a hiring committee to administer to potential candidates to ensure they have the ability to lead coaches. Some suggestions for personality tests can include the DISC personality assessment, Big Five Model of Personality, and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Barnhill, 2021), or the CliftonStrengths assessment (see CliftonStrengths, 2023). Identifying behaviors and skills prior to hiring a new candidate could ensure the candidate will be able to work successfully in the many roles that will be assigned to the employee. While these personality and skill tests are certainly not entirely indicative of a candidate's fit to work in a DII one-person compliance operation, it could be a beneficial supplement to a hiring process.

Person-Organization Fit

Previous research indicates person-organizational fit is related to organizational commitment and improved work satisfaction (Fan, 2018; Kristof, 1996; Morley & Morley, 2007). Additionally, the need to develop a tool to measure person-organization fit was encouraged in the literature (Kristof-Brown, et al., 2005). One measure of person-organization fit that may help athletic directors find the right hire is Holland's Theory of Vocational Choice. Pierce and Johnson (2017) applied Holland's Vocational Choice Theory to careers in intercollegiate athletics and found in general, the employees in the sport industry seek the social environment. As a part on one of six model types, the social environment "is characterized by social activities, and interpersonal skills that inform, train, enlighten and help other people. Social individuals are concerned with the welfare of others and enjoy helping, training, and developing other people. Social types seek to work as part of a team and solve problems by working with others" (Pierce & Johnson, 2017, p. 75). Although the social environment was dominant in intercollegiate athletics, it is important to note that individuals who identified their career as a compliance office matched a conventional environment where individuals "prefer working within an established chain of command to execute

prescribed tasks" (Pierce & Johnson, 2017, p. 75). The finding indicates the value in understanding an applicant's desired work environment prior to taking on a role in compliance. The finding also indicates it may be advantageous for a prospective employee to complete a personality test or other training during the hiring process to ensure they are the right fit for the environment.

Required Experience

A better understanding of the required experience can help hiring committees at DII institutions recruit the best candidates for the position. Currently, the NCAA publishes minimum guidelines for the position of a compliance officer on a DII campus. According to the website, the only noted criteria is the individual serving in the position must be "devoted full-time to compliance duties. In other words, compliance officers at Division II schools can't also have coaching responsibilities at the school" (NCAA.org). For low-budget DII athletic departments, more guidelines may help athletic directors make more informed hiring decisions, especially as it relates to the additional tasks that may be assigned to the individual. The NCAA staff hosts yearly Regional Rules conferences for current compliance officers to review current, proposed, and recently legislated NCAA rules and regulations. With the number of compliance officers attending these seminars, it may be advantageous to host joint sessions between compliance officers and athletic directors to discuss required experiences that should be included on a model job description that can be used by all DII athletic departments in the hiring process for compliance officers. These job descriptions should include the entire scope of the position, including tasks related to those areas outside of strictly compliance. Moreso, the athletic departments need to prioritze and streamline the scope of the position in order to support success in the role. The participants in this study discussed the multitude of job responsibilities that go above and beyond the compliance officer position. With the overlap reported, it may be important to have a conversation between compliance officers and athletic directors to determine the experiences that lead to a better compliance officer and which experiences are not necessary. For example, a candidate with experience overseeing the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee may have more leadership skills and have the ability to conduct rules education sessions and practices for coaches and administrators on campus.

Conclusion and Future Research

As previously mentioned, when a department relies too heavily on one person to understand their own databases, worksheets, contacts, and more, it is a significant detriment to the institution if that employee leaves. It is a challenge to not only

have them replaced, but their institutional knowledge as well. Thus, institutions operating in a one-person model need to prioritize solutions to this concern. It is important to note previous research has suggested person-organization fit has been found to have a greater influence on the intent to quit compared to person-job fit (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001). Future research is needed to analyze the current practices using institutional isomorphism. Institutional isomorphism occurs as organizations attempt to seek legitimacy within their peer group by adopting institutional norms (Dacin, 1977).

Future research could help Division II institutions put together best practices for hiring compliance administrators, such as pushing for the NCAA to provide training or a certification program for compliance officers that relate to the entire scope of the position, not just strictly compliance education. NCAA Division II institutions have less resources compared to their Division I peers. The lack of resources includes staffing to make the hiring decision and help train the new hires. Future research can include interviewing current compliance administrators and athletic directors at DII institutions to determine the exact responsibilities for compliance administrators on campus and what the desired responsibilities for the position are. This information could help create a model for the compliance administrator position that could help athletic directors at DII institutions create more effective compliance operation practices.

Although this research provided information related to the daily work demand of a compliance officer working on a DII campus, the study is intended to be exploratory and allow for future research with an expanded pool of participants that can add greater clarity to the typical tasks assigned to compliance officers working on a DII campus. Future research can use the data provided by participants in this study to inform a quantitative survey to be sent to all compliance officers working in Division II to better fill the gaps related to the true job description of an on-campus compliance officer working in the division, while also considering if a restructuring of Division II athletics departments is necessary.

References

Ajagbe, A. M., Sholanke, A. B., Isiavwe, D. T., & Oke, A. O. (2015). *Qualitative inquiry for social sciences* (pp. 319-325). International Conference on African Development Issues 2015: Social and Economic Models for Development Track.

Barnhill, Smith, N. L., & Oja, B. D. (2021). *Organizational behavior in sport management: An applied approach to understanding people and groups.* Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-67612-4

Bolton, C. B., & Rosselli, A. C. (2017, September 1). The assessment of NCAA Division I compliance professionals: A comprehensive look at these administrators, their experiences, and the pressure they face. *Journal of NCAA Compliance*.

Brinkmann, S. (2013). *Qualitative interviewing*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199861392.001.0001

Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1994). Pay preferences and job search decisions: A person-organization fit perspective. *Personnel Psychology, 47,* 17–348. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1994.tb01727.x

Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person-organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 67,* 294–311. https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1996.0081

Chan, D. (1996). Cognitive misfit of problem-solving style at work: A facet of person-organization fit. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 68,* 194–207. https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1996.0099

Chatman, J. A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Review, 3,* 333-349. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1989.4279063

Chelladurai, P. (2014). *Managing organizations for sport and physical activity: A systems perspective* (4th ed.). Holcomb Hathaway Publishing.

Clifton Strengths (2023). *Gallap.* Retrieved from https://www.gallup.com/cliftonstrengths/en/home.aspx?utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=us_strengths_branded_cs_ecom&utm_term=clifton%20strengths&gclid=Cj0KCQiAic6eBhCoARIsANlox86sJ-sausv2VVCnmmndh2sIS9aeGfWu3yXRPsvydYI4KSMnL6l2MfsgaAm0sEALw_wcB

Dacin, M. T. (1997). Isomorphism in context: The power and prescription of institutional norms. *The Academy of Management Journal, 40,* 46–81. https://doi.org/10.2307/257020

Division II Model Athletic Department Document. (2005). NACDA. Retrieved from https://nacda.com/documents/2018/8/3/6484__div2ada__DivisionIIModelAthleticsDepart.pdf

Fan, P. (2018). Person-organization fit, work-family balance, and work attitude: The moderated mediating effect of supervisor support. *Social Behavior and Personality, 46,* 995–1010. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.6915

Gilad, C. (2005). Newcomer adaptation in teams: Multilevel antecedents and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 48,* 101–116. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2005.15993147

Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. B. (2016). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Kaltenbaugh, L. P., & Parsons, J. W. (2013). A preliminary investigation of NCAA Division II compliance officers. *The Sport Journal, 16.*

Kim, I., & Kuljis, J. (2010). Applying content analysis to web-based content. *Journal of Computer and Information Technology, 4,* 369–375. https://doi.org/10.2498/cit.1001924

Kirkpatrick, N. (2018). Collegiate = corporate? The business and financial backgrounds of athletic directors at the "Power 5" conference level. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 11,* 98–114.

Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrated review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology, 49,* 1-49. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01790.x

Kristof-Brown, A. L., & Billsberry, J. (2013). *Organizational fit: Key issues and new directions.* Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118320853

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology, 58,* 281-342. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00672.x

Lauver, K. J., & Kristof-Brown, A. (2001). Distinguishing between employees' perceptions of person-job and person-organization fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59,* 454-470. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1807

Mertens, D. M. (2020). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods.* SAGE Publications.

Morley, M. (2007). *Person-organization fit.* Emerald Group Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710726375

Morse, J. M. (2010). Simultaneous and sequential qualitative mixed method designs. *Qualitative Inquiry, 16*(6), 483-491. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410364741

National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2022). Division II finances. https://www.ncaa.org/sports/2021/6/10/membership-division-ii-finances.aspx

Parsons, J., Kaltenbaugh, L. P., Brubaker, K, Winters, B., & Cali, S. (2013). A preliminary investigation of NCAA Division II compliance officers. *The Sport Journal, 16,* 154-174. https://doi.org/10.21038/sprt.2013.0223

Pierce, D. A., Lawrence, H. J., & Kaburakis, A. (2011). Creating synergy between athletics compliance and academic programs—Student workers in the compliance office. *Journal of Contemporary Athletics, 5,* 183-201.

Pierce, D., & Johnson, J. (2017). Applying Holland's vocational choice theory in sport management. *Sport Management Education Journal, 11,* 72-87. https://doi.org/10.1123/smej.2016-0015

Sofaer, S. (1999). Qualitative methods: What are they and why use them? *Health Services Research, 34*(5 Pt 2), 1101.

Taylor, S., Bogdan, R., & Devalut, M. L. (2016). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: A guidebook and resource.* Oxford University Press.

Wheeler, A. R., Gallagher, V. C., Brouer, R. L., & Sablynski, C. J. (2007). When person-organization (mis)fit and (dis) satisfaction lead to turnover. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22,* 203-4219. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710726447

Appendix A

Survey Instrument

1. What is your current title at your institution?
2. How many years have you worked in athletic compliance?
3. Provide your education history below (including undergraduate and graduate degrees obtained).
4. Provide your professional history below (including the career path that led to your current position).
5. List all functions you serve at your institution in addition to compliance operations (e.g., SAAC liaison, Marketing, Development, Administrative tasks, etc.)
6. Do you feel supported in your role as compliance administrator at your institution?
7. If no, please explain below.

8. Do you feel overworked in your role as compliance administrator at your institution?

9. If yes, please explain below.

10. Do you have any assistants helping with athletics compliance operations on campus?

11. From your perspective, do you believe it is effective to have a "one person" compliance operation on a NCAA Division II campus? Please explain your response.

12. From your perspective, as many NCAA Division II institutions have "one person" compliance operations, should requirements be added to the compliance role (e.g., setting minimum educational and experience levels)?

13. Please list requirements you believe NCAA Division II compliance officers should have prior to serving in the role. If you do not believe there should be requirements, please respond indicating "none."

14. Please provide recommendations below that you believe would help NCAA Division II compliance administrators running a "one person" department. If you do not have any recommendations, please move on to the next question.

15. Do you have aspirations of moving beyond your current position?

16. What is your career goal?

17. Do you believe serving as an NCAA Division II compliance administrator will help you achieve your goal?

18. Please list any additional information you would like the researchers to know about NCAA Division II compliance administrators and your experience.

Appendix B

Title	Years of Experience	Highest Degree Earned
Athletic Director and Compliance Officer	22	Doctorate in Instructional Management and Leadership
Associate Director of Athletics	13	Master of Education
Associate Athletics Director	5	Master in Education
Assistant Director of Athletics for Compliance	2	Master of Science in Sport Management
Compliance Coordinator and Academics Assistant	1	Master of Business Administration
Assistant AD for Compliance and Academic Services and SWA	15	Master of Business Administration
Associate Athletic Director/Compliance	6	Bachelor of Science
Associate Director of Athletics for Compliance and Student-Athlete Welfare	12	Bachelor of Arts in Psychology
Associate Director of Athletics/ Compliance Director/Athletics Facilities Director	3	Master of Business Administration
Associate AD – Compliance	20	Master of Business Administration
Compliance Officer	4	Bachelor of Science in Organizational Leadership
Assistant AD for Compliance and Academic Success	10	Master of Strategic Leadership
Assistant Athletic Director/Compliance Coordinator	17	Master of Organizational Leadership
Senior Associate Director of Athletics for Compliance	13	Master of Sports Management
Associate Director of Athletics	10.5	PhD in Administration and Leadership Studies, ABD