Motion presented to Faculty Senate 5/10/11
Intercollegiate Athletics Committee committee charge

Proposed change to the charge of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee:

Current (old) charge:

to make recommendations and suggest policies to the Faculty Senate regarding the impact of intercollegiate athletics on academic standards and practices.

Proposed (new) charge:

to oversee procedures by which the Department of Athletics maintains NCAA, conference, and university standards for the academic pursuits of student athletes. This includes

1. developing guidelines for the integration of student athletes into university academic life;
2. evaluating procedures by which the Department of Athletics ensures compliance with NCAA academic requirements, promotes the academic success of student athletes and maintains university academic standards;
3. promoting initiatives that integrate Department of Athletics academic support programs with other campus resources, offices and programs;
4. making recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding these and other academic issues that impact student athletes and the Department of Athletics.

Explanation:
The IAC has reviewed its committee charge and suggests the above change. At a meeting on April 13, 2011, a quorum of voting IAC members unanimously approved a motion to submit this proposed charge for consideration.

The following documents suggest that the IAC charge be updated:

1. The Kaye Report [1] discusses the role of the IAC, and includes the following "principal finding and recommendation" on page 97:
   "6. BU Should Establish a More Active Role for the IAC and the IAB in Oversight and Control of the Athletics Program."
   Within the body of that item, the Kaye Report continues:
   "The IAC should consider revising its charter, in light of the findings of this Report, to formalize a more active role in monitoring and documenting its review and analysis of important issues faced by men's basketball and intercollegiate athletics."
2. Roger Westgate's Preliminary Report [2] to faculty leadership, from June 2010, includes the following:
   "The IAC should be charged to revise its bylaws and strengthen its oversight to ensure academic integrity of the athletic programs (whose mission statement defines the intercollegiate athletics program as a "legitimate part of the academic programs of the University")."

The above text from the two documents states that the charge should be updated; the same documents also include recommendations about what the IAC charge should include.

1. The Kaye Report states:
   "Particular areas that might benefit from ongoing review and analysis by the IAC include the admissions standards for prospective student-athletes (including standards applicable to transfer credits), admissions procedures, the academic success and retention of student athletes by team, the effectiveness of support services offered to student-athletes in need of assistance, effectiveness of the Athletic Department's supervision of coaches, the prevalence of behavioral problems by team and the appropriateness of disciplinary responses."
2. The Westgate Preliminary Report addresses at some length the role of several committees and university officials related to athletics, including the Intercollegiate Athletics Board (IAB), the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), and the IAC. In particular, the Report includes a bulleted list of recommendations for the IAC, including establishing policies to guide admissions on special admits, evaluating academic support resources and advising, establishing appeals processes for admission decisions, and providing oversight for student athlete academic experiences.

The IAC considered the recommendations above before settling on the proposed charge.

Discussion:
As described more completely in the reports cited in this memo and elsewhere, other university committees and individuals (that is, the IAB and the FAR) have oversight roles with respect to the Department of Athletics. Importantly, the IAB membership includes faculty, and those faculty are suggested by the Faculty Senate (and appointed by the University President). Therefore, whereas the IAC is the Faculty Senate's committee on athletics, it need not (and in the opinion of the current IAC membership, it *should* not) address all university issues related to athletics. For example, universities with Division I intercollegiate athletics programs face challenges related to recruiting, NCAA compliance with rules and procedures, gender equity issues, budgets, and more.

The new IAC charge would focus the IAC on *academic* issues related to athletics. This does not represent a departure from the previous IAC charge, which also explicitly targets academics. The IAC believes that the examples provided in the Westgate Preliminary Report are potentially within the scope of the new IAC charge. Some of the examples in the Kaye Report would be in scope, others would be outside the purview of the IAC.

The new charge uses somewhat general language to define its role. Rather than naming Admissions specifically, for example, the new charge focuses instead on integration with other campus "resources, offices, and programs." In addition to Admissions, these could include, for example, the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), the Registrar's office, the various academic advising units within each school and college, and more. The new IAC charge is intended to suggest a somewhat broader and more active role for the IAC to address academic issues, without specifying any particular reports or specific procedures. In other words, the intent of this language is to keep the IAC focused on academics but to provide flexibility in how it does so.
The new charge suggests that the IAC focus on more effective *integration* of athletics with the rest of the university, and on *oversight* of Athletics programs related to academics.

Items 1 and 3 of the proposed charge address integrating student athletes and the Department of Athletics programs more effectively with the rest of the university. Item 2 in the charge calls for the IAC to evaluate those aspects of the Athletics Department that relate to academics. Our thinking in including this language and these themes is that the IAC should not duplicate services already performed within Athletics, nor should it necessarily proactively prescribe how such services should be rendered. Athletics runs a Student Success Center to provide academic advising and support services specifically tailored to student athletes. Athletics also includes procedures to certify the academic eligibility of student athletes each semester. The IAC should evaluate the Athletics Department's effectiveness in these areas and should make recommendations for changes and improvements when necessary. Similarly, the university includes a wide variety of academic policies and procedures for the general student population. The IAC should consider how these policies and procedures effect student athletes in particular, and recommend changes when necessary. Item 4 in the charge defines the IAC's role as advisory to the Faculty Senate.

Examples:
The new IAC charge would encompass most but not all of the examples provided in the Kaye Report and in the Westgate Preliminary Report. Issues that are not directly related to academics would not fall within the purview of the IAC. For example, "effectiveness of the Athletic Department's supervision of coaches," and "behavioral problems by team and the appropriateness of disciplinary responses" [1] both would fall outside the scope of the IAC.

The following more specific items would fall within the scope of the new IAC charge:
1. The GPA policy, which determines the minimum GPA that student athletes must achieve at different academic stages to be eligible to compete.
2. The Missed Class policies of the University and of the Department of Athletics, which address the effect of conflicts between athletic competitions and classes on student athletes.
3. Assessment of the effectiveness of student athlete support services, and of the admissions policies for student athletes, considering their different challenges, responsibilities, and support structure.

During the Spring 2011 semester, the IAC has worked with representatives from Admissions, Athletics, and the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) to design a semester report on the academic progress of student athletes, tying performance at BU with application data including High School GPA, entrance exam scores, and more. The data will be organized by team and individual and will enable

i. Admissions to evolve their policies for special admits of athletes,
ii. Athletics to better design and customize academic support programs for particular athletes, and
iii. the IAC to evaluate the effectiveness and appropriateness of admissions policies for prospective student athletes, and of the support services provided by the Student Success Center within Athletics.

This example illustrates the IAC working in a way that reflects the spirit of the new charge, to improve integration of Athletics with other departments (in this case Admissions), and to

evaluate how well those departments administer policies and programs that are related to both academics and athletics.

References

[1] Judith Kaye, "Report to the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York," Kadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP, February 11, 2010. Available from http://www.suny.edu/Files/sunynewsFiles/Pdf/KayeReport.PDF as of April 26, 2011.

[2] C. R. Westgate, "Preliminary Report to the Faculty Senate CGL's on Athletics and Academics at Binghamton University," June 3, 2010.