

**Intercollegiate Athletics Committee Meeting**  
Director's Conference Room - Casanova Center  
March 2, 2005

**Committee Members and Guests Present:** Gary Gray, Dave Heeke, Jim Isenberg, William Kopeikin, Tom Larson, Michael Moffitt, Bill Moos, Rick Mowday, Jim O'Fallon, George Rowe, Jim Schombert, Kim Sheehan, Nathan Tublitz, Katie Wallace, and Debbie Nankivell.

**NCAA Academic Progress Rate**

The NCAA released data this week on the standings of all Division I schools in meeting the new Academic Progress Rate (APR) standards which were developed as part of the NCAA's new academic reforms. As discussed at previous IAC meetings, the NCAA formula used to calculate the APR is based on each student-athlete being able to earn up to two points per term - one for staying enrolled and one for making academic progress. The team's APR is calculated based on the total points earned by the team at a given time divided by the total points possible. Penalties will be invoked when a team's APR falls below the .925 cutoff once the rules go into effect next fall. Beginning in 2006/07, teams will be penalized by losing scholarships if the cutoff is not met.

The low APR's in some UO programs have definitely caught the attention of the department's coaching and administrative staff. The football, men's track, men's golf, and wrestling teams' APRs did not meet the .925 cutoff for the 2003/04 academic year indicating if the rules were effective now, scholarships would be lost in those sports. Discussions continue within the Pac-10 and nationally regarding the new rules. There is also some question about the equity of the system for quarter schools vs. semester schools.

**IAC Report to the Senate on the COIA Document** (from Jim Isenberg - 3/8/05)

"Academic Integrity and Intercollegiate Athletics Principles, Rules and Practices" (Voting Draft 24 February 2005).

The IAC devoted its March 2 meeting to discussing this document, after having examined an earlier version in December. The current version has been available to IAC members since February 25.

Before discussing the members' views on the document, let me comment on the nature of the document. The document includes three types of statements: Proposed NCAA regulations, Best Practices, and Statements of Principle.

**Proposed NCAA regulations:** Three specific regulations are proposed for adoption by the NCAA. The first proposes that athletic scholarships be awarded on the presumption that they last five years or until graduation, and that they be revocable only for academic reasons. The second proposes the collection of data on student-athlete academic performance by course section. The data is to be delivered to the Senate, and monitored to note any preferential treatment of student-athletes by individual faculty. The third proposed NCAA regulation bans "divided competitive seasons", thus outlawing intercollegiate competition during a non traditional playing season (e.g., spring soccer).

**Best Practices:** A large number of proposals (over 50) are listed as "best practices". The idea is to raise issues

for schools to consider, and to suggest approaches that individual schools may wish to follow on their own. Included are proposals regarding admissions (e.g., closely monitor the academic performance of special student-athlete admits), athletic scholarships (e.g., reduce and perhaps phase out athletic scholarships in favor of need based scholarships), curricular integrity (e.g., scrutinize courses offered by the Athletic Department), athletic competition scheduling and time commitment (e.g., reduce season length and work to avoid competition during class time), and academic advising (e.g., emphasize academic achievement rather than eligibility maintenance).

**Statements of Principle:** The document includes a number of broad statements concerning the value of intercollegiate athletics, its relation to the academic mission, the role of the student-athlete on campus, and the relation of faculty to athletics.

A large majority of the IAC members at the meeting expressed support for the overall intention of the COIA to raise awareness among university faculty members regarding issues concerning intercollegiate athletics. There was broad support for many of the Statements of Principles, for a number of the Best Practices, and for some of the proposed NCAA Regulations.

However, a number of the IAC members were not happy that the document is being offered as a single document, to be voted up or down as a whole. The reasons for this include the following:

- 1) Disagreement with one or more of the specific proposals.
- 2) Uncertainty regarding what one should do with the Best Practices. Develop them into proposed NCAA regulations? Work to enact them on one's own campus? Admire them but do little about them?
- 3) Reaction to inadequate time to fully discuss the document and the 60 plus proposals that it contains.

The meeting included an extensive discussion of a number of the individual proposals, especially those proposed as NCAA regulations. The most widespread discussion concerned the proposal that data be collected on student-athlete grades by course section. Some of those favoring this proposal noted that it might help all of us to have our grading practices checked. It was also stated that one certainly does not want certain course sections to be used as "gut sections" for athletes, with the intent to keep athletes eligible. Some of those opposed to this proposal were unhappy with infringement of the academic freedom of faculty members. Others thought it unfair to track student-athletes in this way, but to track no one else. Finally, there were some who noted that collecting this data could entail considerable expense of time and money.

Discussion of the other proposals involved a similar range of opinion, but lack of time prevented the airing of all views.

There was some debate over whether one who supports some but not all of the document should vote for it or against it. The argument was made that if the document as a whole is a positive step toward a comprehensive discussion of athletics on campus, then one should vote for it. The argument was also made that since a vote for the document is necessarily construed as support for all of its provisions, then anyone with severe reservations concerning one or more of the proposals should vote against it.

**The final vote was:**

4 - Yes

6 - No

**Next IAC Meeting**

The next IAC meeting has been scheduled for 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, April 6, 2005 in the Johnson Hall Conference Room.

dln