

Report to the Membership

The Steering Committee of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics

March 2014

Executive Summary

The context of college sports, 2013-14. The past year saw an abrupt rise in pressures for professionalization, especially of the revenue sports, and increasing dissatisfaction with the NCAA. The ongoing O'Bannon lawsuit, rising revenues from media contracts, and continued questions about NCAA enforcement procedures have generated increased public demand that athletes share in revenues, and an attempt to form a unionized team was initiated. The largest conferences pushed for autonomy to respond to these pressures, leading the NCAA to pivot from its decentralization focus to a Division I restructuring initiative. COIA and FAR groups responded by lobbying for a greater faculty role in the NCAA, to strengthen the priority of academic values in decisions and sustain the collegiate model against pressure to professionalize.

The Coalition in 2013-14. After early efforts to advocate its plan for increasing faculty engagement at campus and conference levels in response to the NCAA's decentralization plan, COIA shifted focus to raising faculty presence in NCAA decision making, once the D1 restructuring process began. On both issues, the Coalition has worked to partner with FAR groups to increase faculty leverage, and COIA has had a seat at the table in NCAA meetings held on restructuring. The Coalition also began a partnership with the NCAA to learn more about campus approaches to concussion-related issues, promote information sharing, and raise faculty awareness.

Faculty engagement. COIA's proposal for increasing campus and conference faculty engagement met with mixed response: neither the NCAA nor IA FARs backed an approach requiring campuses to support faculty senate engagement. Reactions of individual senates and campuses varied widely, but the general goals of the proposal did have broad support, and COIA's effort moving forward will be to assist senates interested in using the plan as a model.

The 2014 national meeting. The major topics of the national meeting were the faculty role in NCAA D1 restructuring, the viability of plans to bring athletics spending and pressures for professionalization under control through an antitrust exemption protecting the collegiate model, the NCAA's view of the COIA concussion survey preliminary findings, and the impact of academic fraud scandals.

Leadership changes. The Coalition has shifted, on an ad hoc basis, from a co-chair leadership model to a structure involving a single chair and a supporting three-person leadership group. In addition to its Steering Committee, the COIA leadership plans to strengthen the engagement of continuing COIA representatives appointed by its 62 member senates.

Preliminary agenda, 2014-15. The major focus of COIA for the next six months will be partnering with FAR groups to enlarge the faculty voice within the NCAA. Building faculty capacity on athletics issues in campus senates through implementation of the faculty engagement model will complement this effort to raise the faculty profile. Completing the concussion survey and creating an informational online resource will be a priority over the next three months, and COIA will explore possible areas of expanding this partnership with the NCAA. In partnership with the NCAA Research Division, a subcommittee on athletics governance will survey current campus practices.

Introduction: The changing national context for intercollegiate athletics and the NCAA

The past year saw abrupt changes in the dialogue surrounding intercollegiate athletics. While the confusion of conference shifts that dominated 2012 subsided, more fundamental questions emerged, including issues that threatened the survival of the NCAA and the collegiate model of college sports.

There was a sharp uptick in media attacks on the NCAA, some connected with the ongoing O'Bannon lawsuit, in which the NCAA has been sued for its practices in licensing athlete images, and others connected to problems in the NCAA's enforcement approach to infractions, including its handling of sanctions in the 2011 Penn State case. Some of these attacks have called for the dissolution of the NCAA, while others have focused on the inequities of a collegiate model that rewards athletics administrators and coaches on a scale never before seen, while constraining athletes within the narrow economic limits of scholarships. The latter issue has increased support for some form of professionalized pay-for-play system, and dovetailed with calls for a players' union and the first petition to the NLRB to permit an attempt to unionize a college sports team.

A simultaneous development last summer created an existential threat from another direction: the apparent willingness of the five most powerful conferences to leave the NCAA if not granted significant autonomy to enhance the scholarships and benefits available to their athletes beyond levels most other conferences could afford. This led the NCAA to respond with a quickly designed process for restructuring Division I in a way that would, among other outcomes, grant such autonomy. But in view of the intent of the "Big 5" to begin upping the ante for athlete scholarships and benefits, many wondered whether this self-described attempt to respond to the pressures of professionalization was not, in fact, simply a major step on the road towards it.

For COIA, these events generated a sharp pivot from advocacy for its 2013 plan to respond to the NCAA's program of decentralized regulation – an initiative that has, for now, apparently been sidelined – to an effort to contribute to the NCAA's restructuring initiative, and ensure that the faculty voice was well represented. In COIA's view, given the low public esteem for the NCAA and the sharply rising pressures for professionalization, the D1 restructuring initiative should be understood to be the last chance the NCAA will have to put the collegiate model on a sustainable footing and prevent the shift to a professionalized model that now seems a more likely outcome.

In this report, the COIA Steering Committee will discuss five topics:

1. Coalition activities, 2013-14
2. The current state of COIA's 2013 proposal for faculty engagement in athletics
3. The 2014 annual Coalition meeting in Tampa
4. Coalition leadership changes
5. The agenda for 2014-15 and the role of COIA member senates

The following appendixes are included:

- Appendix 1: COIA Membership Chart
- Appendix 2: Principles and Proposals Concerning NCAA Division I Restructuring
- Appendix 3: COIA Mission Statement

1. Coalition activities, 2013-14

At COIA's annual meeting, February 1-3, 2013, members of the NCAA administrative leadership requested that the Coalition propose a plan for enhancing faculty engagement in athletics oversight, anticipating accelerated decentralization of athletics regulation, and the need for active faculty involvement in increased regulation on the campus and conference levels. Following discussions at the annual meeting, the Steering Committee completed and submitted a final draft of the COIA plan within two weeks.

The NCAA's response to the Coalition proposal was received from President Emmert in May, and stressed the importance of working together with the 1A-FAR Association and FARA in further discussions of the plan, and email communication led to a conference with the 1A-FAR and FARA leadership in September, at the 1A-FAR Association's annual meeting in Dallas. COIA was represented by Chair Mike Bowen (South Florida), along with Steering Committee members Sue Carter (Michigan State), Bob Eno (Indiana), and John Nichols (Penn State). The substance of those discussions is described in the following section of this report, which focuses on the current state of the Coalition proposal.

During the second half of the year, COIA activities were focused on responding to the new NCAA initiative to restructure D1. After the NCAA announced in August that the process would formally begin with a meeting of representatives of stakeholder groups, Mike Bowen sent a request to the chair of the Subcommittee for Restructuring, Wake Forest President Nathan Hatch, NCAA Executive Committee Chair Lou Anna K. Simon and NCAA President Mark Emmert asking that COIA be included among those groups. The Coalition request was granted and in early October, the Steering Committee submitted its recommendations on D1 restructuring to the Subcommittee (Appendix 2). Subsequently, the Coalition joined with FARA and the 1A FAR Association to submit a joint statement of common themes shared by all three faculty groups. On October 29, Mike Bowen represented COIA at NCAA headquarters in Indianapolis at the Subcommittee's meeting of stakeholders, presenting COIA's perspective and taking questions from the Board on the joint faculty statement.

Mike Bowen, accompanied by Steering Committee member Bob Eno, also represented COIA at two days of meetings on restructuring that were scheduled during the NCAA's 2014 Annual Convention, held in San Diego this past January. More detailed discussions of the NCAA restructuring process and COIA's role are included in COIA's 2014 Annual Meeting Report.

A separate initiative grew out of Steering Committee discussions in November, prompted by the release of a National Academy of Sciences report on concussions in sports. Concerned about the importance that faculty demonstrate due diligence in responding to this student health issue, the Steering Committee established a Subcommittee on Concussions (including Bob Eno, Bruce Jaffee [Indiana], Ginny Shepherd [Vanderbilt], and Nathan Tublitz [Oregon]) which, in consultation with NCAA Chief Medical Officer Dr. Brian Hainline, designed a questionnaire on concussion-related policies and practices. Questionnaires were sent to COIA member senates, recommending that they ask their athletics departments to complete the survey, and asking that results be forwarded to the Subcommittee. Our hope was that the survey would form a baseline of knowledge that could inform normal oversight in the context of annual senate consideration of athletics. The results of the survey were compiled in a preliminary report, prepared for the 2014 COIA annual meeting, and a final report is scheduled for completion by April 1.

The Coalition leadership continued COIA's history of building and maintaining bridges to partner organizations throughout the year. Some of the tangible products of these efforts have been a February 2013 Steering Committee statement in support of a position paper on initial student-athlete eligibility issues by the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletes (N4A), which has led to discussions of how our groups could renew partnership work on academic integrity issues, and a June Steering Committee statement in support of the 1A FAR Association statement on limiting the scope of post-season football playoffs. The leadership has also continued to communicate with regularity with the NCAA, the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics, the N4A, and the Drake Group, representatives of which either attended or gave presentations at COIA's recent annual meeting. In addition, the COIA leadership sent a letter to Secretary of Education Arne Duncan and Former Representative Tom McMillan, supporting their joint *USA Today* column addressing the current contractual incentive structures for coaches, and calling for changes resembling those recommended by COIA in its 2005 report to the NCAA Presidential Task Force.

Beyond these activities, the Coalition leadership has responded to numerous press requests for interviews and comments, and maintained contact with its membership through letters and updates sent to incoming and continuing member senate chairs, and reached out to other FBS senate chairs through letters and updates.

We continue to actively invite questions from senates whose members wish to consider joining the Coalition, and a number of non-COIA FBS senates have indicated that they are discussing the possibility of membership. We are pleased to announce that the Rice University and University of Akron faculty senates have recently voted to join the Coalition, becoming COIA's 62nd and 63rd member senates (see COIA Membership Chart, Appendix 1).

2. The current state of COIA's 2013 proposal for faculty engagement in athletics

In February 2013, responding to the NCAA's request for a proposal to increase faculty engagement in campus athletics policy and oversight, the Coalition proposed a plan to institutionalize engagement through senate appointment of a "Senate Athletics Representative," who would lead initiatives on campus athletics policy under a decentralized NCAA regulation regime, complementing campus FARs. The plan called for SARs to pursue this work through an "Academic Integrity Group" (which could be a subcommittee of an existing campus athletics board), and for coordination across campuses through conference-level interactions and an annual report to an NCAA committee of FARs. Recognizing that campuses vary widely in traditions and structures, the proposal specified that the model should be treated as "strictly conceptual," to be adapted as appropriate to individual campuses. However, believing that on many campuses, administrations would not allow SARs and senates to fulfill these new functions, we recommended that the NCAA make some such arrangement a requirement for member FBS schools.

The proposal met with mixed response. All essential features of the proposal were the product of discussions and work sessions at the 2013 annual meeting, and the leadership of many senates represented at the meeting, and others, were supportive. At least one school has since taken the

proposal as a model and implemented its features in a realigned structure of senate/campus athletics oversight.

However, there was significant dissatisfaction from some other schools and groups. While not rejecting the general goals of the proposal, the 1A FAR Association leadership objected strongly to any uniform mandate, and expressed concerns that the SAR could hamper the effectiveness of campus FARs. Some schools, including some COIA senates, were sharply negative, seeing the plan as the imposition of unwelcome uniformity and an added level of unproductive bureaucracy.

It is apparent in retrospect that the proposal was not clear enough when it specified that its model was intended to be strictly conceptual, specifying functions needed to respond to the NCAA's deregulation initiative, which should be adapted to existing campus structures. Indeed, some of the schools we heard negative responses from were ones where virtually all the campus-level elements of the proposal were essentially in place.

One thing that is quite clear now is that there is no prospect of the NCAA mandating the appointment of SARs, or undertaking to educate and bring SARs together to create a well informed network of senate representatives who could complement FARs on levels beyond the campus. In view of this, COIA's plan now is to pursue the goals of the proposal from the bottom up, asking senates to consider individually appointing colleagues well informed about athletics issues to find ways to implement the plan's functions to whatever degree possible.

To facilitate this strategy, the COIA leadership will ask those member senates that have not yet appointed a continuing COIA representative to do so, and will attempt to foster communication among COIA reps through regular reports and discussions on a new COIA rep listserve. This plan is discussed further in Section 4 below.

3. The 2013-14 annual COIA meeting, February 28 - March 2, University of South Florida

The chief focus of the 2014 annual meeting was on three issues: NCAA D1 restructuring; athletics financing and the Drake Group proposal for an NCAA antitrust exemption and restructuring; and the Coalition's concussion survey. The meeting also focused on COIA's perennial concern with issues of academic integrity, considering lessons to be learned from the academic fraud scandal at the University of North Carolina.

NCAA restructuring. Jean Frankel, who is facilitating the NCAA D1 restructuring process, provided an overview of the history and goals of the restructuring process. In terms of organizational aspects, the goal of restructuring is to move NCAA legislation from a constituency-based to a knowledge-based process, and to clarifying accountability. Criticism of an early draft plan has led to an added focus on basic questions of mission and governance principles, and ways that policy decisions can be measured against them. In terms of history, the effort should be understood as a response to pressures from the Big 5 conferences for greater autonomy, a development that is, in large part, itself a response to growing public pressure to professionalize some or all college sports. Discussion, in both plenary and work sessions, focused on the role that faculty should play in a restructured NCAA, including expansion of FAR influence and increased influence of the broader faculty, through elected senates. Given strong operational pressures to let imperatives of success on the field and revenue generation shape

athletics decisions, institutionalizing a strong faculty advocacy of prioritizing academic values is essential to an NCAA that can sustain the amateur collegiate model.

Athletics finances. Amy Perko, Executive Director of the Knight Commission, presented extensive data showing that the growth of athletics budgets was far outstripping academic growth on a per student/student-athlete basis. While enhanced media contracts allow a small number of programs to operate athletics programs in the black, the overwhelming majority rely on substantial direct subsidies from general funds and student fees. For a subset of conferences, media contracts will generate enormous new revenues in the near future, but indications are that schools are already designating this money for enlarged athletics expenditures.

Antitrust issues. Allen Sack and Gerald Gurney of the Drake Group leadership presented a draft of the College Athlete Protection (CAP) Act, a legislative bill for which they are recruiting sponsors in the US Senate. The CAP Act would provide the NCAA with an antitrust exemption, and outlines detailed features of a regime that would ensure that NCAA regulation of athletics was in accord with the academic priorities of higher education and NCAA member institutions. Discussion concerned the practicality of the CAP Act's design and optimal ways to configure principles of regulation under an antitrust exemption.

Concussions. NCAA Chief Medical Officer Dr. Brian Hainline provided an overview of issues related to sports concussions and student-athlete health, and of essential features of well informed policies and management of concussions on the college level, including the design of conflict-of-interest free protocols. Dr. Hainline proceeded to analyze in detail the preliminary findings of the COIA concussion survey. The results strongly indicate that schools have responded actively to the need to professionalize concussion-related protocols and have well informed policies in place. Some areas that may need improvement include baseline testing instruments, coach education, and return-to-classroom protocols. Dr. Hainline plans to use the survey results to revise NCAA best practice guides and provide enhanced online resources. (The final report of the Subcommittee on Concussions is scheduled for April 1.)

Academic integrity. Bob Malekoff, a member of the Rawlings Commission that investigated academic fraud at UNC, reflected on the lessons we should draw from the Commission's findings. One contributing factor to problems of academic integrity was the lack of clear accountability, or "ownership," in college sports. Presidents, nominally in charge, are undercut by other powerful constituencies that may determine key decisions, weakening integrity. Another factor is the failure of faculty to take responsibility for monitoring faculty conduct with regard to student-athletes, allowing faculty-abetted fraud to persist over long periods. And lastly, lack of financial transparency in athletics frustrates oversight and creates a context that makes rules violations harder to detect.

COIA business. In its business meeting, COIA's leadership for 2014-15 was confirmed and the plan to work on implementing the Coalition's faculty engagement plan locally on individual campuses was confirmed. A decision was made to undertake a study of current campus athletics governance practices, in partnership with the NCAA research division. Finally, participants voted to endorse a new mission statement for the Coalition (see Appendix 3).

Detailed accounts of these presentations and sessions appear in COIA's 2014 Annual Meeting Report.

4. Coalition leadership changes

COIA's bylaws call for the Coalition to be led by two co-chairs. However, because the Coalition is an all-volunteer organization, without funds and offering no career rewards, it is not always possible to recruit two colleagues willing to share leadership burdens. As Mike Bowen completed his first year as Co-Chair in early 2013, and Senior Co-Chair John Nichols stepped down, the second co-chair slot fell vacant. Three former co-chairs, Bob Eno, Ginny Shepherd, and Nathan Tublitz, agreed to serve as ad hoc "associate co-chairs," sharing tasks in support of Mike's efforts as sole Chair. Because this four-person leadership group included members familiar with COIA leadership spanning the period since the Coalition's inception, the arrangement was effective. At the 2014 annual meeting, participating COIA representatives voted to continue this ad hoc structure in the coming year.

However, as we have all learned, COIA's mission is not likely to be accomplished soon, and the need for this Coalition of senates will certainly continue beyond the time that this ad hoc arrangement can survive. The leadership will continue to seek for and welcome colleagues who want to play more active roles in COIA, and to hope that some will be willing to consider and prepare for a future term as co-chair.

5. The agenda for 2014-15 and the role of COIA member senates

Concerning the COIA agenda for the coming year, it was agreed that COIA's engagement in NCAA restructuring would continue to be the main focus of the Coalition through the projected completion date of the process, August 2014. The importance of joining with the two NCAA faculty groups FARA and the 1A FAR Association was a theme of the 2014 annual meeting, and negotiations for collaborative work over the coming months have already begun.

Given the value that the COIA concussion survey has already provided, the Coalition will explore for ways to continue collaborative work with the NCAA Sport Science Institute. The final report of the concussion survey is now scheduled for April 1; all additional survey questionnaires submitted by March 21 will be included in the report database. Brian Hainline's stress on the importance of proper management of mental health issues during his talk to the Coalition suggests that this may be an area where COIA can contribute by exploring how faculty understanding of the issue can be improved through optimizing campus policies and protocols. This is an issue with implications for better faculty support for all students, and may be of particular interest to senates for that reason.

In addition, discussions with Michael Miranda, NCAA Associate Director of Research, who joined the Tampa meeting, indicated that the NCAA was interested in partnering with COIA in a project to determine the ways campus athletics governance is practiced among FBS schools: for example, the ways that senates, FARs, campus athletics boards, and athletics departments communicate and divide responsibilities, an issue on which COIA has guided research in the past. Participants felt that topical surveys and data-based research of this nature had been demonstrated to be appropriate Coalition activities, and it was agreed that Mike Bowen would organize a subcommittee to explore these governance questions, working with the University of

Tulsa's COIA representative, Adrien Bouchet, whose expertise is well suited to this type of research, and University of Hawaii representative Kelley Withy.

Organizationally, COIA needs to seek ways to build capacity in several respects. Within the Coalition structure, the COIA leadership will initiate more regular Steering Committee interactions and reports to the membership, and will work to organize COIA reps in a more coherent structure with closer ties to the leadership and avenues for inter-school communication.

Beyond COIA, through leadership communications and the work of a more interactive COIA rep group, the Coalition will attempt to help interested senates implement aspects of the 2013 faculty engagement blueprint to whatever degree is feasible on individual campuses. Part of that model involves increased senate-to-senate communication on athletics issues of common interest (not to rule out relationships that may extend beyond athletics), and the COIA rep group can become an initial support in fostering these contacts.

Members of the COIA Steering Committee

Bob Akin (Texas Christian University)
Jane Albrecht (Wake Forest University)
Chris Anderson (University of Tulsa)
Mike Bowen (University of South Florida)
Sue Carter (Michigan State University)
Gary Engstrand (University of Minnesota)
Larry Gramling (University of Connecticut)
David Kinnunen (California State University - Fresno)
Dan Orlovsky (Southern Methodist University)
Jerry Peterson (University of Colorado)
Ginny Shepherd (Vanderbilt University)
Ben Taylor (New Mexico State University)
David Turnbull (Washington State University)

Appendix 1

COIA Membership Chart

By Football Bowl Subdivision Conference

March 2014



COIA Member Senates



Schools without faculty senates

AAC	ACC	Big Ten	Big 12	CUSA	MAC	Mt. West	Pacific 12	SEC	Sun Belt	Ind.
Central Florida	Boston College	Illinois	Baylor	Alabama - Birmingham	Akron	Air Force	Arizona	Alabama	Arkansas State	Army
Cincinnati	Clemson	Indiana	Iowa State	East Carolina	Ball State	Boise State	Arizona State	Arkansas	Georgia State	Brigham Young
Connecticut	Duke	Iowa	Kansas	Florida Atlantic	Bowling Green	Colorado State	Cal - Berkeley	Auburn	Louisiana - Lafayette	Idaho
Houston	Florida State	Michigan	Kansas State	Florida International	Buffalo	Fresno State	Colorado	Florida	Louisiana - Monroe	Navy
Louisville	Georgia Tech	Michigan State	Oklahoma	Louisiana Tech	Central Michigan	Hawai'i	Oregon	Georgia	South Alabama	New Mexico State
Memphis	Maryland	Minnesota	Oklahoma State	Marshall	Eastern Michigan	Nevada - Reno	Oregon State	Kentucky	Texas State	Notre Dame
Rutgers	Miami	Nebraska	Texas	Middle Tennessee	Kent State	Nevada - Las Vegas	Southern California	Louisiana State	Troy	
South Florida	North Carolina	Northwestern	Texas Christian	North Texas	Massachusetts - Amherst	New Mexico	Stanford	Mississippi	Western Kentucky	
Southern Methodist	N. Carolina State	Ohio State	Texas Tech	Rice	Miami (OH)	San Diego State	UCLA	Mississippi State		
Temple	Pittsburgh	Penn State	West Virginia	Southern Mississippi	Northern Illinois	San Jose State	Utah	Missouri		
	Syracuse	Purdue		Texas - San Antonio	Ohio	Utah State	Washington	South Carolina		
	Virginia	Wisconsin		Texas - El Paso	Toledo	Wyoming	Washington State	Tennessee		
	Virginia Tech			Tulane	Western Michigan			Texas A & M		
	Wake Forest			Tulsa				Vanderbilt		

Note: Idaho and New Mexico State play non-football sports in the WAC; Notre Dame plays non-football sports in the ACC.

Total number of FBS schools: 127 (number with senates: 123)

Number of COIA member senates: 63

Appendix 2

Principles and Proposals Concerning NCAA Division I Restructuring

Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics

October 2013

The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) welcomes the opportunity to convey its views on the restructuring of NCAA Division I. We are one of three faculty organizations whose input has been invited; our perspective reflects the orientation of faculty senates, which comprise our larger membership. Our IA FAR colleagues have offered specific analyses of the current NCAA structural organization from the perspective of their NCAA experience. In our statement we will focus on strategic issues that appear most critical from the perspective of campus faculty leadership.

Our brief contribution concerns principles that we believe should govern the restructuring process, and a concise set of specific recommendations. Its unifying theme is that given the challenges facing college sports today, restructuring must convey in substance and appearance that while it is the function of the NCAA to regulate athletics, its larger purpose is to ensure that athletics enhances and does not jeopardize the educational mission of its member schools.

The essential features of our principles and recommendation are as follows:

- Restructuring should be designed to anticipate the challenges of the coming decade.
- Major challenges will include protecting the collegiate model from professionalization, dramatic salary increases, loss of fee flexibility, and loss of tax exemptions.
- Rearticulating the NCAA mission as regulation of athletics to enhance the success of US higher education in a global context can set a foundation for restructuring.
- Increased engagement of faculty within the NCAA structure and in athletics governance on campuses and in conferences can strengthen the NCAA mission.
- Leverage to answer current challenges and restore public confidence can be gained by restructuring a presidentially-controlled DI Board to include a non-presidential component made up of athletics directors, faculty, and representatives of the public.

Principles

Basis for planning. We believe that planning for reorganization should be based on an assessment of the trajectory of college sports over a ten-year time frame, identifying the projected state of athletics in 2023 on the basis of current conditions and trends, and contrasting it with the ideal state of athletics as framed by the NCAA mission. The gap between the current trajectory and the appropriate mission cannot be bridged by structural reorganization, but structural reorganization should be strategically designed to help minimize that gap.

Current trajectory. On the current trajectory, we believe the present NCAA Division I will include the following features by 2023 or sooner: a significant subset of programs will have become professionalized and perhaps unionized, abandoning the collegiate model; leading head coach salaries will have grown to the \$10m level, with athletics costs rising proportionately; institutional fiscal sustainability will be increasingly leveraged on the continued and perhaps unsustainable growth of athletics revenues; reaction to the visibly escalating student-athlete spending curve will have limited elasticity in general tuition and fee rates, capping the main source of general fund growth; and tax exempt status for athletics gifts and revenues may have been limited or lost. We believe these that features are inconsistent with the mission of the NCAA and of its member schools, and that a principal objective of reform should be to create structures that can best help to shape a future far more consistent with the principles of the NCAA mission.

Mission definition. The basic principle that legitimates the NCAA is that intercollegiate athletics is conducted in the interest of the common academic mission of member schools. We believe this principle needs to be rearticulated and refocused. The current NCAA structure expresses its mission in terms of the sum of the interests of its members, rather than in terms of the interest of US higher education as a whole, of which its membership is the elite tier. The NCAA can protect the collegiate model, its contributions to campus and alumni culture, and the tax exempt status of athletics only by accepting the enhancement of higher education as a critical national enterprise in a competitive global educational environment as the object of its regulatory mission. Because the pursuit of aspirational goals by NCAA member schools individually takes place in a zero-sum win-lose context, free market principles will not promote the mission of the whole without a regulatory perspective that transcends the sum of the interests of individual schools. The NCAA structure should enable and empower such a guiding perspective. In this sense, the nature of NCAA DI as a membership organization may need to be reconceived to align regulatory design with the mission goals of its collective membership.

We believe that these principles point towards solutions that will both facilitate more effective regulation consistent with the mission, and demonstrate to a skeptical public the membership's commitment to preserving the basis of intercollegiate sports as an enhancement of the academic experience for a critical public purpose.

Recommendations

1. Enhancing the faculty role. As an alliance of FBS faculty senates concerned about the effects of athletics on the academic mission, COIA holds that the faculty can provide unique and essential contributions to athletics regulation. Faculty are normally listed as one among many interest groups in a complex athletics environment that privileges the perspectives of on-field competition and fiscal management. But the unique nature of the faculty "interest" is that as

professional stewards of campus academic missions, the faculty interest is entirely in the potential of athletics to enhance the academic culture of our campuses. This deep alignment to the ideals of the NCAA's mission is strengthened by the faculty's ability, through the protections of tenure, to express this perspective with exceptional independence.

For this reason we recommend the enhancement of faculty engagement in athletics on two levels: within the FAR administrative structure, and as a dispersed engaged academic group at the campus and conference levels.

- Within the NCAA administrative structure. We strongly support the recommendations of our FAR colleagues for an increased faculty presence on NCAA councils and committees.
- On campus and conference levels. We recommend that the NCAA take the necessary steps to promote the strengthened capability and role of faculty governance in athletics policy making and oversight, in concert with FARs, and to foster organs for intercampus communication among faculty governance groups undertaking these responsibilities. We have submitted one detailed vision of these ideals to the NCAA in *INCREASING FACULTY ENGAGEMENT IN A DEREGULATED ATHLETICS CONTEXT* (February 2013), and look forward to further discussion and revision of those ideas.

2. Constitution of the DI NCAA board. The governing Board of DI must play a fiduciary role ensuring the alignment of policy and practice with the NCAA mission, and develop and monitor strategic plans to retain that alignment under changing conditions. While the problems facing athletics have only grown over the past two decades, we believe that the principle of presidential leadership remains valid. However, as an organization that has a critical impact on US higher education, the structure of the Board should reflect to the public in substance and appearance the NCAA's commitment to athletics under the collegiate model, and build and maintain public confidence in the authenticity of the NCAA mission and integrity of its pursuit.

We believe that to fulfill these criteria, the DI Board should include, in addition to a strong majority of presidents and chancellors, three other types of members: Athletics Directors, faculty members (such as FARs), and public members external to higher education.

- We recommend that at least two Athletics Directors and at least two faculty appointees to Board positions. Board participation by these internal groups, which reflect the most broadly informed perspectives of athletics and academics, will not only provide a representational function, but will better align responsibilities and authority within the NCAA structure, and facilitate the more holistic engagement of these groups through the incentive of shared ownership.
- We recommend that a limited number of Board seats be allocated to public representatives with appropriate stature, credibility, and understanding of American

education, who can bring valuable expertise to the Board, represent the public interest that the NCAA's mission reflects, and enhance public trust in the NCAA.

We believe that this judicious sharing of control by the presidents and chancellors will produce a far greater return in internal and external leverage over the challenges that face DI athletics than is lost by relinquishing a monopoly on Board decision making.

*

We are a faculty group: naturally, we have much more to say. We are well aware of important questions concerning the continuing integrity of the present Division I, the role of conferences, the design of key committees, the voting basis of legislative action, and so forth. But given the complexity of the current task, the multiplicity of groups asked to comment, and the expertise of our FAR colleagues, we think it would be best at this time to restrict our Coalition's contributions to this limited list of strategic points, briefly outlined from a faculty perspective. We look forward to ongoing participation in these discussions.

Appendix 3

Mission Statement
Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics

The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) is an organization representing elected faculty governance bodies of FBS universities in activities related to the administration and governance of intercollegiate athletics.

COIA's mission is to promote the academic integrity of our universities, and to represent the interests of our faculties, non-athlete students and student-athletes in matters related to college sports that can significantly affect the health, sustainability and educational missions of our institutions.

COIA aims to accomplish these goals by assisting the governance of intercollegiate athletics on our campuses through data collection, information sharing, and the development of best practices, partnering with peer-faculty and other organizations in areas of common interest, and also by providing a constructive, responsible and informed representative faculty voice at the conference and national (NCAA) levels.

March, 2014