COIA Meeting Notes

14th Annual Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics Meeting

Wake Forest University

Winston-Salem, North Carolina

02/17/17 - Steering Committee meeting

Present: Jane Albrecht (Wake Forest), Mike Bowen (South Florida), Matt Wheeler (Illinois), Wendy Smooth (Ohio State), Kelley Withy (Hawaii), John Elson (Northwestern), David Ridpath (Drake Group), Jessica Gall Myrick (Indiana), Brian Turner (Ohio State), Marty Crimp (Michigan State), Chris Anderson (Tulsa), Larry Gramling (Connecticut), John Nicholas (Akron)

Brief discussion of the process related to the by-laws. There was confusion on whether half of the membership or two-thirds of voting institutions were needed to pass the by-laws. By the end of the meeting, people generally agreed it should be two-thirds of those who voted with abstentions not counted at all. Members of the steering committee expressed their hopes that the by-laws would pass as they felt there was no other way to move COIA forward. Other expressed concern that these weren’t just slight amendments to the bylaws but instead wholesale changes (for example, the new bylaws are 8 pages and the old ones were 3 pages long).

02/18/17 – Day 1 of Full COIA Meeting

Present: Jane Albrecht (Wake Forest), Mike Bowen (South Florida), Matt Wheeler (Illinois), Wendy Smooth (Ohio State), Kelley Withy (Hawaii), John Elson (Northwestern), David Ridpath (Drake Group and Ohio), Jessica Gall Myrick (Indiana), Marty Crimp (Michigan State), Chris Anderson (Tulsa), Larry Gramling (Connecticut), John Nicholas (Akron), Sharon Beckman (Boston C.), Colleen Bee (Oregon St.), Kathy Bailey (Boston C.), Brennan Berg (Memphis), Max Boycoff (Colorado), David Keys (New Mexico St.), Joan King (Louisiana St.), Ben Carrington (Texas), Margaret Blake (Houston), Christopher Schwirian (Ohio), Todd Adams (Florida St.), Bonnie Ownley (Tennessee), Deborah Clarke (North Carolina, President’s Office), Scott Grozdz (Colorado), Bob Malekoff (North Carolina), Erianne Weight (North Carolina), Jean Frankel (Ideas for Action LLC), Jeanne Herrick (Northwestern),

After coffee and breakfast, Mike Bowen began introductions and gave thanks to Wake Forest for hosting us as well as to the steering committee members and Jean Frankel (President of Ideas for Action, consulting company, former NCAA governance consultant on the redesign). Then individual members all introduced themselves to each other.

It was established there was not a quorum present so elections will have to take place afterward somehow. Mike Bowen discussed that he believes our universities, faculty and students are “under assault” in today’s world, citing recent state-based legislation to end or diminish tenure as well as the March for Science as a demonstration that science is under attack.

Dave Ridpath (Ohio University), president of the Drake Group, mentioned that they have been working with researchers to put out position papers when hot topics come up (e.g., scheduling, time demands, sexual assault on campus, etc.). Proposed that Drake could do the legwork on getting these out but then the COIA steering group could choose to endorse it.

Kelley Withy noted that COIA’s roots are in academics and student-welfare, so maybe we should work within those areas now and attack those as a group instead of the broader faculty-related issues.

Mike Bowen reiterated that he has been frustrated as the chair because he represents the entire membership but hasn’t had a fully representative steering committee that would have made it possible to take stances on recent topics.

Marty Crimp, Michigan State, notes that we need to be sure the steering committee represents the values of faculty senates. This group (COIA) isn’t focusing on its core issues and things we can agree on, but instead gets caught up in issues that divide us. It’s an engagement and leadership issue, not a bylaws issue.

Jean Frankel said she wants to build off what Marty said and that she thinks it is a focus issue. She hears a mix of strategy and structure, but she is a firm believer that strategy needs to drive structure. We need to answer the question as to what the role of COIA really is. Does COIA have a unique role and how will it use its influence? It needs to articulate its values more clearly. One value that is important in many organizations is engagement. She is hoping to help COIA through a conversation about purpose and role, how do COIA members work together, what would success look like for COIA? Then, once we know these, what strategic actions to take and how to organize. She believes the bylaws are important but thinks they need to be driven by some consensus.

Bob Malekoff (UNC) noted that the three or four times he has been at COIA wonders what everyone does after they leave the annual meeting. The work people do when they go back to campus and the sharing of that work with other member schools is really important, he noted. He thinks people probably leave inspired and excited but then life gets in the way. So, one question is what level of engagement COIA members are willing to put forward and will they be leaders on their own campuses.

Joan King (LSU) noted that she has started a separate COIA group of faculty at LSU and they meet periodically with individuals in athletics and their FAR. She also works to share relevant articles via email to help everyone stay informed, and brings relevant issues up to her AD. LSU’s athletics department makes a profit, and $7-$10M comes back to academics.

Todd Adams of Florida State noted he was a little bothered by the process of the bylaws and would like to hear what the rationale and strategy was behind all of that.

Mike Bowen recalled discussions at the San Diego meeting, and at last year’s meeting in Indianapolis, and stated that due to the conference restructurings and faculty retirements the steering committee had shrunk very quickly in the past several years. He also argued that large past COIA steering committees were unwieldy, hard to manage and often unresponsive, and that past chairs had complained about those things too. He thus proposed in San Diego that the organization needs to be more responsive to member needs, and quicker to respond, if the steering committee deems necessary, to issues that arise. The end result of the extensive discussion generated by these ideas was that the membership proposed a smaller steering committee/organization structure, where all conferences need not necessarily be represented. The argument for this, Bowen reminded the group, also included the idea that the issues facing COIA are not just athletics related, but faculty-related.

Multiple members disputed some of the details of the proposed timing and details of previous rounds of proposed by-laws. There was also debate about when individuals were notified of the bylaws changes.

Matt Wheeler (Illinois) noted that the conferences want to be equally represented in COIA, otherwise the conferences will probably dismiss COIA because they won’t know for sure their interests are involved.

Kelley Withy suggested putting the bylaws aside for a moment and discussing values instead. Jean echoed that sentiment and said we would do that very soon. She suggested we next talk about what issues are each of us dealing with at campus.

Kelly Withy said their issue at Hawaii is money—they lose $7-8M on it, so it frequently is suggested they get rid of it. Mike Bowen said his faculty senate at South Florida doesn’t discuss athletics at all. Todd Adams at Florida State said a big issue there is Title IX (particularly the sexual assault side). Now with the new presidential administration it could all change. Faculty Senate President from University of Tennessee followed up noting they had just settled a multi-million dollar lawsuit over sexual harassment and assault involving the athletics department.

Jeannie Herrick from Northwestern noted that the discussion in her faculty senate is a greater need for information (to know what’s going on) regarding athletics, better communication between faculty members and athletic departments. She thought one of the best things that could come from COIA is sharing of best practices. We don’t have to spend all our time calling out bad actors but instead sharing ways to help and improve situations across all our campuses as faculty members. Northwestern keeps track of which classes student-athletes take and if they get disproportionately higher grades and will even make faculty changes as need be.

Jean Frankel mentioned how Bob M. noted faculty engagement and suggested that sharing best practices is exciting and an act of knowledge creation we could do.

Matt Wheeler (who is also a FAR and represents the Big Ten Conference on COIA) followed up on the Northwestern comments and noted that in any given year, a school can get hit with a scandal/drama (which Marty Crimp from Michigan State also mentioned during his introduction). Matt then also noted that there’s an academic freedom issue with athletics overly investigating how faculty teach their classes and that the average faculty member might not respond well to that everywhere since we don’t tend to do that with other groups of students, too. Another issue to deal with is bad behavior by student athletes. The trick is that faculty want to know what is going on, but you have to protect privacy rights and victim rights, so it is hard to be transparent as some faculty would like. But, Matt also noted that it is good that faculty are asking questions and involved, even if he can’t always answer the question. If COIA could come up with a list of best practices for what faculty senates should do when these types of things (investigations, etc.) happen, that would be great.

Matt also noted how a student-athlete gets extra punishment after a transgression (e.g., a grad student who gets a DUI doesn’t get as much attention/punishment as an undergraduate student-athlete does).

Jane Albrecht noted that collecting syllabi happens across all departments now, and as part of the accreditation process those can be examined for legitimacy without focusing solely on student-athletes. At some point, the responsibility falls on the academic officer of the university.

Marty Crimp noted that clustering has come up (in classes and in majors), but the bigger question is integrating student-athletes more generally on campus.

Kathy Bailey from Boston College noted that they have 31 varsity sports, most of the student-athletes being rowers, swimmers, etc., and there are stark differences between the bulk of them and the few big-time teams. Sharon Beckman from Boston College asked where the actual place to find best practices depository would be.

Jean Frankel followed up asking if COIA adds greater value than what people learn from their conferences and FARs.

Bob Malekoff from UNC noted that a challenge COIA might consider is how to get more faculty involved and aware of academic-athletic issues. UNC had a huge scandal, but there are 4,000 faculty there and only 15-20 faculty are paying any kind of attention to athletics oversight. He can’t say it loud enough that the only group that can improve the student experience is the faculty. This sentiment received claps and head nods from the room.

Larry Gramling noted that at a past meeting there was research presented demonstrating that very few faculty members are actually invested in athletics and it will be a uphill battle to get any more of them interested. They’re more invested in survival of the university and their career at the moment given the overarching issues facing higher education at the moment. He observed that there has been three big topics repeated this morning: student-athlete welfare, academic integrity, and financial issues. Larry noted that the only mention of athletics in his faculty senate was why they are paying a past football coach not to coach (as part of a $3M buyout), as well as impending state budget cuts.

Mike Bowen wondered how this discussion lines up with what the FARs do.

Break from 9:30-9:45am

Chris Anderson and Matt Wheeler, both FARs, then made a presentation about the FAR-COIA relationship, which has been quite strained in the past. Chris noted that Mike had reached out to some FAR groups but there hasn’t been a lot of interest in working together after past incidents/disagreements.

FARs have a NCAA-mandated mission to monitor student-athlete wellbeing, academic integrity, and institutional control. They are independent of the athletics department—appointed by and report to the president. FARs are one of five people with direct reporting access to NCAA.

Matt Wheeler noted a while ago there used to be many more FARs who attended COIA. In the new governance structure there are 2 out of 39 governance positions that belong to faculty voices in the NCAA now. D1 FARs won the power struggle and there is now a split in the FAR groups due to differences of opinion. After last year’s meeting in Indianapolis, Matt said he would not come back (but he is here). In the Big Ten there are 14 institutions and 22 FARs as some of men’s and women’s athletic departments. Each university has a FAR.

Sharon Beckman, Boston College, noted a lack of diversity in FARs. Matt Wheeler noted there are also Senior Women’s Administrators, but in D3 more than half of those are men. Can get that information from NCAA or FARA websites. Term limits differ from institution to institution for FARs. Matt noted that you need a FAR who understands the issues and can get involved nationally. If the FAR only has a three-year term, that person will never get on important conference or NCAA committees. Matt stated that the FARs are the Rodney Dangerfield’s’ of college athletics—everybody hates us. The faculty think they’re co-opted by athletic departments, the athletic departments don’t always like the oversight, and even COIA doesn’t trust FARs. But, Matt noted, most COIA members don’t know their FARs. If you got to know them, you’d probably like them. His main job is student-athlete welfare. When Illinois fired their football coach and athletic director, Matt went to every single football practice, team meeting, game, etc. to make sure the student-athletes were okay and doing well.

About a quarter of FARs get nothing (no compensation, course relase, etc.) from their schools, some get .5 FTE. The average FAR has served 7.2 years. Chris and Matt said it probably takes at least three years to start to even understand what is going on.

Chris noted that COIA sessions in the past have focused on FARs not being independent, but he thinks that is not accurate at all. They are typically as independent as they get. Matt noted he is often described as a bulldog because of his independence/focus on student-athlete welfare over all other issues.

Chris pointed out that’s a campus-level problem that specific campus needs to deal with. Typically FARs are tenured faculty members.

John Elson of Northwestern said some presidents only appoint cheerleaders or choose new FARs too often. But Chris noted that in the end, the president will pay if they do not choose a good, independent FAR. Presidents lose their jobs because of what happens in athletics, so FARs all need a direct line to the president. The academic people should also be reporting to campus officials outside of athletics.

Chris noted that he has lots of access, makes lots of suggestions, but the athletics department and president don’t take all of them. But that’s typical, and that’s why he wants to come to COIA to try to see if there’s a national consensus on what would be best practices to help him propose consensus-driven policy back on his campus.

Chris does not see the conflict between FAR and COIA, but in the past COIA individuals have repeatedly said he is not independent. He doesn’t appreciate that.

Kathy Bailey asked what’s the relationship between FAR and faculty athletics board/committee. Chris answered that to his knowledge there is nothing that his board has asked for that he hasn’t been able to share with them, depending on the time of the year. Another way Chris fostered independence was to move faculty athletic board meetings away from the athletics building and into an academic building. FARs often go to as many matches and games as possible so student-athletes can see them, get to know them, feel comfortable to talk with them if there are problems they don’t feel comfortable bringing up to the athletics department. Part of the job is getting student-athletes to mature, learn how to tackle problems on their own, too. At Illinois, Matt was chosen as a trusted person to do a six-month investigation of the football team. The people who trust FARs the most should be the student-athletes, so it is weird for FARs that COIA members also don’t trust them. But that’s not their problem—their problem is the student’s welfare and the integrity of the university. One issue is part of the campus disciplinary system is that the accused students don’t have an advocate but there are multiple campus lawyers in the room asking for the student to be expelled. In our criminal justice system individuals at least get an advocate. So, often student-athletes ask for the FARs to listen to them, be there with them, when difficult situations arise.

Chris stated that the newer generation of COIA representatives seems to be more enlightened and Kelly Witte said she has noted a decrease in FAR-bashing. Kelly suggested evaluations of FARs by faculty after five years. She suggested the FAR ask for feedback on performance from faculty senate, but Chris noted that the faculty senate isn’t involved and doesn’t care much about athletics.

Matt Wheeler mentioned that he can get any data he needs, can go to any practice or meeting at anytime, and that is how he gets a lot of his information. It is a lot of time, but if you are going to do the job right then you have to invest in it. Matt discussed how the Big Ten is a little different in that it was founded as a group of faculty representative in the late 1880s after deaths during football games. Through today, Big Ten FARs have a prominent place and are fighting back against things they don’t like (e.g., Friday-night football games). Mike proposed joint FAR-COIA meetings, but Matt noted that it will take some effort to convince Big Ten FARs to come back to COIA meetings, would have to be an effort to insure their voice is respected.

Ben Carrington from University of Texas at Austin asked if there’s something in-between FARs spending 25 hours per week or spending 100s of hours at practice and having multiple FARs because part of the issue is reliance on individuals who are dedicated and have good intentions can result in problems, be unsustainable (lead to burnout). Ben said that his FAR at Texas is well-intentioned, wants to do the right thing, but can always be at all places at all time.

Matt stated that the university president, AD, and FAR is involved in any NCAA investigation, and to remember that NCAA runs on one-institution-one-vote. So yes, there is a lot of weight on the FARs. Having a second FAR (they split up the sports) helps. FARs do a huge amount of paperwork, from eligibility to medical reports.

Jeannie Herrick from Northwestern asked how we as COIA might help be advocates for FARs. How can we add value to what FARs do, and how can we move this forward. Marty Crimp asked Chris and Matt if they would want an associate FAR who gets mentored, helps with the work, and then takes over eventually. Chris noted that it depends on the school and how many student-athletes there are, but giving institutions the chance to decide that might help some other places. It might also help to have an “FAR in waiting,” though. Matt Wheeler said that clerical support (e.g., reminder about reports, helping to set up meetings, handle simple inquiries, etc.) would be more useful than anything.

At Illinois and Michigan State, chancellor/president appoints the FAR, but the faculty senate has to approve that person. That doesn’t happen at every school.

Chris stated that his proudest accomplishment in his nine years as a FAR is to create the classroom grit award, which took six years to create. It is given to a student who comes in from a more difficult background but does what he or she is supposed to do and graduates (one man and one woman every spring).

Jean Frankel noted that there are differences between FAR activity levels, with the Big Ten FARs being more active. Matt and Chris stated that there has not been a national-level conversation on differences between conference FAR standards and best practices. Matt reminded everyone that he and the former Penn State FAR wrote a best practices document for FAR guide as part of COIA many years ago. Other COIA members asked where to find this information and nobody was quite sure where.

10:55am presentation by the individuals from UNC (Erianne Weight, Bob Malekoff, Debbie Clarke, and Rudi Colloredo-Masfield) titled “Meaningful micro-changes in intercollegiate athletics that faculty can influence/control.”

Bob M. started the presentation by stating that they would be offering some thoughts that might stimulate conversation and discussion. He noted that Carolina made a lot of mistakes but in the last few years has been very intentional in focusing on what it could do and made important tangible changes. One of those was that the Provost hired Debbi Clarke as a high-level staff member (she has an Ed.D., ran the UNC MBA program for several years). In 2013, new chancellor, Carol Folt started and made the business school dean the provost, and several business school faculty moved over into the provost’s office. They are now working to document the processes involved in student life from recruitment through post-graduation. This includes work on student-athlete related processes (called Academic Processes for Student-Athletes. See <http://apsa.unc.edu/> for the details on the 21 processes they’ve identified that are related to student-athletes. It gets updated in real time. A group of faculty, administrators, student-athletes, and others put these processes together.

The head of academic support for student-athletes at UNC is now part of the provost’s office, reports directly to the Provost (not to athletics, although that person works very closely with athletics). If more than 20% of the enrollment in a course is comprised of student-athletes, it is examined. Doesn’t mean it can’t happen, just that it gets more oversight.

Larry Gramling asked what are the 2-3 most salient outcomes that came out of this process. Debbie noted it was returning the focus on students and being better about monitoring and assessing what is going on (e.g., they realized they didn’t have syllabi for all the courses like they should have).

UNC became the first university to hire a chief ethics officer (there’s an ethics and integrity group and a policies and procedures group, and together those two groups suggested the chief ethics officer). They also hired Deloitte to help them identify problems and fix them. Now there is much more emphasis on developing policies and making sure they are clear to everyone involved.

Other members of COIA noted that this type of situation could happen anywhere, which is why all COIA member schools should try to learn from UNC. Now, there are random class checks to see if classes are meeting.

Dave from the Drake Group also suggested that academic advisors’ salaries should be paid outside of athletics, too, to help improve independence. At UNC now, costs are shared (staff salaries are paid by the provost’s office, but tutoring and other academic services paid for by the athletics department).

Both UNC folks and Matt Wheeler from Illinois noted the importance of getting all faculty members to support student-athletes as representatives of the university who put themselves out there for everyone’s good, but not all faculty follow course absence policies and not all of them help with things like rescheduling exams, etc. If some types of faculty members tell student-athletes to get out of their classes, that can foster clustering in majors that are more friendly to them but maybe aren’t what the student-athletes are actually interested in/what will prepare them best for life after college.

UNC also started a secure-test taking center and using new technology for make-up assignments, etc. Try to team with the Dean of Students office on many of those initiatives. A psychology professor has made a one-week study-skills course that they are trying to get as many student-athletes to take in the summer as possible. There will be no other practices, athletics activities that week (other than optional morning conditioning).

UNC is also piloting new study-abroad options for student-athletes. They believe their FAR is quite independent.

Bob M. then presented some of his own thoughts. He observed that initially, when the UNC scandal broke, many schools thought that sort of thing could never happen to them. Now, he believes there is a bit more humility and willingness to learn, be proactive, based on all the hard work UNC has done in the years since their transgressions became known.

Bob M. said one of the things that bothers him is this focus on technical compliance. It is good to have the base of the thick rulebook, but sometimes we rely on that too much instead of focusing on the kind of experiences our students are having. We need to focus on what’s happening to our students on a day-to-day basis.

We assume our student-athletes are learning about teamwork, other values we typically associate with sports, but that is not always true (depends on the coach).

Bob M. thinks there must be an alignment of athletics with educational values. Also, think about the two competing frameworks of excellence: boundary-breaking achievement versus balance. The similarity between faculty life and a coach’s life are more than most realize. Faculty members need to be amazing researchers (breaking boundaries), but we also want the faculty to play other roles (teach, service). Likewise, coaches are expected to have teams that win championships but also are supposed to teach bigger life skills and mentor the student-athletes as well-rounded individuals with lives outside of and after athletics.

Bob M. has three big pet-peeves about intercollegiate athletics.

1: Time demands.

For instance, Brian Hainline, M.D., at NCAA says mental health is the #1 medical challenge, also a majority of student-athletes report lack of ample study time, lack of sleep, voluntary actually meaning mandatory, and can’t participate in extracurricular activities). What has been done to address this? Lots and lots of new rules passed. He sees an overreliance on legislation. Once it passes, individuals pat themselves on the back and feel good, but it very well might not result in significant changes/improvements in the lived experiences of student-athletes. We want to blame coaches for putting to much pressure on kids, but the coaches’ reward structure is to win in order to keep their jobs, so the “scorecard” is out of balance.

Another example is the disagreement that surrounded defining a “day off,” and a “day off” can also include things like life-skills practices. So, a best practice to come from this is to actually talk to the student-athletes as often as possible.

2: Athlete segregation.

We do certain things intending to help student-athletes, but often they set athletes apart from the rest of the students. For example, class checkers make the student-athletes feel like they are children, like they are not adults. And if athletes get caught missing class, they might get punished by having to run at 5:30am (which just adds to the time demands). When we hold their hands too much, they don’t grow. It becomes a near militaristic existence where they do not learn to make decisions for themselves. Obviously, this is driven by the need to keep student-athletes eligible, but may not be in their (student-athletes’) best long-term interests. Plus, things like class checkers result in a “check-box” mentality—the student-athletes just need to show up for class, doesn’t assess if they are prepared or engaged.

3: Celebrating but not over-valuing graduation rates.

First, there are too many ways to calculate graduate rates so we are often comparing apples and oranges. In modern times, if someone enrolls in college the minimum expectation is to graduate (parents expect their children to graduate). But in athletics, we are taking this minimum expectation and making it a really big deal. For some student-athletes, it is, but in the big picture it doesn’t leave room to also focus on the full university experience and taking advantage of what is happening on campus.

Another challenge Bob M. presented to the group: thinking national and local. Might work best to do things on the local level and share them at the national level in a systematic way (not just at a once-a-year meeting).

Another challenge: The wrong people are in charge—wealthy donors and conference commissioners. University presidents will often acknowledge the difficult position they are in as they need athletics to do well to keep donors happy and keep the money coming into the university as a whole. Presidents feel like their hands are tied, so might depend on faculty tackling a lot of these issues.

Ben from University of Texas noted the dangers of calling out student-athletes publicly in class even for good things because it can do them a disservice and many student-athletes do not want to be identified in classes so they can just be another student for a few hours.

Larry noted the math at UCONN (3.5% of students are student-athletes), so it is hard to get faculty to pay extra attention to this small minority of students. But the problem arises when there is a crisis (like at UNC). Bob M. said only 12-15 faculty at UNC are actively involved (faculty athletics committee), because they have to publish, run labs, teach, etc. He suggested one way to get more faculty involved is to not ask them to be cheerleaders but to highlight the role of faculty in contributing to oversight of the university.

Jeannie noted that more and more faculty members are non-tenure-eligible (which is what she is, but is still expected to do some service and also research on her won time). So these non-tenure-eligible faculty members have to make even more judicious choices as to how to spend her limited extra time. Bob M. said he agrees, but the way he sees it is that faculty are the only group of people who can realistically address the challenges with see with intercollegiate athletics right now. But Jeannie noted it will be very hard to do with the complicated shifts in higher education right now.

John Elson from Northwestern asked for more clarification on Bob M’s dislike of the overreliance on legislation. John E doesn’t see a good alternative to clear, enforceable rules. Bob M. says the problem is more that the rules are not strong enough and we need faculty to help institute stronger rules instead of just more numerous rules. Erianne from UNC calls this “whack-a-mole” management and said it would be better to have research-informed legislation (which is why UNC has a center on research for intercollegiate athletes, which she leads).

Erianne noted the disconnect between what she saw in the news about UNC (all about “bogus academics”) and what she witnessed in person (e.g., an intense four-year leadership program student-athletes went through for no credit, coaches who made their students memorize poetry passages in order to be a member of the team, other coaches who went through books with their students, etc.). Theoretically, there is an educational value to participating in athletics while being a student on a larger campus. Erianne noted the integrated model proposed by Myles Brand (inside-out reform). One view is that athletics as an academic unit similar to the performing arts, but there are also a lot of potential problems with “majoring in athletics” as they might not develop as well-rounded individuals. So, she started researching the possibilities more systematically.

-- Break for lunch --

12:45pm

Erianne surveyed academic advisors and found that 1/3 of schools award credit for athletic participation, 20 % offered academic rouses specifically for athletes (e.g., leadership, sport psychology). There are huge geographic differences: Schools in the west are much more likely to offer credit for participation (65.8% in the West to 36.4% in the Midwest, 25.3% in the Northeast, 17.8% in the Southeast).

Her work has also found that some corporations specifically seek out student athletes, so that post-graduate job potential adds value to the student-athlete experience. There are also businesses that work specifically to help student-athletes get jobs (e.g., CareerAthletes). Employers in her survey reported they associate values such as competitive nature, goal-orientation, ability to handle pressure, strong work ethic, confidence, coachable, ability to work with others, self-motivated, mentally tough with student athletes. Also, surveyed Fortune 500 companies and found that 13% specifically recruit college athletes when hiring a new employee (of those, 80% said it was a personal preference while 24% reported there was a company policy/strategy, e.g., Cisco gives an extra “point” to an applicant if he or she is a student-athlete).

Her team also surveyed former student-athletes and compared it to a random sample of non-student-athlete alumni from UNC. They found that former student-athletes who work full-time (outliers and professional athletes were excluded) out-earned non-athletes in nearly every single category (men, women, White, age of cohort, and industry). Only two groups where there was not a significant difference was Black graduates and non-White, non-Black graduates. Athletes also reported being more engaged than non-athlete graduates as well as greater levels of social support and life satisfaction, and lower levels of depression, fatigue, and difficulty with physical activity.

Erianne also has done work comparing the experiences of athletes to music students as well as to traditional students. Compared across five top athletics and top music programs. In general, athletes spent less time on athletics than musicians did on music practice and traditional students did on activities for their majors.

Her work also examined self-efficacy across the three groups. While there was a main effect overall that men reported higher self-efficacy, that gender gap was very small for athletes and musicians but was very large for traditional students (with male traditional students much more confident than female traditional students).

Erianne surveyed coaches to ask if they see themselves as educators. Nearly 100% of the coaches reported that teaching character-building is part of their job but less than 70% said the athletics administration values the character-building aspect of coaches’ performance. 55% of coaches said they would like to be viewed as a faculty member (but 45% said no). Reasons for yes: We are educators, lots of learning happens on the field, coaches would have better career stability (could whether bad performance years of their students are still good people), and would help correct for the dominance of revenue-generating sports. Reasons for no, don’t want athletics to be like an academic unit: Coaching is unique, hard to compare to academics when there is this extra stress, desire to focus on athletic excellence in this arena, want to protect the current athletics model/perceive athletics as being run better than most academic unites, no time for added responsibilities.

Erianne suggests our vocabulary and the paradigm that athletics is not academic is part of the problem. She wrote an op-ed to point out this issue and was worried about backlash due to the stigma of being seen as too athletics-friendly. But it actually facilitated some partnerships with other faculty and encouraged action.

She and a colleague (Rudi) put together a proposal to address issues at UNC (and elsewhere), starting from the premise that the current deal offered to UNC students is unjust because coaches offer prospective students the full college experience but they don’t actually get all of it.

They proposed four options:

1: An on-boarding course in the first semester (that athletes get credit for)

🡪 1/3 of it being leadership training, how to set up good decisions and contribute to the community, 1/3 liberal arcs growth opportunities, 1/3 the existing off-field activities like rules education, honor court, alcohol awareness, academic advisor meetings, media training, even signing of compliance papers (explain them, use them as a teaching opportunity instead of just having students sign them and move on). If there is an academic credit to the onboarding class, athletes can also receive athletic aid (housing and food).

2: Elite performance or applied sport science minor modeled after dramatic arts/music (get credit for some current activities)

🡪 15 credit-hour academic minor including applied anatomy/physiology, emergency care, performance psychology, nutrition, 6 credits for participation/1 each semester (e.g., music majors at UNC are allowed 22 credits for individual lessons, ensemble, etc., club sports people could also do it with some faculty oversight)

3: Athletics-Academic Hub (experiential education): collection of courses that can facilitate the use of sport-related experiences in courses from diverse disciplines (e.g., anthropology of a team).

🡪 Faculty could propose courses that all students could use, but some might actually take advantage of sports-specific topics/areas of expertise. Brining in other types of activism experiences, too. Connecting topics students are passionate about with formal education.

4: Formalizing a four-year Carolina Leadership Academy in a way that gives course credit

🡪 This was already happening, but could not integrate faculty into it instead of just having athletics staff run it

*Subject to three conditions:*

1: Team-by-team evidence of academic breadth and achievement (hold coaches accountable for academic culture of teams)

2: Integration of non-athletes and student athletes

3: A campus-wide vetting of these “education through athletics” proposals by faculty, coaches, and students.

Possible concerns:

* Is this just a replacement for “paper classes”?
* Further isolation of athletes?
* Unintentionally forced upon athletes?
* Additional university resources redirected to student-athletes?
* We are here to educate students, not win championships

Erianne’s research and opinion suggests that time demands are really at the crux of student-athletes receiving a less-than-complete education. Hopefully allowing these educational opportunities early might allow for some time to do non-athletically oriented majors, particularly in offseason.

Larry Gramling suggested that perhaps onboarding classes would be good for all students, not just student-athletes (even if there was a specific one related to athletics). He also asked if adding a minor might impact progress toward degree because nobody has to get a minored (it’s not required for graduation). Other members noted some majors don’t have much room to add in a minor (engineering, some business programs, etc.).

UNC’s next steps include development (get a donor to fund it), participating in a larger undergraduate education quality enhancement plan (including innovation and entrepreneurship, experiential education).

John Elson from Northwestern asked for clarification on how participation for athletic participation is compatible with pursing a liberal arts education, particularly if athletics often teaches obedience and not necessarily broadening of the mind. Bob M. pointed out there are other classes open to everyone where they get credit for physical education. Erianne pointed out that 72/120 hours of music major must be in music department, and 22 of those are for either ensemble or music lessons. There was continued debate among the members about whether athletic participation is actual preparation for a career or not.

Erianne noted that UNC hit rock bottom and has since made a lot of changes and are “air-tight” in terms of legislation and policy. But she argues that the actual student-athlete experience is not any better. In fact, there is so much oversight it is perhaps even more difficult for student-athletes to have a full, rich experience than before when there was more flexibility. But she says at UNC there is actually a reverse phenomenon amongst faculty now in that it is risky to stand up in support of the value of athletics.

Ben Carrington from Texas offered the clarification that perhaps not all of athletics is educational. Proposed the analogy that a student says I read a couple books, which is an educational experience, can I get credit for English literature, then faculty would say no there is more that goes into understanding English literature. The question is how does just playing and practice come to the level of critical inquiry we hope is in most university-level course work. Erianne said there are both applied and critical/theoretical courses across the university, and that sports participation would fit more into an applied, experiential type of class.

Jane Albrecht noted that she thinks John’s question is still unanswered: How does playing a sport engage the mind? There were many members who immediately said it takes a lot of mental expertise and work. Jane noted that the faculty could help articulate that better in supporting this type of proposal, then. Kelly pointed out they could create learning objectives around participation that might also help. Jeanie noted that any course would have to go through a campus course approval process, so that could help ensure rigor, too. As long as there’s a uniform test of rigor compared to all other courses on campus, then they could be credit-bearing.

Colleen Bee from Oregon State noted the lifetime benefits of athletics does support this type of participation, but maybe formalizing and measuring more of the specifics could help improve these outcomes even more.

Marty Crimp mentioned that inherent in this proposal is clustering. Whereas musicians cluster in the music major, there is no athletics major, but there would be clustering in the athletics minor. Erianne reiterated that she is hoping faculty who participate in the onboarding course and other guest lectures in the minor would work to convince student-athletes to major in anthropology, etc. and that they might have more time to do so and stay on track to graduate.

Dave Ridpath from Drake/Ohio University pointed out that if an athlete is getting credit for participation, but has to be 30 minutes late to practice due to a lab, then there’s an even bigger conflict there. Erianne noted that Debbi and UNC have looked at the times courses are offered and talked to departments to offer required classes at different times on different semesters. Dave suggested that faculty should work hard to demand that sports only be in-season during one semester.

Bob Malekoff reminded the group that athletes are really interested in their sports and want to spend time doing them (and sometimes skip classes to practice even when their coaches don’t want them to do so).

Mike Bowen asked how COIA can help UNC/Erianne. Her answer was they need more research, which requires time and funding. But also noted that many of these changes are intuitive and could happen at individual institutions so we can get more outcome measures from pilot programs. Need to get some results to show others it might work. Her vision is really to change the dialogue more than anything. Millennials are learning-by-doing and they want experiential education.

Peggy Blake from Houston asked if sharing more details about schools in the West who already get credit for participation might help other schools understand the format before trying it.

Ben noted that the difference between music and athletics is that music is an academic department and the scholarships are tied to studying that subject, majoring in music, etc. However, an athlete with an athletic scholarship can major in any academic topic. His main question is that if they want to major in something related to athletics, couldn’t they just major in kinesiology, exercise science, sports marketing, etc. His analogy continued in that reading books is different from getting a degree in English literature. Mike Bowen noted that if coaches were actual faculty members this could change (or if there was some sort of designated faculty overseer at least).

2:10pm break

2:25pm Jean Frankel leads the next section of the meeting

Her goal is to help COIA turn ideas into action. Often this can be assisted by a strategic plan. COIA now has a draft strategic long-range plan that she put together based on the survey responses.

Jean offered a review of COIA’s history, which originated during the era of Myles Brand. She found text from a strategic plan that she helped facilitate with Dr. Brand at the NCAA in 2003. It incorporated all three divisions, but she also assisted on a D1-specific project in 2012. Even in 2017, there are remnants of that 2003 strategic plan at the NCAA. Missions, purposes, and values are not goals but they are our identity. But you can envision your future and put in markers of potential achievement to help motivate groups across timeframes (1-year to 30-year horizons). The important thing is to tell your story—why what you want to accomplish means something. If intercollegiate athletics and academics meet in a meaningful way, we need to tell a story about it and also calibrate it to our current environment. There are critical uncertainties out there (e.g., what the new administration will do to Title IX). So, a plan should include those in there to add context and check back on them to see if they shift at all. Review and see if the vision still works every single year.

Short-term goals should be stated in the form of an outcome (how will the world be better based on what this organization does). For NCAA, an example was the creation of the APR. Goals should be a couple years out at most and should be tangible, help you organize your resources and figure out how to get work done. You have to have the operational planning integration or else the vision won’t move forward.

Underlying the planning is the idea of how you are organized to get stuff done (systems, structures, process, culture). Jean believes that strategy should drive structure. You should figure out what you want to do before you try to organize to do that. She suggests we look at strategy first before dealing with the bylaws. If you can do that, you’re more likely to get consensus and then the arguments about balance of power and what roles people should play gets a little easier because there is already some buy-in with the mission/goals.

Jean plays four roles here: facilitator, educator, consultant, and witness. During the NCAA reorganization, university presidents thought about getting faculty involvement in the restructuring but didn’t know which faculty group to turn to so it didn’t work out well for the faculty voice. And Jean actually has an extra, fifth role: Den mother (will give tough love).

Jean: “The train has left the station.” COIA will not have a seat on the NCAA governing board. FARs almost didn’t even have a seat. The presidents argued that they represent faculty and academia. Jean noted that presidents do have a tough job at the moment (and not all are actually even traditional faculty). They are often now chief fundraising, chief firefighter, etc. As there are more non-traditional presidents, there’s another opportunity for a faculty group to speak up and fill that gap in the realm of intercollegiate athletics.

Jean pulled pieces from what COIA has done over the years as well as from the survey. But eventually we need to figure out how to organize and move forward with what kind of resources. There’s no infrastructure for little things like finding and posting PowerPoints. Jean: “At some point, you’ve got to professionalize a little bit.” Groups with fewer resources than COIA have professionalized more than we have. Perhaps getting a 501c3 status and a founding board with a nominations process, charging dues, finding administrative support, are all possibilities. She says COIA needs to think of itself as an association first.

Jean then showed some visuals of a model she has used for 25-plus years about how associations need to organize. Every association needs a structure and processes.

Under structure, there are stakeholders (faculty senates, any dues, returns in exchange for dues), program (what programs and services will we offer—only one right now is the annual meeting, but in the past there were some white papers… could also be to create research, networking/sharing information, thought leadership, advocacy, etc. we could be in the influence business instead of advocacy, though), governance (where’s the oversight, where does policy get set—steering committee or board, elected officers, nominations, etc. Jean likes at-large over representative governance, but faculty are traditionally oriented toward representative governance), workforce (two sides: volunteer committees/task-forces, and a paid administrative workforce/employees that provide institutional memory and keep membership lists, etc. Jean has worked with smaller associations that are much more organized than COIA), and financial (associations can do more with more money and there are untapped resources COIA could potentially charge for like holding conferences to share best practices, etc.).

Processes: Market & Marketing research, strategy (thinking and planning), governance (policy and strategic intent), operational planning and budgeting, new product development, knowledge management.

Jean suggested we probably make some changes to bylaws before voting on them again. They should be very short and not include committees because then you have to formally alter the bylaws every single time you want a new committee (or to end a committee). Jean says most all of these things don’t have to be codified in bylaws but could instead be in a policy manual. A policy manual is simply how you do business.

Going back to 2003: NCAA’s strategic plan was built on the same plan Jean is presenting to COIA. The stated core purpose of the NCAA in this document is: “Our purpose is to govern competition in a fair, safe, equitable and sportsmanlike manner, and to integrate intercollegiate athletics into higher education so that the educational experience of the student-athlete is paramount.”

The purpose only states why a group exists. Doesn’t say how the organization will do it. It is meant to inspire. Values then get more specific than the purpose (e.g., the collegiate model, integrity, pursuit of academic and athletic excellence, role of athletics in higher education, diversity, autonomy, university presidents as leaders).

Jean suggested that a word that hasn’t been used enough today is “culture change.” You can’t legislate culture change but it is what really matters.

In the most recent restructuring, the real power was not with the NCAA but with the conference commissioners. Not all of the Power 5 members think alike and that dictated most of the restructuring conversations and debates.

Debbie Clarke noted that institutional and presidential control of the campus has become a bigger and bigger issue.

Jeannie Herrick from Northwestern noted that another stakeholder today that hasn’t been mentioned today is the media and how much of the funding of intercollegiate athletics (at NCAA and conference and individual school level) is tied to media contracts and media coverage. Matt Wheeler noted that the network people say they need “more inventory.” The student-athletes are the only inventory. With a 24/7/465 network, they need a lot of content. The content on the Big Ten Network that isn’t related to athletics has gone away. This has really affected student travel schedules in a negative way for student-athlete welfare. However, all sports television ratings are starting to go down and the bubble might burst (perhaps not completely, but the margin of profitability may change dramatically). New technologies may also revolutionize the market and continue to put pressure for drastic travel schedules to fill content holes.

Bob Malekoff noted that historically (and no sign that it’s changing) when there are financial challenges, people ask how to generate more revenue instead of reducing expenses. Therefore, the pressures on students will continue if not get worse. Mike Bowen noted that money was not part of the discussion with reorganization. NCAA relies on 92% of revenue coming from March Madness contract with CBS Sports, which is a dangerous business model.

Jean: The outcome-oriented goals include which groups/people are responsible for implementing them (accountability).

Kevin Lennon at the NCAA said to Jean: If you can help COIA be a meaningful voice, you would do us all a valuable service.

So much of what people probably intended to have happen at the NCAA level is now happening at the conference level. Yes, conferences are different, but could facilitate activities to share best practices and talk amongst the conference (perhaps more than once a year). Marty pointed out that the Big Ten does this through the Big Ten Academic Alliance, because it has always been more academically-oriented than most conferences. Todd noted that Florida State involves faculty members from away teams (across multiple sports) to come give talks (they borrowed this idea from Clemson and expanded it)—they call it “Roads Scholars”. Matt and Marty noted that it depends a lot on your conference commissioner. For instance, the Big Ten commissioner is a pretty strong player. Not to say they’d be unwilling to work together, but we would have to convince them of COIA’s value.

The Big Ten conference now has a “death penalty” where they can be kicked out of the conference for bad behavior.

Don’t look to the NCAA for sharing of best practices and collegiality between schools anymore because they have other issues to deal with, but this is where COIA and individual schools and conferences can step in and assist. Instead, advocacy is best done at the big, national level because the collective power is more influential.

Jeannie suggested that sharing of best practices, dialogue, research/data-collection might be good ways for COIA to have purpose. Need to make COIA a potent, value-added partner to faculty senates/councils and other faculty-led groups (e.g., FAR, Drake, etc.).

Jean stated that the Power 5 have a huge opportunity to create a new governance structure and dialogue instead of just attending conventions once a year, but it hasn’t quite happened yet.

Jean put together a draft strategic plan document for COIA (see additional document titled “COIA Strategic Plan Document February 2017 firstdraft (3).docx”). She suggests word-smithing the core purpose mission to make it more concise.

Marty and Jean talked about being careful to not let discussions of finance take over what COIAs mission should be. There should be an issues management process: What are the three things we will focus on this year?

Marty noted that nobody would go to the American Medical Association to talk about academic integrity in sports. Likewise, nobody is going to come to COIA to ask for ways to prevent concussions. Larry also suggests that faculty have ownership of academic integrity and student-athlete welfare and should focus on those two things alone instead of five different things. Faculty would be foolhardy to think we can go in and shift how media contracts are awarded, etc.

Jane Albrecht noted that COIA also wanted to promote general faculty awareness of issues facing student-athletes and the academics-athletics balance.

There was some back and forth about how much COIA should focus on concussions. Jean pointed out COIA should focus on what the goals are—influencing policy or being an information source. Those decisions should get into assumptions about the future.

Scott Grozdz from Colorado suggested a tagline for COIA: Faculty members working to rebalance the student-athlete experience.

Jean noted that a good set of purposes and values should articulate what it is like to be a part of this organization. COIA has the opportunity to repair their reputation, and this could help recruit other schools to join.

Proposed big audacious goals from the COIA member survey: Be a source of thoughtful influence on academic issues related to intercollegiate athletics, which is where faculty are experts. Another is 100% graduation rate for student athletes. Typically, the more people you represent, the more influential you will be. However, associations can have a different type of influence by being thought leaders. COIA could be just as influential despite a small number of member schools.

Mike Bowen threw out the possibility that all FBS schools automatically become members for discussion, but multiple individuals pushed back against this idea because we wouldn’t represent them. Jean then noted that representation isn’t always the end goal if thoughtful influence is your goal. Depends on what your role is. Instead of representing, COIA might hold a dialogue and invite people to the table, where people can choose to engage. We won’t be influencing policy per se as we will be creating thought, which requires a lot of people to roll up their sleeves (can’t be on the back of one person).

The “vivid descriptions” are all from the survey, include statements like “COIA will be focused on academic issues in intercollegiate athletics, and, through COIA participation, faculty on campuses will be better equipped and empowered to influence policy in their own institutions.”

Proposed outcome oriented goals: thought leadership, institutional empowerment, industry partnerships, infrastructure/resources.

Will need to create more detailed objectives and metrics than what is present in the proposed strategic plan document.

4pm Broke into small groups to discuss reactions to the document

4:30ish we reconvened

Kelley’s group said they didn’t like the word industry, want to have a little more purview beyond academics as other things touch on academics, maybe member senates should have some input too and identify how their COIA reps have permission to vote/represent their senates, perhaps all COIA reps should be ex-officio members of all faculty athletics committees, all faculty senate presidents should know what COIA is, it would be helpful to have more data and COIA recommendations as best practices. And, have a directory of COIA reps. Also, perhaps FARs and COIA could meet together.

A discussion of if COIA rep names and emails can be shared followed as that was another request from Kelly’s group. There seemed to be support for at least sharing rep names and emails internally (further consideration may be needed for posting it on a public website), but there are best practices we can turn to (Jean wrote many of them). You can even get an association management company or virtual assistant to help. Jean noted that having a more formal membership structure will help as there will be agreements on who is a member, etc.

Jean Frankel asked us to remember to make a shift from representation to dialogue. It’s less important to vote on everything single thing as it is to get people actively involved.

Matt Wheeler noted that it is important to have a variety of types of people in COIA so different people have all types of expertise.

Jessica Gall Myrick’s group talked about perhaps having a value beyond academic integrity of promoting an academics-focused culture would help create culture change. Another issue is defining thought leadership as something other than just responding to individual news stories but instead focusing on the big picture issues (let the Drake groups or other organizational partnerships that we are in dialogue with respond to each news topics but COIA fill a bigger/different niche). And, our group also suggested taking out the representation part of the mission statement and instead focusing on dialogue and campus-level advocacy and potential other areas of influence.

Jean Frankel: Agrees, suggests taking out the representation part as much as possible, add in something about culture.

Scott Grozdz suggested that COIA can try to connect the dots more explicitly between academic excellence and athletic excellence. Making the link between professionalism in both domains clearer. Erianne mentioned that a UNC professor has created a three-part metric: ratio of GPA-to-playing time, number of honors theses per team, and the breadth of majors per team. Together this has helped UNC get at that “academic culture” idea. Debbi noted that sharing best practices won’t only help athletes but could also help non-athletes when the ideas are really good and scalable.

Jean Frankel said that most associations that work well pick only one or two things to focus on in any given year. So, the last piece is looking at all these ideas/goals, and picking one or two to focus on. Or, let’s pick three strategies to attempt this year. Then, perhaps create ad-hoc annual committees for each yearly strategy (that’s why it’s best to keep committees out of the bylaws). It’s a commitment for people to do work virtually, but it’s doable. It could even have a mid-year meeting via virtual conference software.

Jeannie suggested we need an “early success” for the new era of COIA to help build confidence in it, and then more people will be willing to take a risk and commit.

Dave noted that COIA endorsing a best practice that any class with 20% or more student-athletes should be flagged and examined by a group of faculty could be an easy “early success” as many faculty senates might be willing to endorse it.

John from Akron said his group talked about a starting point just starting a repository of best practices.

Jean: Sometimes starting by doing an inventory of knowledge is a great starting point for struggling associations. From there, pick some targets for collating information from all of our different senates/councils. One thing could be getting senates and councils to be more involved, another could be to start recruiting more members.

Ben reiterated that two phrases that have been repeated are: 1.) “I don’t know how it is on other campuses, but…” and 2.) “Where can I get that data?” COIA reps can help make practical, small changes locally. COIA reps want to go back to their faculty athletics committees and executive committees after the annual COIA meeting and say “look what other people are doing.” Use COIA as the mechanism to stop having a race to the bottom and instead compete to have the best practices.

Jean is hearing a growing commitment to sharing and communicating and using that as leverage to create change back on our individual campuses.

Peggy noted that not merely reporting what we do will make it a best practice. Jean responded that so there will be need to be a second round of dialogue to understand what is going on and then decide if it will be a best practice for one’s own campus or not. There might be some “SIGs” special interest groups created around specific issue.

Matt receives a FOIA request once a month. Most state laws mean that anything you are using to conduct business on behalf of the university can be required to be turned over, even if it is a privately purchased device. He said at Illinois, at faculty athletics committee meetings, people leave their cellphones and laptops outside the room. Therefore, now lots of conversations do not occur over email anymore. Erianne suggested a platform called “Slack.” Most said “no” to a LinkedIn. Basecamp is another process.

Jean: If people participated as an individual instead of as a member of a faculty senate, the FOIA access would change. Erianne’s response: If COIA members do not represent faculty senates, then it is no different than the Drake group which is driven by volunteers who are opinionated. Mike noted that there could be crossover, each group has representatives from the other faculty groups (FARA, Drake, etc.). Some members noted they would not come if the trip were not paid for by the faculty senate’s account. It also adds a lot of meaning and purpose to some members to be associated with the faculty senate.

COIA could create some guidelines on what to mention in online working platforms (e.g., don’t use identifiers related to students, etc.). But at some point, need to figure out the best way to connect with each other. Some people prefer phone calls, regular “Go To Meeting” calls and talk in real time. Dave noted that Dave’s working group does weekly calls, executive committee does monthly WebEx meetings. But that would depend on who would be meeting—the steering committee, board, or some other group empowered to work on behalf. Marty noted that scheduling is really difficult and can help ensure everyone who wants to gets a chance to respond, so perhaps email is the best way to start discussions, then those who are most passionate can join in on calls later if need be.

Jane Albrecht noted: Jean seems to be implying that we need to rework the bylaws, trim them down, then write a policy manual, and possibly have a different membership structure. Jean responded: It’s a chicken or the egg problem. You need the vision, but you need some structure to implement it, so what’s the biggest problem at the moment. It might be good on an interim basis to clarify a few things but do a long-term group to do a year-long bylaws rewrite.

Jean would hope that after tomorrow there is more than one person serving on a board that is committed to moving this all forward. Matt suggested the immediate past-chair should be on a board if we want to retain some institutional memory. (People seemed to generally agree that we should call it a board instead of a steering committee).

Mike Bowen said the biggest concern the membership had in the two previous meetings was that the conference membership-based committee structure didn’t foster sufficient engagement. Mike suggested the need to be quicker to respond to certain issues that arise; issues requiring a quick response, but other members stated they do not want to be immediately responsive but instead be a thoughtful group of people who want to share best practices and empower and create dialogue.

Jean noted that representative governance mostly has gone out the window and that the NCAA is one of the few associations left that still relies on it.

Marty Crimp mentioned that maybe in the past representation was needed for COIA, but perhaps going forward it doesn’t as much.

Wendy Smooth from Ohio State asked if the faculty senate representative focus is a crucial part of our identity that would shift how others view us if we gave it up.

Dave noted that the Drake Group does care about COIA and wants it to exist because it wants faculty to realize they have some power. Drake affects change more from the outside, but Dave suggests that COIA can perhaps represent faculty senates and make more internal change amongst presidents and deans and trustees. Dave said COIA’s reputation in the past is to put forward a few great ideas but nothing actually happens whereas Drake has perhaps been associated with a bit more change.

Larry noted that Power 5 conferences have much more permanence than other conferences (e.g., the American Conference is shifting like crazy). Therefore, basing board/steering committee membership on conference membership may be iffy in this era. Instead, get dedicated people he suggested. Jean noted the NCAA often has that issue, especially when the volunteers from certain conferences are not diverse but there are multiple diverse individuals at other conferences ready to serve.

Jean: Most associations have a nominating committee that tries to balance out a few things (e.g., geography, expertise, demographics). That way those things are considered without having slotted seats for each constituency.

Sharon notes that representation on the board/steering committee would be more important for when COIA makes statements than for other business of the organization.

Matt noted that the reason for the Power 5 is that the NCAA wasn’t moving on student-athlete welfare issues so those schools threatened to leave the NCAA unless there was a change in the NCAA that allowed those changes to move forward. The Big Ten is not looking fondly upon COIA, thinks of COIA as more of a nuisance. Conferences can be arrogant—it’s something we have to live with and can’t change. So, Matt said to be aware that conferences still might respond negatively.

Jean: The big question is: Do you have common issues? The Power 5 conferences do have common issues, which are very different than those outside the Power 5. Therefore, who is invited in for membership needs to have common issues.

Matt said that he hasn’t heard anything today that Jim Delaney wouldn’t like, but he won’t know that necessarily.

Jean: Ideas like “academic culture” is a lot more inarguable. Matt: Conferences and coaches would probably support non-freshmen eligibility, but nobody would do it alone, so COIA would be thanked if they worked on that.

Erianne: COIA needs to outsource the research, but research requires funding.

5:40pm it was requested that the bylaws votes be announced. Larry stated that 64 schools were solicited, but only 32 voted (yes, no, abstain). 7 abstained… so 25 are left with a yes or no vote. Of those 25, 18 voted yes, and 18/25 = 72%, which is more than 2/3, so they pass. But, in reality, only 18 out of 64 schools voted for them to pass.

The bylaws passed and Jean suggested there be a group that meets to clarify if the membership should be Football Subdivision Sub-division (FBS) Schools (which is what is stated in the mission statement), but the bylaws themselves say Division I. There was confusion and discontent about the process and past emails to the entire group showed that there were many schools that vocalized their discontent. People also expressed the desire to move on and start fixing what is going on, in particular focusing on who will be in the small leadership group that will move the organization forward.

Jean suggested five people would be good for the board/steering committee. She then asked: How are you all going to explain to people who are not in the room what happened here? If we send out a request to elect an interim board, that will require a lot of selling (versus picking people now this weekend). The new rules say a majority of members present at the annual meeting can elect individuals.

Matt noted: Back to what Jean said, how is that going to look and will it past the smell test?

Jean: Could you temporarily create some ex-parte working group? Jean volunteers to work with that group. It could last for six months and at the end recommend a formal nominations process or process for additional bylaws changes.

Larry: I understand what Matt is saying, and acknowledge Jessica’s point that the membership (FBS versus all DI) needs to be clarified. But what else in the bylaws is objectionable? Jeannie: C4—steering committee can release press releases. Many agreed that was a big problem and that the membership should at least get a chance to give feedback. Others noted ambiguity in votes needed (two-thirds of “who”, for instance).

Mike stated that we do not have a quorum so we cannot vote here. But the working group can work on it.