Background:

The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) is an alliance of 56 Division 1A university faculty senates whose aim is to promote comprehensive reform of intercollegiate sports. COIA believes the need for reform of intercollegiate athletics is serious and requires immediate and focused action. The COIA has emerged as a faculty voice to address the overall problems facing intercollegiate sports. These issues include academic integrity, athlete welfare, governance of athletics at the school and conference level, finances, and commercialization.

Over the past 4 years, COIA members have drafted, revised and adopted a comprehensive plan of reforms. The plan was developed by COIA members with input and feedback from the NCAA, the Association of Governing Boards (AGB), the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the Knight Commission, the Division 1A Faculty Athletics Representatives (D1A-FARs), the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association (FARA), the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics (N4A), the Division 1A Athletics Directors Association, university presidents, and conference commissioners.

On April 3, 2007, the Executive Committee of Academic Council (ECAC) met and elected William A. Anderson, Ph.D. as Michigan State University’s representative to the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA). Dr. Anderson is a tenured full professor in the College of Human Medicine. He attended the COIA annual meeting at Stanford University, May 18-20, 2007, and participated in the development of the COIA white paper. After a formal vote of all institutional representatives, COIA published “Framing the Future: Reforming Intercollegiate Athletics”, on June 15, 2007. A copy of the final white paper can be found at: http://www.neuro.uoregon.edu/~tublitz/COIA/index.html. A summary of the specific COIA recommendations is included.

On October 30, 20007, Dr. Anderson presented a summary of the “Framing the Future” to ECAC. At that meeting, a small ad hoc task force of ECAC members was appointed to review the COIA recommendations and report back to the ECAC on February 5, 2008 with a progress report and present a final report of findings no later than April 1, 2008.

Task Force Members:

William A. Anderson, College of Human Medicine (MSU COIA Representative)
Mary Noel, College of Human Medicine
John Powell, College of Education
Frederick Tims, College of Music
Connie Zheng, Graduate Student, College of Education
Charge:
The ECAC ad hoc task force was charged with the following tasks:
1) to review recommendations in “Framing the Future: Reforming Intercollegiate Athletics” published by the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), June 15, 2007.
2) to determine the extent of MSU’s compliance with the proposed recommendations, and
3) to provide an interim report of findings no later than February 5, 2008, and a final report no later than April 1, 008.

Methods:
To accomplish this charge, the ECAC ad hoc task force met regularly during the 2007-2008 academic year. The following methods were used to address the charges:
1. Responsibility for reviewing each cluster of COIA recommendations was assigned to a task force member.
2. Each task force member used the following methods to conduct their review:
   • reviewed MSU, NCAA, and Big Ten Conference documents and websites;
   • interviews with MSU academic and Athletic Department representatives;
   • drafting of findings for MSU’s compliance with each COIA recommendation;
   • review of each finding by other task force members and academic and Athletic Department representatives with revisions as necessary.

Findings:
1. Overall, Michigan State University is in substantial compliance with the COIA institutional level recommendations.

2. Communications lines between the MSU Athletic Council and the University Committee on Academic Policy (UCAP) should be strengthened to increase faculty understanding and participation. Specifically, reporting from the Athletic Council to UCAP should be done on a regular basis.

3. Some of the COIA recommendation conflict with existing NCAA regulations making it difficult for MSU to comply/ Example: student-athlete major changes.

4. The existing MSU academic governance system and athletic department policies and procedures have created an appropriate system of checks and balances to assure that MSU student-athletes are treated well, allowed opportunities to be integrated into campus life, and to progress toward the completion of a degree.

5. The MSU Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR), like other MSU administrators,
should be formally reviewed on a regular basis (5 years) with meaningful participation by the Athletic Council and the University Committee on Academic Policy (UCAP).

6. The Athletic Department budget is established and monitored using procedures common to all University departments. The Athletic Department should provide opportunities for meaningful faculty participation and review of draft budget plans.

7. The COIA recommendation that the Athletic Department’s budget growth rate be no greater than the University’s overall budget growth rate is not feasible for MSU because of several unpredictable costs within the Athletic Department budget.

Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA)
Reform Proposals

Proposal: Institutional Admission and Recruiting Policies (1.1)
A. Student-athletes should be admitted on their potential for academic success, and not primarily on their athletic contribution to the institution.

B. General admissions policies should be the same for all students, student-athletes, and non-student athletes.

C. Campus administrators and campus faculty governance bodies should work together to develop admission policies consistent with the educational mission of the institution.

D. The academic profiles of freshman or transfer student-athletes as a group and by sport should be similar to those of the entering freshman class or the non-athlete transfer cohort, as applicable.

E. Data on the academic profiles of entering student-athletes and non-student-athletes should be reviewed at least annually by the Campus Athletics Board or the campus faculty governance body.

F. Special admissions of freshman and transfer student-athletes should reflect the same philosophy as special admissions of non-student-athletes.

G. Data on the academic performance of student-athlete special admits should be reviewed at least annually by the Campus Athletic Board or the campus faculty governance body.

H. Faculty should be involved in developing and overseeing campus policies regarding recruiting of student athletes.

Proposal: The Primacy of Academics (1.2)
A. No academic programs or majors should be designed specifically for student-athletes or created for the purpose of allowing student-athletes to maintain their eligibility.

B. Qualified student athletes should be allowed and in fact encouraged to pursue the major of their choice and to have the same access to academic classes and programs as other students without explicit or implicit athletic consequences.
C. Data on student-athletes’ choice of major should be gathered and evaluated by the campus faculty governance body or the Campus Athletic Board, and should also be provided to all prospective recruits.

D. To preserve academic integrity, the campus faculty governance body or the Campus Athletic Board should monitor student-athlete enrollment by course.

E. Academic Progress Rate (APR), Graduation Success Rate (GSR) and other available graduation rate data should be reviewed annually by the campus faculty governance body to sustain processes that will improve the academic success and graduation rates of student-athletes.

F. Athletic eligibility shall be dependent on the maintenance of a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.0 on a 4.0 scale to ensure that student-athletes are acquiring the educational foundation leading to a degree.

Proposal: Athletic Scholarships (2.1)
A. Athletic scholarships should be awarded on a year-by-year basis with the presumption that they should be renewed up to four times for a total award of five years, or until graduation, whichever comes first, for students who are in good academic standing, conform to campus codes for student behavior, conform to the athletics department’s standards of conduct, and adhere to team rules.

B. Institutions should establish criteria and a mechanism for revoking a scholarship.

C. The final authority for revoking a scholarship should rest with the campus’ chief financial aid officer or with the chief academic officer.

D. A student awarded an athletics scholarship who is no longer participating in athletics should be counted against the NCAA maximum number of awards for that sport, unless the scholarship is revoked.

Proposal: Competition and Practice Scheduling (2.2)
A. Individual athletic competitions, as distinct from conference, regional, and national tournaments and championships, shall not be scheduled during final exam periods unless an exception is granted by the Campus Athletics Board or equivalent.

B. Individual athletics competitions and associated travel should be scheduled to minimize loss class time.

C. Institutional policies designed to minimize lost class time should be described.

D. Athletically-related activities (e.g. formal and informal practices, team meetings, and any activities at which the attendance of student-athletes is required) should be scheduled outside the prime times for academic classes. Each institution should explain how it achieves this scheduling goal.

Proposal: Integration into Campus Life (2.3)
A. Life skills and personal development programs for student-athletes should have as a goal the integration of student-athletes into the rest of the student population. These programs should help
student-athletes develop an appropriate balance between their athletic time requirements and their paramount need for academic and social integration.

B. Administrators, faculty and athletic departments should mitigate the time demand on student athletes to allow them to pursue the full range of educational experiences open to other students.

**Proposal: Campus Integration of Academic Advising for Student-Athletes (2.4)**

A. Academic advising and academic support for student-athletes should be structured to give student-athletes as valuable and meaningful an educational experience as possible, and not just to maintain their athletic eligibility.

B. The academic advising facility for student-athletes should be integrated into and report through the existing academic advising structure and not through the Athletics Department.

C. The campus academic advising structure or the office of the chief academic officer should have oversight of and regularly review the academic advising of student-athletes.

D. Athletic academic advisors should be appointed by and work for the campus academic advising structure and not solely for the Athletics Department.

**Proposal: Campus Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics (3.0)**
A. Each NCAA member institution should establish a Campus Athletic Board. The charge of this Board should be to monitor and oversee campus intercollegiate athletics.

B. A majority of Board members should be tenured faculty who should be appointed or elected through rules established by the campus faculty governance body.

C. The Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) should be an ex officio voting or non-voting member of the Board.

D. The chair of the Board should be a senior tenured faculty member. An Athletic Director should not be chair.

E. Major athletic department decisions (e.g., hiring of the athletic director and key athletic department personnel, changes in the total number of intercollegiate sports, initiation of major capital projects, etc.) should be made in consultation with the Campus Athletic Board and leaders of the campus faculty governance body and appropriate faculty committees.

F. The Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) should be appointed by the University President based on recommendation by the campus faculty governance body.

G. The FAR appointment should be made for a specific term and a review of the performance of the FAR should take place prior to reappointment. Such a review should include meaningful participation by the campus faculty governance body or the Campus Athletic Board.

H. The Athletic Director, Faculty Athletic Representative and the Campus Athletic Board chair should report orally and in writing at least once a year to the campus faculty governance body.

I. Their report should focus on academic benchmarking including APR, GSR, graduation rate sand the percentage and progress of student-athlete special admits.

J. Leaders of the campus faculty governance body should report annually to the University President that: 1) the faculty has been able to fulfill its responsibilities in regard to athletic governance, or 2) that it has not, in which case the report should specify the obstacles that have prevented it from doing so.

K. These reports should be made available to the NCAA during re-certification.

Proposal: Fiscal Responsibility (4.0)
A. The Athletic Department’s budgets, revenues and expenditures should be transparent and aligned with the mission, goals, and values of the institution.

B. The University President should take the lead to ensure that fiscal reports, including dashboard indicators as listed in the 2006 NCAA Presidential Task Force Report, are issued annually and made available to the campus faculty governance body.

C. The President should work closely with faculty leaders, existing faculty committees, and Athletic Department personnel to achieve the goals.

D. The overall growth rate in the Athletic Department’s operating expenditures should be no greater than the overall annual growth rate in the university’s operating expenditures.

E. The Athletic Department budget should be integrated into the university general budget process where feasible.

F. The proposed athletic department budget should be evaluated by the same process as the budget for academic units.

G. The University President should take the appropriate steps to fuse athletic fundraising efforts into those of the rest of the University, including eliminating separate, athletic-only 501(c)(3) entities and establishing faculty representation on the board of the institutional fund-raising entity.

H. Commercialization policies in athletics should be comparable to other commercialization policies conducted throughout the University, and should include meaningful faculty participation in their oversight.