

IAC YEAR-END REPORT FOR 2010-11

In our report last year, we emphasized the upheaval in the athletic department and the challenges that caused. This year has brought more stability in the athletic department, and with that the IAC can focus beyond the latest headlines.

1. RECAP OF EVENTS

We organize this report by themes, rather than proceeding chronologically.

1.1. Athletic department leadership. Last summer the university ran a search for a new athletic director. The IAC was represented on the search committee by the current chair, Dev Sinha, and recent member Deborah Morrison. Current member Nathan Tublitz was invited to participate in the final interview round but could not attend. Over the summer, Lorraine Davis continued her capable, calming leadership of the athletic department. It was noted many times that there was no rush in the search for a new athletic director in light of how quickly matters had settled during her tenure.

Throughout the search process there was tension between openness and broad participation as expected at our university and the level of confidentiality which is standard practice for executive-level searches. The search firm repeatedly suggested that we would get a larger pool with more high-profile candidates if the university president and perhaps one or two others were the only ones included in the process. President Lariviere chose to have a committee with representation of faculty, students (both a student-athlete and a representative of student government), alumni, athletic department staff, a coach, and administrators. This was already a large committee, leading to less IAC representation than would be ideal.

For purposes of institutional memory, it should be said that the applicant pool we were able to attract was very strong, as evidenced by our ability to hire Rob Mullens. It included some sitting athletic directors, plenty of rising talent and some talented people from outside of NCAA athletics. When the need arises in the future (we hope and expect far into the future) we strongly recommend continuing the practice of having a full search committee, allowing us to attract talented individuals in the context of our whole-campus values. The search committee also held a forum for community members to help shape the vision of what we were looking for in a candidate, and the IAC was able to share its vision with search committee chair Robin Holmes at the end of last year. We recommend the practice of an open forum continue as well.

1.2. Finances, Matthew Knight Arena, and the Legacy Fund. With Lorraine Davis's hiring of Jamie Moffitt, the financial and operational structure of the department started to be reworked. That process was able to proceed in full once Rob Mullens arrived. Indeed, one of their first charges was a financial and operational report which was given (in order) to President Lariviere, the Faculty Advisory Committee, the chair of the IAC, (on the next day) faculty on the IAC who could attend a special meeting, athletic department staff, and then the press. This report was the first of many on the financial side, which in summary said that because of increase expenditures on general athletics operations (rather than on the Arena side) the Legacy Fund would need to be relied on more than originally planned. A new model, focussed on getting back to original estimates for Legacy Fund withdrawals within six years, was presented to the IAC in January. The Legacy Fund is projected to be drawn down to as low as \$40M and end up with an endowment of approximately \$80M. The assumptions of this model included one of increased revenue from a new Pac-10 (now Pac-12) media deal, and that assumption was validated with the announcement of such a deal at the beginning of May. The athletic department has been engaged throughout the year in a

new zero-based budgeting process (that is, budgeting “from the ground up” rather than based on previous expenditures), and the IAC will be curious to know about the outcomes of that process next year.

The opening of Matthew Knight Arena also started clarify the financial picture. The IAC was given a special tour of the Arena in October, two months before its opening, and the IAC met in November with Mike Duncan who schedules events at the Arena. The completion of the project in such an ambitious timeframe is quite an accomplishment, and to the IAC’s knowledge costs are also entirely within estimates. While some of the original revenue estimates for basketball were probably too aggressive, the income from outside events is greater than estimated. At this point, the new model includes numbers which would not require a large increase in arena revenue from what can be expected based on experience so far.

Another component of the financial picture is that of fundraising, and this is one area which faculty suspect that athletic department fundraising efforts can have a negative effect on general university fundraising. Indeed, one of our Business School faculty, Dennis Howard, has been writing papers on the relationship between athletic and non-athletic fundraising which over the years shows possible detriment as well as possibilities for positive reinforcement. The IAC scheduled a discussion with Mike Andreasen, VP for Development, Jim Bartko from the athletic department, as well as Hal Abrams who reports to both of them. It was clear that there is a base of sharing information, as evidenced by this reporting structure. For example all those who donate over twenty-five thousand dollars to the athletic department were invited to broader university fundraising events. But many IAC members continue to feel that overall this is an area of concern, and would like to have a better picture of next steps in coordination, perhaps after the Development Office finishes updating its systems.

1.3. Academics. The Services for Student Athletes program marked a full year of running and the Jaqua Center this year. Early in the year it was clarified that their operating budget is drawn from general fund monies, in line with having full operational control from the Provost’s office. Staff from SSA reported to the IAC on multiple occasions, in particular at the orientation event prior to the start of the academic year and in another meeting fully devoted to discussion of the academic performance of student athletes. In preparation for this meeting, IAC members collected questions from their academic units, which we shared with Steve Stolp and his staff before the meeting. The discussion pretty thoroughly addressed all of these questions. We recommend that in the future IAC members regularly solicit questions on topics of concern. Questions ranged from quality control of tutors (a significant issue with over eighty at a given time), to choice of majors (which parallels the general student body fairly well), to the scope of services involved, to communications with faculty. In all cases it was clear that any IAC and broader campus concerns were being fully considered, and in some cases (such as communications) small changes were to be made. At another meeting, James Harris briefed the IAC on Life and Study Skills programming and the O-Heroes program.

An unusual kind of academic issue arose, with the football team invited to the BCS Championship which was held on the Monday of our second week of classes. Arrangements had been made quietly late in the fall, and the IAC asked to be involved after our November meeting. While the planning for football players was handled capably by Tim Bruegman, Steve Stolp and others (, the IAC ended up playing a significant lead role in crafting a statement describing what these plans were along with the policy and suggested procedures pertaining to missed time by everyone who attended the game.

1.4. Compliance. While Compliance was not slated to be much on the IAC agenda this year - and has not been an area of focus historically - issues around compliance made the news and thus were on the minds of many on the IAC. It seems that the NCAA is currently investigating the athletics department, regarding practices in football recruiting. News outlets have reported uses of and contracts with recruiting services which may be inappropriate. But the Athletics Department, Faculty Athletics Representative and President’s Office are not even sharing whether in fact there is an NCAA investigation, much less what its parameters are. Apparently, because it lacks subpoena authority the NCAA attempts to have as little

information publicly available - and thus available to those being interviewed, to coordinate stories - as possible. Sometimes the NCAA sanctions an institution for sharing information with its own employees, including coaching staffs under investigation.

The NCAA has indicated to the University that having the involvement of the IAC with our athletics program's leadership is a valuable practice. It is frustrating to then have the NCAA direct the University to not share information with the IAC. We have been promised that when the case is resolved we will be able to fully revisit what transpired and what the Athletics Department is doing to improve practices, if need be. But at that point the Athletics Department will have been addressing such issues for a long time without dialogue with the IAC.

1.5. Messaging. The IAC followed up on the new initiative from the previous year, which was using athletics-related media venues in order to highlight strengths of the University more broadly. With the major media opportunities associated with football in the fall, this year was when the work from last year could actually pay off. The IAC coordinated efforts between the Provost's Office, the Athletics Department and the Office of Communications. Ultimately, the Provost's Office with the IAC's help prioritized areas of strength to highlight. The Office of Communications took those areas and worked them into Know the O spots, to be done within the broadcast narrative of games. Former IAC member Deborah Morrison from the School of Journalism and the Warsaw Center's Paul Swangard identified themes and points in the broadcast where the spots could be incorporated more seamlessly, such as highlighting a player's academic accomplishments when that player was in the spotlight. The spots produced by the Office of Communications were then passed on to the broadcast team and were indeed incorporated into the local broadcast feeds. Because of the football team's success, an unusual number of games were carried nationally, limiting the number of times where the local feed had a wide audience. But the pieces seemed to work well and represent a good foundation for future collaboration. Indeed, in the run-up to the BCS Championship, the IAC Chair was a guest on Jerry Allen's radio program.

Phil Weiler from the Office of Communications joined the IAC at a couple of meetings to discuss both the Know the O campaign and also to discuss communications efforts which happened around the BCS Championship. There were an impressive number of "hits" in various types of media, generally exceeding expectations. The Admissions Office noticed a significant increase in applications, which they associate with the increased national exposure. Hopefully the University can continue to use this exposure to highlight the strengths of academic programs rather than overshadowing them. There should be increased opportunities to do so as part of the new Pac-12 media deal.

1.6. Conversations with coaches and womens' sports. The IAC invited two coaches to meet, Coach White from softball and Coach Mulkey from Acrobatics and Tumbling. The conversation with Coach White focussed on academics and in particular planning around class time missed. Along with golf and baseball, softball has some of the greatest number of absences by competition requirements. While it would be strongly preferable for the schedule to involve less missed class time, it was reassuring to hear Coach White's policies for time spent on academics especially during travel.

Coach Mulkey visited as part of a review of womens' sports and Title IX. Her sport of Acrobatics and Tumbling is the most recent sport added. As part of fulfilling the "expanding opportunities prong" of Title IX, the University has added a womens' sport roughly every eight years (with Lacrosse being the previous addition). Some of the discussion focussed on the status of Acrobatics and Tumbling as an emerging sport, and an ongoing reckoning between different philosophies and certifying bodies. The IAC learned that there are more gymnastics ties to the University's version of the sport, a point which was underscored by conversations with student-athletes who had competed in gymnastics at the highest levels as children and found this sport the right next step.

The IAC was also asked to inquire whether the athletics department was engaging in irregular practices to artificially inflate numbers of female participants, namely counting non-participants as participants and

counting male practice players as participants. These practices do not occur on our campus. Indeed, there is no incentive for them to occur since it is the expansion of opportunities by adding sports which “counts” towards our Title IX compliance. Along with those, the Senate asked whether the “irregularity” of counting multi-sport athletes more than once was occurring. This is not our campus’s practice currently, and would not be an “irregularity” if it did as long as male multi-sport athletes were counted in the same way. (This is akin to a department counting students multiple times if they take multiple classes from that department.)

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

A consistent point brought up by members of the IAC has been wanting further engagement. The chair would also like to see the workload distributed more across the committee. With these points in mind we make the following recommendations.

- (1) Expand the successful practice of submitting questions for presenters ahead of time by having an IAC member briefly meet with each presenter ahead of time as well. In that way, IAC members can start gaining more expertise and developing working relationships with members of the athletics department, the services for student athletes program, and the administration.
- (2) Expand contact between the IAC and members of the athletics department, student athletes, and the athletics donor community. Consider initiatives which could be of benefit to the University which involve the IAC working with these groups.
- (3) Devote more time to and take a closer look at academic performance of student athletes. Look across the spectrum, not only at those struggling to remain eligible, to see if student-athletes are getting full academic opportunities (e.g. being able to write honors theses).