

**Faculty Board on Athletics  
Meeting of January 31, 2011  
Monogram Room, Joyce Center**

**Members present:** Patricia Bellia (Chair), Eileen Botting, Stephen Fallon, Thomas Frecka, Umesh Garg, Patrick Holmes, William Kelley, Richard Pierce, Kevin Richards (student representative), Ann Tenbrunsel

**Members excused:** Rev. Tom Doyle, C.S.C., Tracy Kijewski-Correa, Clark Power, Frances Shavers, Jack Swarbrick.

**Board Liaison present:** Bill Scholl

**Observers and Guests:** Kevin Dugan—Director of Operations, Men’s Lacrosse, Tracey Thomas (Recorder)

**1. Call to order and opening prayer:** Prof. Patricia Bellia called the meeting to order and gave the opening prayer.

**2. Minutes of December 14, 2010:** Members unanimously approved the minutes of the December 14, 2010 meeting.

**3. Chair’s Announcements**

Prof. Bellia made announcements on four topics:

a. Schedules and Captaincies: Prof. Bellia noted that she approved a schedule for rowing and revised schedules for men’s and women’s lacrosse and softball. Of these latter three, the changes did not affect class misses. For women’s basketball, two class misses were approved for a single player who has a Tuesday/Thursday evening class running until 7:00 pm class, which she must miss for two scheduled home games that begin at 7:00 pm.

Prof. Bellia discussed certain procedural issues regarding the approval of football captaincies for the Fall 2011 season.

b. NCAA Legislative Process: Prof. Bellia provided an update on the NCAA legislative cycle, particularly with regard to the proposals the FBA had considered at its December meeting. She circulated a diagram of the NCAA legislative process and noted that, after the Legislative Council meeting in January, there are three possible courses of action for a proposal: approval, rejection, or a middle category in which the proposal is sent to membership for comment and revision. Most of the proposals that were reviewed at the December 2010 meeting as being of particular interest to the FBA received this last action. Of the proposals dealing with football eligibility, two were defeated, and the third was sent for membership review. The rest of the proposals reviewed by the FBA were also sent back for comment. In April 2011, the Legislative Council will meet to reconsider these proposals. The Big East will most likely carry forward its stated position at this meeting.

c. Academic Council Report. The Board is now required to submit an annual report of its work to the Academic Council. Prof. Bellia submitted the report for 2009-2010 and made an

oral presentation at the last meeting of the Undergraduate Studies Committee of the Academic Council. Prof. Bellia noted that the timetable has been set for the 2010-2011 reporting cycle, and the written report is due on April 27, 2011, which is before the FBA will have completed its year's work. Prof. Bellia has negotiated with the chair of the Undergraduate Studies Committee to submit a provisional written report by that date, with a revised report to follow once the FBA completes its work for the academic year. The oral presentation will follow in Fall 2011.

Prof. Bellia explained to members that she is seeking Board approval to circulate the provisional written report by e-mail for comments and approval by members. This choice will enable her to include the business of the April meeting (April 13) in the report, leaving only the May meeting yet to be included. Following the end of the year's work, Prof. Bellia will prepare a final report, also to be circulated by e-mail for approval. Members approved this plan.

d. Prof. Bellia announced some guests to upcoming meetings. On February 28, 2011, Dennis Jacobs has been invited to present new data on the honor code, with particular attention to student athlete involvement in honor code issues. Coach Brian Kelly will attend the April 13, 2011 meeting. Finally, Don Bishop, the new associate vice president for Enrollment Management, will attend either the February or April meeting to discuss admissions, financial aid, and related issues.

#### **4. Presentation by Kevin Dugan, Director of Operations, Men's Lacrosse; Founder and Director, Fields of Growth International**

Prof. Bellia welcomed Kevin Dugan to the meeting. Mr. Dugan is the Director of Operations, Men's Lacrosse, having come to Notre Dame a year ago. Mr. Dugan is a Notre Dame graduate from the Business School, and was head lacrosse coach at the University of Scranton before returning to Notre Dame. He has been invited to speak to the Board about service work he has been doing in Uganda, through a not-for profit organization he founded called Fields of Growth International. Mr. Dugan has been engaged in this work for several years, and has now brought his interest to Notre Dame, where current student-athletes have become involved as well. Prof. Bellia noted that FBA members had likely read Mr. Dugan's profile in *Strong of Heart*; she and others thought it would be interesting to hear first-hand about Mr. Dugan's service work and how student-athletes and others can take part in it.

Mr. Dugan thanked members for inviting him to talk about the work he has been involved with in Uganda. Mr. Dugan spoke briefly about his own transformative experience as an undergraduate student at Notre Dame; he sees in the student athletes with whom he works the same desire for impact. Service work in conjunction with their athletic vocations combines to be a meaningful form of outreach for both the student-athletes and those they are able to aid.

Mr. Dugan discussed the work he has been involved with, including while he was at the University of Scranton and since he has arrived at ND. His initial focus was to bring lacrosse to the villages of Uganda; since that initial effort, he has used the not-for-profit organization to create structures through which aid can be delivered to the residents to address specific needs. For instance, money has been raised to clear ground for the growth of crops, residents have been assisted to start small home-based businesses, and money has been raised to build schools. Mr. Dugan shared the story of Jake Brems, a current men's lacrosse player at Notre Dame, who used his science-business education to assist a widow and her two children to develop a poultry-

rearing business that is now providing the family with a much needed \$4.00/week income. Mr. Dugan spoke about the infectious sense of purpose that develops in the student-athlete who is able to combine his or her passion with Notre Dame's mission of education for service.

Through his organization, Mr. Dugan works with athletes from a wide range of institutions; the opportunity for Notre Dame athletes to interact with their peers from other universities is another gain. In addition, he has joined forces with Play Like A Champion, the program directed by Notre Dame's Prof. Clark Power. While much of this American-oriented program does not translate to the context in Uganda, the cardinal virtues of teamwork, good sportsmanship, and dedication can effectively serve as fundamental virtues for the future. Prof. Power and his colleague Kristin Sheehan will be traveling to Uganda this summer, 2011, to further develop this program. He also mentioned the involvement of Oscar McBride, former Notre Dame football player and associate director of the Play Like a Champion program, who has become increasingly involved in Ugandan service work.

Mr. Dugan discussed the Batwa pygmy home building project, which is the service component to which the student athletes have most strongly responded. The Batwa tribe has a transient lifestyle, which results, among other things, in a forty percent mortality rate for children under five years of age. The resettlement project, which protects them from the elements, is able to give some stability to the community. Student-athletes have embraced the project of raising \$750.00/house.

Mr. Dugan talked about some of the other activities in which student-athletes have been involved, including the Stand for Sudan 3-on-3 basketball tournament held this past winter. Even the simple activity of teaching flag football to local children has been a demonstrably beneficial activity that the athletes are able to engage in, reaching out to the children, sharing their love and their personal passions.

The future of the connection between Notre Dame athletes and service work in Uganda is promising. Mr. Dugan's organization, Fields of Growth International, has a separate field of action; the overlap between this group and Notre Dame has been very satisfying. As Notre Dame increases its commitment in this area, it has its own wealth of resources, both in personnel and expertise, to develop its own dynamic programs to put in place; Play Like A Champion is one such program. Notre Dame is an obvious and natural place for this kind of program, part of a growing national trend to develop global citizens on college campuses.

Members were invited to comment. Kevin Richards asked about the connection on campus of other sports to the program Mr. Dugan has been running. All agreed that it would be wonderful for student-athletes from other teams to have this sort of experience. Mr. Dugan said that this is an ongoing and developing conversation; he would love to see some formal institutionalization of this kind of service work. It is beyond the scope of his own work, both professional and private. The Center for Social Concerns is an obvious possible partner to take up a significant role in the future development of this program.

Prof. Botting noted that the opportunity for study abroad experiences are limited for student-athletes; summer service work in international locations would be an interesting answer to that

dilemma and another way to connect the athlete to campus activities. Certainly, all agreed that it is the future of elite institutions to encourage service abroad; increased involvement of the athletes would be valuable. Mr. Dugan noted that the Holy Cross missions abroad offer a ready-made template; there is little groundwork to do. Coaches from many of the other sports have expressed interest in the work Mr. Dugan has been doing. Coach Kelly's wife, for example, has contacted Mr. Dugan and supported his work. In addition, each team takes an international trip once every four years, which could offer an opportunity. So the stepping stones are in place.

Prof. Frecka asked if the programs that exist among various teams represent grassroots efforts, or if there is encouragement "from the top." Mr. Scholl noted that several teams are engaged in special projects: Women's basketball supports breast cancer research, the soccer teams support heart research, men's basketball is involved in Coaches against Cancer. It is important to continue support of each of these efforts, so a unilateral system is not currently the aim. Prof. Fallon noted that it might be useful to investigate the functionality of several models and then devise a series of programs with which student-athletes could be involved regardless of sport affiliation. Mr. Dugan said the ongoing concern is to devise programs that are significantly meaningful and not simply "poverty tourism." Finding a way to take advantage of institutional expertise and resources, but not at the expense of the programs individual teams are passionate about, is the manageable challenge facing Notre Dame now. Again, the Center for Social Concerns presents a willing and ready partner with which to explore ideas.

Prof. Bellia expressed the Board's admiration for Mr. Dugan's work, and offered the ongoing support and assistance of both the Board and the faculty in general. Prof. Bellia thanked Mr. Dugan for his presentation, and for his service to both the university and the student-athletes.

## **5. Proposed Revision to Transfer-Release Appeal Procedures**

Prof. Bellia reported that because the NCAA has changed its rules for appeals from denials of permission-to-contact and transfer-release requests, Notre Dame has had to make adjustments in its procedures to stay in compliance. The major change made by the NCAA is to compress significantly the time line for appeal. Prof. Bellia charged the subcommittee on student welfare with reviewing and revising Notre Dame's procedures. She also submitted the subcommittee's proposed revision to Jill Bodensteiner, Associate Athletics Director for Compliance and Legal Affairs, and she is presenting the proposed revision here today for comment and approval by members.

Prof. Bellia briefly reviewed the changes. Per the new NCAA rules, if the hearing process is not completed within a 15 day period, the student-athlete's request is deemed approved. The old appeal procedure required that a hearing be conducted within 30 days of the Faculty Athletics Representative's (FAR's) receipt of an appeal request; this has been changed to 12 business days. (Prof. Bellia noted that the term "business day" has been used throughout as defined by the NCAA; it includes days when Notre Dame might be closed, such as during the Winter Break.) The old procedure allocated a 10 day period for the panel to deliberate and to communicate its decision to the student-athlete and the Department of Athletics. This period has been changed to 2 business days. In addition, Prof. Bellia reviewed an added paragraph that details a "safety valve" allowing exceptions to the appeal procedures. Based on recent experience, it was noted

that circumstances out of anyone's control can make it very difficult to convene the required panel even under the previous 30-day time frame. Many appeals are filed during break periods, when potential panel members may have left town. The provision would give leeway for the FAR to adjust the procedures as necessary to complete the appeal without prejudice to the parties. It also includes a short list of sample adjustments that might be approved.

Prof. Bellia invited comments.

Prof. Fallon questioned the breadth of the language allowing deviations from the stated procedures, particularly as to the structure of the panel. Prof. Bellia said that this topic received a lot of thought. A panel is mandated, so it must be at least 2 people, which means that at most 1 person can be absent from the panel. It was also contemplated that the language would accommodate the possibility of including a faculty member who is not a member of the FBA but who has appropriate experience to serve in this capacity (for example, a former Board member).

Prof. Botting agreed that she would like the structure of the panel to be specifically stated. She suggests simply stating that there will be 2 rather than 3 members. Or, again, the phrase "substituting a regular faculty member for a FBA member" could be added to the document, thereby taking care of the problem.

Prof. Kelley questioned the phrase "and only as necessary" in the added paragraph detailing the extraordinary exceptions. In response to a question, Prof. Bellia said this phrase was not mandated by Compliance. The language mirrors that in the Grant-in-Aid proposal, and Prof. Bellia explained it was included because it offered a measure of control over adjustments to be made: only if absolutely necessary.

Prof. Kelley raised concerns about the sentence that lists possible exceptions ["Examples of such adjustments may include honoring a student-athlete's request to participate telephonically or to rest on a written submission or altering the structure of the appeal panel."]. He feared that including these examples would cause interpretive difficulties—that the provision would be read to exclude other possible adjustments. Prof. Botting said the examples sentence provides some clarity about what an extraordinary circumstance might be, thus providing helpful context. Prof. Fallon also advocated keeping the examples, but wondered if the list ought to be exhaustive. He recognized that it could be impossible to reach the end of such a list, as there will always be some kind of unforeseen eventuality. Prof. Garg offered that an exhaustive list brings its own set of problems. Prof. Frecka agreed that there could never be a complete list. The spirit of the sentence appears to be that alternative forms of communication are allowed which is useful information for all participants. Prof. Tenbrunsel said this list could represent the types of exceptions that have been foreseen and thus do not need pre-approval; others would be presented for approval. Thus, the sentence indicates that the FBA is aware of the possibility for exceptions.

Prof. Bellia replied that if an exception needed Board approval, then the value of the extraordinary circumstances paragraph has been undercut, as the problem is that the Board can find itself under dire time constraints and unable easily to collect a quorum for approval or to gather the requisite panel. Prof. Kelley noted that the calling of such a panel is the kind of

situation that arises without many on the Board ever being aware of it happening. He suggested that clarity is a lesser value under those circumstances than the preservation of each person's rights. The extraordinary circumstances clause has been added in response to NCAA imposed rules. Further, the floor for any exception is set by Compliance. Therefore, he said he would be comfortable with no examples clause; the final call on any exception would be in the hands of the head of the Compliance Office. Prof. Bellia agreed that Compliance has the final call.

Prof. Kelley moved to approve the procedures as written with the sentence noting examples (see above) deleted. The motion carried by a vote of 5-3, with one abstention.

Prof. Fallon asked a hypothetical question as to an inappropriate decision made by a future FAR. How might that be prevented? He suggested that a vote of committee on any exception would probably be too cumbersome. He offered the phrase "absent objection from the Board." This could be attained by an email request to Board members. Prof. Kelley suggested that delays could arise if some but not all of the Board objects. There would then need to be a backstop process for the Board as a whole to come up with an alternative procedure. Prof. Kelley said that he found this to be cumbersome and risky. He asked how often an appeal is entered; Prof. Bellia said no more than one per year, if that. Prof. Botting observed that if the difficulty is getting all necessary people together in one place, the exceptions sentence could permit convening of the panel by telephone; that would facilitate the three-member requirement. Prof. Bellia stated her belief that, because NCAA rules give the student the right to appear in person, the panel must be "live."

Prof. Fallon moved that the following sentence be substituted for the examples clause: The FAR shall report to the Board on any exception made. All agreed that this would permit the Board to revisit the procedures at any time.

The motion thus amended was unanimously approved.

## **6. Proposed Academic Code Revisions Affecting Student-Athletes**

Prof. Bellia introduced the discussion of proposed Academic Code revisions that may affect student-athletes. The revision of the Academic Code has been undertaken by the Undergraduate Studies Committee of the Academic Council. Although the process has been a long one, and a draft came to Prof. Bellia's attention last April, the Undergraduate Studies Committee completely restructured the draft, and no "settled" draft emerged until December 2010. That draft was recently made available to Prof. Bellia. Now the movement to approve changes is on a fast-track, as the Undergraduate Studies Committee would like to pass its draft to the Academic Council before the end of the academic year. Because of the timetable, there is no time to refer the draft to the Academic Integrity subcommittee. In light of the timetable, Prof. Bellia has already held discussions with Pat Holmes in Academic Services and Jill Bodensteiner of the Compliance Office about the issues that have arisen. Today she is seeking the input of FBA members, so as to ascertain and articulate the Board's response to the proposed changes. Two main issues require attention.

a. The first issue concerns the student athlete who plays for three years at Notre Dame and then “goes pro” in the junior year. This athlete then plays 4-5 years in the professional league, at which point s/he wants to return to the university to finish the degree.

The current provision says that after five years from the last date of attendance, credits are forfeited. The newly proposed code will cancel all credits after ten consecutive or non-consecutive semesters of non-attendance. Prof. Bellia noted that for student athletes, this is moving the rules in the opposite direction from that which she perceived the Academic Integrity subcommittee to favor in previous discussions; more flexibility is sought rather than less.

With the athlete’s permission, Prof. Bellia discussed a specific case involving a professional athlete who has been away from campus for six years and whose playing season has made it impossible for him to return to “refresh” his credits. The relevant college has expressed a willingness to readmit the student and will not wipe out all of the credits, but has said that it will require 60 credits rather than the 28 that remain for the student to graduate. This amounts to a two-year commitment to achieve a degree that is one year short of completion.

Prof. Botting expressed a strong sense of the injustice of this decision; student-athletes have made an investment and should have a right to come back and complete the degree. Prof. Pierce noted that the issue is not confined to student-athletes. A situation arose in 2009-2010 involving a student who was serving in the military; because of military rules, he could not return to campus, and he was concerned that the years would tick away before he could finish his degree.

Members asked what the rationale for the college’s approach is. Prof. Bellia noted that one rationale given by the college is that the curriculum is always changing; thus credits do not adequately represent the current education offered. As to the proposal that would use an absolute 10-semester bar rather than giving students an opportunity to “refresh” credits, Prof. Bellia noted that the draft Academic Code contained a marginal comment indicating the drafters’ objections to students who appear every few years to “refresh” credits without actually completing the degree.

Prof. Botting observed that the problem of curriculum change is an institutional problem rather than a fault of the student. Prof. Kelley asked why the “refreshing” of credits is considered a problem; Prof. Botting noted that Yale permits such action, and, in fact, has a very open policy on finishing degrees. For any reason whatsoever a student can return, as long as procedures are followed. Prof. Kelley concurred. He questioned why an institution would create or increase the difficulty for any student, even an 80 year old, to finish a degree. He was particularly dismayed at the notion that the year on the diploma signified a standard of knowledge. Under these terms, he noted, his diploma, for instance, would signify a curriculum now decades old; and yet no one ever challenges his right to be gainfully employed in his profession.

Prof. Frecka also expressed surprise that there would be any hesitancy to encourage anyone from getting a degree under any circumstances. Prof. Botting stressed that because of the special circumstances of students such as those in the military or athletes, they should be permitted to return without restriction.

Prof. Bellia informed members that one option for them would be to ask for deletion of the provision. Short of that option, the Board could ask for some wording that expresses a robust waiver power, including the power to make a determination based on the reason for the absence. This would leave the question of how to deal with expired pre-requisite credits; should a revised provision build in the ability to tack on credits in that situation? That is, currently, the policy of

the College of Business, for instance. Members discussed whether a pre-requisite provision would be necessary; the policy tends to vary from college to college. Prof. Frecka noted that it is always possible to wave pre-requisites.

Prof. Fallon suggested that concern about discrimination in favor of the student athlete might be raised as an objection to the kind of change the Board is discussing. It is clear that the concern about the evolving curriculum is of serious concern to the subcommittee. Prof. Fallon said that the discussion, as he has understood it, can be framed as a rhetorical problem. The Board's interpretation of the current ruling and the situation overall is that it is not per se a student athlete problem but rather one for all students. He expressed concern that the Board might not have standing to address a student-wide problem. On the other hand, a suggested change that framed an exception for student athletes is likely to get push back. Prof. Bellia agreed that she had that experience with a recent discussion about residency requirements when she proposed language that was more inclusive.

At members' request, Pat Holmes gave some perspective on the student athletes who are affected by this provision. He reported that currently there are 15-20 former student athletes who might fall into the category under discussion. Nine of those are football players, several are from baseball, one or two are hockey players, and one each are from men's basketball, swimming, and men's soccer. The longest time period away from campus and the completion of the degree is 20 years; this student has been given an opportunity to pursue the degree and declined. Prof. Kelley asked how many student athletes who leave without completing the degree attempt to return after five years. Mr. Holmes said about half do so. However, he noted that if the rules were more flexible, there could be a practice of more active outreach to encourage them to return. Prof. Garg asked for the numbers in the last five years. Mr. Holmes said that between 10 to 15 student athletes have left and made inquiries about returning.

Prof. Bellia noted that as the university continues to recruit elite athletes and embraces a goal of helping programs compete for national championships, these numbers may very well increase. Mr. Scholl demurred; he does not think the numbers will get appreciably greater. Prof. Garg affirmed that for every student it is a good idea to be able to come back and complete an unfinished degree.

Prof. Botting urged deletion of the whole provision, which would be fair to all students who might fall into this category. While this objection might come from the FBA, it is not a problem limited to student athletes. Prof. Tenbrunsel, speaking from her own experience with Academic Council subcommittees, suggested offering a second alternative. She reminded members that the Undergraduate Studies Committee is new every year; it faces the challenge of completing its work by April of each academic year. Thus there will be pressure and commitment to the language over which they have worked hard. And, as a practical point, the last meetings of the year for the committee will be overflowing with work that must get done. It would be best to be strategic in the objection.

Prof. Fallon said he is strongly in favor of deletion. Failing that, he said it would be a mistake to move to a more restrictive policy than is currently in the code. Mr. Holmes noted that Stanford, a peer institution, has absolutely no restrictions on returning to campus to finish a degree.

Prof. Bellia noted that she has been advised by the Board; she will carry their opinion to the Undergraduate Studies Committee meeting, and report back on the discussion. She asked for a formal vote. The members voted unanimously to object to the provision and ask for deletion.

Failing that, the members voted unanimously to move for an extraordinary circumstances modification for the existing provision (not the newly revised provision).

b. The second issue relates to a cluster of provisions that would adjust the definition of good standing. Current provisions set good standing for first semester First Year of Studies (FYS) students at 1.700, and for second semester FYS students at 1.850. The proposed provision would change the GPAs to 1.750 and 2.000 respectively. In addition, revised provisions would permit students to be placed on academic probation for poor summer performance; currently a student's summer performance does not affect good standing (except to restore good standing through a combined spring and summer performance that meets the relevant GPA threshold).

Mr. Holmes noted that the purpose of FYS is exploration, and he expressed concern that the shift from 1.850 to 2.000 for the second semester would curtail the exploratory nature of the first year. Mr. Holmes stated that the change, in combination with the proposed changes for summer school, would negatively affect what Academic Services tries to accomplish. Prof. Bellia expressed concern that although a small number of student-athletes would be affected each semester, a disproportionate number of them would be African American student-athletes in high-profile sports.

Prof. Garg asked how many students would have been affected in Spring, 2010; Mr. Holmes said a handful. Prof. Botting stated that students typically come out of FYS with a lower GPA than desired and recoup that GPA through the specialization of the next 6 semesters. She agreed that FYS ought to be an opportunity for exploration.

Prof. Frecka asked if this battle is worth fighting for, given other priorities. Prof. Kelley made the case that this issue is of paramount importance. He supported the function of FYS exploration. Further, he spoke about the commitment the university has made to students who are at academic risk from day one. Historically, these students do get an education and get their degrees through the support of academic tutors and lots of hard work. If the first year is difficult, the academic support can assist these students to make adjustments over the next three years. He said it is an injustice to bring in these students who, with maximum all out effort, will achieve at best GPAs in the range of 1.7. Either we do not admit these students, or we give them time to find their way, to achieve over time.

Members discussed the provision that would include summer session as part of the assessment for academic probation. Members discussed the fact that summer session is an integral tool in getting student-athletes successfully through the degree program. It is in the summer session, under the current rule, that student athletes are able to take challenging courses without fear of a penalty to their GPA and, consequently, their eligibility.

Prof. Pierce pointed out that since some student athletes are enrolling in the spring semester, the crisis GPA semesters for those athletes would be spring and summer of the first year of enrollment. Prof. Bellia, noting that the current provision (but not the proposed provision) includes the qualification "in his or her classification," said that this point is an important one to bring to the attention of the Undergraduate Studies Committee.

Prof. Fallon referred to the scenario of the student who gives his/her best effort and yet does not make it: typically, do these students make their best effort? While Mr. Holmes said that many but not all do, Prof. Kelley stressed that the university should be especially concerned with the student who is in this situation. Prof. Botting, noting the interconnection between these two provisions, stressed that the summer school program allows the student athletes to make significant progress toward the degree before they leave to go pro. This is greatly to the credit of

Notre Dame. In fact, for many of the student athletes who are not high profile, the summer sessions provide an opportunity to take courses during a less hectic time of the year. The proposed change will make the summer session substantially less friendly. Mr. Holmes said the focus in advising student athletes is on balance; summer school is a big part of achieving that balance. The looming ineligibility at the end of summer session for FYS students would impact the courses chosen. Under these circumstances, the option to take a harder course will not be taken.

Prof. Bellia summarized the discussion, noting that while there is not unanimity by the Board, the overall sense is that these provisions are disadvantageous to the student athletes. Prof. Tenbrunsel noted that the Undergraduate Studies Committee will be particularly concerned not to show a bias either to or against the student athlete. She suggested that an alternative be proposed to give the subcommittee a positive direction to move. Prof. Kelley stressed again that the affected population will be at-risk minority students; he suggested that the subcommittee may not have access to this information. Prof. Kelley also stated his position that the set of provisions affecting good standing is the more important of the two issues discussed today. The commitments the university has made to these students who have been recruited and admitted to the university are significant, and the harm that can be done to them is serious.

Prof. Bellia said she “feels advised” by the Board and will convey to the subcommittee the concerns of the Board.

As time had expired, the meeting was adjourned.