Faculty Board on Athletics
Meeting of April 13, 2011
500 Main Building

Members present: Patricia Bellia (Chair), Eileen Botting, Stephen Fallon, Thomas Frecka, Umesh Garg, Patrick Holmes, William Kelley, Richard Pierce, Clark Power, Frances Shavers, Jack Swarbrick, Ann Tenbrunsel

Members excused: Rev. Tom Doyle, C.S.C., Tracy Kijewski-Correa, Kevin Richards (student representative)

Board Liaisons present: Missy Conboy, Charmelle Green, Bill Scholl

Observers and Guests: Brian Kelly—Head Coach, Football; Don Bishop—Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Enrollment; Bob Mundy—Director of Admissions; Tracey Thomas (Recorder)

1. Call to order and opening prayer: Prof. Patricia Bellia called the meeting to order and offered an opening prayer.

2. Minutes of February 28, 2011: Prof. Bellia noted two minor changes made by Dr. Jacobs to the minutes that had been circulated. The minutes were unanimously approved as so amended.

3. Chair's Announcements

Prof. Bellia reported that she approved class absences for three teams participating in NCAA tournaments: Fencing, Women's Basketball, and Hockey. Class misses were also approved for members of the cheerleading squad who traveled with Women's Basketball and Hockey. Prof. Bellia noted that the Fencing team won the national championship, Women's Basketball played in the championship game, and the Hockey team reached the Frozen Four.

4. Scheduling of Night Game for 2011 Football Season

Mr. Swarbrick briefed members on the decision to schedule a night football game in the 2011 football season. He discussed the factors that led to this decision. Mr. Swarbrick said that Notre Dame has retained its football independence and has continued to pursue opportunities to play on the national stage for the specific purpose of promoting the University. Data on viewership indicates that there is a significant increase in promotional opportunities when a game is scheduled in the evening network time slot—the audience increases threefold. It behooves the University to take advantage of this greatly larger pool of viewers who will see the program in action, view the well-crafted PSAs, and thus become better acquainted with Notre Dame. Mr. Swarbrick also noted that the shift in the scheduling model from a 7-4-1 model to a 6-5-1 model has reduced the number of broadcast opportunities that Notre Dame can deliver to its broadcast partner. The night game enables Notre Dame to offer its broadcast partner two prime-time broadcasts (i.e., one home night game and the neutral site game).

Mr. Swarbrick noted the decision was made after lengthy discussion. An important on-site factor that influenced the decision was administrative confidence in the significant changes that have resulted from the work done by the Game Day Task Force. There has been a dramatic improvement in the public safety issues due to implementation of the Task Force's findings. Mr. Swarbrick believes that Notre Dame can successfully stage a night game and avoid some of the issues present when night games were last scheduled some eighteen years ago.

Prof. Fallon acknowledged the reasoning behind the decision but noted that members would have preferred to be notified before the decision was finalized. He spoke about the campus atmosphere during night games in the past, noting that it was "very, very unpleasant" to be on campus during the day of a night game. The primary cause of this was an extremely high level of drinking by fans. He asked about the measures to be taken to improve the atmosphere.

Mr. Swarbrick said the plan includes working closely with the students because they have a strong investment in ensuring a successful outcome for this first event. Meetings will be held with student leaders and a student game day group will be formed to help with planning the event. Additional security measures will be in place to respond to the possibility that guests might overindulge in alcohol, and the screening process to enter the stadium will be more rigorous than usual. The Department of Athletics will actively promote the message that cooperative behavior is required.

Prof. Power seconded Prof. Fallon's remarks. He noted that this event is an experiment and asked if there is intent to repeat it, should it be successful. He also noted the later kickoff times for home games in the 2011 season. He inquired about a follow-up report in Spring 2012 to the Board so that there can be an assessment of how these experimental changes worked. Mr. Swarbrick was agreeable to that plan. He noted that outside factors have made the start times less flexible than in the past. It is incumbent on Notre Dame to insure the success of this event because of the invaluable promotional opportunities sporting events offer for the University. He agreed that a review would be useful, and noted that some relevant data is already available.

Prof. Bellia thanked Mr. Swarbrick for his report.

5. Brian Kelly, Head Football Coach

Prof. Bellia welcomed Coach Kelly to the meeting, and invited him to share with members his observations on his first year as Notre Dame's head football coach.

Coach Kelly began with his perspective on recruiting student-athletes to Notre Dame. He noted that it is imperative to recruit a "highly motivated young man." Given the competitive environment in the classroom, the student-athlete at Notre Dame must be motivated and must recognize and prize the value of the Notre Dame degree. The successful recruit must "get" Notre Dame and must understand that when he steps on this campus, "he's shopping on a different aisle." Student-athletes will be most successful when they understand the Notre Dame community. He noted, for instance, that there is no apology for living in the dorms; if this option is undesirable, there are other programs to join.

Coach Kelly applauded the relationship that has been established between faculty and the football program. This effective communication about classroom expectations allows members of the Academic Services office to be proactive about tracking academic progress. He noted that this kind and quality of information is both unusual and very helpful. He hopes to maintain this beneficial transparency and expressed his thanks to faculty.

One area of academic concern for Coach Kelly is the situation concerning honor code violations. Kelly would like to receive information about student-athletes who have committed violations of the honor code in order to be able to offer the full range of support and education to these students. Not having access to all available information about academic performance inhibits the development of effective relationships with the athletes. Kelly's previous experiences have made him a hands-on coach; he considers his main function to be player development, that is, the development of young men into successful adults. It is this that justifies the many long hours and missed family time.

Members were invited to ask questions. Prof. Bellia offered the Board's support about coaches' access to honor code violation information. She said this is an ongoing discussion with the Provost's Office and the University Committee on the Academic Code of Honor. Prof. Tenbrunsel said that there is growing understanding of the unique situation for student-athletes on this issue. One concern is the question of parity. If coaches can have access to this information to provide a supportive function, then who might serve the same function for non-student-athletes? She noted that it should not be the responsibility of the head football coach to worry about the access to assistance of the rest of the student population. However, if agreement could be reached on this function, the obstacles to notification of coaches would not be insurmountable.

In reference to honor code violations, Ms. Conboy noted that players can voluntarily self-report violations to coaches. Coach Kelly said that while he feels confident that the athletes have no problem walking into his office to talk privately with him, in actual practice, no athletes have self-reported honor code violations, and it is likely that none would. Again, he stressed the importance for his ability to develop players successfully that he have access to this information.

Prof. Pierce asked about criteria used to select team captains. Coach Kelly apologized for an oversight on captaincy procedures. He assured members that the football program is now clearly informed on the appropriate procedures. He explained the system for captains used in the first year. Captains were appointed as "game day captains" and varied from game to game, based on leadership, preparation, attitude, etc. He used this system because the players were unfamiliar to him, and he wanted to push leaders out front as they emerged over the course of the season. Coach Kelly noted that a player chosen as a captain for the spring 2011 training season, Harrison Smith, represents the ideal that Kelly would like to promote to other players. He noted that the program will not honor the best player who is not the hardest worker, but it can honor the hardest working player who may not be the best player.

Prof. Botting expressed her admiration for an increased emphasis on service for the football program. She inquired about future emphases. Coach Kelly said that encouraging spiritual

development in the student-athletes can be challenging, even at an institution such as Notre Dame. The service component offers an opportunity to encourage participation that can lead to an increased spiritual awareness—volunteerism creates an other-awareness that is beneficial to these young men. Last summer, football players had an opportunity to take a Center for Social Concerns course with a morning classroom component and an afternoon community service focus. The summer 2011 course will be structured similarly and will focus on ethics.

Prof. Fallon noted the increasing test scores among the general student population and asked how student-athletes react to this development. Coach Kelly reported that for some student-athletes, acceptance at Notre Dame constitutes a "jump into the deep end." He stressed that there are several lifeguards. First, faculty members are supportive and willing to help motivated student-athletes. Second, the summer session permits student-athletes to spread their course work in an optimal way. Third, the Academic Services office—which is absolutely undermanned—is particularly supportive of student-athletes. He noted that the coaching staff is completely transparent with student-athletes when they come here; they must understand the competitive nature of the institution and the expectations for all students. The University provides a tremendous amount of support and expects a high level of responsiveness from the student-athletes.

Prof. Power shared his experience teaching in the CSC summer program. He complimented the student-athletes who were highly engaged in the classroom and service work. Turning to the question of academic success, Prof. Power noted that one difficulty is that afternoon practice times can interfere with a student's ability to have appropriate advising and consultation sessions with faculty and others. He asked Coach Kelly's advice. Coach Kelly noted that for spring 2011, practice times were shifted to the morning. Student-athletes meet with coaches at 7 a.m. and then practice from 8 to 10 a.m. The rest of the day is devoted to academics, which allows student-athletes to be focused. They do not meet again as a team until the 5 p.m. dinner. This is a beneficial schedule for the off-season and one that allows the student-athlete to take advantage of broader course offerings. It cannot be implemented in the fall semester, however. Kelly also said that student athletes are encouraged to work one-on-one with faculty when there are conflicts. It is his policy to stay out of these kinds of discussions; Adam Sargent, in Academic Services, assists student-athletes with these kinds of issues.

Prof. Kelley asked about disciplinary processes for various kinds of violations by student athletes. He noted that there is a perception that the University is less draconian in its disciplinary decisions than in the past. He also noted that Coach Kelly has publicly said that University discipline is separate from him, and that his discipline would be separate from that administered by the University. Prof. Kelley asked if Coach Kelly had discussed the parameters and expectations about discipline while participating in the job search. Coach Kelly said he had no discussions about Residence Life rules and made no negotiations concerning those rules. In fact, he was unaware of any particular features of Residence Life at Notre Dame. In terms of team discipline, Kelly stated that he does not have a "big book of do's and don'ts." Rather he promotes certain core principles. The distinct University process does not preclude him from being informed about behavior, meeting with violators, and making a decision as to response to violations. He noted, too, that serious disciplinary issues such as those addressed through the Residence Life process form a small part of the work he must do; a far greater amount of time is

devoted to personal discipline issues, such as timeliness, commitment to academics, etc. He believes that attention to these "minor" offenses makes "a big difference" in promoting appropriate behavior.

Coach Kelly thanked the Board for the opportunity to review his first year of coaching with members. Noting that recruiting is ongoing now, he observed that the coaching staff is fully aware of how fortunate a young man is who gets the opportunity to attend Notre Dame on an athletics scholarship. He mentioned that of the 25 players who verbally committed to the team in 2010, 19 did so in the presence of their mothers in his office. Kelly said every mother was happily tearful at the prospect of the wonderful opportunity that was being offered to her son. The mothers—and the athletes—are passionately aware that they are relinquishing their sons to a culture and an environment that they can trust.

Prof. Bellia thanked Coach Kelly for his time.

6. Don Bishop, Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Enrollment

Prof. Bellia welcomed Don Bishop to the meeting; Mr. Bishop has been invited to meet with the Board and discuss his vision and plan for undergraduate enrollment. Mr. Bishop began by noting that he was hired to a new position for the University, of associate vice president for undergraduate enrollment; the position is no longer "head of admissions." A broader set of functions will report to him, such as admissions, financial services, financial aid, and the summer programs. The most significant change concerns the addition of the financial aid component. While this change is new to Notre Dame, it is the modern approach to the enrollment environment.

Mr. Bishop noted that rising college costs have affected the enrollment landscape in a significant way. One change includes an increase in selectivity for universities. Another impact is in consumer behavior. Specifically, the university has tracked its lowest yield in the $200,000 bracket. Institutional response has taken the form of increased financial aid and merit scholarships, in an effort to attract this consumer group.

In this competitive environment, strategies need to be well coordinated, with one person to oversee strategic plans. Mr. Bishop defined his job as continuing to evaluate as well as ramp up recruitment with the dual goal of attracting the best students—who will become the best alumni to represent Notre Dame—while also becoming more competitive among peers in financial aid packages. In a nutshell, Mr. Bishop would like to "get more kids to put Notre Dame on their list."

Mr. Bishop gave an overview of some statistics for the class of 2015 applicant pool. The pool reflected an increase of 2000 applicants. The acceptances represented the most selective pool ever. 5300 applicants were in the top 1% ranking in the nation; half of these were accepted. The median student admitted had academic credentials that would qualify that student for national merit scholarship. The average SAT score was 1442. With 16,543 applicants, admissions is able to look at other attributes besides academics, so faculty-identified qualities such as motivation,

attitude, aptitude in academics, service work, and evidence of leadership were part of the selective process.

The 2015 class will be smaller than the 2014 class, at just under 2000 members (the class of 2014 had 2068 enrollees). Presently, the admissions office is meeting with accepted students as they pay site visits; applicants have until May 1 to accept their offers of admission.

Mr. Bishop introduced Bob Mundy, director of admissions, who works with his devoted and hardworking staff to read application files. The hard-to-determine cases are reviewed by Mr. Bishop. Mr. Mundy spoke about the admissions process. Mundy noted that the additional 2000 applicants provided an opportunity for increased substance in each of the categories that shape selection, that is, choosing 10 or 12 rather than 5 or 7 in a category. The staff agreed, in hindsight, that it was "more fun" to have more to choose from; the selections could be richer. He spoke about the hardworking staff, who are exclusively Notre Dame graduates. That a terrific advantage for Notre Dame, as staff members' passion for the University fuels their willingness to work tirelessly in the crunch period. Currently staff is occupied with meeting the prospective students as they arrive on campus for visits.

Mr. Mundy talked about the evaluation process for prospective scholarship student-athletes. It is typical that a staff member will review the basic credentials of a recruited student-athlete, having been notified of the prospective student-athlete by coaching staff in the summer before the senior year. This affords the opportunity to guide course selections in the senior year, to ensure the student-athlete meets the requirements for admission to Notre Dame. There is often an exchange of guidance between the coaching staff and the admissions office. Mundy noted that the relationship is very strong, and each office has great respect for the work being done by the other. This effective working relationship serves the students very well.

Mr. Mundy noted that a change is occurring in the recruiting timetable for student-athletes. Whereas in the past this review and consultation would occur after the junior year, when the student-athlete has amassed a three-year high school record, now only about half the cases proceed in this pattern. Student-athletes are being recruited during the junior year or even prior to the beginning of the junior year. This change introduces more risks for the University as well as for the student-athlete (Mr. Bishop noted that larger and competitive institutions have also begun to recruit younger and younger students based on academic records). This change began a number of years ago, in the Olympic sports and women's soccer specifically, as a response to market pressures. The risks lie in development both academically and athletically. All agree that early recruitment is not the preferred procedure, but admissions also recognizes that the market, driven in part by student-athlete pressure, has shifted to this approach.

Prof. Bellia asked about the impression that Notre Dame is becoming more selective about student-athlete admissions in the non-revenue sports. For example, one coach told her that a student-athlete accepted at Harvard and Duke was being asked by Notre Dame admissions to improve SAT scores by retaking the test. Mr. Bishop and Mr. Mundy questioned this scenario, noting that the student-athlete may have had interest but not actual offers of admission from the other schools. Mr. Mundy affirmed that the admissions office is highly cognizant of not putting the coaches at a disadvantage in the competitive recruiting environment.

Members discussed the competitive nature of recruiting and the need to balance academic requirements with athletic skills. Mr. Bishop said that given the shift to younger and younger recruiting, the admissions office needs to be constantly recalibrating and to work closely with coaches. If student-athletes will be recruited in the sophomore year, for instance, then a monitoring system needs to be in place to ensure checks later in the high school career. Although one could argue that an upside of this shift in recruiting is that problems that occur in the ninth grade can be addressed and corrected with a prescribed plan, there is a lot of risk involved in early recruiting.

Mr. Swarbrick emphasized the extraordinarily successful working relationship that exists between coaches and the admissions office. The admissions staff makes every effort to understand the specific needs and development systems of each sport, to understand why a given student-athlete would be an important recruit. Mr. Swarbrick noted two developing trends: 1. Earlier and earlier evaluation of student-athletes, and 2. Greater competition from institutions that ostensibly do not offer athletic scholarships but that are able to offer guaranteed aid through a cost-of-tuition program. Many of Notre Dame's sports, including men's sports, offer only partial scholarships, which puts the aid offered to student-athletes at Notre Dame lower than at these competing institutions. This is an issue that Notre Dame is facing in other areas besides athletics: how can Notre Dame be more competitive than peers such as Dartmouth or Brown, which are offering more financial benefits than Notre Dame?

Prof. Pierce asked what percent of male African American students are student-athletes. Mr. Bishop stated that 8% of enrolled student-athletes in all sports are African American, or [20% of all African American students and 30% of male African American students]. Prof. Pierce noted that the Board is concerned about the numbers as part of a recruiting issue. Student-athletes express concern about the social life at Notre Dame for this cohort. Mr. Bishop noted that there has been an 11% increase in African American acceptance this year. Because of federal code changes, hundreds of more students qualify as of mixed race; this will raise the statistics to perhaps as high as 18% of the student population. Mr. Bishop noted that the yield for African Americans is lower than most other categories. This may be due in part to the fewer number of Catholics among this population. In addition, in the competitive environment of college applications, African American students with strong academic records have superior college lists. He noted that his team will be addressing this topic in a Notre Dame report this spring, as part of a study on where we lose students and why. One response to this issue has been a recent increase in financial aid; the new Provost's Scholarship is one example.

Prof Bellia thanked Mr. Bishop and Mr. Mundy for appearing before the Board to share information about admissions and enrollment.

7. Kanaley Award Nominations

Prof. Bellia invited Prof. Kelley to report on Academic Integrity subcommittee's deliberations on the Kanaley Award. Prof. Kelley said there were twelve nominations to the committee. Prof. Kelley discussed the credentials of the candidates, the nature of the Academic Integrity subcommittee's discussion, and the subcommittee's recommendation. Members discussed the

trends in the number of awards over the last several years. In response to a question, Prof. Kelley said that the subcommittee had not considered making a single award, given historical practice. He noted that if the number of awards were to be decreased, he would recommend making an award to a female and a male athlete. He also noted that such a change would be a surprise to the teams and would require explanation and some advance notice. Ms. Conboy mentioned that in the past, when the award was given to a single athlete, the Athletics Department was "vastly smaller." Prof. Kelley noted that the nominations were notably fewer than the last several years. Coaches take this nomination quite seriously and are selective. It is clear that the level of nominee achievements is increasingly higher over the past decade.

After discussion of the nominees, the Board unanimously approved a motion to grant Kanaley Awards to the following student-athletes: Jeb Brovsky (men's soccer), Tyler Davis (men's tennis), Lauren Fowlkes (women's soccer), Cole Johnson (baseball), Erin Marrone (softball), and Christopher Stewart (football).

8. Proposed Amendments to Academic Articles, Article IV, section 3(k)

Prof. Bellia reviewed the ongoing discussion of the proposed changes to the Academic Articles concerning membership on University committees. The changes are being proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Council. Under current rules governing the FBA, a member can serve only two consecutive terms. Once a committee member has a break in service, however, he or she can return to the committee. The proposed changes would impose a five-year bar to service after two consecutive terms or after a single term if the member does not immediately return to the committee. Professor Bellia noted that she had circulated to the Board an analysis of the proposal and an alternative proposal. One seemingly unforeseen problem is that the change proposed by the Faculty Affairs committee would preclude members from moving among different types of seats (college, at-large, appointed) unless the vacancy arose immediately after the faculty member's current term expired. Professor Bellia's alternative proposal would account for these problems, as well as situations in which a past member might be asked to serve a "stub" term (e.g., when an elected or appointed member is on leave for a portion of a term). She noted, however, that she had received several comments to the effect that the status quo was the preferred position. Since the crowded nature of the agenda precluded a full discussion, Prof. Bellia asked members to send to her and Prof. Tenbrunsel any comments or suggestions they have on the various proposed changes. Prof. Tenbrunsel, who chairs the committee working on the proposed changes to the Academic Articles, noted that the committee is actively seeking feedback on all of the 15 proposed changes. Prof. Bellia noted that members should submit these comments soon, as the process is moving forward quickly, ahead of the final Academic Council meeting of the year in May.

9. Report on Status of Proposed Amendments to the Academic Code

Prof. Bellia reminded members that the Undergraduate Studies Committee of the Academic Council is presently considering proposed revisions to the Academic Code. The Board previously identified several proposed code changes that could affect student-athletes. Prof. Bellia briefly reviewed the status of provisions falling into two broad categories: degree completion and good standing requirements.

a. *Degree Completion*. The Board was successful in conveying that both the existing and proposed provisions concerning "forfeiture" of credits after an extended absence from campus will have a negative impact on student-athletes who leave campus early to pursue a professional athletics career. The current Academic Code provides that students who do not return to the University for five consecutive years will forfeit all of their credits. The Undergraduate Studies Committee's working draft would have provided that students forfeit credits after ten consecutive or non-consecutive semesters of non-attendance. The proposed change would have prevented students from returning to campus to "refresh" their credits. Instead of providing for automatic forfeiture of credits, the newest proposal would simply state that the applicability to the degree of previously earned credits is at the discretion of the student's dean. In addition, if degree requirements change during the time a student is away from the University, the student must meet the new requirements. The goal of the provision is to permit deans to handle returning students on a case-by-case basis.

In addition, current language requiring all students to spend their last year "in residence" has been modified to require that students spend their last semester in residence.

b. *Good standing*. Prof. Bellia discussed the status of several proposed changes to University "good standing" requirements. Those requirements, in addition to NCAA requirements, determine the eligibility of student-athletes to participate in intercollegiate athletics.

First, the Undergraduate Studies Committee had proposed increasing the threshold requirements for academic good standing for first-year students. These changes have been eliminated; the GPA requirements will remain what they have been.

A second proposal concerns how summer session performance would affect good standing. Under current rules, a student who is not in good standing after the spring semester can achieve good standing through a combination of spring and summer performance. A student who is in good standing after the spring semester, however, will not be placed on probation for poor combined spring/summer performance. The Undergraduate Studies Committee has proposed introducing probation for combined poor spring/summer performance. The Board expressed concern about this proposed change. The change could hinder student-athletes' progress toward their degrees, because in some cases student-athletes in good academic standing after the spring semester might be discouraged from taking summer courses if doing so could put their eligibility at risk. Students would no longer seek to take their most challenging courses in the summer. Prof. Bellia noted that this provision has not been finalized, and the Undergraduate Studies Committee meets one more time, which offers her an opportunity to express the Board's concerns and to present additional data from the office of Academic Services for Student-Athletes about the possible effects of this provision.

A third proposal relates to the circumstances under which a student who is not in good academic standing can be dismissed from the University. Under current rules, a spring semester probation followed by a fall semester probation are not treated as two "consecutive" semesters warranting dismissal, if the student returned to good standing after the spring semester probation by attending the summer session. The proposal would treat the spring/fall probation sequence as two

consecutive semesters of probation, warranting dismissal regardless of the student's summer performance between those two semesters.

A related issue concerns the timing of a dismissal for poor academic performance. The Academic Code currently does not establish an effective date for dismissal. The proposal would state that a dismissal is effective 14 days after grades are due. The proposal would also create a right of appeal, displacing the current system under which appeals are available in some colleges and not in others.

As time had expired, the meeting was adjourned.