

**Faculty Board on Athletics  
University of Notre Dame  
December 14, 2006  
Jordan Hall of Science, Room 325  
6:00 – 7:30 pm**

**Members:** Prof. Donald Pope-Davis (Chair); Prof. Patricia Bellia; Prof. Harvey Bender; Prof. Eileen Botting; Prof. Stephan Fallon; Mr. Patrick Holmes; Ms. Kathryn Lam (Student Rep.); Prof. Daniel Lapsley; Prof. Richard Pierce; (Rev.) Mark Poorman, C.S.C.; Dr. Frances Shavers; Prof. John Weber; and Dr. Kevin White.

Members absent: Prof. Francis Castellino, Prof. David Kirkner

**Board Liaisons:** Ms. Missy Conboy, Mr. Michael Karwoski, and Mr. Stan Wilcox of the Department of Athletics;

**Observers and Guests:** Mr. Philip Purcell, chair, Athletic Affairs Committee, Board of Trustees; Susan Holt, head coach, Women's Golf; Dave Schrage, head coach, Baseball; Ms. Nina Stephan, Director Rules Education, Athletic Compliance ; Ms. Mary Hendriksen; Ms. Kitty Cooney Hoye, recorder.

**1. Call to Order and prayer:** The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m. Prof. Steve Fallon offered the opening prayer.

**2. Minutes of previous meeting:** Prof. Pierce moved for approval of the minutes from the meeting of November 30, 2006. Fr. Poorman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**3. Introduction of coaches: Susan Holt (Women's Golf) and Dave Schrage (Baseball)**

Susan Holt, head coach, Women's Golf, was introduced to the board. Coach Holt came to Notre Dame from the University of South Florida (USF), where she served as head coach for 13 years. Prior to joining USF, Coach Holt spent four years as head coach at Purdue University (1990-1993). Holt directed the USF program to 16 team titles and 17 runner-up titles, including five of 10 Conference USA Championships. She has guided the team and/or individuals to 11 NCAA Regional appearances and two consecutive trips to the NCAA Championship Finals in 2001 and 2002.

Dr. White noted that in addition to her record on the course, Coach Holt's players have excelled in the classroom as well. Her players have been named to the National Golf Coaches Association All-Scholar Golf Team (18 times) and have earned the Conference USA Commissioners Academic Medal (18 times). The overall team grade point average over the past 12 years is 3.24.

Coach Holt explained that she was drawn to Notre Dame for several reasons. "I have a lot of respect for the Notre Dame tradition, both athletically and academically. I assure you that I will do my best to uphold that tradition." Coach Holt is already at work recruiting what Dr. White described as the "top recruiting class ever" at Notre Dame.

Dave Schrage, head coach, Baseball, was also introduced to the board. Coach Schrage has 19 years of experience as a head coach, including 16 seasons at the Division I level. Most recently, he served as head coach at the University of Evansville (2003-2006), where his 2006 squad won the Missouri Valley Conference title and a first-ever appearance in the NCAA regional tournament. Prior to joining the staff at Evansville, Coach Schrage spent three years at Northern Illinois (2000-2002) and nine years at Northern Iowa. Coach Schrage has been named Missouri Valley Conference coach of the year three times (1995, 1997, and 2006).

Prior to his formal remarks regarding baseball, Coach Schrage thanked the members of the Board, the Athletic Department, and the Notre Dame community for their continued support and prayers for his wife, Jody, who was diagnosed with liver cancer this fall. The outpouring of support from members of the Notre Dame community has been “humbling” said Coach Schrage.

Coach Schrage said he is looking forward to his first season at Notre Dame and described his goal for his players as follows: “I want them to have a positive experience in an academic framework and win a few games as well.” He sees his relationship with the FBA as one that includes a “healthy exchange of ideas” and said he looks forward to working with Board members in the future.

Coach Schrage went on to give a brief update on key NCAA changes that will go into effect in 2008—particularly the establishment of mandatory start and end dates for the season. He also described the unique circumstances surrounding a Notre Dame student-athlete and the Major League Baseball draft. Coach Schrage also said that he is committed to making sure his players are able to succeed both on and off the field. He has organized practices in a way that allows the players to “go and be students” and will ensure that there are plenty of opportunities to study on the road as well. Coach Schrage thanked Mr. Holmes and the staff of Academic Services for Student-Athletes for their work with student-athletes.

Dr. White concluded the coaches’ introduction to the Board by saying that he is extremely pleased with the recruiting efforts of both Coach Holt and Coach Schrage. “I would like to underscore that both of these coaches have been at Notre Dame only a short time, and both can be credited with having the best recruiting classes ever.”

### **3. Update on FBA member / team pairings**

Prof. Pope-Davis asked members to give a brief update on their liaison activities.

Prof. Fallon, assigned to both Fencing and Women’s Soccer, reported that he has attended some team practices and matches for the women’s soccer team. He has also met for lunch with each of the head coaches. Prof. Fallon described the relationship with his teams as “very positive” and added that the pairing initiative has given him a much better sense of the lives of Notre Dame’s student-athletes.

Prof. Botting reported on her activities as liaison to the Women’s Cross Country team. She noted that she had even joined the team for a practice run. She described the team members as being “well coached” and “incredibly happy, with a great spirit.” She added, however, that some team members expressed concern over “equal access” to specific athletic facilities and programs (e.g, sports medicine) between scholarship and non-scholarship student-athletes. Prof. Botting emphasized that the issue did not seem to be wide-spread but thought the issue was “worth noting” for the Board. Dr. White explained that all student-athletes, regardless of their scholarship status, are to be afforded equal access to Notre Dame programs and facilities. He asked that Prof. Botting provide him with additional information after the meeting.

Prof. Pierce, assigned to Women’s Rowing and Ice Hockey, reported that he has attended some hockey practices and games.

Prof. Bender, assigned to Softball and Men’s Basketball, said he would like to take credit for the early-season successes of the Men’s Basketball team but acknowledged that it likely had more to do with Coach Brey and his coaching staff. He will be meeting with the Softball coach in the near future.

Prof. Weber, who is assigned to Men’s Swimming and Women’s Golf, suggested that an informal gathering be planned next year to help facilitate a meeting between the FBA and coaches. Dr.

White thought it was an “excellent suggestion” and noted that there are several forums and venues already in place where coaches and Board members could meet informally.

The Chair asked that members continue to make contact with their respective teams. He will look for another update from members during the next semester.

#### **4. Discussion of NCAA legislative items**

Board members received a copy of the most recent NCAA legislative proposals, along with rationales, prior to tonight’s meeting. Mr. Karwoski and Ms. Stephan chose proposals with the most academic implications for presentation to the Board tonight. For each item, an advisory vote was taken. Along with advisory votes of other campus constituencies, that vote was considered when Notre Dame voted on legislative items for the January 2007 NCAA Division I meeting. As an institution, Notre Dame has one vote in the Big East conference, which, in turn, submits its vote (based on a majority of votes) to the NCAA Management Council.

The following proposals were discussed during the meeting. The text of each proposal is accompanied by the NCAA’s published “Intent” and “Rationale.”

##### **#2005-54 (p.1) Eligibility – Graduate Student or Post-Baccalaureate Participation – Transfer Eligibility.**

*(Intent) To permit a student-athlete who is enrolled in a specific graduate degree program of an institution other than the institution from which he or she previously received a baccalaureate degree to participate in intercollegiate athletics, regardless of any previous transfer.*

*(Rationale) This proposal would allow a student-athlete to enroll in a specific graduate degree program at an institution other than the one from which he or she earned a four-year degree and be immediately eligible for intercollegiate competition, provided the graduate student has remaining eligibility. A student-athlete who earned his or her undergraduate degree has achieved the primary goal of graduation and should be permitted to choose a graduate school that meets both his or her academic and athletic interests, regardless of previous transfer history.*

Mr. Karwoski said that he brought this proposal to the board’s attention because of past concerns regarding student-athletes enrolling in legitimate graduate programs. Last year, the department was opposed to the proposition, but Mr. Karwoski cited a recent MBA student as an example of how the new rule can work well for student-athletes. He pointed out that a concern for coaches is that it will allow the recruiting process to begin all over again. This proposal does *not* apply to football, hockey or basketball.

Some members questioned whether it was appropriate to override the proposal. Mr. Holmes asked: “Should we deny the student-athlete an opportunity to compete?” Stan Wilcox said: “We want to help student-athletes along to graduation. If he or she has already graduated, what reasons do we have to prevent the transfer, especially if we don’t offer a graduate program the student-athlete is interested in?”

Members were advised that if they were in favor of the proposal standing, they should vote “yes.”

##### **#2006-16 (p. 6) Institutional Control – Campus Athletics Boards.**

*(Intent) To require each institution to designate a campus athletics board responsible for advising or establishing athletics policies; further to specify that faculty and administrators who hold an academic appointment shall constitute at least a majority of the board and that the faculty athletics representative shall serve as a voting or nonvoting member.*

*(Rationale) Campus athletics boards play a key role in the integration of athletics into the university as a whole; thus, they should be required and not discretionary. The board-composition requirement ensures appropriate faculty involvement in the overall checks and*

*balances system designed to ensure academic integrity and athletics rule compliance. This concept was forwarded to the cabinet by the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA)*

There is no current requirement for this type of board, explained Mr. Karwoski. It is within a school's "institutional discretion" to create one. The Athletics Department supports this proposal.

Members discussed particular terminology ("academic administrator" vs. "campus administrator") as well as the advisory nature of the board.

Prof. Botting was concerned that the legislation would in some way compromise the Notre Dame's faculty board's history as both an advisory board and one that sets policy. Mr. Karwoski explained that the legislation is merely a benchmark or minimum. "We can always do more."

**# 2006-40 (p. 49) Recruiting – Recruiting Materials – Electronic Transmissions**

**(Intent)** *To specify that electronically transmitted correspondence that may be sent to a prospective student-athlete is limited to electronic mail and facsimiles.*

**(Rationale)** *The unlimited use of certain forms of electronic communication, such as instant and text messaging, to contact prospects has become problematic. Coaches feel compelled to contact prospects constantly; prospects are distracted at all hours of the day and night, and prospects and their parents are bearing significant costs involved with receiving text messages. In addition, instant and text messaging further removes the parents and high school coaches from the recruiting process.*

The coaches, explained Mr. Karwoski, are generally not in favor of this proposal. To eliminate instant and text messaging would be "unacceptable" to them. A discussion regarding the increase in this type of "instant" communication followed. Prof. Weber said he fears that failure to impose such limitations on communications with student-athletes will "open a Pandora's box" and allow coaches to barrage students with text messages. Prof. Fallon concurred, arguing that students will adjust to whatever limitations were imposed. "If they are all told to use e-mail, then that is what they will do."

Mr. Wilcox noted that he does not believe the proposal has enough support to pass.

**# 2006-41 (p. 51) Recruiting – Recruiting Materials – Computer Mediated Communication – Time Periods.**

**(Intent)** To define computer-mediated communication and specify time limitations on contacts made by institutions. An institution may not initiate computer-mediated communications with a prospective student-athlete prior to September 1 of the prospect's junior year of high school; that communication must be limited to the hours of 4 to 8 p.m. Monday through Friday and from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. Saturday and Sunday based on the time of the location where the prospect resides.

**(Rationale)** New developments in communication methods have had a significant impact on the recruiting process. Given the additional intrusion factor this technology adds to the lives of prospective students, appropriate limitations should be established in order to balance the intrusive nature of such communications with the value of computer-mediated communication in the recruiting process.

Ms. Stephan described this proposal as being a "logistical nightmare" and "too restrictive. The athletic department is opposed to it.

The following proposals were discussed only briefly:

**#2006-64 (p.92) Eligibility – Seasons of Competition – Hardship Waiver – Maximum Number of Contests or Dates of Competition. (Intent)** To increase the maximum number of contests or dates of competition in which a student-athlete may participate in a season and

remain eligible for a hardship waiver to *three* scheduled or completed contests or dates of competition or 30% of the institution's scheduled or completed contests or dates of competition. **(Rationale)** The current hardship-waiver legislation (two contests or 20% of schedule) overly penalizes a student-athlete who becomes injured or ill. If a student-athlete has competed in more than three contests, he or she has a much better opportunity to compete for a significant part of the season.

Ms. Stephan noted that the current "2 contests / 20% of schedule" rule is working well. Ms. Conboy expressed her concern, adding "Where do you draw the line?"

**# 2006-68 (p. 101) Eligibility – Four-Year College Transfers – One-Time Transfer Exception.**

**(Intent)** To specify that the one-time transfer exception shall apply only to a student who transfers to the certifying institution from an NCAA Division III institution.

**(Rationale)** The one-time transfer exception allows a dissatisfied student-athlete to transfer to another four-year institution and be immediately eligible for competition; oftentimes to the detriment of an entire intercollegiate team. A residency requirement should discourage transfers and increase the likelihood of academic success for transfer students.

This legislation does not apply to football, hockey or basketball, explained Ms. Stephan. The current policy is working well and the Athletic Department opposes this legislation.

Members disagreed with the position of the Athletic Department.

Although time limitations did not allow for discussion of any other proposals, both Mr. Karwoski and Ms. Stephan encouraged members to review the proposals and bring any questions or concerns to their attention as soon as possible. Mr. Karwoski will report back to the Board on the outcome of the NCAA legislative items at the next meeting.

**5. Discussion with Mr. Philip Purcell, chair, Athletic Affairs Committee, Board of Trustees**

The Chair introduced Notre Dame Trustee Mr. Philip Purcell. Mr. Purcell serves as chair of the Athletic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Purcell expressed his gratitude to Prof. Pope-Davis and the Board for the invitation to attend today's meeting. Noting that there are many similarities between the faculty board and the Athletic Affairs Committee, Mr. Purcell gave a brief overview of the role of his committee. He explained that there are four key areas the committee considers when evaluating the Athletics Department: compliance, academic performance, on-field performance, and financial /economic support. The committee meets three times a year and routinely hears reports from the coaches and administrative staff. He described the committee as the "eyes and ears of the Board of Trustees" and reiterated how pleased he is to see a closer working relationship with the FBA.

In response to a question from Prof. Fallon on how "on-field performance" is evaluated, Mr. Purcell explained that the process is different for each sport. The "key" is in identifying not only "What is being done?" but also "What should we aspire to be?"

Prof. Pierce asked Mr. Purcell to comment on the state of the athletic facilities, in particular the hockey arena. Mr. Purcell reiterated that his is an "advisory" committee and any plans to build new facilities or to renovate existing facilities are part of a larger facilities plan that must be approved by the Board of Trustees. Other committees, such as the Capital Planning Committee and the Finance Committee, must also approve any facilities plans. Associate Athletic Director Missy Conboy is currently working on a 10-year facilities plan for the Athletic Department. Prof. Pope-Davis suggested that Ms. Conboy report on the current athletic facilities plan at a future FBA meeting.

## **7. Subcommittee Reports**

Because of time constraints, the subcommittee chairs agreed to provide reports at the next meeting.

## **8. *Ex officio* and Liaison reports**

None

## **9-10. New / Old Business**

Dr. Shavers gave a brief update on the status of a statement from the Association of Governing Boards regarding board of trustee involvement with intercollegiate athletics. She explained that a thorough evaluation of the issue with faculty members as well as athletic department staff and other members of the University community has already taken place. The statement is now in the hands of the President's Office. Dr. Shavers noted that Notre Dame is "doing better than most" institutions. She will provide the board with a final report as soon as it is available next semester.

The chair thanked to Prof. Tricia Bellia for her service to the board. Prof. Bellia will be a visiting professor at the University of Virginia next semester. Prof. Vincent Rougeau, Law School, will serve the FBA in her place. Although Prof. Power was not able to attend the meeting tonight, he will be in London next term. His replacement is Prof. Dan Lapsley, Psychology.

Prof. Bender extended a "special thanks" to Mr. Purcell for attending today's meeting.

There being no further business, Prof. Pope-Davis adjourned the meeting at 7:35 p.m.