



## FACULTY BOARD ON ATHLETICS UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

---

Meeting of September 7, 2005

Room 331 of the Coleman-Morse Centers

**Members Present:** Prof. Fernand Dutile (Chair); Prof. Patricia Bellia; Prof. Harvey Bender; Prof. Eileen Botting; Mr. Bobby Brown; Prof. Francis Castellino; Prof. Stephen Fallon; Mr. Patrick Holmes; Prof. David Kirkner; (Rev.) Mark Poorman, C.S.C.; Prof. Donald Pope-Davis; Prof. F. Clark Power; Prof. John Weber; and Dr. Kevin White.

**Member Absent:** Dr. Frances Shavers.

**Observers Present:** Ms. Missy Conboy, Mr. Mike Karwoski and Mr. Stan Wilcox of the Department of Athletics; Ms. Kitty Hoye, recorder.

**Guests:** Mr. Jeff Jackson, head coach, hockey; Ms. Carrie Nixon, head coach, women's swimming.

**1. Call to Order and Prayer:** The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.; Father Poorman led the group in prayer.

**2. Introductions:** Since this was the first Board meeting of the year, the Chair invited those present to introduce themselves. [The 2005-06 edition of the Faculty Board on Athletics includes two new members: Dr. Frances Shavers, Executive Assistant to the President of the University; and Prof. Frank Castellino, elected to the Board by the College of Science].

**3. Announcements:** The Chair announced that he had approved the fall 2005 schedule for men's and women's cross-country. (Although that schedule calls for six missed-class days in the Monday-Wednesday-Friday sequence, no individual student-athlete will miss more than three.) The Chair also approved schedules for men's and women's indoor track and field; volleyball; hockey; women's tennis; men's tennis; women's swimming; men's swimming; football; softball; rowing (fall 2005 only); men's lacrosse; and cheerleading (Gold Unit—fall 2005 only). The Chair also noted for the record that the Board had approved through listserv votes the schedules for women's golf; men's golf; and outdoor track and field.

The Chair announced his approval, on the Board's behalf, of amendments to the schedule for women's soccer (adding Thursday, August 25, 2005, as a missed-class day); and men's soccer (adding Thursday, September 15, 2005, as a missed-class day). Even after these amendments, both schedules remain within University guidelines.

The Chair announced that he had approved, on the Board's behalf, the following captaincies for the 2005-06 academic year: Meg Henican and Lauren Brewster (volleyball); Megan Duffy and Courtney LaVere (women's basketball); Tim Moore, Sean O'Donnell and Kurt Benninger (men's cross-country); Lauren Connelly (women's tennis); Heidi Schindler and Steve Rzepka (cheerleading–Gold Unit); Katy Marvin and Gabriella Obregon (cheerleading–Blue Unit); Mark Baldwin, Scott Gustafson and Cole Isban (men's golf); and Katie Brophy and Suzie Hayes (women's golf).

The Chair informed the Board that Patrick Buchanan has been named captain for men's tennis. (The two names listed in the Board's minutes for an earlier meeting actually comprised a slate from which selection of the actual captain took place.)

At this point, the Board ratified these decisions of its Chair.

The Chair informed the Board that on June 17 the faculty athletics representatives of the Big East Conference voted unanimously to seek a rescission of the conference's decision to include Friday games in typical weekend scheduling for baseball. Under the new arrangement, teams would play single games on Friday, Saturday and Sunday, rather than a "doubleheader" on Saturday and a single game on Sunday. The change carries serious, negative implications for class attendance. Maintaining Notre Dame's current class-miss policy for baseball, and ultimately and inevitably for other sports as well, would likely become impossible.

The Chair noted for the record that, through an e-mail vote, the Board had elected Prof. Castellino as its delegate to the University Committee on the Drug Testing of Student-Athletes.

The Chair noted that he had sent copies of the 2005-06 edition of the *FBA Manual* to all members of the Board and to all head coaches.

Finally, the Chair announced that University president Father John Jenkins, C.S.C., would speak to the Board at its next meeting (October 5, 2005).

**4. Introduction of New Hockey Coach:** The Faculty Board on Athletics has traditionally met with all newly appointed head coaches. In keeping with that tradition, the Chair introduced Mr. Jeff Jackson, new head coach for hockey. In introducing him, the Chair pointed out that Coach Jackson had won two national championships while at Lake Superior State and, in the year between these two, competed in the national-championship game. In 2003, the magazine *Inside College Hockey* listed Coach Jackson as number twelve on the list of the greatest college hockey coaches ever. Coach Jackson came to Notre Dame after two years as an assistant coach for the New York Islanders. Coach Jackson expressed his appreciation to the Board not only for the opportunity to meet with it today, but also for the "important work" done by the Board. Academics, he stressed, remain of prime importance to him as a head coach. As a matter of fact,

the only dismissal he experienced as a coach stemmed from the commitment to academic standards reflected in his having suspended twelve players. He takes pride in the academic accomplishments of his student-athletes. In addition, during his brief tenure as a director of athletics, he actually created a board similar to the Faculty Board on Athletics. He remains proud of that achievement. Currently he spends most of his time at Notre Dame getting to know the players. He does find their character impressive and, on average, their academic achievement sound, indeed; currently, the team boasts a 3.4 grade-point average. The Chair: How has your transition from Long Island to South Bend worked out? Coach Jackson: I certainly do not miss the commute I had in my former situation. I really think I am more inclined to be a “Midwesterner” in many ways. The Chair: What are your thoughts on the Central Collegiate Hockey Association (CCHA) as presently constituted? Coach Jackson: Even during my professional career, I have maintained fairly close contact with the CCHA. There does exist a pretty real divide between some schools; some, in fact, want to separate from the CCHA. I am concerned that smaller schools will no longer be able to go to the “big dance” as often, if ever. These smaller schools do not have the resources to sustain themselves at the elite level for any number of years. Prof. Castellino asked Coach Jackson for his thoughts on access and recruiting at the high-school level, including in premier hockey areas like Minnesota and New England. Coach Jackson replied that not all the traditional hockey locations even have high-school teams. Many hockey players progress through travel leagues and AAU competition. To a question put by Prof. Weber concerning the coach’s aspirations for the program, the coach responded that his short-term goal is “to out-work and out-discipline our opponents. I’ve got to reserve judgment on the quality of our players until we have a chance to get out on the ice. But coaches don’t decide where to coach without a reason; they want to win. Notre Dame has a lot to offer. I thus see this as an opportunity to build something big and then to sustain it.” The Chair thanked Coach Jackson for meeting with the Board and wished him good luck and much success.

**5. Report on the Honor Code:** Mr. Holmes reported that Prof. Dennis Jacobs, vice president and associate provost, had formed a committee to address issues concerning the new University Honor Code as it relates to student-athletes. That committee includes three members of the Faculty Board on Athletics: Mr. Holmes, Prof. Bender and Prof. Dutile. The committee seeks to deploy a proactive program in communicating to our student-athletes and other people associated with athletics the changes in the Honor Code and the importance of adhering to it. The issue of honor, said Mr. Holmes, presents a number of considerations and implications. For example, the Office of Academic Services for Student-Athletes employs over a hundred tutors. If even one of those becomes involved in an Honor Code violation, the University faces an issue of academic integrity and a possible NCAA violation.

This summer, Mr. Holmes continued, twenty-four student-athletes took part in the Bridge Program. Under that program, student-athletes who show the greatest likelihood of profiting from an early introduction to Notre Dame come to the University during the summer preceding their first academic year. Prof. Jacobs met with these new students, as well as with their coaches, to explain the Honor Code. It is obviously crucial that coaches be “on board” and understand the seriousness of Honor Code requirements. These coaches constitute an important link for communicating with student-athletes. We have always talked about the Honor Code during orientation, but coaches are critical if students are going to “get it.” Prof. Castellino noted the importance of the coach as role model; if the student-athlete has not been recruited

ethically, that student-athlete may not trust the coach. Mr. Holmes stated that the education of student-athletes concerning such issues will continue through meetings of groups of about twenty-five student-athletes in a workshop-seminar format. Mr. Holmes informed the Board that from September 9 through September 20 discussions with all of the coaches will take place to impress upon them the significance of their involvement in the process. Once those meetings have occurred, the twenty-five-person groups of student-athletes will be set up. The Chair noted that honesty has become a huge issue across the country. The matter seems cultural to the extent that much of what would have been considered “wrong” years ago is now often considered an “entitlement” of sorts. We need to change attitudes, but how best to do that? Prof. Castellino expressed his view that honor codes rely on students “turning in” other students; the reality, he added, is that students will rarely do that. In response to Father Poorman’s question concerning the substance of the workshops, Mr. Holmes responded that a large number of hypothetical situations are used in order to make correlations among behaviors. For example, a scenario in the non-academic context will be compared with a parallel scenario in the academic context. Father Poorman found this approach very encouraging. In the past, he noted, discussion has revolved around the policy and the rules within the Honor Code. The current approach is more concrete and therefore much better. Prof. Fallon thought it important to look at the general culture. What do peers think about cheating? Only the ten percent to fifteen percent who work hard really care. The rest do not. Prof. Fallon observed that Notre Dame faces twice the problem presented at schools under whose honor code students do in fact regulate each other. The Chair: But honor codes have run into problems even at military schools; the problem is very complicated. Prof. Weber stressed the importance of providing multiple exposures to the Honor Code. Students at all levels of education, as well as teachers and student-athletes, should get a variety of presentations. Prof. Weber alluded to one situation in which fifty-nine percent of the students witnessed a wrong, but only three percent were willing to turn the wrongdoer in. Prof. Castellino stated that the situation at Notre Dame is extremely complex. We preach “family” and “brotherhood.” This creates bonds among students that are very hard to break. Some students would never turn their “brother” in for anything. That same strong bond also makes others more forgiving. For student-athletes, these bonds may be even stronger. Alas, thus is our strength also our weakness. Professor Fallon felt that the success of an honor code depended on the extent to which an institution embraces the entire concept of honor. At Princeton, for example, not much cheating occurs, his experience tells him. It is a different place. The people feel bound by honor and consider it honorable to turn in someone who cheats. For Notre Dame to get serious about the Honor Code, it must embrace the concept fully, that is, exams must not be proctored and the system must be student-run. Prof. Weber stated that at least one dimension has in fact improved under the new Honor Code. In the past, a faculty member pursuing observed misbehavior faced a very time-consuming process. Now the faculty member and the student involved can agree between themselves to deal with the matter in a particular way. The Chair added that a student’s involvement will now be centrally recorded so that repeated violations can be detected; that too is a positive change. Prof. Bender stressed how serious and committed to the Honor Code the Office of the Provost is. Nonetheless, he wondered whether an honor code works really well at any institution. If any university can make an honor code work, he added, Notre Dame should be the one. Whether the new Honor Code at Notre Dame will work better overall remains to be seen, but justice will likely be quicker. We will perhaps see more student-faculty agreements. Prof. Power expressed his concern that allegedly eighty percent to ninety percent of high-school students report having engaged in or witnessed some

form of cheating. He agreed that students need to be educated, but also that we need to develop ways of coping. We must build a culture that recognizes the needs of the community. Students must know that, through cheating, they let down the community because the community cares. We must discuss this aspect of the issue. Prof. Power observed that a number of military schools have spent a lot of time on the issue. In those institutions, the community is disappointed with the student who cheats. These schools have had success in building this type of culture. Mr. Brown, conceding the validity of much of the discussion, strongly suggested that the Board look further into the unique relationship between the student-athlete and the professor. Further investigation might provide a tip-off to other things. The discussion ended at this point.

**6. Introduction of New Head Coach for Women's Swimming:** The Chair introduced Ms. Carrie Nixon, the new head coach for women's swimming. The Chair pointed out that this 2002 Notre Dame alumna boasted eighteen Big East Titles. A twelve-time All-American, she formerly held the NCAA 50-meter freestyle record. While at Notre Dame, she won the Francis Patrick O'Connor Award, given annually to one female and one male student-athlete who best exemplify the spirit and leadership prized at Notre Dame. Ms. Nixon is the first female student-athlete at Notre Dame to become head coach at her alma mater. Ms. Nixon expressed her great excitement at being head coach at Notre Dame. She views her appointment as an opportunity to build from the inside out. Her philosophy, she stressed, is simple. First and foremost, Notre Dame is a special place and, therefore, we must recruit special people, people who have a commitment to both academics and athletics. The two must go hand in hand. Such special students will be committed to excellence both in the classroom and in the pool. She plans as head coach to emphasize the message that was stressed when she was a student-athlete: Maintain the excitement of being at Notre Dame and enjoy, physically, mentally and spiritually, the experience that is Notre Dame and that encompasses the classroom, dorm life and team life. Ms. Nixon pointed out that she began her education here in pre-med and science, but decided to branch out. This opportunity to wade into other disciplines constitutes part of the real beauty of Notre Dame. As it turned out, she added, she did a double major "of sorts" in anthropology. She alluded to the ability of professors here to make "all the difference in the world." She finished by thanking the members of the Board for the opportunity to speak before them and, as well, for their service on the Board. The Board, she felt, could be a great recruiting tool for the special kind of student we look for.

**7. Reports of Subcommittee Chairs:** Prof. Botting, Chair of the Subcommittee on Student Welfare, told the Board that the subcommittee this academic year would focus on learning more about student-athletes' perceptions of their opportunities for religious worship, both during team travel and on campus. The subcommittee is particularly interested in the extent to which non-Catholic student-athletes experience adequate opportunities for religious worship and expression. As outlined by the subcommittee last spring, it plans to work with the Department of Athletics to study existing survey data on this issue and discuss whether other means (such as focus groups or supplementary questions for existing surveys) might appropriately reveal more about the issue. After acquiring more data, the subcommittee will report back to the Board for suggestions on proceeding further.

Members of the subcommittee will attend meetings of the Student Athlete Advisory Council (SAAC) to learn the current concerns of student-athletes. At these meetings the subcommittee

will raise questions on issues that have long concerned student-athletes and the Faculty Board, including access of student-athletes to quality sports medicine and training-room facilities on campus. The subcommittee remains anxious to see the extent to which the Guglielmino Athletics Complex contributes to improvement of student-athletes' views on such issues.

This subcommittee, Prof. Botting continued, shares with the Subcommittee on Academic Integrity an enduring concern with the current class-absence policy for student-athletes and its implementation across the various teams. Certainly, the protection of student-athletes from the diminution of their educations in order to be part of a "winning" athletics team presents a serious student-welfare issue.

Finally, the subcommittee plans to work with the Department of Athletics to assess and revise the current hearing procedures for the denial of the one-time-transfer exception. Although those procedures technically constitute a policy of the Department of Athletics, members of the Faculty Board on Athletics serve as the hearing panel and the provisions appear in the *FBA Manual*. Written before the spring 2000 change in the structure of athletics oversight at Notre Dame, the policy needs rewriting concerning those implementing the policy, a streamlining of the procedure for requesting a hearing, and perhaps clearer and more precise criteria for the ultimate decision.

Prof. Power, Chair of the Subcommittee on Communication, informed the Board of that group's plans for this academic year. The subcommittee will review the provision (Article IV, section 3(k) of the *Academic Articles*) setting out the composition, jurisdiction and duties of the Faculty Board on Athletics in order to ascertain whether to pursue changes, including perhaps the term limits currently specified for the Board's Chair. (The Chair made clear at this point that any such change would apply prospectively only and not, therefore, to him). Prof. Power noted that the subcommittee would also consider proposing changes in the University's *Statement of Principles for Intercollegiate Athletics*. Such proposals might include clarification of the roles of the University Board of Trustees and of the Faculty Board on Athletics with regard to University personnel decisions dealing with athletics. Finally, the subcommittee will organize a meeting with various academic advisors on campus to discuss issues of common concern with regard to student-athletes.

Prof. Bender, Chair of the Subcommittee on Academic Integrity, outlined the plans of that group for the current academic year. The subcommittee will consider whether to allow student-athletes in their ninth semester the flexibility to take only the number of credits required to complete their undergraduate degree (as they may now do in their eighth semester). The subcommittee will consider whether the criteria for off-campus residence applied to grant-in-aid student-athletes should be changed. The subcommittee plans to re-visit the class-miss policy for student-athletes, with a focus on teams whose sport—for example golf—makes scheduling within current guidelines difficult. The group will pursue the presentation, hopefully in the fall of 2006, of a conference on "Sport and Religion."

**8. Adjournment:** The Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

\*\*\*