

FACULTY BOARD ON ATHLETICS

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

Meeting of December 5, 2002

Members present: Prof. Fernand Dutile (chair); Prof. Matthew Barrett; Prof. Harvey Bender; Prof. William Berry; Ms. Emily Bienko; Prof. John Borkowski; Mr. Patrick Holmes; Prof. Stephen Fallon; Prof. Umesh Garg; (Rev.) Mark Poorman, C.S.C.; Prof. Katherine Spiess; Prof. John Weber; and Dr. Kevin White.

Guests present: Mr. William Scholl, associate athletics director; and Mr. Michael Karwoski, assistant athletics director for compliance.

Observers Present: Ms. Sandy Barbour and Mr. Bernard Muir (both of the Department of Athletics); and Ms. Mary Hendriksen (recorder).

1. Call to order and prayer: The chair called the meeting to order at 4:20 p.m. Father Poorman led the group in prayer.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting: Prof. Berry moved the approval of the minutes of the meeting of November 11, 2002. Prof. Weber seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Announcements: The chair announced that he had approved the team schedule for rowing (including a competition scheduled for the spring-semester study days, as had been specifically approved by the Board on October 14, 2002). The chair announced approval of a site change for softball: the doubleheader against Western Michigan has been moved from Notre Dame to Kalamazoo, Michigan. This change carries no class-miss implications.

The chair announced that he had approved the following team captains, all of whom met University criteria: Brandon Lunke (men's golf); and Kelly McCardell, Danielle Shearer and Elizabeth Knight (women's lacrosse).

The chair announced that Father Malloy had approved the drug-testing policy recommended to him by the Board at its previous meeting. Testing under the policy has already begun. Dr. Cullinan will report to the Board on this matter at its next meeting. The chair added for the record that, through an e-mail vote, the Board had elected Prof. Umesh Garg to represent it on the standing committee created by the new drug-testing policy.

In light of the Board's concern for the University's class-miss policy for student-athletes, the chair informed the group that on November 26, 2002, the Academic Council had rescinded its action of last spring changing all Monday-Wednesday course sequences to Wednesday-Friday ones. The rescission reportedly followed a "firestorm" of protest from faculty members. The issue has now been sent to a Council subcommittee.

4. Baseball Schedule: The chair brought to the Board his concern that over the last several years insufficient attention had been paid to the University guideline regarding scheduling of competition during the last week of class. That guideline provides: "Competition necessary due to conference schedules or NCAA championships is permitted. Limited non-conference competition is also permitted; every effort must be made, however, to play at home, and overnight travel is discouraged. Proposals for non-conference competition must be discussed, prior to scheduling, with the departmental administrator responsible for that sport." To be sure, the chair continued, the guideline is anything but clear. Does the "last week of class" include intervening week-ends? What is "limited" non-conference competition? If a team already has games scheduled during that week due to conference requirements, may it still avail itself of the "limited non-conference" clause? Does the provision for approval by the departmental administrator imply that the administrator, and not the Board, implements this provision? The 2002-03 baseball schedule provides an occasion to address the meaning of the University guideline. That schedule much resembles those of previous years, which called for four or five games during that last week, three of them being conference games played during the intervening week-end. The chair made clear that he did not wish to put this year's schedule at risk, but rather to address the matter for the benefit of future years. To do this, he invited the administrator for baseball, Mr. William Scholl, to speak to the Board.

Mr. Scholl reiterated that typically three games are played during the Saturday and Sunday of that last week of class. This coming spring, on Tuesday of that week, we will compete in a joint "fund-raiser" in Grand Rapids against the University of Michigan. Of course, the game provides us with competition against a quality opponent from a quality conference, thus helping us to secure NCAA post-season attention. Finding a mutually acceptable date for this game, however, proves very difficult. The team will leave Notre Dame at 4:30 p.m. on game day and return at midnight. Baseball head coach Paul Mainieri has always offered any players so minded to stay at home for that game; occasionally players take him up on the offer. Coach Mainieri and the team pay close attention to academics. The baseball team may well have no one on academic probation this year, and its team GPA has been in the 2.9 to 3.1 range. We could try to move the game, but that will be very difficult. The team has traveled to Grand Rapids for this game over many years, and the arrangement has worked well. Prof. Barrett: What is the justification for the game against the University of Oakland, also typically scheduled during the final week of class? Mr. Scholl: The baseball team must schedule 56 games in order to be competitive. At the end of the year, opportunities for competition become sparse. Also, these games keep our players in shape. We must remember that baseball reflects a philosophy of playing games *rather than* holding practice sessions. Prof. Barrett: Is it realistic to expect student-athletes to opt out of games? It happens, Mr. Scholl replied, though, given the competitiveness of our players, a student-athlete would probably have to be in pretty bad academic shape to do it. Prof. Barrett asked whether such scheduling decisions by the Board should be made on a team-by-team basis, as opposed to using

one rule for all sports. Prof. Bender stressed the importance of having rules in place while being sensitive to the idiosyncratic needs of various sports. Golf, for example, presents serious scheduling hurdles not faced by other sports. Our coaches are sensitive to the academic lives of their players, but they also need to be competitive. The chair asked whether in future years it would make sense to forgo scheduling the Oakland game, at least. Baseball's scheduling of several last-week games puts the Board in a bad position vis-a-vis other sports, most of which schedule none. Prof. Borkowski noted that the final-week Oakland game had been challenged within the Board before. Indeed, the chair observed, on at least one occasion—the 1995-96 academic year, a baseball game had been moved, at the request of the Board, outside the last week of class. How important is the Oakland game?, Prof. Barrett queried. We have to get in our full complement of games, Mr. Scholl stated; moreover, if at that point we have thirty-nine wins, the game carries the significant potential of getting us to what coaches might consider the magic of forty. This explains why we re-schedule rain-outs. We can try to move the game to another week, but for both teams other weeks are already pretty full. Prof. Borkowski: The optimal path in future years would be to move the Oakland game out of that period. Then, the Michigan game on Tuesday would be the last one until that week-end. Father Poorman, agreeing, pointed out that, in any event, a five-game schedule during that last week of class surely did not honor the principle underlying the guideline. At this point, Prof. Berry moved that the 2002-03 baseball schedule be approved. Father Poorman seconded that motion. Both that motion, and a related one calling for the moving or dropping of the “Wednesday game” traditionally played during the final week of class, passed unanimously.

5. Women's-lacrosse schedule: The women's-lacrosse team brought before the Board a schedule calling for an away game against Vanderbilt during the spring 2003 study days. University regulations allows only “limited non-conference” competition during study days. In support of the schedule, the administrator for women's lacrosse, Ms. Sandy Barbour, pointed to the uniqueness of women's lacrosse, which is essentially an Eastern sport. The team has a ten- or eleven-week period, including study days, in which to schedule just seventeen contests. With seven of these games taking place at home, traveling is dramatically limited. Indeed, until the scheduled game against Vanderbilt, the team plays only at home for the last three weeks of the season and misses no classes during that period. It is difficult to get a top-25 non-conference team to come to South Bend. Our relationship with Vanderbilt, a top-15 team, is very important. We beat Vanderbilt here last year, then moved on to the NCAA tournament. Over the six years of this program, the team GPA has been above 3.2; the current team's GPA stands at 3.17. The program has never had a player on academic probation. Father Poorman: Does approval of this study-day game set a pattern for future years? Probably so, responded Ms. Barbour; last year, she believes, the Notre Dame-Vanderbilt game here occurred during Vanderbilt's study days. The coaches keep trying to adjust the schedule, but that game may come before the Board again. Prof. Garg moved that the 2002-03 schedule for women's lacrosse be approved; Prof. Berry seconded. The Board approved the schedule unanimously.

6. Men's-golf schedule: There then came before the Board a request by the golf team for an additional class-miss day (Friday, April 25, the practice-round day for a week-end tournament at Michigan State University) during the spring 2003 semester. Mr. Mike Karwoski, newly appointed administrator for men's golf, reminded the Board of the difficulties the team faces in scheduling. This

very competitive team, in order to join the elite teams, must work its way into better tournaments. Alas, golf requires two days for a tournament, not counting the practice round needed because golf courses differ so much one from another. Moreover, golf teams play at most one match a year at home. Finally, golf courses increasingly limit university competition to week-days in order to keep week-ends open for more lucrative individual play. Prof. Barrett: Although the Big East tournament will be played here, can we add a home match that would preclude the need for a practice round? Head coach John Jasinski would like to add a home tournament, Mr. Karwoski responded; the problem lies in getting “quality” teams to come here. Most tournaments have already locked teams in; the higher your rank, the better your opponents. Dr. White added that our unpredictable weather, especially earlier in the semester, makes scheduling matches here difficult. Moreover, just now “high-end people” are discovering the quality of the Warren Golf Course. A tournament here obviously occasions the closing of the course and a significant loss of income. At the same time, we expect Coach Jasinski to take us to that elite level. Prof. Fallon pointed out that the logic of the proposal augurs still more class-miss days in future years. Except for Northwestern, universities with good golf programs seem to allow many more class-miss days than we do. Are we looking at a policy for golf dramatically different from that for our other sports? No, Dr. White replied; it is important for us to “stay the course” with regard to class misses for athletics scheduling. After all, some other sports could also justifiably press for broad-based waivers. What golf does need, though, is slight and occasional relief from our class-miss policy in light of the difficulties that scheduling in golf presents. Prof. Bender moved that the 2002-03 schedule for men’s golf be approved. Prof. Weber seconded the motion, which carried with one abstention (Father Poorman’s).

7. Bowl Prospects: At this point, as provided for by the *FBA Manual*, Dr. White briefed the Board on Notre Dame’s football bowl prospects. Should UCLA beat Washington State, we could be invited to the Orange Bowl. Still less likely, should both Miami and Georgia lose a game, we could get invited to the Sugar Bowl. Although theoretically our non-BCS Bowl prospects include both the Gator and the Cotton (under our oral agreement, Notre Dame could go to the Cotton Bowl one year in four), our likely bowl appearance will be in the Gator, against North Carolina State. We will probably know by next Saturday. The chair thanked Dr. White for this information.

8. Reports of subcommittee chairs: Prof. Berry reported that his subcommittee on communication had held separate breakfast meetings with academic advisors in deans’ offices and with those in departments, respectively. A variety of academic issues related to student-athletes came up for discussion. Many advisors in the departments were not aware of the “DARTing” priority provided for certain teams. They have asked to be informed of such developments. Prof. Berry stressed the importance of regular communication between the Board and academic advisors. Prof. Borkowski expressed his concern that priority registration could result in student-athletes constituting a third of the enrollment in certain small classes. Mr. Holmes responded that some administrators had already spoken of limiting the percentage of student-athletes in any one course; after registration, he plans to meet with some of these administrators to “tweak” the policy. Prof. Fallon suggested that the policy needed “tweaking” by the Board, as well. Father Poorman: This Board is advisory to Father Malloy alone; should not this policy have been promulgated by him, if by anyone? And, in any event, this policy should carry the authority of the Board; the policy has enormous impact on academic advisors. What is

the proper procedure here? The chair noted that the matter had not come before the Board, but had been resolved by the Office of the Provost. To be sure, Mr. Holmes, Father Poorman and the chair of the Board did attend a meeting held to discuss that priority, after which Mr. Holmes reported to the Board on the action taken by the Office of the Provost. But the matter did not come to the Board for its approval. To Prof. Barrett's observation that the policy finds its roots in the era of Coach Bob Davie, Mr. Holmes stated that football has had priority registration since the fall of 2000.

Prof. Bender, on behalf of the subcommittee on academic integrity, reported on the progress of plans for a conference entitled, "Religion, Ritual and Sport." He hopes that the Notre Dame Library, the Mendelson Center for Sport, Character and Culture, and the Department of Athletics might jointly produce the conference. The conference could be one installment of an annual "Joyce Conference."

Prof. Barrett, for the subcommittee on student welfare, reported that since the drug-testing policy has now been approved and put into action, the subcommittee will address whether any additional or different regulations might be needed to protect Orientation Weekend, an issue concerning which the Board has recently expressed concern. As part of this evaluation, the subcommittee will soon meet with Dr. Eileen Kolman, dean of the First Year of Studies.

9. Adjournment: The chair adjourned the meeting at 6:40 P.M.