Preparing for NCAA Partial Deregulation of Intercollegiate Athletics
Ensuring a Faculty Role in a New Regulatory Structure

COIA National Meeting, February 1-3
Overview of Plenary and Break-Out Group Sessions

Basic Agenda

The NCAA has begun a two-year process of redesigning the way it regulates college sports. It is moving away from devising an ever more elaborate code of uniform rules, an approach that has not proved successful. The new approach will shift towards a uniform set of governing principles, which campuses are charged to realize through local rules and self-regulation. This shift entails abandoning the standard of “competitive equity,” or a strictly level playing field, as a measure of regulatory success. Differences in campus cultures and resources will have greater impact on the conduct of athletics within Divisions. The new goal is “fairness of competition,” which would be reflected by a uniform commitment to abide by the defining principles of the “Collegiate Model” of athletics. An overview statement from the NCAA is included as Document 1.

The governing principles of this Collegiate Model are described in a revision of Bylaw 20.9.1, a 1000-word description of the terms of Division I membership [included as Document 2]. A key theme is that within this model, “athletics competition is an integral part of a student-athlete’s effort to acquire a degree in higher education.”

The initiative to shift much of athletics regulation from the national to more local levels reflects an assessment that the current regulatory structure has not been successful in many of its aims, has entailed great overhead cost, and has generated inevitable tension between the detail of its uniform requirements and the diversity of campus cultures in Division I. The shift of many regulatory functions to the local level provides an opportunity to address the problems of athletics regulation from a different direction. However, it can only succeed to the degree that local actors are, in fact, committed to the principles of the Collegiate Model and devise and maintain regulatory regimes that reflect that commitment.

Given the intense pressures on college sports to grow in the direction of professional/Olympic models, a major challenge of the new regulatory initiative will be to build capacity on campuses, in conferences, and among national collegiate groups (e.g., the DIA FARs, the N4A, the DIA Athletics Directors Association, etc.) to carry out the tasks of creating effective structures to support the Collegiate Model through local regulation.

The 2013 COIA meeting is a response to the NCAA’s request that COIA assist in devising a framework that will build faculty capacity to participate in and support the new regulatory regime. This will entail identifying, for example:

1) the types of roles campus faculty can and should play;
2) the tools campus faculty need in order to play these roles effectively;
3) potential resistance to full faculty participation that must be addressed;
4) requirements needed to empower and motivate faculty to participate effectively; 
5) structures to link participating campus faculties on conference and national levels.

Break-Out Discussions

NCAA Vice-President Kevin Lennon will begin our consideration of the NCAA deregulation initiative in the Saturday plenary session, scheduled for 10:00-11:00. Following this, participants will move to smaller break-out groups to begin discussion. The first break-out session (11:00-12:00) will focus on local impacts of changes in regulatory structure and appropriate ways for faculty to respond. NCAA representatives will join the break-out groups.

Session 1:
The impact of deregulation on campuses and the campus faculty response

The NCAA initiative towards partial deregulation will affect many areas of athletics, and faculty concern is likely to extend to all or most of them. For policy areas that do not have close connection to athletics, there are likely to be local debates over the appropriateness of faculty involvement. COIA has traditionally viewed virtually all areas of intercollegiate athletics policy to be legitimate areas of faculty concern. However, for the purposes of the task at hand, the COIA Steering Committee proposes that participants focus discussion on policy matters that have a direct impact on academics, since the appropriate involvement of faculty in those areas should represent initial common ground among all parties, which can best permit discussion to focus on the specific agenda of this meeting.

What will deregulation mean concretely on individual campuses?

The NCAA is proposing to eliminate many prescriptive rules that directly or indirectly relate to academic issues, such as limits on budgetary commitments to athletes’ academic success and the types of support that may be offered, limits on non-competition travel time intended to minimized classes missed, limits on team activities to exclude recreation without academic purpose, and so forth. As directive rules of this sort are eliminated, it will be up to campuses to decide whether and how to replace them with local policies.

An example to illustrate the changes underway is the proposed change to NCAA Bylaw 16.3.1.1, which is provided on a separate sheet [Document 3]. (The NCAA has provided information on many proposed changes, and additional examples are included in the general information packets. However, to avoid redirecting discussion to specific proposals, we cite only one example to clarify the overall nature of the types of tasks that deregulation will shift to campuses.)
1. How should faculty involvement be structured?

Assuming that there is agreement that faculty should be involved in the development and maintenance of local policies to replace abrogated NCAA policies relevant to academics:

- What should be the extent and form of that involvement (from minimal forms such as receiving notice of policy, to consultative or determinative roles)?
- What types of campus governance structures would be minimally required, and how can their satisfactory function be assured?
- What aspects of such governance structures (in form, function, or performance) should be universally mandated through minimal-standards legislation binding on all NCAA FBS members?

What would an optimal/acceptable solution entail?

What elements already exist?
What new structures are needed?

Background. In its previous work on campus athletics governance, COIA has focused on the issues binding rules and best practices for three governance components:

- The Faculty Governance Body (FGB – comparable to a faculty senate)
- The NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR)
- The Campus Athletics Board (CAB – named variously on campuses)

A selection of previous COIA positions concerning these components and governance issues appears on a separate sheet [Document 4].

Additional campus personnel relevant to these issues may be important to consider: e.g., athletics directors, compliance officers, offices of academic advising for athletes, etc.

2. What obstacles must be overcome to reach an optimal or acceptable outcome?

Aspects to consider here might include two broad areas:

a) Obstacles external to the faculty
   These might include: highly mobilized state/community/campus cultures unsupportive of meaningful regulation; unfavorable administration or governing board relations with faculty or habits of operation; problematic patterns of athletics department operation or governance; lack of transparency or unwillingness to share information necessary for current or expanded faculty participation, etc.

b) Obstacles internal to the faculty
   These might include: lack of adequate faculty governance structures; low faculty interest in or knowledge about campus and/or athletics governance; poor functionality in faculty committee/senate performance, etc.
3. What are the priority issues in building capacity so that faculties, administrations, and campuses are prepared to perform new regulatory functions effectively?

Following the initial working sessions and a break for lunch, we will reconvene in plenary session to share ideas from the break-out sessions and develop an initial list of priority issues related to local athletics governance under the new regulatory regime. Participants will then move to a second round of break-out sessions (3:00-4:00) to address the implications on conference and national levels.

Session 2: Building structures for faculty athletics governance beyond the campus

Campus faculties and their senates have few or no inter-campus avenues of communication. In a deregulated environment, where presidents, ADs, FARs, and groups such as compliance offices and academic advisors for athletes all have venues within and outside the NCAA to share information and participate in national-level planning, the lack of inter-school representative faculty contact will have the consequence of isolating senates in terms of both information and action. Campus athletics policies will always be under pressures created by the competitive conference and national environments, and with the NCAA eliminating the “level playing field” objective in favor of “fairness of competition,” schools and faculties will need to understand how other schools are interpreting “fairness” in concrete policies and implementation. This work session is devoted to issues concerning forums for information sharing and articulating the faculty voice on conference and national levels, so that campus faculties are not rendered irrelevant by isolation.

What models of inter-campus and inter-senate communication exist?

Several existing models of inter-campus governance may help provide a starting point to the discussion.

1. Existing conference-level structures

Despite the fact that the instability of conferences has been amply illustrated in recent years, conferences have created or maintained inter-campus faculty structures. Many or all conferences provide venues for their FARs to meet at intervals. Since conferences are already a source of athletics regulation beyond the NCAA, these contacts can provide the FARs a very meaningful role in shaping policies and procedures informed by a faculty perspective. In addition, in at least two conferences, member schools sponsor annual meetings of conference senate leaders to discuss a self-determined agenda of issues of concern to faculty, including athletics. (COIA is, in fact, a product of such meetings.)
2. Existing national-level structures

As noted above, many individuals with appointed functional roles in campus athletics governance belong to national associations of their peers. In the case of faculty, FARs in the FBS are members of two national groups: FARA and the D1A FAR Association. These associations share information through websites, newsletters, and national meetings. Funding is provided through the NCAA as part of general association governance support.

3. Existing structures within the NCAA

Despite its initiative towards relative deregulation, the NCAA will continue to be a dominant force in regulating athletics, continuing its roles in oversight, enforcement, and many aspects of principle and policy design. Currently, faculty are represented in the NCAA structure through FARs, who participate in meetings and who are among the many groups represented in the NCAA committee and legislative structures. This level of national FAR participation ensures that knowledge and values shared at the conference and national levels can be informed by and conveyed within the decision making processes of national athletics regulation.

1. What types of conference-level structures should be created for representative faculty voices?

The new regulatory environment within conferences will provide much greater leeway for variance among conference schools. In some cases, this may reflect (as the NCAA already envisions) different levels of resources among schools, but it may also reflect different interpretations of the Collegiate Model and “fairness of competition.” Do conference senates need, in order to fulfill their campus roles, a formal mechanism to participate in information sharing, policy creation, and oversight of competitive fairness on the conference level? If so, what form should this take? To what degree might conference-level senate-based participation be focused on the senate chair, the FAR, some additional faculty appointee.

2. What types of national-level structures should be created for representative faculty voices?

Should FBS faculty senates have a national association dedicated to the faculty role in athletics governance? What would be its tasks and who would represent senates in such an organization (again, senate chairs, FARs, some additional faculty appointee)? How could it appropriately be funded?

Should the views of senates and the recommendations they make concerning campus (and perhaps conference) regulation be represented formally within the NCAA structure?

Next Steps

As we come towards the close of Saturday work sessions, the following two topics should become part of the conversation:
3. Given the inevitable gap between the current state of faculty governance with regard to athletics and the capacity that it will need to have once deregulation is in place, what steps should COIA, as the sole existing inter-senate alliance, take immediately to mobilize for change?

4. Given the limited leverage that faculties themselves - campus by campus or nationally - presently have over issues of athletics governance, what steps should the NCAA be prepared to take, immediately and in the long term, to ensure that the faculty voice is appropriately represented in a deregulated environment?

The Saturday work sessions will end about 4:00. Saturday evening, members of the COIA Steering Committee will develop materials for the Sunday morning continuation of discussions on the new NCAA approach and its consequences for faculty. The Sunday meeting will begin (8:00-9:00) with plenary discussion of ideas from Saturday’s second break-out groups; the second hour, from 9:00 to 10:00, will focus specifically on identifying concrete steps that COIA and the NCAA need to take immediately.
NCAA Information Sheet

Breakdown of Division I rules changes

One of the key elements of NCAA President Mark Emmert’s reform agenda is the deregulation of the Division I rulebook. January 19, the Board of Directors approved a series of proposals designed to make the rules meaningful, enforceable and supportive of student-athlete success.

Over the years, the Division I manual has grown to include rules that many in the membership believe are best left to individual schools and conferences. The Rules Working Group is identifying those rules that are less national in scope and refocusing the rules-making process on a group of commitments that speak to the values and principles of Division I members.

“Some of our rules are counterintuitive, outdated and just unenforceable. They don’t make sense in the world we live in,” Emmert said. “We are refocusing on the things that really matter, the threats to integrity, and the biggest issues facing intercollegiate athletics.”

Emmert emphasized that the goal is to shrink the manual by simplifying rules and focusing on student-athlete well-being. The following Q&A provides more details on the deregulation effort:

**Why is the NCAA changing its rules?**

The goal of deregulation is to protect and enhance the student-athlete experience, shift the regulatory focus from competitive equity to fair competition and allow schools to use the natural advantages of geography, a talented student-athlete or deeper pockets. Over time, the rulebook has expanded to include rules designed to limit those things. The deregulation effort hopes to shift the focus from limiting the advantages of individual schools to making sure all schools compete within the framework of the collegiate model, in which athletics competition is an integral part of the student-athlete’s education.

**Why focus on fairness of competition instead of competitive equity?**

The current justification for rules as creating a level playing field has produced too many rules that are not meaningful, enforceable or contributory to student-athlete success. The shift to a fair competition model acknowledges that natural advantages exist between campuses that cannot – and should not – be regulated. The changes are intended to better define what fairness means in terms of eligible student-athletes, scholarships, the length of the playing and recruiting seasons, and the number of coaches. Ultimately, retaining the current rules will not impede the competitive shift.

**Why rely more on campus-level policies and procedures than rules for everybody in Division I?**
The Rules Working Group recognizes that some schools will be pressured to adopt policies and procedures to not place their program at a competitive disadvantage. The new rulebook would require that policies be in place in specified areas, that they address key components or campus values and that they will be followed. NCAA violations would occur if policies are not developed or followed.

**When will the rulebook be reduced in size?**

The deregulation process began January 19, when the Board of Directors approved the first round of proposals from the Rules Working Group. These proposals will make major changes in the way the NCAA views personnel, amateurism, recruiting and benefits for student-athletes. The working group will have a second round of concepts for membership feedback and review this spring. The result of these efforts may not necessarily be a significant smaller rulebook, but the rules will be vastly more meaningful and enforceable.

**Why does the NCAA have to do it this way?**

The NCAA is a membership organization. The Division I membership includes 346 schools and 31 conferences, representing a divergent group of missions, resource levels, public profile and student populations. Preserving this diversity is important to leaders within the division, and in order to do that, the working group strives to build consensus around its approach and the ultimate proposals it recommends to the Board for adoption.

**How will the NCAA make sure the rulebook doesn’t get back to the way it was?**

Part of the Rules Working Group’s goal is to develop a process by which each new piece of proposed legislation must pass a three-part test of being meaningful, enforceable and supportive of student-athlete success. The working group is taking this charge seriously and is in the early stages of developing a new process for rules-making.

**What if some of the deregulation turns out to have unforeseen consequences?**

The working group has proposed a two-year period in which the membership can digest the new rules. After that period, if some areas are identified in which the working group went too far toward deregulation – or didn’t go far enough – changes will be considered.

*Publish date: January, 2013*
Proposed NCAA Bylaw 20.9.1

20.9 Division I Membership

20.9.1 Commitments to the Division I Collegiate Model. In addition to the purposes and fundamental policy of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, as set forth in Constitution I, members of Division I support the following commitments in the belief that these commitments assist in defining the nature and purposes of the division. These commitments are not binding on member institutions but serve as a guide for the preparation of legislation by the division and for planning and implementation of programs by institutions and conferences.

20.9.1.1 The Commitment to Value-Based Legislation. Bylaws proposed and enacted by member institutions governing the conduct of intercollegiate athletics shall be designed to foster competition in amateur athletics, promote the Association's enduring values and advance the Collegiate Model as set forth in the NCAA Constitution. In some instances, a careful balancing of these values may be necessary to help achieve the purposes of the Association.

20.9.1.2 The Commitment to Amateurism. Member institutions shall conduct their athletics programs for students who choose to participate in intercollegiate athletics as a part of their educational experience and in accordance with NCAA bylaws, thus maintaining a line of demarcation between student-athletes who participate in the Collegiate Model and athletes competing in the professional model.

20.9.1.3 The Commitment to Fair Competition. Bylaws shall be designed to promote the opportunity for institutions and eligible student-athletes to engage in fair competition. This commitment requires that all member institutions compete within the framework of the Collegiate Model of athletics in which athletics competition is an integral part of the student-athlete's effort to acquire a degree in higher education. The commitment to fair competition acknowledges that variability will exist among members, including facilities, geographic locations and resources, and that such variability should not be justification for future legislation. Areas affecting fair competition include, but are not limited to personnel, eligibility and amateurism, recruiting, financial aid, the length of playing and practice seasons and the number of institutional competitions per sport.

20.9.1.4 The Commitment to Integrity and Sportsmanship. It is the responsibility of each member institution to conduct its athletics programs and manage its staff members, representatives and student-athletes in a manner that promotes the ideals of higher education and the integrity of intercollegiate athletics. Member institutions are committed to encouraging behavior that advances the interests of the Association, its membership and the Collegiate Model of athletics. All individuals associated with intercollegiate athletics programs and events should adhere to such fundamental values as respect, fairness, civility, honesty, responsibility, academic integrity and ethical conduct. These values should be manifest not only in athletics participation, but also in the broad spectrum of activities affecting the athletics programs.
20.9.1.5 The Commitment to Institutional Control and Compliance. It is the responsibility of each member institution to monitor and control its athletics programs, staff members, representatives and student-athletes to ensure compliance with the Constitution and bylaws of the Association. Responsibility for maintaining institutional control ultimately rests with the institution's campus president or chancellor. It is also the responsibility of each member institution to report all breaches of conduct established by these bylaws to the Association in a timely manner and cooperate with the Association's enforcement efforts. Upon a conclusion that one or more violations occurred, an institution shall be subject to such disciplinary and corrective actions as may be prescribed by the Association on behalf of the entire membership.

20.9.1.6 The Commitment to Student-Athlete Well-Being. Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be conducted in a manner designed to enhance the well-being of student-athletes who choose to participate and to prevent undue commercial or other influences that may interfere with their scholastic, athletics or related interests. The time required of student-athletes for participation in intercollegiate athletics shall be regulated to minimize interference with their academic pursuits. It is the responsibility of each member institution to establish and maintain an environment in which student-athletes' activities, in all sports, are conducted to encourage academic success and individual development and as an integral part of the educational experience. Each member institution should also provide an environment that fosters fairness, sportsmanship, safety, honesty and positive relationships between student-athletes and representatives of the institution.

20.9.1.7 The Commitment to Sound Academic Standards. Standards of the Association governing participation in intercollegiate athletics, including postseason competition, shall be designed to ensure proper emphasis on educational objectives and the opportunity for academic success, including graduation, of student-athletes who choose to participate at a member institution. Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be maintained as an important component of the educational program, and student-athletes shall be an integral part of the student body. Each member institution's admission and academic standards for student-athletes shall be designed to promote academic progress and graduation and shall be consistent with the standards adopted by the institution for the student body in general.

20.9.1.8 The Commitment to Responsible Recruiting Standards. Recruiting bylaws shall be designed to promote informed decisions and balance the interests of prospective student-athletes, their educational institutions, the Association's member institutions and intercollegiate athletics as a whole. This commitment includes minimizing the role of external influences on prospective student-athletes and their families and preventing excessive contact or pressure in the recruitment process.

20.9.1.9 The Commitment to Diversity and Inclusion. The Division I membership believes in and is committed to the core values of diversity, inclusion and equity because realization of those values improves the learning environment for all student-athletes and enhances excellence within the membership and in all aspects of intercollegiate athletics. The membership shall create
diverse and inclusive environments, promote an atmosphere of respect for and sensitivity to the
dignity of every person, and include diverse perspectives in the pursuit of academic and athletic
excellence. Member institutions, with assistance from the National Office, are expected to
develop inclusive practices that foster positive learning and competitive environments for
student-athletes, as well as professional development and opportunities for athletics
administrators, coaches and staff from diverse backgrounds.
Proposed Changes to Bylaw 16.3.1.1 on Academic Counseling & Support Services

The following is one example of the way in which the regulatory approach of the NCAA is changing. Boldface additions and indicated deletions suggest the changes; the stated NCAA rationale is appended. The basic thrust of these changes is to remove limitations, which had been expressed in terms of detailed specifics, and leave to campuses decisions concerning what sorts of academic support should be provided to athletes and what limitations shall apply. This would cover support commonly provided to all students, and also support to athletes that may involve university commitments beyond those provided to all students. Issues that may inform campus policy making in this specific area might include, for example:

Ensuring that athletics participation commitments do not put athletes at an academic disadvantage; ensuring that athletes receive academic support comparable to non-athletes; ensuring that excess academic support does not provide an unearned advantage interfere with development of academic skills; principles of budgetary responsibility and fairness to tuition-paying non-athletes. Other issues could concern the external environment: e.g., principles of how to campus policies limiting academic services may affect recruitment and competitiveness.

16.3.1.1 Academic Counseling/Support Services. Member institutions shall make general academic counseling and tutoring services available to all student-athletes. Such counseling and tutoring services may be provided by the department of athletics or the institution's nonathletics student support services. In addition, an institution, conference or the NCAA may finance other academic and support, career counseling or personal development services that the institution, at its discretion, determines to be appropriate and necessary for support the academic success of its student-athletes.

16.3.1.1.1 Specific Limitations. An institution may provide the following support services subject to the specified limitations. [R]

(a) Use of institutionally owned computers and typewriters on a check-out and retrieval basis; however, typing/word processing/editing services or costs may not be provided, even if typed reports and other papers are a requirement of a course in which a student-athlete is enrolled;
(b) Use of copy machines, fax machines and the Internet, including related long-distance charge, provided the use is for purposes related to the completion of required academic course work;
(c) Course supplies (e.g., calculators, art supplies, computer disks, subscriptions), provided such course supplies are required of all students in the course and specified in the institution's catalog or course syllabus or the course instructor indicates in writing that the supplies are required;
(d) Cost of a field trip, provided the field trip is required of all students in the course and the fee for such trips is specified in the institution's catalog; and
(e) Nonelectronic day planners.

Rationale: As a result of the Presidential Retreat in August 2011, the Collegiate Model – Rules Working Group was formed and charged with reviewing current Division I rules with a view toward reducing the volume of unenforceable and inconsequential rules that fail to support the NCAA’s enduring values, and emphasizing the most strategically important matters. This proposal is part of a package recommended by the Rules Working Group designed to accomplish those objectives. This proposal will provide institutions and conferences with the flexibility to provide student-athletes with services that support their success and
will enhance the student-athlete experience. Given the recent emphasis on academics and the various support services available, deregulating this area will allow institutions and conferences to further support the academic and personal success of student-athletes.

Existing COIA Positions Concerning Campus Athletics Governance

Faculty Athletics Representative

*Overview Statement from “Framing the Future” (2007)*


The Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) should be appointed by the University President based on recommendation by the campus faculty governance body. The FAR appointment should be made for a specific term and a review of the performance of the FAR should take place prior to reappointment. Such a review should include meaningful participation by the campus faculty governance body, or the Campus Athletics Board.

In “Campus Athletics Governance: The Faculty Role” (2004), COIA formulated over 30 best practice guidelines for the FAR position. Among these are the following examples [for the full list, see: http://blogs.comm.psu.edu/thecoia/wp-content/uploads/FTF-White-Paper2.pdf]:

- The appointment of the Faculty Athletics Representative shall be made by the President; the process of appointment shall involve meaningful consultation with the elected body that exercises campus-level faculty governance; the appointment shall be made for a specified term; a review of the performance of the Faculty Athletics Representative that includes meaningful participation by the elected faculty governance body shall take place prior to any reappointment. If no elected faculty governance body exists on a campus, the campus athletics board shall be the consulting body. (*proposed as an NCAA bylaw*)

The FAR:

- position is defined by a written job description, which has been reviewed and approved by the President, in consultation with the Campus Athletics Board (CAB), Faculty Governance Body (FGB), and Athletics Director.
- has regular access to the President or Chancellor of the institution or campus.
- operates from an office that is located outside both the department of intercollegiate athletics and the academic athlete advisement center.
- ensures that all procedures and roles related to student eligibility are fulfilled.
- is available to meet with athletes on an individual basis.
- reports regularly to the Faculty Governance Body.
- sits on the Campus Athletics Board.
- sits on search committees for athletic administrators and head coaches.
- serves as a leader or committee member for NCAA Athletic Certification.
- serves on conference and/or NCAA committees.

Faculty Governance Body

*Overview Statements from “Framing the Future” (2007)*

Leaders of campus faculty governance body should report annually to the University President (1) that the faculty has been able to fulfill its responsibilities in regard to athletic governance, or
(2) that it has not, in which case the report should specify the obstacles that have prevented it from doing so. These reports should be made available to the NCAA during re-certification.

The Athletics Director, Faculty Athletics Representative and the Campus Athletics Board chair should report orally and in writing at least once a year to the campus faculty governance body. Their reports should include a focus on academic benchmarks including the APR, GSR, graduation rates and the percentage and progress of student athlete special admits.

In “Campus Athletics Governance: The Faculty Role,” COIA formulated 12 best practice guidelines for the FGB. Among these are the following examples:

- The FGB elects members to the CAB or nominates a stipulated number of individuals for appointment to each faculty position on the CAB, from among which the President selects appointees.
- The faculty chair or president of the FGB consults regularly with the FAR and chair of the CAB to learn of issues that may be of concern to the faculty.
- The faculty leader of the FGB consults at least annually with the President concerning the success of the faculty in fulfilling its athletics governance responsibilities.

**Campus Athletics Board**

*Overview Statement from “Framing the Future” (2007)*

Each NCAA member institution should establish a Campus Athletics Board. The charge of this Board should be to monitor and oversee campus intercollegiate athletics. A majority of Board members should be tenured faculty who should be appointed or elected through rules established by the campus faculty governance body. The Faculty Athletic Representative should be an *ex officio* voting or non-voting member of the Board. The chair of the Board should be a senior (tenured) faculty member. An Athletics Director should not be chair.

Major athletic department decisions (*e.g.*, hiring of the athletic director and key athletic department personnel, changes in the total number of intercollegiate sports, initiation of major capital projects, *etc.*) should be made in consultation with the Campus Athletics Board and leaders of the campus faculty governance body and appropriate faculty committee(s).

In “Campus Athletics Governance: The Faculty Role,” COIA formulated 12 best practice guidelines for the FGB. Among these are the following examples:

- The Board has clearly established functions and responsibilities that are acknowledged by the president of the institution.
- The Board includes faculty and academic administrators (including the AD) who are highly respected by peers for their research, teaching, service, or administrative work outside intercollegiate athletics.
- The Board has a specified relationship to the Faculty Governance Body.
- The Board reviews data on admissions decisions, including progress and graduation success rates by admission category.
- The Board, by FGB policy or in tandem with the FGB, establishes policy for normal progress and grade point average that meets or exceeds NCAA and conference requirements, where this is consistent with the institution’s standards for other students.
- The Board, by FGB policy or in tandem with the FGB, guides athletics program decisions by establishing policy for excused absences and maximum amount of missed class time for athletic competition.
- The Board reports activities, on at least an annual basis, to the FGB.
• The Board coordinates informational reports to the FGB, given by the Chair of the Board and/or the Faculty Athletics Representative.