



# **Davis Division Academic Senate**

## **Request for Consultation Responses**

### **Report Review: Special Committee on Athletics**

**April 12, 2012**

During the October 2012 Representative Assembly Meeting, the Division enabled a Special Committee on Athletics. The Special Committee's report is distributed for your comment. You may recall the current discussion of intercollegiate athletics was initiated by the release of the UC Davis Athletics Strategic Audit of 2011 by Cedric Dempsey in early October 2011. The Audit is associated with the search for a new Director of Athletics. The Academic Senate Special Committee on Athletics was charged with reviewing the Audit and associated issues and with offering recommendations to aid the Academic Senate in formulating a position on the topics under discussion. Please note a web forum will be initiated to allow campus community comment on the report.

# **Admissions & Enrollment**

**April 12, 2012 12:56 PM**

The CAE response is provided in the attachment.

*Response continued on next page.*

The Academic Senate Committee on Admissions and Enrollment (CAE) has reviewed the report of the Special Committee on Athletics and provides below our comments and concerns regarding the recommendations on pages 12 and 13 of the report pertaining to Principle 2 of the Davis Way for intercollegiate athletics (that admissions and graduation standards must in no way be specially altered or amended for student-athletes).

**Recommendation 1 (bottom of p. 12)**

It has not been customary for the Academic Senate (AS) to regularly review individual candidates for undergraduate admission (whether eligible or under consideration for admission by exception), and this would represent a departure from current practice. However, we agree that periodic review of ICA-ABE requests by appropriate AS Committees, including CAE and the Undergraduate Council, would provide additional transparency and hopefully assuage concerns that some might have about the integrity of the process by which ICA-sponsored applicants are considered for ABE.

We are concerned, however, about the potential for the Academic Senate to become unnecessarily involved in individual admissions cases; for example, by communicating concerns about admissibility of a particular applicant to UAO prior to UAO's decision on admission. We suggest, therefore, that only the cases of ICA-ABE applicants that have been evaluated by UAO and accepted for admission be shared (after redaction for privacy) with the appropriate AS committees on a regular basis (e.g., at the end of each quarter). This would not preclude the possibility of AS consultation concerning individual cases at any time upon request by UAO.

**Recommendation 4 (p. 13)**

We do not believe that the stated status quo of ICA being delegated effective authority to make admissions decisions for UC-eligible student athletes is appropriate or acceptable, as this could potentially result in a decline in the competitiveness and post-matriculation academic performance of ICA-sponsored student athletes relative to their non-athlete counterparts, as pressure for our athletic teams to be more competitive in Division I increases. We believe that it should be reaffirmed that ICA-sponsored applicants should be held to similar standards of competitiveness (as assessed through holistic review) when compared to other applicants for admission, in accordance with the expectations of the faculty articulated in (a) the AS Certification Self-Study Report prepared in May, 2006 as a requirement for our transition to NCAA Division I Athletics and (b) Principle 2 of the Davis Way.

We believe, however, that it would be worthwhile to articulate measures of flexibility that ICA is given to assist with the effective recruitment of student athletes; for example, allowing the consideration for admission of ICA-sponsored applicants after the regular fall deadline for applications. Appropriate measures of flexibility deemed beneficial to ICA would be identified and approved by the Academic Senate (through its representative committees) after consultation with ICA and UAO.

# **Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction**

**April 6, 2012 12:27 PM**

*Response continued on next page.*

CERJ comments on the recommendations of the Special Committee on Athletics.

“We recommend that the Senate affirm support for the existing Eight Principles with the interpretation and elaboration provided in this report and add to these Principle 0 as stated above.”

**This would be implemented via a resolution adopted by the Representative Assembly.**

Definition of excellence and success: The program has achieved excellence and success to the extent that each student athlete is encouraged to realize his or her full academic and athletic potential and is supported in doing so while the values of the campus and the principles for the program are maintained.

**These matters are in the hands of the administration, and the Division could at most advocate it with an RA resolution.**

“We strongly recommend that the administrative processes be strengthened so that University Admissions can and will easily verify that for each ICA ABE request, all three of the required individuals have given their approval.”

“All ICA-ABE requests that are sent to Admissions also be sent to the Academic Senate for routing to the Undergraduate Council and the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment. We are not, at this point, recommending that either of those committees should be part of the decision chain, but we do believe that proper functioning of the system will be more likely if the Senate receives current information on ABE cases.”

**This is not at this time in the charge of the Admissions and Enrollment Committee or Undergraduate Council. A Bylaw amendment giving them the charge of overseeing the “admit by exception” process.**

“We recommend that AAAC, the FAR, the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment, and Undergraduate Council coordinate in proposing improvements to the SARI reports for including more recent data and distributions, where they would be most useful, rather than just means of the data on academic characteristics and performance.”

**No Assembly action would be needed to implement this proposal.**

“AAAC and the FAR be required to report any concerns that they have about ICA admissions or academic standards to the Academic Senate.”

**At present, there is no legislation governing the activities of the AAAC or the FAR, because they are administrative appointments. The requirement would have to be initiated by the administration. An RA resolution could ask for this.**

“The SARI Athletics report prepared annually for the Academic Senate and AAAC shall provide additional data comparing measures of academic performance and graduation rates for ABE student athletes and ABE nonstudent-athletes (disaggregated) with their non-ABE counterparts.”

**These matters are in the hands of the administration, and the Division could at most advocate it with an RA resolution.**

“The Academic Senate make explicit its heretofore implicit delegation to ICA of effective authority to make admissions decisions for UC-eligible student-athletes with a written specification of the procedure followed and the acceptable range of parameters within which it can operate.”

**Authority lies with the systemwide BOARS (Board of Admissions and Relations to Schools). By Senate Bylaw 145(B)(3), BOARS has the authority to: “Regulate the examination and classification of all applicants for admission to undergraduate status, and report thereon to the**

**Assembly, including the authority, in exceptional case, to admit applicants with minor deficiencies.” The Admissions and Enrollment Committee should clarify with BOARS what role the Division may play in this process.**

“The admissions files of all prospective student athletes be given the standard holistic review, even if the applicants are admitted through an ICA-specific process, and that SARI reports show data on the academic performance of those UC-eligible student-athletes whose holistic review scores are below the regular admissions bar (to the extent consistent with individual student privacy).”

**This would seem to fall under the authority of the Admissions and Enrollment Committee, whose Bylaw states, “The duties of the committee shall be to consider matters involving admission and enrollment at Davis.”**

“Thus, following from Principle 0, we recommend that financial and material resources be allocated within ICA so that basic needs are met and each student athlete and each particular team of student athletes has an equal opportunity to develop to their full potential in both athletic and academic performance. We further recommend that changes to present practices, which may or may not measure up well relative to this standard, should be agreed upon within the program through an open process. For proposals that would involve a large resource reallocation, the process should include consultation with AAAC and the FAR. The goal should be a consensus that allocations are fair and move the program forward as a whole.”

**These matters are in the hands of the administration, and the Division could at most advocate it with an RA resolution.**

“As a general recommendation, we concur with the Chancellor on the need for thorough budget analysis and modeling as a part of strategic planning for ICA.”

**Since the Chancellor is in agreement on this point, no further Divisional action seems necessary.**

“We recommend that a comprehensive cost/benefit analysis be conducted to evaluate this policy.”

**The policy in question is an NCAA policy concerning funding. Implementation of this recommendation would be by an RA resolution.**

“We recommend that donors be encouraged to consider contributions to grants-in-aid, team operating expenses, compliance, endowment, and services that directly affect the welfare of student athletes. Until there is a demonstrated need and a solid financial plan, we do not support large spending on spectator facilities such as increased seating or luxury boxes.”

**This recommendation would be implemented by an RA resolution.**

“We recommend that policy be reviewed to assure that it is adequate to prevent outside donors from unduly influencing program decisions.”

**The policy referred to concerns conflicts of interest. This recommendation would be the subject of an RA resolution.**

“We recommend that the lecturer part of the teacher coach appointments be counted like the other academic units and be included in the budgeting of campus general funds. In addition, we recommend that the money that pays the PE lecturer appointments for teacher-coaches flow through the PE program budget rather than the ICA budget.”

**These matters are in the hands of the administration, and the Division could at most advocate it with an RA resolution.**

We strongly recommend that there be no further erosion of the percentage as lecturer or in the number of contact hours with ordinary students. In addition we strongly recommend that all head coaches and first assistant coaches hold lecturer appointments at no less than 32%.”

**These matters are in the hands of the administration, and the Division could at most advocate it with an RA resolution.**

“Thus we recommend that the position of the FAR at UC Davis have stronger links to the Senate as described below.”

“1. The Athletics Administrative Advisory Committee (AAAC) should be reconstituted as a joint committee of the Senate and the administration that provides its advisory reports to both the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (VC-SA) and the Academic Senate.

2. The Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) should be appointed by the Chancellor from a slate of candidates offered by the Senate. The FAR should report to the Chancellor and should be required to brief the Davis Division Senate chair on matters of concern to the Academic Senate each academic quarter. The term of the appointment should be for at least three years. Early dismissal by the Chancellor can occur only following consultation with the Davis Division chair and the Davis Division Executive Council.

The campus administration and the Academic Senate should join in endorsing the following major decision-making process for ICA, the wording of which is inspired by the UC Davis self-study document filed with NCAA when the move to Division I occurred:

When major issues (including material alteration of the eight principles) arise the process of consultation within the ICA program will be for the AD to first discuss the issues with the SMG and, as appropriate, with the VCSA. In consultation with the SMG, the AD would develop a base of information to ensure a full understanding of the issue by others, identify questions that need to be answered as part of the decision-making process, and plan a consultation process within ICA to get input regarding the issue. The desired outcome of the consultation process is a proposal developed by the AD in consultation with the SMG after receiving input from consulting groups, including AAAC, CAC, and SAAC. The goal is to achieve a consensus within ICA before the proposal is forwarded to the VCSA.

The VCSA may consult with the Vice Chancellor's Council within the Division of Student Affairs, and may refer major issues involving athletics to the Chancellor, who would ultimately make the final decisions on major issues. The Chancellor would determine the scope of the consultation process appropriate for the major issue, with the specific groups consulted varying from issue to issue. This process might involve one or more of existing committees and administrative groups, such as the CODVC, the Academic Senate Executive Committee, ASUCD (the undergraduate student body governance group), the Alumni Association, the Title IX Workgroup (if the issues involves gender equity in any way), or other campus groups. The Chancellor might also choose to form ad hoc committees charged with examining the issue and making recommendations. Upon receiving recommendations and information from the groups consulted, the Chancellor would make a final decision on behalf of the campus. The overall process is consistent with the process followed for major decisions involving other administrative offices or groups on campus.”

**These matters are in the hands of the administration, and the Division could at most advocate it with an RA resolution.**

# **Graduate Council**

**April 4, 2012 10:49 AM**

*No response at this time.*

# Planning & Budget

**April 4, 2012 4:52 PM**

CPB has reviewed the ICA report. For the most part, CPB is strongly supportive of the report. There are two exceptions. The first is the use of general campus funds to support the PE courses offered by the coaches in the Intercollegiate Athletics Program. We note that the students voted to tax themselves to support these PE classes (as part of Student Activities and Services Initiative). This money should be used for this purpose and student permission should be required to redirect the money they allocated for one use to another use. Taking \$2.45 million of general campus funds, at a time of budget cuts, from core university courses where they can provide many more units of instruction vital to students completing their degrees, does not make sense. Therefore, CPB recommends that no additional general campus funds, beyond that arising from the student fees voted on by the students for this purpose, be used to fund these PE courses.

In addition, the report states that "UC Davis cannot reduce its broad-based program, but rather must seek to add sports." This would imply that we cannot remove sports from the program, only add. In the long run this is untenable. ICA is already struggling financially. Sports programs should not be protected from closure as a matter of principle. A goal of maintaining a broad-based program is good, but it is important to remain realistic.