

3-22-2005

Faculty Senate Summarized Minutes, 3/22/2005

UNM Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/fs_minutes

Recommended Citation

UNM Faculty Senate. "Faculty Senate Summarized Minutes, 3/22/2005." (2005). https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/fs_minutes/99

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

FACULTY SENATE SUMMARIZED MINUTES

2004-2005 Faculty Senate March 22, 2005

The Faculty Senate meeting for March 22, 2005 was called to order at 3:10 p.m. in the Lobo Room, Student Union Building, Room 3037. Senate President Ed De Santis presided.

1. ATTENDANCE

Guests Present: Dean Camila Aire (University Libraries).

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved as written.

3. APPROVAL OF SUMMARIZED MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 22, 2005 MEETING

The minutes for the February 22, 2005 meeting were approved.

4. FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT'S REPORT

The Faculty Senate President reported on the following:

- Senate President Ed De Santis announced a meeting with University President Louis Caldera is being planned for either May 5 or May 6, 2005. President De Santis asks senators to notify the University Secretary's office of the preferred date.
- Senate President Ed De Santis explained that Faculty Elections are almost complete and nominations for the Operations Committee and President-Elect will begin once the at-large senator election concludes. A senator asked what the Operations Committee does. President De Santis explained that the Operations Committee meets every Tuesday except on full senate meeting dates. The Operations Committee sets the agenda for the Faculty Senate Meetings, represents the Faculty Senate to the administration and looks at issues that effect the senate and the faculty as a whole.

CONSENT AGENDA

5. APPROVAL OF FORMS C FROM THE CURRICULA COMMITTEE

The following Forms C were approved by unanimous voice vote of the Faculty Senate:

- Revision of Major and Concentration in English, *English*
- Revision of B.S. of Nursing, *Nursing*
- Revision of Major in M.S. of Nursing, *Nursing*
- Revision of Major in PhD of Nursing, *Nursing*
- Revision of Masters in Landscape Architecture, Architecture and Planning
- Revision of Masters in German, *Foreign Languages*
- Revision of M.A. in Linguistics, *Linguistics*
- Revision of Graduate Program in Sociology, *Sociology*
- Revision of M.A. in Portuguese, *Spanish and Portuguese*
- New Department in Teacher Education, *Education*
- Revision of B.S. in Education, *Education*

- Revision of Major in Secondary Education, *Education*
- Revision of Majors in Education, *Education*
- Revision of Post B.A. Licensure in Art Education, *Education*
- Revision of M.A. in Art Education, *Education*
- Revision of Concentration in Art Education, *Education*
- Revision of Minor at Masters Level in Art Education, *Education*
- Revision of B.S. and Major in Computer Engineering, *Electrical and Computer Engineering*
- Revision of Concentration in Master of Music, *Music*
- Revision of Masters in Public Health, *Medicine*
- Revision of Concentration in Masters of Water Resources, *University College*
- New Department of Diabetes Prevention, *Gallup*
- New Certificate in Diabetes Prevention, *Gallup*
- New Degree of A.S. of Diabetes Prevention, *Gallup*
- Revision of Degree and Major in Business Administration, *Anderson Schools of Management*
- Revision of Minor in Undergraduate Management, *Anderson Schools of Management*
- Revision of Post Masters Professional Certificate, *Anderson Schools of Management*
- Revision of B.A., Major, and Concentration in Journalism, *Communication and Journalism*
- Revision of B.S. and Major in Environmental Sciences, *Earth and Planetary Sciences*
- Revision of Major in Organizational Learning, *Education*
- New Concentration and Emphasis in M.A. Degree in Elementary and Secondary Education, *Education*
- Revision of M.A. and Licensure in Elementary Education, *Education*
- New Department and Revision of Teacher Education, *Education*
- Revision of M.A. and Licensure in Secondary Education, *Education*
- Revision of Majors in Elementary Education, *Education*
- New Degree and Revision of Elementary Education, *Education*
- Revision and Name Change if Concentration in Educational Thought and Sociocultural Studies, *Education*
- Revision of Major in Physical Education, *Education*
- Revision of B.S. in Athletic Training, *Education*
- Revision of Major in Exercise Science, *Education*
- Revision of B.A. and Major in Art Education, *Education*
- New Minor and Concentration in Educational Leadership, *Education*
- New Concentration and Revision of Educational Specialties, *Education*
- Revision of Ed. D., *Education*
- New Concentration in American Indian Education, *Education*
- Revision of Degree and Major in Russian Studies, *Foreign Languages and Literature*
- Revision of Major in B.A. of Classical Studies, *Foreign Languages and Literature*
- Revision of Minor in B.A. of Classical Studies, *Foreign Languages and Literature*
- Revision of M.A. of French, *Foreign Languages and Literature*
- Revision of Major in German, *Foreign Languages and Literature*
- Revision of M.A. of German, *Foreign Languages and Literature*
- Revision of Minor in M.A. in Comp. Literature and Cultural Studies, *Foreign Languages and Literature*
- Revision of Concentration in M.A. in Comp. Literature and Cultural Studies, *Foreign Languages and Literature*
- Revision of M.A. in Comp. Literature and Cultural Studies, *Foreign Languages and Literature*
- Revision of Major in B.A. of Languages, *Foreign Languages and Literature*
- Revision of B.A. of Russian, *Foreign Languages and Literature*
- New Concentration in Ph.D. of Linguistics, *Linguistics*
- Revision of Ph.D. of Linguistics, *Linguistics*
- New Concentration in M.A. of Native American Languages, *Linguistics*
- Revision of Major in Master of Nursing, *Nursing*

- Revision of Majors in Education, *Education*
- New Concentration in M.S. of Physics and Revision of Department, *Physics*
- New Concentration in Ph.D. of Physics and Revision of Department, *Physics*
- Revision of Ph.D. of Physics, *Physics*
- Revision of M.A. in Spanish, *Spanish and Portuguese*
- Revision of B.S. and Major in Astrophysics, *Physics and Astronomy*
- Revision of Minor in Peace Studies, *Sociology*
- Revision of Major Dance, *Theatre and Dance*
- Revision of B.S. and Major in Nutrition Dietetics, *Nutrition*

AGENDA TOPICS

6. UNIVERSITY HONORS COUNCIL MODIFICATION OF CHARGE

President De Santis presented the modification to the University Honors Council charge on behalf of University Honors Director Rosalie Otero. The last revision to the charge was in 1961. After some discussion the charge was passed with one modification. The following charge passed unanimously by voice vote.

UNIVERSITY HONORS COUNCIL

The University Honors Council advises the Director of the Honors Program. The University Honors Council shall be chaired by the Director of the Honors Program (Ex-officio) and shall: (1) represent the interests and concerns of faculty and students in the members ♦ respective colleges concerning the Honors Program; (2) represent the Honors Program to the faculty and students of the members ♦ respective colleges; (3) serve, along with two members of the Honors Students Advisory Council, as a committee to which students may appeal, in extraordinary circumstances, to continue participation in Honors courses even though their cumulative grade point averages do not meet normal requirements under the Honors Program policies; (4) assist the Director with graduating senior interviews; (5) advise the Director on issues related to the Honors Program; and, (6) serve as requested by the Director on faculty search committees including the Garrey Carruthers Chair, the UHP curriculum committee, and other necessary committees that may be required.

The University Honors Council consists of the Director of the Honors Program (Ex-officio); six faculty members appointed by the Faculty Senate in consultation with the Director of the University Honors Program; two from Arts and Sciences and one each from at least four other schools and colleges; one student appointed by the Associated Students of UNM (ASUNM), and one student elected by the Honors Students Advisory Council (HSAC) to serve a one year term. The terms of office of the faculty members shall be for three years set up on a staggered basis so that the terms of two members will expire each year. Faculty members may serve up to two).

7. SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE MODIFICATION OF CHARGE

Scholarship Committee Chair, Assistant Professor Teddy Warner (Family and Community Medicine), presented a modification to the charge of the Scholarship Committee. The modification of the charge was passed unanimously by voice vote.

SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE

The Scholarship Committee will:

1. formulate and oversee the implementation of policies governing the allocation of scholarships to students when policy is not stipulated by the granting agency;
2. coordinate scholarship issues with the Scholarship Office (SO), Student Financial Aid Office (SFO), and other university offices and administrators and advise the Directors of the SO and SFO on matters brought to the Committee by the UNM community;
3. submit an annual report to the Faculty Senate each May on issues and decisions related to the granting of scholarships by the SO and SFO;
4. evaluate scholarship-related budgetary policy in the Student Affairs Division and advise the Vice-President of Student Affairs and the Provost on scholarship-related budgetary policy, and on matters brought to the committee by the UNM community;
5. assist in the selection process of the Regents and Presidential Scholars; and,
6. oversee and assist designated UNM faculty representatives in disseminating information concerning screening and preparing applicants from among UNM students for major national and international scholarships such as the Truman, Rhodes, Marshall, Goldwater, and Fulbright Scholarships.

8. COALITION ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS: PRICIPLES, RULES AND BEST PRACTICES

Senator Fred Hashimoto (General Internal Medicine) presented the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics: Principles, Rules and Best Practices. Senator Hashimoto is the UNM representative to the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA). COIA is a coalition of faculty senates from Division IA athletics universities. After much discussion the Faculty Senate voted to endorse the draft as a practical step in the process of athletics reform. The following draft passed by voice vote.

VOTING DRAFT

VOTING DRAFT

Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics: Principles, Rules, and Best Practices

**Submitted for vote by the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics
22 February 2005**

Introduction

There are three primary rationales for intercollegiate athletics: 1) for the athlete, the discipline and values of sports can contribute to personal development reinforcing academic excellence; 2) for the campus, the ceremonies and competition of intercollegiate sports can contribute to community and institutional loyalty; 3) for the college and university community, college sports can broaden positive interest in and public support for higher education.

While the experience of the past century has frequently called into question whether these ideals have a close relationship to the practice of college sports, the Coalition for Intercollegiate Athletics has adopted these principles as goals in its advocacy of intercollegiate athletics reform. College sports should be pursued in a way that supports these claims for its value. If that has not generally been the case in the past, we need to change our practices.

None of the values ascribed to college sports can be realized if we abandon the principle that personal development through athletics participation and academic achievement are linked. Yet experience suggests that in many sports programs, academic goals are treated as subordinate, and in a variety of ways students are encouraged or enabled to let their athletics commitment undermine their academic work. To the degree that athletics undermines academic integrity, it reflects a cynical attitude towards the ideals of college sports and of higher education.

It is a norm of long standing in higher education governance that the faculty bears primary responsibility for maintaining the academic standards of institutions. For this reason, the COIA, as a faculty governance based coalition devoted to athletics reform, has developed the following set of proposals and guidelines to help faculty fulfill their responsibilities with regard to the impact of athletics on academic standards and integrity.

Although this document includes many proposals, only three are suggested as rules, or NCAA bylaws, that should apply to all schools. The great majority are intended as best practice guidelines ↔ policies that have worked well in practice at some schools or, in some cases, new ideas that are shared because they promise to address difficult problems that have resisted solution. The object is not to prescribe what schools must do, but to suggest issues that schools need to consider and approaches that may with adaptation fit local needs and strengthen the way athletics supports the educational mission. Where other local practices already accomplish the goal of academic integrity, those may in fact constitute best practices for that institution.

The Coalition is an alliance of over forty-five NCAA Division IA faculty senates, and proposals and recommendations in this document are intended to apply only to Division IA schools, although in

the case of proposed NCAA bylaw changes, the NCAA structure requires that proposals apply to all of Division I. It is our hope, however, that to the degree that these ideas articulate well founded principles, they will be of use to all schools that engage in intercollegiate sports.

The recommendations are in five sections:

- 1. Admissions**
- 2. Scholarships**
- 3. Curricular Integrity**
- 4. Time Commitment, Missed Class Time, and Scheduling of Competitions**
- 5. Policies Concerning the Office of Academic Advising for Athletes**

Proposals within each section are numbered. Boldface numbers indicate proposals for NCAA bylaw changes (there are three altogether: 2.1, 3.1, 4.3.2). Other proposals are best-practice guidelines for schools to consider and adapt according to local needs and judgments, or general calls for action on the part of Division IA schools.

1. Admissions

At many Division IA universities there are students admitted on athletics scholarships who do not meet normal minimal admissions criteria. The practical integrity of such admissions processes are difficult for faculty to evaluate in their role as stewards of academic integrity. At many institutions, faculty have not been responsible historically for setting minimum standards for admissions or in monitoring how these are administered in practice. However, because of a history of problems associated with college sports, the Coalition recommends that campuses consider developing policies and procedures that will clarify the principles for athlete admissions, and set parameters for them consistent with the institutional mission. Scholarship athletes who are admitted in this way may not be the only students who receive special consideration based on grounds other than academic qualifications, and the Coalition recommends as a best practice that campuses address policy development in this area broadly, so that values of providing educational access and maintaining academic integrity in special admissions are balanced for all groups. With specific regard to special admissions for scholarship athletes, the Coalition recommends for consideration the following guidelines, which may be adaptable in framing special admissions policies more broadly:

1.1 Campus administrations and Faculty Governance Bodies should develop policies setting criteria for admission of scholarship athletes. These criteria should be set with regard to both minimum standards for regular admissions and average qualifications of entering students. They can and generally should be above NCAA minimum limits.

1.2 Campus administrations and Faculty Governance Bodies should develop policies that set standard criteria for special admissions, consistent with maintaining academic integrity in special admissions balanced for all groups selected for admission, including special admissions for athletes, either for all sports programs taken together, or for individual programs. Efforts to obtain and maintain diversity in the campus population of athletes should not be compromised, so that athletes of all races, classes, and genders have access to the university.

1.3 The Campus Athletics Board should receive information on all scholarship athlete admits, and should annually certify to the campus Faculty Governance Body compliance with these policies.

1.4 Campuses should develop means to track and share with the Faculty Governance Body the academic performance of scholarship athletes who enroll through special admissions, to permit better understanding of how successfully the campus supports the academic needs of these students and what costs to the campus this may involve. Faculty Governance Bodies should also be provided with data concerning the academic progress of all athletes, allowing them to assess the range of admissions qualifications appropriate to athletes, adhering in all cases to the requirements of protections under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

1.5 Analogous policies and procedures should be developed to govern admission of transfer students who are scholarship athletes.

□

Athletes who transfer to four-year institutions from two-year institutions face particular difficulties. The COIA is not aware of good data pertaining to the academic success of athletes who transfer from junior colleges. Because concerns about possible problems are of longstanding, the Coalition supports the following recommendation:

1.6 The NCAA is encouraged to compile data and undertake a systematic study of the success rate of athletes transferring from junior colleges and of problems particular to this transition, with

the goal of providing information that can help guide schools in admissions decisions and effective advising. Such a study should include a survey of the impact of recent NCAA academic reforms on junior college transfer students.

2. Scholarships

The basis for the award of an athletics scholarship is generally excellence in athletics, but the purpose of the award is to provide access to higher education. From the school's standpoint, retention of any scholarship should be determined on the basis of academic criteria. The expectation should always be that a student receiving a scholarship will graduate.

Currently athletic scholarships at many Division IA schools are awarded on a one-year renewable basis, and an athlete's commitment to participation and success in athletics may determine scholarship renewal. Athletes may be placed in a position where continued academic opportunity requires prioritizing athletics participation and success over academics, in a manner inconsistent with the positive values of intercollegiate athletics. The Coalition recommends the following policies, to be implemented through NCAA bylaws:

2.1 Athletics scholarships shall be awarded on a year-by-year basis with the presumption that they will be renewed up to four times for a total award of five years, or until graduation, whichever comes first, for students who are in good academic standing, conform to campus codes for student behavior, conform to the athletics department's standards of conduct, and adhere to team rules. If a student graduates in fewer than five years an institution may renew the scholarship if the student has athletic eligibility remaining. Institutions shall establish criteria and a mechanism for revoking a scholarship. The final authority for revoking a scholarship shall rest with the chief academic officer. A student awarded an athletics scholarship who is no longer participating in athletics will be counted against the NCAA maximum number of awards for that sport, unless the scholarship is revoked.

Until this policy is adopted as an NCAA bylaw, the Coalition recommends it as a best practice, to be considered and adopted by local campus Faculty Governance Bodies.

□

The Coalition believes that the number of athletics scholarships should be reduced, and will

address this issue in future discussions concerning cost containment in college sports.

Need-based scholarships

Ultimately, the rationale for athletics scholarships is fundamentally weak. A scholarship award based solely on athletic ability and commitment to participate in varsity sports resembles in important respects payment for services, and such scholarships further encourage high-school athletes who are college aspirants to prioritize sports over academics. Moreover, on some campuses scholarships for athletes who have no financial need are partially supported, through tuition and fee payments, by other students who may have various levels of financial need, an outcome that is extremely difficult to justify. While the Coalition regards ending scholarships based on athletics skills as an ideal that fully reformed intercollegiate athletics would entail, it recognizes that it would be difficult to design a need-only basis that would not lead to negative consequences, including, among others, the following: opportunities for fraud in the awarding of aid, which the current system does not entail; severely unequal impact on high- and low-tuition schools, which may undermine competitiveness on the field.

In light of these and other difficulties in designing a need-only system that has integrity, is fair, and continues to provide access where it is needed, the Coalition cannot now propose the end of athletics scholarships. However, as noted earlier, the premises and impact of athletics scholarships conflict in significant ways with the principle of our academic mission, and the Coalition urges continued efforts to design a system that does not permit them on bases other than need.

We note also that to the degree that athletes are awarded generous scholarships on the basis of non-academic criteria other than need, the principle that athletes should be treated similarly to other students is deeply compromised.

Pay for play

The Coalition does not support proposals to compensate athletes through means other than scholarship support. Intercollegiate athletics on college campuses plays a constructive role when it is an amateur pursuit designed to enhance the academic experience. The athlete who represents an institution does so as a representative of the student body, engaging in an extracurricular activity designed to enhance his or her academic experience. If these activities were not of direct benefit to the student participant, there would be no rationale for supporting them.

We do not support ♦pay for play♦ because it does not conform to the principles underlying the Coalition's support of college sports. To the degree that institutions abandon those principles, they strengthen support for professionalized the revenue sports, and undermine the Coalition's position. The Coalition anticipates further addressing this issue in the context of athletics finances and commercialization.

3. Curricular Integrity

The campus faculty bears primary responsibility for ensuring that academic programs conform to high standards of integrity in curriculum and student evaluation. On many campuses, this role is performed by faculty within individual schools or units. However, continuing reports of compromises in academic integrity related to athletics have been persistent over the past century, and are a matter of concern to campus faculties as a whole. The most common forms of reported abuse are courses or programs intentionally designed to attract athletes by being academically unchallenging either in content or in grading, or that provide preferential grading for athletes. The COIA makes no judgment about the validity of such reports; our concern is that campus faculties be provided the information necessary to determine whether there is evidence of abuse and authority to establish the policies and procedures necessary to investigate and remediate if they appear warranted.

Although the potential abuse in question primarily concerns behavior by faculty and advisors, the principal tool necessary to allow campus faculties to determine whether the possibility of abuse is occurring is data concerning enrollment and grading patterns of students in individual sports programs. Such data would be designed to reveal whether there are clusters of athletes enrolled in identical courses or in courses with identical instructors, unusually high class GPAs in such courses or from such instructors, or grades significantly higher than predicted for athletes as compared to others in such courses or from such instructors. The presence of positive data in this regard is not necessarily an indication of compromised integrity, but compromised integrity would likely generate such indicators, and their presence should be a cause for concern and inquiry.

For this reason, the Coalition recommends that such data be collected and made available to campus faculty governance, which should also be empowered to report on it and investigate the significance of problematic features. In this regard, the Coalition recommends the adoption of an NCAA Division I bylaw, as follows:

3.1 Campuses shall collect data on athlete enrollments and grades by course section, including

indication of course GPAs, and data on choice of majors, for each individual sport, and shall convey that information to the campus Faculty Governance Body, ensuring that the anonymity of individual students is protected to the degree provided by law. Where no campus Faculty Governance Body exists, the information shall be conveyed to the Campus Athletics Board.

Until this policy may be adopted as an NCAA bylaw, the COIA recommends it as a best practice, to be considered and adapted by local campus faculty governance.

In addition, the Coalition recommends the following best practices:

3.2 Campus administrators and Faculty Governance Bodies should develop policies and procedures specifying the format in which such data will be presented, and the degree to which the data shall be made public or restricted, adhering in all cases to the requirements of FERPA protections.

3.3 The Faculty Governance Body should create a committee on academic integrity, specifically assigned to review and interpret data collected concerning athlete enrollment and grade patterns, in order to determine whether data consistent with a failure of academic integrity exist. This committee may be organized as a subcommittee of a standing committee on educational policies or academic affairs, to which it would report.

3.4 Campus administrators and Faculty Governance Bodies should develop policies and procedures allowing for investigation of problematic data concerning athlete enrollment or GPA patterns, and for remediation, if deemed necessary. The goal of these policies should be to ensure that faculty and advisors associated with all campus programs are maintaining standards of academic integrity with regard to students participating in intercollegiate athletics programs. Policies should include guidelines that will help assure that data are interpreted in a manner that is well informed and sensitive to patterns of student enrollment and performance independent of athletics.

□

It is equally a matter of concern that there is anecdotal evidence that instructors have been unwilling to afford to athletes the academic accommodations necessary for them to fulfill appropriate athletics commitments, for example, by refusing to provide make-up tests or otherwise penalizing athletes for missing classes during team travel periods, when campus regulations call for accommodations. Such actions or other forms of bias against athletes place these students in an untenable position and interfere with their ability to succeed academically. Campuses typically provide for academic accommodations in cases where students fulfill commitments as representatives of the institution, and these apply to athletes as

well. Therefore, the Coalition recommends as a best practice:

3.5 Faculty Governance Bodies should ensure that campus policies concerning accommodations to be granted students in the course of their representation of the institution be clearly codified and conveyed to all faculty. Procedures for reporting violations of these policies should be clearly stipulated and conveyed to all students, and mechanisms developed for mediation and adjudication.

On many campuses, team coaches have regular or adjunct academic appointments and offer courses for academic credit, generally related to athletics. While coaches may be well qualified to offer academic courses in some areas, the history of and potential for abuse are well known; in cases where an instructor-coach has grading authority over an athlete, conflict of interest is very clear. The Coalition offers the following proposals as best practices:

3.6 Campus administrations and Faculty Governance Bodies should develop policies regarding whether athletes can enroll in credit courses taught by a coach or other member of the athletics department staff. If permitted, campus administrations and Faculty Governance Bodies should develop procedures for monitoring enrollment, credit, and grades of athletes and non-athletes to minimize any appearance of or actual conflict of interest.

3.7 When an athlete is permitted to enroll in a course taught by his or her coach, that coach should not participate in any grade assignment for that athlete. Faculty Governance Bodies should consider whether such policies should be extended to cover assignment of grades by a coach to athletes in other varsity sports.

On some campuses, academic credit towards degrees is awarded for varsity participation. This practice has the potential to be in conflict with academic integrity, especially where the coaching staff is involved in assessing student performance. Therefore, the Coalition recommends the following policy:

3.8 Academic credit may be awarded for participation in varsity sports only if specifically approved by the campus faculty in its supervisory role over curriculum. Any such credit should not exceed a small number of total hours toward degree, such as 2-3 percent, and should be assigned only on a pass-fail basis. Faculty-approved procedures should be developed to monitor the awarding of such credit, and to address any cases of abuse that may arise.

4. Time Commitment, Missed Class Time, and Scheduling of Competitions

It is sometimes said that education is the only industry where the less one provides for the price the more pleased customers are. ♦ most of us, when we are students, welcome a day off from class or a homework-free weeknight. Athletes are no different, and the rewards of competition in an area of their special skills have the potential for many to weaken further the commitment to coursework and class attendance. Faculty work hard to engage students in learning, and perhaps in no other area does a university signal an inappropriate prioritization of athletics over academics than when, by policy or by administrative decisions, it sends the message that training or competitions take priority over class attendance and coursework. While travel time and the practicalities of tournament play may make some missed class days inevitable, it is the responsibility of faculty and administrators, at individual schools and in conferences, to ensure that missed time is kept to a carefully designed minimum.

4.1 Total time commitment

The NCAA has established detailed rules and monitoring procedures designed to limit to four hours per day and twenty hours per week the amount of training and competition time athletes are required to devote to their sports. This limit pertains only to required activities set by the coaching staff, not to personal decisions athletes may make to devote time to training, and for safety reasons, NCAA bylaws allow for coaching staff to provide general supervision for athletes undertaking personal training beyond the twenty-hour limit.

There is widespread belief that the twenty-hour rule is in many programs routinely violated, either purposefully, by coaching staffs, or because monitoring is not pursued with care or in good faith. Individual athletes must make their own choices about the amount of time they can devote to training, and the best choices will vary widely among athletes. But coaching staffs and others acting for the university are obligated to abide by the twenty-hour rule.

NCAA and conference groups continue to discuss how refinements in the twenty-hour rule can better accomplish its goals, and the COIA encourages these efforts. However, training-time issues involve an unusual number of ambiguous situations, and problems have less to do with inadequate rules than with a failure by coaching staffs to take seriously the academic priorities of the students who play for them. In the view of the COIA, to accomplish the goals of the twenty-hour rule, incentives must be created to help coaching staffs see their role as helping to foster the all-around student development that athletics has the potential to reinforce, rather than to

maximize athletics excellence, even at the cost of academics.

For this reason, the COIA supports a proposal under discussion by the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletes (N4A):

4.1.1 Head coaches must share accountability for the academic achievement of the athletes they select for admissions consideration. Data on continuing eligibility and graduation rates of each recruiting class brought by individual head coaches to their institutions should be maintained, relevant to the period during which the coach was employed at that institution and according to uniform standards, to establish a public record of the academic success of each coach. This record should follow a coach from institution to institution.

Such a process will increase the likelihood that a coach's commitment to appropriate academic-athletics balance will have an impact on the assessment of his or her success and the shape of his or her careers. It will also help ensure that in seeking team success, coaches are less likely inappropriately to recruit students who are not likely to succeed academically at their institutions, a practice that damages schools, students, and intercollegiate sports.

In addition, the COIA recommends as best practices:

4.1.2 The campus administration and athletics department, in consultation with the Campus Athletics Board, should establish clear policies regarding how the academic success of athletes bears on coaches' job descriptions, and how academic performance will be weighed in reviews and personnel decisions regarding coaching staffs. Campus procedures should allow the Campus Athletics Board or its personnel subcommittee to review policy implementation, and to report annually to the campus administration and Faculty Governance Body its assessment of the integrity with which these policies are implemented.

4.1.3 Procedures for exit interviews with athletes should include a focus on issues pertaining to compliance with the twenty-hour rule, and these data should be considered by the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) and Campus Athletics Board in assessments of program integrity.

4.2 Calendar approval procedures

Missed class days are a matter of academic integrity. It is essential that faculty recognize and respect the fact that classes missed because of competition are beyond the control of athletes, and make accommodations to allow athletes to complete course requirements without

prejudice. But when athletes miss more than a minimal number of classes instructional goals are undermined and time and resources are increasingly diverted to help athletes compensate, at cost to faculty and other students. Accordingly, faculty have a deep interest in ensuring that athletics scheduling accords with NCAA principles for minimizing interference with academics, and competition schedules should be approved with meaningful faculty participation.

Schedules are developed at both institutional and conference levels, and procedures for approval at both levels should involve faculty. Many scheduling arrangements are made years in advance and others are determined in the context of complex contract negotiations on the conference level. Meaningful faculty participation means that approval of appropriate faculty, such as FARs and members of the Campus Athletics Board, is sought at points where changes in scheduling can realistically be made.

The COIA recommends the following best practices:

4.2.1 Each campus should develop a set of principles concerning norms and limits of missed class time that should guide annual approval decisions in each sport. These principles should be developed in consultation with the FAR, the Campus Athletics Board, and the Faculty Governance Body.

4.2.2 Each conference should develop a set of principles concerning norms and limits of missed class time that should guide annual approval decisions in each sport. These principles should be developed by conference FARs, in consultation with their Campus Athletics Boards and Faculty Governance Bodies, and should not be less restrictive than campus-based principles of conference members.

4.2.3 Annual conference competition schedules should be in accord with conference principles on missed class time and be adopted only with approval by conference FARs, who should be consulted on all conference scheduling plans and options at a point early enough that their views will affect the final plan offered for their approval.

4.2.4 Annual non-conference competition schedules should accord with individual campus principles on missed class time and be adopted only with approval by the Campus Athletics Board, which should be consulted on all conference scheduling plans and options at a point early enough that its views will affect the final plan offered for their approval.

4.3 Season length and scheduling

NCAA bylaws specify that member institutions shall limit season length and other scheduling elements to minimize interference with the academic programs of its athletes. However, it is clear that in certain sports, seasons are so long or scheduled in such a way as to interfere with coursework to an unacceptable degree. This is particularly true of some spring sports such as baseball, softball, and golf, where the high number of competitions requires many missed class days, and of basketball, where the competitive season bridges two semester terms. In addition, the growth of post-season competition in some sports over the past few decades has resulted in a lengthening of the total season, and conference reorganizations that have broadened the geographical scope of many conferences have added travel time.

In addition, there is an increasing trend in televised sports for conferences to enter into contracts that require weekday or weeknight competitions. These add to the class days missed by

athletes. Particularly problematic are cases where schools without facilities to accommodate the demands of weekday football nevertheless agree to television contracts that require them to do so, resulting in the canceling of a class day for an entire campus in order to stage a sports event.

Although schools theoretically control their scheduling choices, in fact, the dynamics of conference play and the role of conferences in media contracts make the conference a key player in determining schedules. In recent years, the proliferation of pre-season tournaments as well as post-season conference tournaments has contributed more than any other single factor to the lengthening of seasons.

Competitive seasons should be long enough to allow athletes to progress in skill development, coalesce in team sports, allow most or all team members chances to participate in a variety of competitive situations, and establish a basis for overall team competition based on total wins and losses. These criteria allow intercollegiate athletics to accomplish the positive effects that give it value to students and campuses. Seasons should not extend over more competitions or more calendar time than necessary to accomplish these goals, since further extension generates at best diminishing positive returns at direct cost to the academic progress of athletes. With regard to season length, COIA supports the following proposal:

4.3.1 The NCAA should continue to review the present limits on regular season length, in order to determine the number of competitions necessary to accomplish the basic goals of each sport. NCAA limits on regular season competitions should be adjusted to match these recommendations. Adjustments that are warranted on academic grounds must be made regardless of the financial implications; if it is found that the season schedule of a revenue sport, such as basketball, is creating challenges to academic success too demanding for athletes realistically to meet, its length must be reduced.

The NCAA permits schools to divide seasons into two distinct segments in sports other than football and basketball; this option may be restricted to a split of training seasons, but may also involve intercollegiate competitions. In some sports, this has led to the establishment of ♦non-traditional playing seasons.♦ Engagement in both traditional and non-traditional seasons means athletes may experience no school terms free of the pressures of intercollegiate competitions, and for students who need a ♦breather♦ to focus on academics, this can be a difficult problem that outweighs any possible benefits a split season may offer. Therefore:

4.3.2 NCAA bylaws should be amended so that divided competition seasons are not permitted.

4.3.3 In recent years athletics schedules have expanded in at least the following additional two ways, which impinge on the academic schedule: 1) seasons have been expanded at the beginning and at the end, particularly with regard to the proliferation of post-season conference tournaments, 2) athletic events have increasingly been scheduled on weekdays. The Coalition urges the NCAA and the conferences to begin reversing these trends. We recognize that for some universities and in some sports, this goal may remain elusive and that the process may require as long as a decade to accomplish.

4.3.4 Institutions should not permit cancellation of campuswide classes for an athletics event. We urge the NCAA Division IA membership to explore ways in which this can become a uniformly observed principle.

□

It is travel to other schools for competitions that most often leads to missed class days for

athletes.

4.3.5 The NCAA should collect data and develop norms governing maximum times before and after competitions that travel schedules may permit. Such policy should include guidelines for exceptional cases and a waiver procedure, but should establish uniformity in the priority given to minimizing missed class days.

□

Academic calendars differ among schools and it is difficult to generalize about what periods of time may be more important academically than others. However, it is unquestionable that periods of final exams are critical and athletes should not be required to participate in competitions during final exam periods. Ultimately, competition calendars are primarily developed at the conference level and approved by institutions. The Coalition recommends that the following rule be adopted at the highest level of application possible: either at the institutional and conference levels, or as an NCAA bylaw:

4.3.6 An institution shall not schedule athletics competitions during final exam periods on that school's campus; conferences shall develop their schedules to accommodate the final exam calendars of all member institutions.

5. Policies Concerning the Office of Academic Advising for Athletes (OAAA)

NCAA legislation addresses only baseline programs and services to be provided by Division I schools, and there is wide variation in the quality and breadth of services provided to athletes. Academic advisors for athletes have become professionalized, with their own national organization; advisors on individual campuses receive guidance from their national association, and also respond to formal and informal requirements set for them by the institution and athletics department personnel.

The success of athlete advising is critical for the academic integrity of campus sports programs. Faculty have a responsibility to understand the role of the Office of Academic Advising for Athletes (OAAA), and to be assured that it is structured to operate with integrity. The participation of the director of the OAAA on the Campus Athletics Board has been recommended by the COIA as a best practice.

There is a natural tension between the academic goals of advising and goals of athletics success shared by athletes and coaches. Program integrity does not require eliminating this tension ♦ it is an inevitable feature of college sports. Integrity is the product of managing this tension in such a way that the academic focus of the college experience is preserved. To the degree that coaches and Athletics Directors share this goal of integrity, the advisor's task is simplified. When this is not the case, advisors are the front line for preserving academic integrity.

The single most difficult issue that confronts the OAAA is to maintain a focus on maximizing the academic accomplishments of athletes, given their athletics commitments, rather than on maintaining their athletic eligibility. A focus on eligibility will lead athletes towards unchallenging courses and majors, and overuse of academic support. Eligibility standards are the lowest levels of academic accomplishment that universities will tolerate, not goals for students to aim for. Historically, advisors have often encountered pressures from coaches and others to minimize the academic challenges athletes face in order to ensure continuing eligibility and meet graduation rate expectations. Athletes may adopt these minimal goals as well. The OAAA must be structured and led in ways that will help it resist these pressures and focus on motivating athletes to use their academic opportunities to maximize personal growth, intellectual skills, and career success.

The proposed guidelines are not meant to be comprehensive or exhaustive, and it is not expected that each guideline will be applicable to every institution. The guidelines are best used jointly by members of the OAAA, those involved in campus athletics governance, and faculty governance leaders to assess current programs and envision possible improvements.

Certain values or principles inform many of these guidelines. These principles provide a rationale for the recommendations of effective practices.

Academic integrity. The core mission of athletic academic support programs should be to help athletes maximize their academic performance, assume responsibility for their learning, reach attainable academic goals, and make progress toward degree completion. Because the focus of advising is academic achievement and personal growth, although the pressures and rewards of athletics participation are central issues for athletes and their advisors, the role of advisors must be to advocate for *academic* choices and efforts that are in the athletes' interest and have integrity.

Integration. Athletes should be integrated in the student body, culture, and community. The intercollegiate athletics program, including its academic support services, should be an integral part of the institution's educational system. While the OAAA provides specialized services to athletes, it should encourage and expect athletes to utilize the institution's regular academic services.

Scrutiny and support. Unique among campus advisors, academic advisors for athletes are at the interface of the often competing pressures that characterize all intercollegiate athletics: the dual imperatives to succeed academically and athletically. While many athletics departments, administrators, and coaches are committed to fostering academic excellence, history indicates that athletics advisors may sometimes feel strong pressures to prioritize the interests of teams over their judgments of the academic interests of individual students. For this reason, the

academic advising office must receive strong institutional support and attention.

Personal adjustment. Programs and services should help athletes adjust effectively to the various developmental transitions they face in college. Skills needed to cope with changes from high school to college, and then to life after college, should be provided in a well-designed and integrated program. Successful programs will ensure that while the OAAA monitors athletes' academic accomplishment, athletes are led to take increasing responsibility for utilizing campus resources and pursuing academic goals.

Effectiveness. Programs should be held accountable for quality and impact on students' academic achievement. Assessments of programs and services, both internal and external, should be made on a regular schedule.

Campus comparability. The unit's mission and breadth of services should be conceived in terms of the norms of the campus. Because athletes require special skills in time management, must track eligibility issues in making academic choices, and miss classes because of competition schedules, there is reason to provide athletes with enhanced support services. However, athlete support must not reach levels that eliminate academic challenges essential to intellectual growth or that create visible inequities on campus that suggest privileged status and undermine the mission of athletics to promote campus community and loyalty. Similarly, while campuses should ensure that Offices of Academic Advising for Athletes have staff, salary, and budget support commensurate with the challenges and responsibilities undertaken, qualified and well staffed undergraduate advising must be a campuswide priority, and support for athletics advising must not be at a level that creates campus resentment by indicating prioritization of athletics over other parts of the academic community.

Guidelines for the Office of Academic Advising for Athletes

[Drafting comments are added to this section for clarity.]

5.1. Organization

5.1.1 The OAAA should report directly to the campus office of academic affairs. Campuses may choose to have a secondary reporting line to the Director of Athletics, but primary control over academic advising must derive from the chief academic officer of the campus.

Advising is an academic function, and it belongs primarily to the academic side; the campus academic affairs office must be accountable for the quality and integrity of the advising provided all its students. For this reason, the OAAA should report to the office of the chief academic officer of the campus. The campus office of academic affairs should be responsible for and involved with OAAA personnel decisions, supervise policies and procedures for academic advising of athletes, and have authority in budget decisions concerning academic advising. However, it is essential that the OAAA operate with the strong support of the Director of Athletics, in order to combat potential pressures to substitute the goal of continued eligibility for academic accomplishment, and to motivate athletes to make the most of academic opportunities. In addition, it is common for the OAAA to provide athlete services beyond advising, and the design and operation of these services requires the involvement and support of the Athletics Department. Athletics Directors should be provided positive opportunities for engagement with the OAAA mission. Campuses should consider, in delineating OAAA reporting lines, whether this goal will best be met by means of a secondary reporting line or by other means through which the AD can become positively engaged in the mission of the OAAA. The structure that will best ensure support of the OAAA academic mission and best guard against efforts to focus on eligibility over accomplishment, in light of campus culture and organization, will represent the best practice for each campus. However, in all cases, ultimate accountability for the integrity of the OAAA must lie clearly with the chief academic officer.

5.1.2 The OAAA should work closely with the FAR.

The free flow of information between the OAAA and the FAR allows the FAR to support the academic mission of the OAAA, in accord with the role of faculty representative. The FAR should be fully apprised by the OAAA Director of all issues bearing on the integrity of the advising program.

5.1.3 The OAAA should be represented by its Director on a regularly convened committee that monitors the relationship between athletics programs and campus academic and support units, bringing together administrative officers and others responsible for key elements of athlete support and services, such as the Registrar, Bursar, Athletics Director, FAR, Compliance Officer, and a high academic administrator. The OAAA Director and FAR should have the prerogative to introduce agenda items.

5.1.4 The OAAA should collaborate closely with other campus advising units.

A full understanding of the goals, practices, and requirements of campuswide and departmental advising units is essential to ensuring that the OAAA meets the highest campus standards of academic advising, makes maximum use of campus resources, and enables athletes to be aware

and make use of the resources available to other students.

5.1.5 The OAAA should collaborate closely with other campus student support units.

Close coordination with student service units on campus will help ensure that OAAA services conform to best campus practices, that athletes make the best use of these services, and that the OAAA does not inefficiently duplicate services already provided on campus.

5.1.6 The OAAA should have a clearly defined mission statement, consistent with that of the campus, which specifies the centrality of academic integrity to the unit mission.

5.1.7 The OAAA should develop regular and frequent internal self-assessment procedures for all its programs, and work with the campus to arrange periodic campus assessments of its academic advising and athlete services components, to ensure successful external NCAA certification reviews.

In order to create a continuing dynamic for improved OAAA services, the NCAA, perhaps in conjunction with the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletes, should devote resources to research on effective OAAA programs. Conferences are encouraged to support annual meetings of OAAA directors to discuss problems, opportunities, and best practices.

5.2. Personnel

A. Director

5.2.1 The Director should have a Master's or Doctoral degree in student counseling or a related field.

The increasing responsibilities of the OAAA on many campuses has led at some schools to a required or preferred qualification of a doctoral degree in a field of relevant expertise, and this is

recommended as a best practice.

5.2.2 The Director should have prior experience in student counseling, personnel and budget management, and athletics, with a history of rules compliance and commitment to ethical practices.

5.2.3 The Director should have independence in developing and implementing policies related to academic advising, subject to the supervision of the campus office of academic affairs.

5.2.4 The Director should be directly responsible for the development of program budgets, allocation of unit resources, assignment of advisor case loads and other unit duties, and all unit personnel decisions.

5.2.5 The Director should be responsible for designing and supervising advisor training programs.

5.2.6 The Director should have final authority over advising staff, under the supervision of the campus chief academic officer, subject only to usual institutional rules governing the authority and responsibility of unit heads.

5.2.7 The Director should have appropriate and specified authority over support staff.

5.2.8 The Director should be responsible for designing and supervising tutor and mentor training programs.

5.2.9 The salary of the Director, and of all positions in the OAAA, should be determined by the office of academic affairs, with due regard for the specialized skills and work schedules of OAAA personnel, external market conditions, and issues of campus equity.

B. Academic Advisors

5.2.10 OAAA Advisors should preferably have a Master's degree in student counseling or a related field, and experience in student counseling.

5.2.11 Advisors should participate in professional development opportunities.

5.2.12 Advisors should participate in on-campus training provided by other campus academic or advising units.

5.2.13 Advisors should be assigned manageable case loads.

5.2.14 No advisor should report directly to a coach.

5.2.15 A single advisor should not serve as the sole advisor assigned to work with a specific team; multiple advisors should share team advising duties. There are many conveniences to assigning all members of a team to a single advisor; however, there is significant potential for the authority and independence of advisors to be undermined, and the assignment of multiple advisors to teams is a best practice designed to improve conditions for academic integrity.

Although many coaches are committed to the academic success of their athletes, the influence of coaches over academic advising should be strictly limited. There is a significant imbalance of power between coaches and advisors, and coaches' goals may differ significantly from those of academic advisors; these problems are reduced when advisors interact with a coach as a group. Schools that have adopted this model have reported success, but it has not been broadly tested. It is recommended that schools consider its advantages in seeking to improve academic integrity in advising, and that information on the comparative merits of the two systems be collected for ongoing assessment.

5.2.16 Advisors should communicate closely with advisors in athletes' major departments, in order to ensure that athletes receive consistent and accurate counseling.

5.2.17 Advisors should review and have the option to endorse petitions for NCAA academic waivers.

NCAA continuing eligibility requirements may sometimes conflict with legitimate academic goals, such as changes of major motivated by shifts in student interest or career goals. Judicious NCAA review of petitions will be more likely if reliable advisor assessments are included. Campuses should include advisors in such petition procedures, and should design procedures to ensure that advisor judgments about the academic integrity of petitions are not subject to distortion.

5.2.18 Academic advisors, not coaches, should be the contact point between the athletics department and instructors. Coaches should be forbidden from initiating contact with instructors regarding the academic progress or status of individual students.

5.2.19 Academic advisors, not coaches, should have the primary responsibility in the athlete's selection of major and specific courses.

C. Other Appointees

5.2.20 Learning specialists, life-skill coordinators, and other additional staff should be appointed to manage major OAAA program activities apart from academic advising, as necessary. These positions may be shared with other campus student services units to maximize efficient use of resources.

5.3. Programmatic Functions

A. Academic Advising

The OAAA should perform the following functions:

5.3.1 Re-assessment of newly enrolled athletes' abilities and skills.

Because the proportion of sponsored admits tends to be higher for athletes than for other student populations, the identification of at-risk students is particularly critical for the OAAA. Because of the potential for the time management problems associated with athletics to interfere with academic achievement, it is unusually important for advisors to athletes to be able to set baseline academic expectations for individual students.

5.3.2 Academic counseling for academic progress.

The central function of academic advisors for athletes is high quality counseling to optimize students' academic accomplishments, relative to their academic potential and their evolving long-term goals.

5.3.3 Monitoring and tracking academic progress during semesters and towards degree completion.

Because of the competing demands of athletics and academics, the OAAA is more proactive in monitoring and evaluating student progress than other campus advising units.

5.3.4 Assisting students in identifying career goals and choosing a major.

This function may require coordination with campus or other unit advisors. Advisors must help students focus on their long-range interests in choosing a major, rather than on the goal of minimizing potential time and effort conflicts between academics and athletics.

5.3.5 Offering assistance in course scheduling.

Once students choose a major, departmental advisors should be chiefly responsible for course scheduling advice, but the OAAA may continue involvement in order to review for issues of eligibility and time conflicts. The objective should be to resolve conflicts so as best to accommodate academic goals.

5.3.6 Monitoring issues of academic eligibility.

Advisors ensure that students are aware of institutional and departmental requirements to remain in good academic standing.

5.3.7 Monitoring issues of athletic eligibility.

The OAAA provides athletes with information concerning all policies related to eligibility, and assists the student in assessing how best to accomplish academic goals while maintaining eligibility. Advisors coordinate with certification specialists in order to ensure that students are able to make well-informed decisions.

B. Academic Support Services

The OAAA should provide the following academic support services:

5.3.8 Specialized programming and assistance for the freshman transition.

5.3.9 Assistance to students in developing academic planning and time management skills.

Time management is an unusually critical issue for athletes. The OAAA should have programs to help all athletes develop superior time management skills.

5.3.10 Mentoring for at-risk students.

While, in principle, schools assess athletics success as one predictor of college achievement, the OAAA must anticipate that a portion of athletes will be underprepared for college academically. Individualized mentoring programs, particularly for first- and second-year at risk students, must be a significant unit focus. However, it is equally critical that athletes in these programs realize that they are expected to develop the skills necessary for college success in a timely manner. Mentoring programs must be designed to foster student academic independence, and should limit interventions in such a way as to promote this goal.

5.3.11 Access to tutors and, when appropriate, mentors.

The OAAA guides athletes who need special academic help to student tutors and/or mentors. Historically, academic dishonesty associated with tutoring has been a problem with some athletics programs; therefore, the following item is an important facet of OAAA management.

5.3.12 Training and supervision for tutors and mentors.

Prospective tutors should be carefully vetted for academic qualifications and experience. The OAAA must provide significant training for tutors. This training must involve a review of ethical problems that have emerged in the past and detailed guidelines for ethical behavior. Programs are advised to develop contracts that specify the responsibilities of tutors. Tutoring should be restricted to on-site meetings, or reports of tutoring activities should be submitted by tutors for individual tutoring sessions. Although tutors and athletes bear responsibility for the integrity of the tutoring process, the OAAA is accountable for adhering proactively to best practice standards in the hiring, training, and supervision of tutors and mentors.

5.3.13 Other appropriate learning interventions.

These may include classroom checks, required study tables, surrogate class attendees when athletes are at off-campus competitions, and so forth. The principle governing such arrangements is that athletes should be responsible for the maximum effort of which they are academically capable, and the level of intervention should anticipate increasingly mature and responsible behavior. For example, while classroom checks may be considered appropriate for first-year students, to enforce them for juniors or seniors is to perpetuate an expectation of irresponsibility. Increasing independence and responsibility is essential to the college experience. It is unacceptable for the OAAA to inhibit this process in order to minimize risks of academic problems for teams.

5.3.14 Study facilities available and accessible to athletes.

Because athletes spend a great deal of time on the athletics campus, which is frequently at some distance from other parts of the campus, athletics study facilities should be available. Such facilities also should allow the OAAA to monitor tutorials, required study tables, and so forth, which may be especially valuable in helping athletes make the transition to college. It should be emphasized that athletes are fully responsible for making use of other campus facilities, such as the Library.

5.3.15 Laptop computer loans for athletics travel.

5.3.16 Priority registration services.

New NCAA progress-towards-degree requirements make it increasingly necessary for athletes to have some level of priority in class choices, a service that has previously been justified principally on the basis of athletics practice scheduling conflicts. Registration is a campuswide issue, and campus faculty should develop policy governing registration privileges for student groups with special needs that gives due consideration to the increased scheduling pressures on athletes.

C. Athlete Support Services

By providing a range of the following support services to athletes the OAAA can reinforce its overall function in promoting academic strength:

5.3.17 Programs for or assistance concerning transition out of collegiate sports.

5.3.18 Information on campus programs and services relating to: life skills development, career exploration, career skills assessment, job search preparation, graduate school application, internships, and so forth. Where campus services may not exist, the OAAA may advocate for them, or provide independent services for athletes.

It is important for the integration of athletes in the campus student body that they be aware of and make use of the resources of the campus. Wherever possible, the OAAA should refrain from establishing independent programs, and instead coordinate with other campus units and proactively encourage athletes to visit them in order to make best use of the services the campus provides.

5.3.19 Support for the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC).

5.3.20 Organization of appropriate community service activities for athletes.

5.3.21 Academic awards ceremonies and other activities to recognize academic accomplishments and create additional incentives.

5.3.22 A substance abuse education program that addresses alcohol abuse, performance enhancing drug abuse, recreational drug abuse, and other forms of substance abuse, or participates in campuswide programs.

5.3.23 A media education program.

5.3.24 Internship or graduate assistantship programs related to athletics.

5.3.25 Programs to educate athletes concerning agents and NCAA and campus rules governing contact with them.

5.3.26 Programs in diversity awareness; the OAAA may participate in campuswide programs.

5.3.27 A gambling abuse education program.

5.3.28 Programs on sexual harassment and sexual misconduct awareness; the OAAA may participate in campuswide programs.

9. LIBRARY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION ON FUNDING

Library Committee Chair, Professor Barry Kues (Earth and Planetary Sciences), presented the following resolution from the Library Committee. The resolution urges allocation of two percent of main campus facilities and administrative funding to UNM's University Libraries. After discussion, the following resolution passed as amended, by voice vote.

Resolution to Allocate Two Percent of Main Campus Facilities & Administrative Funding to the University of New Mexico's University Libraries

The Faculty Senate Library Committee (FSLC) realizes there is a limited amount of Facilities and Administration (F&A) funding available, and many demands are made upon this funding. However, most of these funds are allocated to specific units on campus, whereas UNM's University Libraries are essential to the function of all departments, centers, institutes, and in conducting basic and applied research.

The factual and statistical case behind the rising costs of scholarly communication was presented in a white paper prepared in 2004 by the FSLC, *The Crisis in Scholarly Communication*. For example, it is stated, according to the Association of Research Libraries from 1987-1999 the Consumer Price Index increased by a cumulative total of 52%, while the unit cost of academic library journal subscriptions increased by 206%. Additionally, during this period academic and scientific publishers achieved profit margins of 40% or more per year, compared to the five percent annual average for the publishing industry as a whole. To compensate for increasing journal prices, the average U.S. research library purchased 26% less books in 1999 than it did in 1986.

UNM's University Libraries have received a fixed amount of \$25,500 annually as part of the F&A pool. This figure represents 0.17 % of the total F&A funds generated by main campus (in FY03), and has remained unchanged for many years. Thus, while research funds and associated F&A funds have grown significantly over the last decade at UNM (for example, total external funding has increased by 25% in the past four years), the amount allocated to University Libraries in support of this research has shrunk in both proportional and real terms. Therefore:

WHEREAS, adequate support for the University Libraries is essential to the health and growth of UNM's research effort in all disciplines;

WHEREAS, the unit cost of materials to support university research, such as journals and other scholarly publications, has increased substantially, far exceeding the rate of inflation, producing a budget crisis;

WHEREAS, University Libraries has had to cancel journals and will have to cancel journals in the near future in order to address the crisis;

WHEREAS, University Libraries has seen an increase in the availability of scholarly publications in electronic format, and faculty demand for these publications has increased while University Libraries has not received an increase in its budget for supporting these changes and demands;

WHEREAS, the book/monograph budget, which is essential to arts and humanities scholars, has declined because of the increase in journal subscription costs in the sciences and social sciences;

WHEREAS, the budget of the University Libraries have fallen far behind the growth of UNM's research endeavors, and will, without action, be unable to support the University's stated priority of significantly increasing research and external funding of research in the future;

WHEREAS, although the University Libraries have benefited from recent bond issues, these funds, while important, are temporary and are not a solution to the UNM Libraries' underfunding;

WHEREAS, other peer and comparable regional universities, (e.g., Oregon, Texas-Austin, Virginia, Washington State, Nevada-Las Vegas, New Mexico State, etc.), allocate to their libraries annually a percentage of their total F&A return ranging from one to seven percent;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the UNM Faculty Senate expects that an allocation of the first two percent of all incoming main campus F&A money will be made each fiscal year to University Libraries for the ongoing support of research at UNM. This funding should be viewed as an incremental increase, rather than replacement, to current funding support for University Libraries.

10. REVISION OF FACULTY HANDBOOK SECTION F70 ARTICULATION

Professor Emeriti Hugh Witemeyer (English), presented the following proposed revision to Section F70 of the Faculty Handbook. The language regarding faculty approvals in section C has the most revisions. The pre-approval process of branch campus faculty that are teaching courses transferable to the main campus, is not working. This process was posing a problem for the branches. Faculty are typically hired after the enrollment patterns for the course have become clear. It is hard to arrange pre-approvals before the semester has begun. Also, approval requests are not treated the same by chairpersons throughout the schools and colleges on campus.

F70 Policy

ARTICULATION: DEGREE APPROVAL, TRANSFER OF COURSE CREDIT, AND FACULTY APPROVAL

Articulation: Though the branch colleges operate under an admissions policy different from that of the main campus, their degree offerings are approved by the University of New Mexico and many of their courses carry transfer credit toward UNM baccalaureate degrees. This connection or articulation of programs means that branch college faculty members may be required to meet a more specific set of approval standards in order to teach transferable courses than to teach non-transferable courses. The policies which govern the articulation of degree programs, course credit, and faculty approval between the UNM branch colleges and the main campus are presented below.

A. Degree Approval

1. All associate degree programs offered at the main campus in Albuquerque are authorized to be offered at the branches, upon approval by the appropriate college and department or program on the Albuquerque campus.
2. To meet local needs, the branches are authorized to develop and offer, with the approval of the Undergraduate Committee, the Curricula Committee, and the Faculty Senate, programs leading to the degrees of Associate of Arts and Associate of Sciences. The branches are also authorized to develop and offer, with the approval of the Office of the Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, programs leading to the degree of Associate of Applied Sciences. The transferability to the main campus of credit for courses in these programs will be determined in accordance with the policy statements B. 1, 2, and 3 below.

B. Transfer of Course Credit

The University will accept baccalaureate credits earned by students at any UNM branch college, in accordance with the following policy:

1. Credits earned in lower division courses that appear in the UNM Catalog and/or UNM Schedule of Classes, which have been submitted by the branches and approved for credit by the appropriate department or program and the UNM Curricula Committee, and the branch instructor, content, and level of performance for said courses having been approved by the appropriate main campus department or program, will be accepted by the University as though they were earned on the main campus at the University in Albuquerque.
2. New lower division courses which do not appear in the UNM Catalog and/or the UNM Schedule of Classes will be accepted by the University as though they were earned on the main campus if they have been designed by the branches in cooperation with the appropriate main campus department or program and college; approved for credit by the appropriate department or program and college and by the UNM Curricula Committee; and approved for their instructor, content, and level of performance by the appropriate main campus department or program.
3. New and existing lower division courses designed by the branches which do not appear in the UNM Catalog and/or the UNM Schedule of

Classes, and which have not been approved by a main campus department and the UNM Curricula Committee prior to being offered, are generally not acceptable for baccalaureate credit except (a) by petition and approval from the UNM degree granting unit, or (b) if determined to be equivalent to a main campus course by the UNM department or program which offers that course.

4. Special curricular offerings are authorized to meet local educational needs which are not being met by other institutions in the area. The transferability to the main campus of credit for these offerings will be determined in accordance with the policy statements B. 1, 2, and 3 above.

C. Faculty Approval

1. Approval standards for transferable courses . Branch college courses carrying pre-designated transferability shall be offered by approved faculty. Tenured/tenure track faculty, by virtue of the standards required for their appointment, are automatically approved to teach transferable courses in their fields of credentialed expertise. Non-tenured/tenure track faculty, and tenured/tenure track faculty teaching outside their fields of credentialed expertise, must be approved to teach transferable courses before or as early as possible during the first semester in which they offer those courses. To be approved to teach transferable courses, faculty members shall meet written standards appropriate to the courses they are to offer.

2. Formulation of standards . The faculty approval standards for each transferable course shall be formulated in writing and adopted jointly by the appropriate branch college and main campus administrators. Normally these will be the administrators immediately responsible for supervising course offerings in a particular field: e.g., the chairs (or directors or coordinators or heads) of the departments or programs in the relevant discipline. Once formulated, the standards for each course shall be transmitted to, and reviewed by, the Office of the Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. The standards shall be kept on file by the Office of the Provost and by the branch college and main campus administrators who formulated them. They shall be transferred to, and applied in a consistent manner by, subsequent administrators, and they shall be revised only by joint written agreement of the appropriate administrators holding office at the time. All revisions shall be promptly transmitted to, and reviewed by, the Office of the Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic

Affairs.

3. Implementation of standards. The determination that a prospective instructor meets the faculty approval standards for a transferable course shall initially be made by the appropriate administrator (department chair, program director, coordinator, or head) at the branch college. Approval of the instructor shall then be reviewed and confirmed or denied by the college's Dean of Instruction. If the Dean confirms the approval, the branch college may hire the instructor prior to receiving main campus approval. The approval shall then be forwarded to the Branch Executive Director for recommendation to the appropriate main campus department chair or program director; it shall be submitted no later than the third week of the semester. The approval shall be accompanied by copies of the faculty member's vita and syllabus for the course in question. The main campus administrator shall confirm or deny the approval before or as early as possible during the first semester in which the faculty member offers the course. This decision shall be promptly communicated in writing to the appropriate branch campus administrator, the Dean of Instruction, and, if the approval is denied, the Office of the Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

4. Denial of approval. If faculty approval is denied, the main campus administrator shall communicate the reasons for this decision in writing to the appropriate branch college administrator, the Dean of Instruction, and the Office of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. This communication shall refer specifically to the written faculty approval standards for the course in question but may include other considerations as well. Courses already in progress shall not be cancelled solely because faculty approval is denied or delayed. If approval is denied, the main campus administrator shall work with the branch college administrator to identify and employ an eligible substitute instructor. If no eligible substitute can be obtained, the faculty member who began the course shall finish it under the supervision of the branch college administrator; but the same faculty member shall not be employed again to teach the same course, or any other course that has comparable approval standards, unless s/he has received branch college and main campus approval to do so before the course begins.

5. Exemptions from standards. Faculty members may teach transferable courses without meeting established approval standards only if the appropriate branch college administrator submits, and the Dean of Instruction supports, a request for an individual exemption from the

standards. . The request shall be accompanied by a detailed explanation of the reasons for the request and by the proposed faculty member's vita and syllabus for the course in question. The request shall be submitted to the appropriate main campus administrator no later than two weeks before the semester begins. If the request is not approved by the appropriate main campus administrator before the course begins, the course shall not be offered by the proposed instructor.

6. Non-transferable courses . Branch college courses not carrying pre-designated transferability shall be offered by faculty who meet the appointment standards set forth in the college's statement on appointment and retention (see section F60 below), and who are recommended for appointment by the appropriate branch college administrator (department chair, program director, coordinator, or head), the Dean of Instruction, and the Branch Executive Director. In making recommendations concerning all faculty appointments, administrators shall act in accordance with the standards and procedures set forth in the branch college statement on appointment and retention and in section F60 below. All faculty appointments are subject to review by the Provost/Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

11. REPORT ON HEALTH SCIENCE CENTER CAUCUS

This agenda item was deferred to the April 26, 2005 Faculty Senate meeting due to time concerns.

12. FACULTY SENATE BUDGET SUMMIT STATEMENT

President Ed De Santis presented the proposed Faculty Senate's budget recommendations for the April 1, 2005 Budget Summit. After much discussion, an amendment was proposed to Budgetary Recommendation item number one, changing the recommendation from a four percent salary increase to a seven percent increase. The amendment passed with 14 votes for and 13 votes against. The following document, as amended, will be submitted for the Budget Summit as the position of the Faculty Senate.

FACULTY SENATE STATEMENT ON BUDGETING PRIORITIES 2005-2006

Introduction:

The UNM Budget Summit on April 1, 2004 was an historic event on campus. Perhaps for the first time in the life of the University the administration, the faculty, the staff and the students collaborated on a matter of great significance to the institution: its budget. What had been previously discussed in private by a small group of people was now debated with candor and strength of conviction in open forum. In this same spirit the Faculty Senate and the Operations Committee presented to the community at large and to the administration their budgeting recommendations for the next fiscal year and beyond.

Summary of Recommendations to Rationalize and Improve the Budgeting Process:

1. The faculty and other core constituencies ought to be integrally involved in more transparent budgetary decision-making.
2. Funds appropriated by the legislature for faculty salaries should be used for that purpose and no other. To avoid frustrating the intent of the legislature, no percentage of these funds should be directed elsewhere, such as for operating expenses.
3. The mean percentage salary increases should be the same for faculty and administrators.
4. Counter-offers should be made only when a written offer from a comparable university is in hand, and only after consultation between faculty colleagues, the department chair, and the dean.
5. There should be an annual accounting of the use of indirect costs (IDC) garnered from contracts and grants generated by the faculty.

Summary of Budgetary Recommendations for FY 2005-2006:

1. Given the continuing importance of bringing UNM faculty salaries up to the mean of our peer group, the average percentage salary increase should be at least seven percent. Since UNM tuition levels remain at the bottom of our peer group, raising tuition to fund a modest faculty salary increase is desirable.
2. The same percentage increase should be given to the School of Medicine faculty, the staff, and the continuing part-time faculty.
3. Two percent of indirect cost funds (IDC) should be allocated to the University Libraries.
4. We recommend an increase in the range of 25% to 40% to continue and enhance funding for University College 's successful student retention and graduation initiatives.
5. We endorse SB 181 (regarding the Educational Retirement Act), which awaits the Governor's signature. The bill calls for a .75% increase in employer contributions for seven years, and a .075% increase in employee contributions for four years. This would result in a 13.9% increase for employers and a 7.9% increase for employees.
6. Some recurring money should be set aside at the college level for equity adjustments in

faculty salaries.

7. Preserving and expanding tenure track faculty positions are a priority. However, until and if the use of contingent faculty should decline, those part-time faculty who are regularly employed deserve fair compensation and benefits.

Statement of Budgetary Priorities, 2005-2006:

The spirit of cooperation and collaboration manifested by all the parties engaged in the budget summit must not be limited to a single annual event. Day by day university life grows more complex, a reality that calls for increased and open communication. A transparent and collaborative budgeting process is important.

UNM's national and international standing is a critical factor in state development efforts, Standing is a direct result of the ability of the University to recruit, retain and sustain high-quality faculty teaching, research and service. Consistent with our strategic plan and the state's long-term economic and educational goals, a five-year plan should be developed that specifies incremental increases to assure that faculty salaries reach the mean of peer institutions. Faculty salary increases at a minimum should be set above the cost-of-living increase and take merit into account. Mean percentage salary increases of medical school faculty should equal those of the main campus faculty. Mean percentage salary increases for those administrators at the deans' level and above should equal the mean percentage salary increases for faculty.

Substantial additional funding will be generated by the funding formula, owing to increased enrollment during the past few years. A significant portion of these I and G funds should be allocated to new tenure-track faculty positions to accommodate increased teaching loads necessitated by the growing enrollment. Until and if the use of contingent faculty should decline, those part-time faculty who are regularly employed deserve fair compensation and benefits.

The faculty is concerned about the financial health of the pension funds managed by the Educational Retirement Board (ERB), and urges full disclosure of the current status of these funds and appropriate adjustments so that there are no unfunded liabilities in the future. Any adjustments should be made in such a way that they do not adversely affect increases in UNM's already low faculty salaries (such as significant increases in employee contributions to the retirement fund).

UNM is about at the national average of the cost of living increase. We are 20% behind the national average of faculty salaries and 15% behind our peer institutions. Is there an audit of the money spent for faculty salaries? Are we as an institution gradually reducing our reliance on state funded salaries? Will the Director of Internal Audit report if and to what extent waste is the result of some of our spending habits? We express these concerns because, compared with our peer group, we are at the bottom in undergraduate resident tuition and fee rates, our salaries are

close to the bottom, and our IDC is 50%.

The University Libraries are major resources for teaching and research. Just as we fear the growing risks of not adequately addressing the university's fraying infrastructure, so we cannot any longer delay having the necessary print and technological materials required by our faculty and students to carry on their research.

University College 's six programs aimed at retaining freshmen and increasing graduation rates are bearing fruit. High quality small group courses and seminars are becoming so successful that the goal of exposing more and more freshmen to these experiences may be inevitable, depending on how long funding will be available to do so.

We thank President Caldera for making the budget summit a true and substantive collaborative effort within the university. We look forward to working with Executive Vice-President David Harris, whose knowledge and experience we consider vital to the success of this project. Finally, we want to thank the Faculty Senate Budget Committee for their valuable assistance.

Ed De Santis, President, Faculty Senate

Operations Committee: Bill Bramble, Beverly Burris, Barry Kues, Anita Obermeier, Chris Smith and Tom White

13. NEW BUSINESS

No new business was raised.

14. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rick Holmes
Office of the Secretary