Memorandum

To: Irene Hanson Frieze, President Faculty Assembly

From: William Zamboni PhD PharmD Chair and James Irrgang PhD PT
       ATC Vice-Chair of Senate Athletic Committee

Re: Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics

Date: May 2, 2005

At your request, the Senate Athletic Committee (SAC) has once again discussed and debated the merits of joining the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA). At this time, the SAC does not recommend that the University of Pittsburgh Faculty Assembly join the COIA. The reasons for this recommendation are discussed below.

The COIA is an organization representing faculty senates of institutions that participate in Division IA athletics. Currently there are 52 institutions that have joined COIA. From the Big East Conference, only Connecticut, Rutgers and South Florida have joined COIA.

In January of 2005, the COIA adopted the document, Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics: Principles, Proposed Rules and Guidelines (see attached). This document contains recommendations for changes in NCAA bylaws as well as best practice guidelines or policies that address admissions, scholarships, curricular integrity, time commitment, missed class time, scheduling of competitions and policies concerning the Office of Academic Advising for Athletes. The SAC, with assistance from the Athletic Department, the Provost’s Office and the Faculty Athletic Representative reviewed performance of the University of Pittsburgh relative to the guidelines contained in this document in detail. This review was completed in the Spring of 2005 and the document was reviewed by the SAC in the Fall of 2005.

On December 9 2005 the SAC formally

At that meeting The consensus of the SAC is that the University of Pittsburgh meets or exceeds all of the best practice policies described in the COIA document. (should we include this as an attachment?)

There is no formal structure governing COIA. The organization has not adopted any bylaws and does not have any formal policies governing its actions. Direction for COIA is provided by a Steering Committee, however it is not clear how one
becomes a member of the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee creates proposals, such as the policy on Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics: Principles, Proposed Rules and Guidelines, which are then forwarded to the membership electronically for review and vote to approve. Proposals are adopted by 2/3 e-mail vote of all ballots that are cast. Amendments to the proposals may be submitted and are adopted by majority vote. Based upon our correspondence with Bob Eno, it does not appear that developing a formal governing structure is a priority for COIA at this time.

In prior COIA documents, it appeared that COIA believed Athletic Department should be governed and controlled by the "faculty governing body". Currently it appears that COIA's position is that the faculty athletics committee (i.e. the SAC) should play an oversight role related to the budget, play a major role in policy determination and report on these matters annually to the faculty governing board (i.e. the Faculty Senate). As stated in our May 2004 report, the SAC is unclear as to the degree of oversight of the Athletic Department that COIA supports. Furthermore, the SAC believes that we already function in this manner, as described in the SAC Mission Statement (see attached). Specifically, at the University of Pittsburgh the SAC recommends policies and procedures related to standards for athletic participation and codes governing the conduct of varsity sports and reviews standards for admission of student-athletes, matters pertaining to academic performance and standing and the academic and counseling support services provided to student-athletes. During our tenure as SAC members, any and all information related to these topics has been provided upon request to the SAC.

In correspondence that we have had with COIA as well as on the COIA website, it is stated that COIA has a close working relationships with the NCAA, the Division IA Faculty Athletics Representatives, the Division IA Athletics Directors Association and other national groups interested in intercollegiate athletics; however, there is little evidence to support this statement. Furthermore COIA states that they will be a catalyst for bringing these groups together to find solutions to very complex problems involving intercollegiate athletics. As evidenced by the recent Academic Performance Program, the SAC believes that there is already interest in reform to improve intercollegiate athletics and it is unlikely that COIA is in a position to serve as a catalyst for this reform.

In summary, given the lack of governing structure of COIA, the performance of the University of Pittsburgh relative to the guidelines contained in the Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics: Principles, Proposed Rules and Guidelines, the limited likelihood that COIA will contribute to reform of intercollegiate athletics and the current mission and function of the SAC, we do not believe that it is necessary or in best interest of the University of Pittsburgh Faculty Senate to join COIA.
We look forward to discussing the position of the SAC with you and other members of the Faculty Senate on May 3, 2005.