

Athletics and Recreation Committee Meeting

Minutes

April 2, 2019; Minno Conference Room, Peterson Events Center

Members in Attendance

Dr. Jay Irrgang, (Co-Chair), Dr. Laurel Roberts (Co-Chair), Dustin Gray, (Senior Associate Director of Athletics), Dr. Sheila Velez Martinez (FAR), Dr. Betsy Nagle, Dr. Matt Darnell, Dr. Dave DeJong (Chancellor Liaison), Matt Borelli (Student Representative) Dr. Amy Aggelou, Dr. Babs Mowery (Staff Association Council), Dr. Cindy Tannanis (Senate rep), Dr. Katelyn Allison, Dr. Jacques Bromberg, Dr. Donna Nativio (Pro-Tem);

- I. Meeting called to order and welcome b by Dr. Jay Irrgang and Dr. Laurel Roberts at 11.
- II. 1st discussion was led by Dr. Martinez regarding Operation Varsity Blues.
 - A. In response to recent national incidents, there was increased Pitt interest in an investigation of current prospective student athlete admission policies. Consensus by the FARS (??) committee report that operations seem solid with no extreme concern.
 - B. Dr. DeJong organized ad-hoc subcommittee which included FARS, Athletics, etc.. to further check this process. Examination of policies and procedures to verify the process has occurred as well as an internal audit to check students who have been brought in before. This provides stakeholders a better literacy and also requests recommendations for better communication as demonstrated by reporting to the Chancellor as well as Senate athletic committee. It was suggested by Dr. Tannanis to notify Senate of updates. Dr. Tananis also asked that reports be provided of summaries of the Path 2/3 cases.
 - C. Path 2 and Path 3 – Considered a different admission process but heavily examined and viewed as a “holistic” review of admissions. This mitigates risk of Path 2. When a Path 2 student has applied, the process of admissions review is scrutinized. Babs Mowery is the A & S POC. An example of such a process is when a student would be reviewed for something like attendance. Of note, Path 1 is considered regular admission. This is checked and also how student athletes progress is also reviewed.
- III. Mr. Dustin Gray also reported on sports wagering
 - A. In PA, any business that has slots can offer sports wagering. Authorization fee \$10 M, 34% tax to PA. Currently there are temporary regulations in state of PA that include window Gaming/Online Gaming. NCAA rules and response endorse a “Don’t bet on it” campaign.
 - B. PA Gaming Control Board is not considered experienced in sports wagering; however, they are open to listening. Example from Dustin is concern for “Prop Bets”; does not feel support from Gaming commission on their own. Specific concerns on threats are prop bets and sports posting lines.

- C. A casino can hire an external integrity service or create their own internal system. No formal regulations on this. No definition of flagging process in PA (i.e. size of wagers or suspicious bets)
 - D. From Pitt standpoint: Better education (ex. Legal but not NCAA). This includes a Sports Wagering Designee ("Czar" Rich Holmes). There was also a reminder that this is not just athletics but all of campus. Furthermore, referees are flagged, nature of play, etc...
 - E. Dustin also explained the U.S. Integrity Partnership as a mechanism of what can Pitt do as a university to protect itself.
 - F. The future of Sports Wagering includes online bets, growth in sports posting odds, dedicated broadcasts to gambling. There is a push to eliminate amateur sports in betting, however, Pennsylvania still allows it.
- IV. Due to time limits of meeting, Mr. Gray asked committees to submit reports. Dr. Roberts asked each committee for update and goal for next year. Dustin created a box folder and sent out invites.
- V. Next meeting May- Future discussion revolving around the need to understand university policies of excused absences for athletes and then further discussion of how to notify faculty of the policy.