

*Senate Athletics Committee Meeting  
November 18, 2013*

*Elected Members:*

*Present*

X	Nancy Burkoff Toby Chapman Nancy Glynn
X	Susanne Gollin
X	Jay Irrgang (Co-Chair) Kevin McLaughlin (Co-Chair)
X	Elizabeth (Betsy) Nagle
X	Leonard Plotnicov
X	Carma Sprowls-Repcheck

*Student Representatives:*

X	Michelle Donato Gordon Louderback Martha Merrill
---	--

*Staff Association  
Member:*

X	Barbara Mowery
---	----------------

*Pro-Tem Members:*

X	Timothy Averch
X	Dan Bartholomae Dave Brienza
X	Tony Eichelberger
X	Lou Fabian Jeanann Croft Haas Nathan Hershey
X	Don Martin Ken Metz
X	Donna Nativio Donna Sanft
X	Zac Saunders Patrick Smolinski

***Chancellor's Liaison  
Appointments:***

X	Susan Albrecht
	David DeJong
X	Steve Pederson

***Senate Liaison  
Appointments:***

Michael Spring  
Lori Molinaro

Jay Irrgang called the meeting to order and began the meeting by welcoming everyone. Irrgang requested the approval of the October 22, 2013 minutes, which were unanimously approved. Irrgang briefly reviewed the agenda then introduced Steve Pederson, Athletic Director.

**NCAA Governance Update**

Steve Pederson started his comments by providing the group an update on key national issues relative to intercollegiate athletics, including the national perception of Division I athletics and the challenges facing the current NCAA governance structure.

In outlining his comments, Pederson explained the organizational structure and mechanisms for adopting membership legislation and compared the structure prior to 1997, between 1997-2008 and the present. In explaining the reasoning behind the membership's review of the structure, Pederson noted the lack of a presence of everyday athletic practitioners and student-athletes within the current structure, as well as the perceived inability of the membership to efficiently adopt reasonable legislation that supports the NCAA's core principles. In expounding upon that concept, Pederson also noted the perceived lack of a mechanism to properly vet such legislative concepts by a transparent organizational structure that also includes a diverse assortment of relevant professional competencies.

In explaining the status of the current review, Pederson outlined the key emphasis areas drafted by the Division I-A Athletic Directors, and noted the NCAA Board of Directors meeting in October which included reports from the Athletic Directors group as well as Faculty, Student, Compliance and other Athletic Administrative professional associations on solutions and suggestions for revising the current structure. The goal of the meeting was to begin a discussion on a revised model which would be distributed to the membership for review in January of 2014. Pederson also mentioned that Dan Bartholomae was present at the October NCAA Board of Directors meeting and participated on behalf of the Compliance professional association.

Pederson concluded that while the current review of the NCAA model was in its infancy stages, organization and structure would still be a necessary component of any intercollegiate athletic model; and that the current review of the NCAA's governance model was appropriate given its current application and the membership's perception of it.

Pederson then introduced Dan Bartholomae, Associate Athletic Director for Compliance & Sport Services.

Bartholomae added to the discussion by providing the group a governance overview of the October NCAA Board of Directors meeting. Bartholomae noted that the Division I Board of Directors want a more transparent, responsive, participative and streamlined governance structure, and it wants the Division I membership to help them design it. Bartholomae discussed the October NCAA Board meeting agenda, goals and made note of the consultant that the NCAA retained to assist in the governance redesign. Bartholomae mentioned the different groups that presented at the Board meeting and then shared with the group the Compliance professional association's ideas and suggestions for the redesign.

Bartholomae found the October NCAA Board meeting to be very productive and noted that it appears the university presidents want practitioners more involved in the process. Bartholomae commented that the on-campus practitioners all seemed to be on the same page at the meeting and ultimately want to do what is best for the student-athletes. Bartholomae concluded by explaining the NCAA Board's action moving forward. Dan noted that the NCAA Board empowered a subcommittee to collect feedback and develop more concrete proposals for consideration.

### **Pitt Faculty Senate President Request Regarding the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics**

Irrgang thanked Steve and Dan for their presentation and then led a short discussion regarding the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics proposal. Due to time constraints there was no time available at the meeting to conduct a vote on the proposal and there was no longer a quorum of voting members. Irrgang followed up with the voting members via email. As a result of the email vote, the Committee recommended that the University of Pittsburgh Faculty Assembly and Senate not support the proposal from the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics to create an NCAA recognized Senate Athletics Representative at each school that would be appointed by and report to the Senate.