

**REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON
ATHLETICS AND THE UNIVERSITY**

December 15, 1989 Faculty Council Meeting

The committee was appointed in response to a resolution adopted by the Faculty Council on February 19, 1988. Its charge, as formulated in that resolution, is the following:

... to (1) examine all relevant aspects of the University's intercollegiate athletics program, its scope, procedures, financing and other resources, and its relations to private entities operating under the aegis of the University, (2) report to the Faculty the facts with respect to the foregoing, and in what ways and to what extent, if any, these may be at variance with the University's purposes and standards of conduct, and (3) make recommendations for action by the Faculty and the administration, as appropriate.

We have carried out the investigations called for in this charge and are pleased to report that the Department of Athletics, the Educational Foundation, and other offices and agencies of the University have provided all the data for which we have asked and have been frank, cooperative, and helpful. We began our inquiries with two meetings that were open to all members of the faculty. As a committee we have met with the Chancellor, two former chancellors, five former chairmen of the Board of Trustees, the President Emeritus of the University of North Carolina, the President of the Student Body, several of the coaches, and other knowledgeable persons. Our subcommittees have independently consulted many additional people. We have solicited the experience and opinions of randomly selected student-athletes by means of a questionnaire and have interviewed student-athletes chosen at random from teams in a variety of sports, including football and basketball. Some of our subcommittees and members have conducted special studies and inquiries in their own lines of interest. Our efforts, in short, have been laborious. We hope the report will be useful to the University.

The authors of the resolution under which this committee was appointed wrote that " ... the University should ... strive to set, and to be seen as setting, the highest standards in the conduct of all its undertakings." We have tried in our work to observe that precept and to apply it in the judgments we have made.

The information we have accumulated is contained in several subcommittee reports and other documents. As a whole, these are too voluminous to be circulated with this report, so we have filed them with the Secretary of the Faculty so that he can make them available, as and when requested, to those members of the University community who wish to study them. They are, in effect, appendices to this report.

Our recommendations appear in the pages that follow, beginning on page 7. There are thirty-two of them. Because their content and arrangement can be correctly understood only in the light of the introduction that follows, we ask our colleagues to read the introduction before passing to the recommendations.

We are deeply grateful for the help given us by Professor Joseph H. Bylinski, who analysed for us the financial information provided by the Department of Athletics and the Educational Foundation. Professor Lawrence B. Rosenfeld formulated the original design of our questionnaires and gave us an analysis of the results. Finally, we are greatly indebted to our secretary, Ms. Ann R. Zappa, of the Chancellor's Office, for indispensable aid of many kinds.

I. INTRODUCTION

Three features of our program of intercollegiate athletics deserve notice at the head of this report. The first is the Faculty Committee on Athletics, which, two years ago, was changed from an appointive committee to an elective one. Under the leadership of Alumni Distinguished Professor Richard G. Hiskey, that committee has developed excellent procedures for monitoring and evaluating the admission of student-athletes and their academic achievements and problems. One of our recommendations (No. 32) is that the purview of this committee be broadened. The second is the establishment by the Department of Athletics of an academic support center for student-athletes, directed by Mr. John G. Blanchard. This center is well equipped and well directed. It has long been needed. It will be a vital component of all efforts to improve and enrich the educational side of our program of intercollegiate athletics.

Third: In the course of our inquiries we have perceived no indications that our program of intercollegiate athletics is in conflict with the Constitution and Bylaws of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, and we have been impressed with the care taken in our Athletic Department, and by the coaches and their staffs, to avoid such conflict. If we take the NCAA regulations as a standard of judgment, we believe our program is one of the best in the country. All this reflects credit on the Department of Athletics, under the leadership of its Director, John Swofford, and his staff, the coaches and their staffs, and all those agencies of the University administration and faculty that interact with our program of intercollegiate sports.

Our charge, however, is to determine how, and to what extent, our intercollegiate athletics program " ... may be at variance with the University's purposes and standards of conduct." On that issue our finding is that all intercollegiate athletic programs of NCAA Division I-A¹, including our own, are in varying degrees in conflict with the purposes and standards of universities in general. That is to say, the intercollegiate athletic programs of The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and all other 1-A universities are part of a nationally competitive athletic system which, in its current state, is in conflict with university principles and priorities. Every university, in its athletic programs, exploits the maximum competitive options the system allows. No university will reform its programs until the system itself is reformed and the reforms are made obligatory for all. And the system, as regulated by the NCAA, strongly resists reform. The result is a deadlock between reform and opposition to reform. Either that deadlock is resolved, or the troubled partnership of universities and intercollegiate athletics will sooner or later be terminated.

This perception, and others to which our investigations and studies have led us, are widely held in public opinion. The exceptional degree of public distrust and discontent with intercollegiate athletics shown recently in polls² and in the press reflects a growing sense, inside and outside the universities,

that intercollegiate sports programs are out of proportion to their functional place in the academic world, that some student-athletes are not students and do not genuinely represent the student bodies of which they are nominally members, that the effort to enroll them and keep them eligible results frequently in a corruption of the academic process, and that the ideal of amateur collegiate sportsmanship engraved in the NCAA constitution³ has been overwhelmed by an abundance of money and an intensity of competition and publicity that drive intercollegiate sports toward professionalism.

Some of this public discontent is caused by publicized violations of NCAA standards in which boosters provide money, cars, and rent-free apartments to athletes⁴, universities enroll heavily recruited athletes who have neither the ability nor the inclination to study, and administrative officers and faculty members favor athletes with exceptions that are not available to other students, so that the athletes can maintain their academic eligibility to compete. Out the NCAA standards themselves are inconsistent with academic values. The playing and practice seasons and game schedules allowed in the NCAA bylaws are excessive. Hours of practice, which the NCAA does not try to limit, have risen in some universities and in some sports to levels that deny student-athletes the time and energy they need to earn their degrees. In their present form, in fact, the NCAA bylaws offer student-athletes no protection against demands of practice, travel, and play that impede their efforts to succeed as students and prepare themselves for careers other than those of professional sports.

We think it obligatory to say in this report that intercollegiate athletics --for all the drama, enjoyment, and sociability it provides--is a university function of secondary importance. The primary functions are teaching and learning, research, and public service. But intercollegiate sports, except for those who participate in it, is primarily entertainment. Aside from the two hundred to four hundred student-athletes each Division I university recruits, students learn nothing from intercollegiate athletics that they could not learn from watching professional sports on television or attending analytical courses on sports. The NCAA itself declares that student-athletes are students first and athletes second⁵. It classifies intercollegiate athletics as an avocation or a recreational pursuit.⁶ Although it insists that athletic programs must be maintained as a vital component of the educational program ...⁷ we have discovered no meaningful sense in which that is accomplished except by subsidizing the education of the student-athletes themselves, which, in many athletic programs, is overwhelmed by requirements of practice and play that obstruct the education of student-athletes and prevent some of them from earning their degrees.

The scale on which Division 1-A athletic programs operate obliges them to solicit donations on a large scale, year after year, to pay operating costs, build and amortize facilities, and constitute endowments for sports programs. It drives universities that cannot fund these efforts into debt. It compels all Division 1-A revenue sports programs to pursue opportunities to play in bowl games and post-season tournaments in order to secure big television fees. The size and extent of athletic facilities on the campus and the excessive exposure intercollegiate sport receives in the media nourish a public misunderstanding of the purposes and priorities of higher education. That misunderstanding takes root in the minds of many students and remains rooted when they become alumni. Here and there, the system of competitive intercollegiate sports has generated coalitions of coaches, administrators, faculty members, trustees, and boosters who intimidate or manipulate administrators and faculty members, reward some student-athletes in ways the NCAA prohibits, and maintain by illicit methods

the eligibility of student-athletes who would otherwise have become ineligible to play. Finally, while university administrations and athletic staffs are mortal, the competitive pressures under which they work are eternal. Accordingly, a program that has for years been responsible and constructive may become corrupt, as responsible administrators and coaches are succeeded by others more responsive to the mandate to win at all costs.

Efforts to correct the anomalies presented by intercollegiate sports have been resisted in the universities and in the NCAA. One theme in the history of American intercollegiate sports is that of a continuous struggle between the partisans of wide competitive freedom and those of restraint and reform. This has never been a struggle purely of athletes against academics. In all the major groups involved--university administrators, faculty members, students, alumni, directors of athletics, conference officials, coaches, players, former players, and journalists --there are, and have been, both libertarians and reformers. Some of the reformers are coaches: although the amplitude of achievement and reward in their profession is on the line, most of them care about their players and the players' future, and some coaches are outspoken critics of the inability of the NCAA to sustain its principles and enforce its regulations.⁸ Correspondingly, while some university administrators and faculty members are partisans of reform, others are libertarians. Most, however, are simply indifferent to the effect of unbridled athletic competition on their institutions.

These divisions are apparent in the proceedings of the NCAA. In the Annual Convention of that organization, each of the 791 participating colleges and universities and each of the 79 member conferences casts one vote. A representative who casts the vote of a college or university is appointed by his or her institution to do so and presumably votes according to instructions of his or her administration. But the fact that the efforts of reformers on significant issues have been so often blocked indicates that many presidents and chancellors are either disinterested in or misinformed on the issues, or hostile to regulation and restraint. Why is this so?

The American system of competitive intercollegiate sports is driven by motivations that are deeply rooted in the society and the culture and very difficult for universities to resist. There is the academic tribalism by which fans and boosters choose an institution and support its teams with fervor, money, and loyalty to the death. There are the compulsions of competition, under which winning is not everything it's the only thing, and nice guys finish last.⁹ There is the unremitting pressure to win that bears constantly on coaches, athletic directors, presidents, and chancellors. (In the eyes of the press and the fans, every loss is a humiliation, and must be accepted as such.) There is the irresistible dogma, which was foreshadowed as early as the 1880s,¹⁰ that the status and growth of academic institutions are somehow linked to the performance of their athletic teams in the revenue sports (football and men's basketball), the conference championships they win, and their prominence in post-season play. Most university administrative officers and faculty members seem to have assumed that winning teams in the revenue sports are essential to alumni loyalty and the success of funding drives. Some of them have been intimidated by coalitions of boosters represented in boards of trustees, and, in fact, some presidents have had to resign for trying to reform their academic programs against the will of such coalitions.

Faculties, also, have not given the reform of intercollegiate athletics the active support it requires. The reason is that faculty efforts to investigate and reform athletic programs have until recently received little support from the administrations or even from the faculties themselves, and further efforts have seemed like a poor investment of time. Most faculty members, we surmise, have reasonably concluded that sports programs carried to excess are necessary evils that should be left in the discreet care of the administrators, who are paid well enough to assume responsibility for them. These and other reasons account for the success with which reform has been opposed in the NCAA and in the institutions themselves.

One of the major obstacles to reform is the disadvantage any university faces when it tries unilaterally to reform its own athletic programs. Being under formidable pressure to have its teams compete at the limit of opportunity the intercollegiate system allows, it cannot sustain for long, against that pressure, reforms that reduce the competitive strength of its teams, as most desirable reforms would do. To cut schedules and practice time at any university, for example, would give its student athletes more time for study. But it would also leave them at a disadvantage against teams and squads that had acquired the greater experience of longer schedules and the benefits of more extensive and intensive practice and conditioning. Athletes who compete consistently under handicaps not of their own making and endure losing seasons year after year are likely to become chronically discouraged and bitter, losing their morale and their regard for their institutions. Under those circumstances, it becomes difficult or impossible for coaches to recruit the talent needed to achieve any success at all. The trouble with unilateral reform, therefore, is that it violates what the NCAA calls the principle of equity in competition,¹¹ by denying athletes under a unilaterally reformed program the so-called "level playing field."

There are, of course, alternatives to unilateral reform, and we have considered them at some length. One is to persuade the Atlantic Coast Conference to accept the reforms this University considers necessary and to schedule non-conference games only against other schools subject to the same reforms and restraints. Given the aspirations of some ACC members for national primacy in the revenue sports, that hope may be utopian. Other options would be to organize and affiliate with a new conference composed of schools that would adopt the reforms we propose for ourselves, or to drop to a less demanding level of competition in the NCAA classifications, such as Division 1-AA (which is that of the Ivy League) or Division II. One difficulty in that approach is that it would take several years to rearrange the scheduled games for which we have already contracted. Another is that it would be hard to detach the schools with which we like to be affiliated from their current schedules and conference memberships. Finally, it would distress our alumni and other fans to deprive them of their annual reckonings with the hereditary enemies in the ACC.

A final option, which has not received the public discussion and institutional consideration it deserves, is for this university and others to withdraw completely from intercollegiate athletic competition. This is the simplest and most decisive solution to the problems of intercollegiate athletics, the one most likely, if instituted, to settle those problems once and for all. It is also the solution that is most likely, wherever proposed, to shake the foundations of the Republic. Recommendations to abolish Congress, or rescind the Louisiana Purchase, would be less controversial than the proposal that any major university renounce intercollegiate athletics. Nevertheless, we regard withdrawal from

intercollegiate athletics as a serious alternative to the present state of things, which is intolerable, and we think that unless major national reforms are enacted and enforced the withdrawal of colleges and universities from intercollegiate competition, singly or in groups, is a valid and realistic option.

In consideration of the foregoing, your committee has chosen as a basis for its recommendations the following strategy of reform: (1) that the University should immediately and unilaterally implement all those reforms it approves that do not place its athletes at a competitive disadvantage; (2) that for a period of five years thereafter the University should join the leadership of current reform efforts in the NCAA and vigorously press for the adoption, by the NCAA or any agency that may displace it, of the remaining reforms that this University has approved; (3) that at the expiry of five years the University should consider, in the light of conditions then prevailing, implementing those remaining reforms that this University has approved that have not been accepted by the NCAA, however they may affect the competitiveness of our athletes and their teams.

Although we have no illusions about the prospects of achieving decisive reforms in an organization so divided as the NCAA, we are encouraged by the appearance, in 1984, of a serious reform effort that has recently begun to accelerate. That effort began with the adoption by the NCAA of Proposition 48, which requires, as a minimum for awarding an athletic grant-in-aid to an incoming freshman, that he or she have graduated from a secondary school with at least a 2.0 average in a stipulated 13-course core curriculum. But no recipient of such an award may play or practice in a varsity sport during his freshman year unless he has scored 700 (out of a possible 1600) on the Scholastic Aptitude Test or 15 (out of a possible 36) on the American College Test. Although these requirements are modest, they exclude the possibility that any NCAA institution will again, to its embarrassment, be found to have admitted an illiterate on a grant-in-aid and retained him during his four years of eligibility, as has occasionally happened.¹²

Proposition 48 was initiated and promoted by a group of college presidents. In the course of the struggle over Proposition 48, the NCAA created a Presidents Commission, to be elected by the chief executive officers of all member institutions, which has the right to review activities of the Association, put matters of concern on the agenda of the Annual Convention, order the agenda, and call special meetings of the Association.¹³ That Commission continues to be active. Recently it has proposed that the NCAA reduce the length of the basketball season of Division I, by a month, reduce spring football practice, and require publication of the graduation rates of student athletes. These matters will be referred to the Annual Convention in January, 1990.

To this evidence of progress must now be added the recent formation of a blue-ribbon national commission to serve for two years under the chairmanship of Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, former president of Notre Dame University, to define and study the problems of intercollegiate sports and make major recommendations to remedy them. The vice chairman and one of the organizers of his commission is President Emeritus William C. Friday of the University of North Carolina. Richard Schultz, Executive Director of the NCAA, will also be a member. The Knight Foundation of Akron, Ohio, has provided two million dollars to support the committee and its work.¹⁴

Finally, we observe that the NCAA in January of this year added to its constitution (Art. 2, Principles for Conduct of Intercollegiate Athletics) some progressive commitments that had not appeared there before.¹⁵ It remains to be seen, of course, when and how they will be embodied into specific, enforceable bylaws. Among them are the following:

2.2 The Principle of Student-Athlete Welfare. Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be conducted in a manner designed to protect and enhance the physical and educational welfare of student-athletes.

2.8 The Principle Governing Recruiting. The recruiting process involves a balancing of the interests of prospective student-athletes, their educational institutions and the Association's member institutions. Recruiting regulations shall be designed to promote equity among member institutions in their recruiting of prospects and to shield them from undue pressures that may interfere with the scholastic or athletics interests of the prospects of their educational institutions.

2.9 The Principle Governing Eligibility. Eligibility requirement shall be designed to assure proper emphasis on educational objectives, to promote competitive equity among institutions and to prevent exploitation of student-athletes.

2.11 The Principle Governing Playing and Practice Seasons. The time required of student-athletes for participation in intercollegiate athletics shall be regulated to minimize interference with their opportunities for acquiring a quality education in a manner consistent with that afforded the general student body.

These are promising signs. But your committee believes that these and other efforts to solve the problems presented by the conflicts between intercollegiate athletics and American higher education will be strongly opposed by large and powerful groups motivated by strong currents in the culture. We seriously advise the Faculty Council and the General Faculty to give organized and concerted support to all movements likely to result in the adoption by the NCAA of the general reforms the Council may choose to recommend to the Chancellor. Unless the Council is prepared to recommend the road of immediate unilateral reform, it should persuade the Faculty to encourage other faculties across the country, and organizations like the American Association of University Professors, to support national reforms, whether the Presidents' Commission of the NCAA and the new national commission recommend them or not.¹⁶

To conclude: The character and scale intercollegiate sports has assumed, and the resources it has acquired, in the last twenty years make it necessary for all faculties to assure that their athletic programs are subordinated to the educational purposes and values of their institutions and that the educational integrity of their institutions is maintained. We hope the Faculty and Administration will see fit to enact the reforms recommended in this report and approve other measures as the need for them becomes apparent. It is our conviction, in any case, that a massive national movement for the reform of athletics in all American universities is now required. And the proper place of this University in that movement is in the vanguard, where its leadership will be useful.



In this report we recommend many additional improvements in the regime of intercollegiate athletics at Chapel Hill. Some of them are specific to this University and, if approved, can be enacted immediately. Others will benefit from adoption on the national level, during the next five years. All are listed and discussed in the pages that follow. It is now the task of the Faculty Council to evaluate them and, on the basis of its deliberations, to make its own recommendations to the Chancellor.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NATIONAL AND LOCAL REFORM

The first nine recommendations are for national reforms in intercollegiate athletics. For five years the University should support them aggressively and do its best to obtain their adoption by the NCAA, the ACC, and other conferences and governing bodies. The University should then resolve to adopt them unilaterally.

1. The season of play in each sport should not exceed the number of weeks in a standard academic semester. It may, if desirable, be divided between the two academic semesters in an academic year.
2. In any sport, the number of competitive events additional to those required by the Conference shall be considerably reduced.
3. During the playing season, the time a student-athlete allots to practice, suiting up, taping up, required team conditioning, chalk talks, travel, orientation, games, films and post-game analysis, and all other obligatory team activities should not exceed 360 hours for the season. These hours need not be distributed evenly among the fifteen weeks, but in no case should they exceed thirty per week. Each coach, or some member of his or her staff, must keep a seasonal log of the time required for athletes participating in the sport he or she coaches and at the end of each week in the semester should submit a cumulative copy of the log to the Director of Athletics.¹⁷
4. The fifteen off-season weeks in the academic year are reserved chiefly for academic growth and progress. Physical conditioning, light workouts, and unsupervised play should be allowed, but such activity required of student-athletes should not exceed fourteen hours per week. Spring practice in football should be entirely eliminated.
5. The freshman year of every student-athlete should be used primarily for coming to terms with the demands a university makes upon its students, mastering fundamental concepts, improving oral and written expression, and establishing habits of study and self-discipline that will enable him or her to profit from the educational opportunities open here to undergraduates. Accordingly, freshmen should be ineligible for varsity play. But since no young athlete can neglect the development of his or her stamina and skills for a year, we recommend that freshman student-athletes be allowed two hours per day of physical conditioning and practice in the sport, with or apart from the varsity, on days of classes, plus four hours of optional conditioning on weekends. They should also be permitted to sit on or near the bench at varsity games. But no freshman student-athlete should suit up for a varsity game or travel with the varsity to away games.
6. The maximum number of years of varsity eligibility should be three. All "red-shirting" should be abolished except in the case of a student-athlete who stands to lose a season of play

because of physical injury certified by a physician, or temporary withdrawal from the university by reason of verified family problems, or some other difficulty recognized as valid by the NCAA and by the Faculty Committee on Athletics.

7. The contract of every coach should include, as a primary obligation, responsibility for the regular academic progress of the student-athletes under his or her supervision. Every NCAA member academic institution should be required to report to the NCAA its graduation rates for each annual cohort of athletes, along with rates of dismissal, probation, advancement, and academic honors, of whatever kind. They should be shown to all potential recruits
8. In the national discussion of Proposal 42 it has been alleged that universities have an obligation to admit outstanding athletes who are academically underqualified. The reason given is that there is no other way in which those athletes can obtain the exposure they need in order to be drafted by a professional team or selected for competition in the Olympic Games. But no university is under any such obligation. The NCAA should make this clear.
9. Because many problems of intercollegiate athletic programs arise from the admission to universities of athletes who are unprepared, or unable, or disinclined to succeed in university studies, we recommend that an NCAA member institution not admit any athlete whose qualifications, measured against the admissions criteria of the institution concerned, do not meet the admission standards that are generally applicable, including affirmative action, within the institution to which they apply.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LOCAL REFORM ONLY

The following reforms apply only to this University. If approved, they may be implemented immediately at Chapel Hill.

10. Out-of-state student-athletes should be recruited and enrolled so as to raise the average SAT score of out-of-state student-athletes, at the end of five years, to equal the average SAT scores of other categories of out-of-state admittees, such as the children of out-of-state alumni; and in the out-of-state quota the University will reduce to a maximum of 50 per year the admissions of athletes who are non-competitive in that admission category.
11. The number of new grants-in-aid in each sport should be increased in proportion as the average graduation rate of student-athletes in that sport exceeds that of the student body, and decreased as the average graduation rate of student-athletes in that sport falls below that of the student body.
12. Every coach and his or her staff should ensure that all student-athletes understand the primacy of their educational objectives and are encouraged to have clear academic goals. They should follow course-tracks that will qualify them for the pursuit of those goals.

13. The Faculty Committee on Athletics should arrange for exit questionnaires or personal interviews to include, among other things, the evaluation of coaches, whenever a student-athlete leaves an academic program, whether for graduation or for other reasons.
14. After a probationary period, a head coach shall have a fixed-term contract and appropriate benefits and shall be dismissed only for just cause. Dismissal shall be by the Chancellor, acting after consultation with his Advisory Committee. Coaches will be evaluated on all capacities having to do with their contributions to the athletic, academic, and personal growth of the student-athletes who come under their leadership. A coach should be evaluated on several criteria, and his or her won-loss record shall be only one of the considerations by which his or her status in the University is determined.
15. The University should make a special effort to involve student-athletes more fully in the life of the student body. University housing should continue to be planned so that student-athletes live among non-athletes. Training tables should be opened, for a fee, to all students.
16. The faculty should extend to student-athletes the same respect and consideration, no more and no less, that is accorded as a matter of right to students in general. The student-athletes we have interviewed unanimously wish to be considered on the same basis as all other students and not to be identified with athlete-stereotypes.
17. The University should propose to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools that a review of the academic support and advising programs of departments of athletics be included in its recurrent institutional self-studies of member institutions. The review should cover the grades and graduation rates of student-athletes and their progress toward degrees.
18. The institutional representative who casts the University's vote in the NCAA and the ACC should report annually to the Chancellor and to the Faculty Council on how the University's vote has been cast on each issue brought before these bodies and why.
19. The University should encourage the ACC to recognize and honor annually the member athletic department that appears to have achieved the best balance between the athletic and; academic responsibilities of student-athletes. It should continue to publicize the outstanding academic achievements of the student-athletes of the member institutions.
20. The University should provide to all students who need it the same kind and level of academic support that is provided to student-athletes.
21. As far as possible, every student should have an opportunity to participate on a non-intercollegiate basis in the sport of his or her choice. The University should carefully preserve, maintain, and expand tennis and basketball courts and other athletic facilities

near the dormitories for the use of students. The intramural sports program should be emphasized. These needs should be given a high priority in the allocation of space on the campus.

22. The University should enlarge and improve its athletic facilities for the University community. Greater access to the Koury natatorium should be permitted to members of the University community.
23. Both the Chancellor and the General Faculty should be represented on the Executive Committee of the Educational Foundation. The Faculty's representative on that Board should be a member of the Faculty Athletics Committee elected by his colleagues.
24. It is the sense of the faculty that simultaneous membership on the Executive Committee of the Educational Foundation and the Board of Trustees creates the potential for actual or apparent conflict of interest.
25. The Educational Foundation should present its annual budget to the Chancellor for his review and endorsement. The Chancellor should consider with his Advisory Committee any major new fund commitments contemplated by the Educational Foundation. The Educational Foundation should consider using to a greater extent its accumulated capital surplus and any annual surplus of income over expenditure to support i) athletic activities for the general student body, ii) academic support programs for students from the general student body, and iii) expanded scholarship funds to be awarded on the basis of need and merit.
26. The Educational Foundation should establish relations and operations with the Development Office in the same modes as now apply to all other major fund-raising foundations in the University.
27. Financial statements and budgets of the Educational Foundation should be open to the public.
28. The practice of re-selling seats in the Student Activities Center in perpetuity should cease and all possible steps should be taken to reassign to students such seats as lapse.
29. The mix of programmed events in the Smith Center, other than athletics, should correspond to the educational, intellectual, and cultural interests of the various constituencies composing the university as envisioned in Chancellor Christopher Fordham's memorandum to the Director of Athletics dated October 14, 1987.
30. Whenever major sports or entertainment events take place on the campus, whether at the Student Activities Center or Kenan Stadium, an adequate number of parking places should be set aside for use of faculty and staff who have to work during the events.

31. The present elected Faculty Committee on Athletics should advise both the Director of Athletics and his Department, and the Chancellor, meeting frequently with those officials.
32. The charge of the Faculty Committee on Athletics should include oversight of matters covered in Recommendations 1-6, 10-13, and 15-16, or such of them as may be adopted.

Respectfully submitted,
The Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics
and the University

[composed of former Chairmen of the
faculty of the Chancellor's Advisory
Committee]

Doris W. Betts, Chair
George V. Taylor
E. Maynard Adams
Beverly W. Long
C. Townsend Ludington, Jr.
Daniel A. Okun
George A. Kennedy
Daniel H. Pollitt
Tom K. Scott
Henry A. Landsberger

NOTES

¹In January, 1988, 105 of the 791 universities, colleges, and schools that held membership in the NCAA were in Division IA, which is the domain, par excellence, of big-time university sports. Nine conferences were members of that division. The other divisions and their memberships were I-AA (87 institutions and 8 conferences), I-AAA (100 institutions and 20 conferences), II (179 institutions and 15 conferences), and III (320 institutions and 27 conferences). For these totals we are indebted to Mr. Ted C. Tow, Associate Executive Director of the NCAA.

²For example, a public opinion poll of March, 1989, shows strong disapproval, even among fans and blacks, of overemphasis on sports in higher education, the payment of money (as distinct from tuition, fees, room, board, or required course-related books) to athletes, and low standards of admission and eligibility for athletes. Respondents also believe it is common for professors to give student-athletes higher grades than they deserve and for the universities and boosters to make under-the-table payments to athletes. As reported in The Raleigh News and Observer, April 8, 1989, p. 5B. In a recent

Harris poll, about 75 per cent of the persons polled believe that intercollegiate athletics is "out of control." Cited by President Emeritus William C. Friday of The University of North Carolina in *ibid.*, August 4, 1989, pp. 1C and 2C.

³ 1989-90 NCAA Manual: Constitution, Operating Bylaws, Administrative Bylaws, Administrative Organization (Mission, Kansas, National Collegiate Athletic Association, March, 1989), Constitution, Art. 2.6, "The Principle of Amateurism": "Student-athletes shall be amateurs in an intercollegiate sport and their participation should be motivated primarily by education and by the physical, mental and social benefits to be derived. Student participation in intercollegiate athletics is an avocation, and student-athletes should be protected from exploitation by professional and commercial enterprises." *Ibid.*, Art. 2.10, 'The Principle Governing Financial Aid': "A student-athlete may receive athletically related financial aid administered by the institution without violating the principle of amateurism, provided the amount does not exceed the cost of education authorized by the Association." Also Operating Bylaws, Art. 12.

⁴ In a recent survey of current and former National Football League players, nearly a third of the respondents reported having accepted, while undergraduates at various colleges and universities, payments that were in violation of NCAA regulations. Fifty-three per cent of the respondents "...said they saw nothing wrong with breaking NCAA rules to get extra cash." Most of the payments were made covertly by alumni and other fans -- slid under the doors of dormitory rooms, or passed from hand to hand in a post-game handshake. Others came from the sale of complimentary game tickets, for as much as \$1,000 each. Out of 3,500 players contacted in this poll, 1,182 responded. The percentages of those reporting having accepted money illegally ranged from 19 per cent in the Atlantic Coast Conference, to 67 per cent in the Southeast Conference, with the Big Ten and Pacific Ten falling in between, at 36 per cent and 39 per cent respectively. The Raleigh News and Observer, November 17, 1989, pp. 1B and 2B; *ibid.*, November 18, 1989, pp. 1B and 6B.

⁵ 1989-90 NCAA Manual, Constitution, Art. 2.6. quoted *supra*, note 3. Also Art. 2.4, 'The Principle of Sound Academic Standards': "The admission, academic standing and academic progress of student-athletes shall be consistent with the policies and standards adopted by the institution for the student body in general." But regardless of such statements of principle, it is in the academic world at large the academic standing of an athlete that alone determines whether he is a member of the student body.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Constitution. Art. 2.6 (encore), quoted in note 3, and Art. 1.2 ("Purposes"), (a) [The purposes of this Association are] "(a) To initiate, stimulate and improve intercollegiate athletics programs for student-athletes and to promote and develop educational leadership, physical fitness, athletics excellence and athletics participation as a recreational pursuit."

⁷ *Ibid.*, Constitution, Art. 2.4. Also Art. 1.3.1: "Basic Purpose."

⁸ Quotations from the remarks of Division I-A football coaches written in a poll conducted by the sports journalists of the Rocky Mountain News (Sunday, August 21, 1988), pp. 1-S, 12-S, and 13-S. Some of the coaches, in their remarks, reflected a strong sense of responsibility toward their athletes and respect for the academic standing of their institutions. One of them wrote, "The win-at-all-costs attitude forces coaches to take short cuts to succeed." There is, among the respondents, a belief that the NCAA, by strengthening its investigation and enforcement capacities and imposing the so-called "death penalty" on Southern Methodist University, has probably reduced the amount of competitive cheating in the coaching profession. Those who observe NCAA regulations want to see the offending programs punished severely. We are indebted to Bob Willis, of the Rocky Mountain News sports staff, for having sent us a copy of the issue in which the poll is reported.

⁹ John Bartlett, Familiar Quotations: A Collection of Passages, Phrases and Proverbs Traced to their Sources in Ancient and Modern Literature, Fifteenth and 125th Anniversary Edition, Revised and Enlarged (Boston. Little Brown and Company, 1980), pp. 867, 925. The attributions, of course, are to Vince Lombardi and Leo Durocher.

¹⁰ George E. Peterson, The New England College in the Age of the University (Amherst, Amherst College Press, 1964), p. 37. For rebuttals to the idea that big-time college sports generate giving to the academic programs of institutions rather than merely to their athletic programs see (1) Allen L. Sack and Charles Watkins, "Winning and Giving," in Sport and Higher Education, eds. Donald Chu, Jeffrey O. Segrave, and Beverly J. Becker (Champaign, Illinois, Human Kinetics Publishers, Inc., 1985), pp. 299-306, and (2) "Oft Repeated Argument: Do Winning Teams Spur Contributions? Scholars and Fund Raisers are Skeptical," Chronicle of Higher Education, January 13, 1988, p. 1.

¹¹ 1989-90 NCAA Manual, Constitution, Art. 27.

¹² In January of this year, the NCAA amended Proposition 48 by passing Proposal 42 (to become effective in 1990), which makes the award of grants-in-aid contingent not only on the 2.0 average in the core curriculum but also on the minimal scores stipulated earlier for the SAT or ACT. Proposal 42, however, has been vigorously contested by Coach John Thompson and others on the ground that the vocabulary sections of the two tests contain words and expressions with which blacks and members of other minorities are unfamiliar and thereby discriminate racially against minorities. Its repeal in the NCAA Annual Convention of January, 1990, is a strong possibility.

¹³ 1989-90 NCAA Manual, Constitution, Art. 4.5.

¹⁴ Knight Foundation, News Release, Akron, Ohio, September 27, 1989.

¹⁵ These declarations are obviously commitments to policy. The specific legislation by which the commitments will be made effective have yet to be proposed. Perhaps some of them will be brought before the Annual Convention in January, 1990.

¹⁶ After this report was written, but before it was presented to the Faculty Council, some members of the North Carolina Conference of the American Association of University Professors adopted a resolution recommending measures intended to strengthen faculty oversight and control of intercollegiate athletics at all institutions of higher learning in North Carolina. Copies of the resolution have been sent to the President of the University of North Carolina and the Chairman of its Board of Governors. The recommendations are: (1) that chairs of faculties or of faculty senates serve ex officio on boards of trustees, along with student body presidents; (2) that members of faculty committees exercising oversight over intercollegiate sports programs be elected by their faculties, and that tenured faculty members be elected as chairs of such committees; (3) that all academic advising programs be located, or relocated, in the division of academic affairs, to be supervised by a tenured faculty member; (4) that the fund-raising efforts of any booster club be made subject to the supervision of the chief fund-raising officer of the university concerned, and that an annual report of the club's finances be provided to the faculty of the institution; (5) that abuses of the grade "incomplete" be curbed by specific procedures devised for that purpose. We believe that the members of the Chapel Hill faculty, and all other North Carolina faculties, should individually, corporately, and aggressively support measures of this kind. Reported in The Raleigh News and Observer, October 29, 1989, p. 30A.

¹⁷ The basis for this recommendation is an estimate that allocates the 168 hours of a student-athlete's week according to three needs in order of priority: 1st, the student-athlete's personal needs for sleep, meals, getting about the campus, and seven hours of leisure per week; 2nd, the student-athlete's academic needs for lectures, recitations, labs, class preparation, and, during the term, preparing out-of-class papers and studying for major examinations; 3rd, time devoted to intercollegiate athletics. Here is the percentage distribution of time for the term:

Personal needs	50%
Academic needs	29%
Intercollegiate athletics	15%
Unallocated	6%

The principle involved here is that the time needed for a student-athlete's education must be accorded and protected, since that is the purpose of the grant-in-aid he or she is given. Obviously, the observance of that principle will compel sharp reductions of practice in all its forms, scheduled competitive events, and travel time. We are aware of the scale of those reductions and have no hesitation in recommending a personal regimen for student-athletes that necessitates those adjustments. We conceive education, moreover, as consisting not of the minimal satisfaction of a minimal number of courses that require the minimal possible exertion, but rather as a line of study and inquiry involving a number of courses chosen for the student's intellectual and professional interests. The following is a quotation from a letter published in The New York Times in March, 1989: "I believe intercollegiate athletics can only be justified as part of higher education and that the young men and women who participate in athletics must be bona fide students, receiving, in exchange for their

participation in athletics, an education of high quality which stretches them intellectually just as the athletic programs stretch them physically." The writer of that letter is Chancellor Paul Hardin.