

**University of Iowa**  
**FACULTY SENATE**  
Tuesday, January 29, 2002  
3:30 p.m.  
100 Phillips Hall

---

**Members Present:** J. Aikin, S. Armstrong, J. Berg, C. Berman, D. Bills, T. Boles, J. Cowdery, D. DeJong, K. Diffley, C. Dungy, L. Dusdieker, R. Hamot, R. Hegeman, P. Heidger, R. Hurtig, S. Kurtz, S. Larsen, R. LeBlond, P. Lloyd, C. Lynch, D. Manderscheid, T. Mangum, K. Marra, A. McCarthy, P. Muhly, G. Parkin, J. Polumbaum, C. Porter, A. Qualls, M. Raymond, C. Ringen, J. Ringen, P. Rubenstein, R. Slayton, L. Snetselaar, C. Sponsler, W. Stanford, K. Tachau, L. Troyer, R. Valentine, E. Wasserman, R. Weir, P. Weller, J. Westefeld,

**Members Absent:** K. Abdel-Malek, J. Altman, N. Bauman, R. Bork, P. Chang, H. Cowen, B. Fallon, V. Grassian, L. Hunsinger, P. Kutzko, J. P. Long, R. Miller, S. Moorhead, J. Moyers, W. Nixon, I. Nygaard, T. O'Dorisio, S. Stromquist, S. Vincent

**Members Excused:** Z. Ballas, D. Brown, J. Jew, J. Menninger, B. Muller, H. Seaba

**Faculty Senate Officers in Attendance:** Amitava Bhattacharjee, President; Jeff Cox, Vice President; Carolyn Colvin, Past President; Erin Irish, Secretary

**Guests:** Nick Colangelo (BICOA), T. Robinson (*Daily Iowan*), Charles Drum (University Relations), Betsy Altmaier (BICOA), Rachel Coolman, Heather Woodward (*Press-Citizen*), Bonnie Slatton (BICOA), Dave martin (Staff Council), Jon Whitmore (Provost Office), Maile Sagen (Ombudsperson), Lee Anna Clark (Provost Office), Steven Hoch (Provost Office), Julie Thatcher (Faculty Senate Office)

## I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:35

## II. Approvals

### A. Minutes: Faculty Senate, December 4, 2001

The minutes were accepted by consensus.

### B. Recommended Council/Senate and Committee Replacements

The replacements were accepted as recommended.

### C. Senate Elections Roster

Prof. Berman has recently taken on the role of Chair of the Elections committee. As part of her duties, she presented the current faculty roster to the Senate and then described roster traditions. She hopes to update current practices to make ballots more accurate, both in listing all faculty as well as how many Senate seats will be open for the next year. Her tally sheet also explains how the Senate make-up is determined. She asked the Senators to examine the roster and notify her of any errors. She explained that faculty who are expected to retire to resign by the end of the year are still to be listed, as those tallies are used in assuring proportional representation for the Senate. She hoped that by next year, the rosters would be more explicit in listing non-tenured and clinical-track faculty. Associate Provost Lee Anna Clark suggested that this can be done quite easily.

### III. Reports

#### A. Report of the Board in Control of Athletics (N. Colangelo)

President Bhattacharjee provided some background to this discussion by explaining that when he took office, one of the first things he did was to ask faculty for items of concern that Faculty Senate might consider. Problems in intercollegiate athletics figured prominently in the responses he received. He did not act on it at the time because he realized that this issue was too big to be addressed by just this university. Then, the CIC drew up a resolution addressing common concerns about intercollegiate athletics. This resolution was passed by those attending the CIC faculty leadership conference last fall. As a result, faculty at the individual institutions that comprise the CIC have been asked to consider this resolution. Once they have considered the principles that govern athletics, the resolution will go back to the CIC to see what has been individually approved. So far, the faculties at Indiana University, University of Minnesota, and Northwestern University have approved the resolution, and Pennsylvania State University is currently considering it.

President Bhattacharjee continued that one good thing that has already come from this resolution has been the opportunities to hear from the Chair of BICOA (Nick Colangelo) as well as the faculty representatives to NCAA and the Big Ten, Betsy Altmaier and Bonnie Slatton. The resolution tells us what to look out for, but it also tells us what Iowa is already doing right. For example, every member of BICOA is chosen by the faculty here, which is not true at every university. He urged the Senate not to look at the resolution as a list of criticisms of Iowa. Rather, it should be viewed as a tool to empower presidents of universities to improve athletics across the country. Faculty Council has voted for the resolution (just the items above the line) as it was written except for the deletion of one clause.

Prof. Colangelo, the current chair of BICOA and a member for the past six years explained how BICOA works, assuming that it is a bit of a mystery to many faculty. BICOA is made up of 11 faculty members, who are nominated by the faculty and chosen by President Coleman. There are additional members who are students or alumni. In addition, administrators serve as ex officio members, such as Lola Lopes (Office of the

Provost) who is concerned with academic issues. Other faculty members on BICOA include Profs. Altmaier and Slatton who represent the University of Iowa in the Big Ten and NCAA. BICOA committees oversee the amount of travel by student-athletes, as well as tracking their academic progress. There are committees concerned with equity and the budget. Prof. Colangelo stressed that faculty and staff play an important role in making decisions about the athletics program.

Prof. Colangelo explained that the attention that sports generates in the newspapers is quite different from the rest of the academy. Athletics needs to do things well, because if they don't, there will be a strong negative impact on the university. Revenues that are generated by athletics all come from football and men's basketball, as do all the horror stories. Revenues come from ticket sales and television contracts. Illustrating the magnitude of effect athletics has on the university, Prof. Colangelo said that whereas he regards himself as a good lecturer, he believes that he could never get 70,000 people to come hear him speak; that many people will come to a football game, and many of those have nothing else to do with the university. He viewed this as a positive for the university. On the other hand, there are other forces, like networks, that do not share our goals of educating our athletes. BICOA members work very hard to oversee athletics. Prof. Colangelo agreed with President Bhattacharjee, that every year Faculty Senate should hear a formal report from the Chair of BICOA.

#### B. Report of the Faculty Representative to the Big-10 Conference and NCAA (B. Slatton and E. Altmaier)

Prof. Slatton explained her and Prof. Altmaier's roles as faculty representatives. They are not representatives of athletics, but rather represent the interests of the university and the Office of the President to the Big Ten and NCAA. It is important to realize that BICOA is made up of faculty, not the staff of athletics. She saw the value of the CIC resolution in starting a dialogue among faculty regarding the value of athletics to universities. She understands that some faculty members believe that athletics has no place in institutions of higher education and that if we cannot get intercollegiate athletics under control, it should be eliminated. She explained that she and Prof. Altmaier approve all athletics schedules, paying close attention to potential conflicts with exams. The competitive argument is always used in athletics --"If we don't spend this, we won't be competitive any longer." Of course, there are real concerns that budget cuts are impairing our competitiveness across the university. Some 44% of athletics programs (at 40 institutions), including Iowa, are fully funded. But when institutions drop an academic program and then pay a coach \$1 million, there is cause for concern. Referring to the original CIC resolution, she felt that we cannot have it both ways, cutting commercialization and academic subsidies. Addressing the concern of some faculty that athletes are admitted under lower standards than are other students, she reported that only 2% of the substandard admissions were athletes. President Bhattacharjee added that President Coleman has been very supportive of this resolution, except for one item. He felt that in the long run, the adoption of this resolution will empower university presidents.

## IV. New Business

### A. CIC Resolution on Intercollegiate Athletics

President Bhattacharjee then read excerpts from a letter from Professor Robert Eno, Faculty Senate President at Indiana University and also chair of the CIC committee on athletics. (The complete text of Professor Eno's letter is attached.) President Bhattacharjee had reported to him the outcome of the Council's deliberations, in which an amended form of the resolution was passed. Prof. Eno is an advocate of the resolution, but has come to realize how complex the issues are. Intercollegiate athletics programs are becoming increasingly unstable on campuses—he would like to see national unanimity of voice to effect a change. Striking that item by Faculty Council, he understood, stems from an unusually strong support of women's athletics at the University of Iowa.

President Bhattacharjee reported that he had voted in favor of the (intact) resolution at the CIC meeting. He is concerned by the escalation in costs of supporting women's athletics, and asked what we should do in apportioning ever-decreasing state support of the university. The Council nonetheless favored not cutting General Fund support for athletics.

Prof. Manderscheid moved and Prof. Tachau seconded the following:

**MOTION:** To adopt the (amended) CIC resolution.

Prof. Tachau moved and Prof. Hurtig seconded the following:

**MOTION:** To substitute the amended resolution with the original wording reinstated (above the line).

Prof. Kurtz argued against this substitution. He had liked General Counsel Schantz's point made at the Council meeting, namely if we leave out football and basketball, what would we have? Rowing, swimming, and so on. Wouldn't we like to have this for our students? They come here not just to learn history, but also to learn to be adults. This learning process properly includes the opportunity to compete as athletes. It is disingenuous to expect football to support all the other sports at a university. Prof. Tachau responded that from reading the minutes she saw that there were two reasons for voting to striking the clause. The first was to comply with Title IX, a reason with which she agrees; it is a matter of law. She did not agree that the only way that this can be done is by contributing from the General Fund. Why not ask the men to support women's athletics? They could raise ticket prices. The second argument was that we have no way as a university to control commercialization if we do not contribute funds. Prof. Tachau believes that we do have a moral right to do so, independent of dollars. Most revenue raised by athletics comes in because they use the university's name. Perhaps we are selling it too cheaply. Also, athletics uses the physical plant of the university (with tax-exempt status). The nearly \$2 million General Fund contribution to athletics, as reported in the December 11 Council Meeting minutes, could cover the salaries of the 31 faculty members of the History department- which, at a per-person 4-course annual load

translates in 124 graduate and undergraduate Liberal Arts courses that could be taught. Noting that the University Library has recently announced on its website that it expects to have to cut \$300,000 –worth of journals and to decrease book acquisitions, she thought that without the athletics subsidy, we not only would avoid those cuts, but also might restore some previously cancelled subscriptions. Or, we could support two philosophy departments, and add faculty to teach courses in Islamic history and culture.

Prof. Hurtig pointed out that there are many units in the university aside from athletics that subsidize or are subsidized by other units. Coming from a science department that is very successful in generating indirect costs, he knows that those funds go in part to support other departments that cannot generate revenues beyond state appropriations. He found it reasonable that revenue sports underwrite nonrevenue sports, and urged the Senate not to think in terms of gender (men supporting women) but in terms of revenue vs. nonrevenue sports, and suggested a new accounting method. He has been bothered for years by the arms race in intercollegiate sports, and added that it is driven by outside forces. If there was no other source but the General Fund, we could hold a cap on the arms race, but coaches' salaries, etc. are driven by forces outside the university. We hear how the costs of higher education increase at a rate much higher than that of inflation, but the costs of intercollegiate athletics has been increasing at an even greater rate. Prof. Hurtig is happy that his indirect costs help support Philosophy, but would not like to see it going to athletics; that's not what NIH had in mind.

Prof. Cowdery asked what the net flow of funds between the university and athletics is. Prof. Colangelo answered that \$2.5 million from the General Fund goes to athletics, up from \$500,000 or \$600,000. This support was instated when Women's Athletics was set up. Football and basketball support all of the other men's sports. He added that it didn't make sense to him to have a unit that is regarded as a part of the university, but then refuse to support it. He agreed that it would be helpful to see how the funds, especially those from the General Fund, are spent. Prof. Lynch stated that one way that money flows back to the General Fund is through athletic scholarships. The almost 20% tuition increase is reported to cost athletics \$1 million more; i.e. they are paying \$5 million in tuition into the General Fund currently. Addressing Prof. Tachau's suggestion of increasing ticket prices, he explained that if we did so we would drive people away. Also, if we don't have competitive teams, people will not come. He was pleased to learn of President Coleman's support of the resolution. Prof. Muhly shared Prof. Tachau's concern; nevertheless he had voted for striking the clause in Council. He asked who controls the budget. Prof. Slatton answered that BICOA, the Director of Athletics, even the Regents do. Regarding the increase from \$0.5 to \$2.5 million dollars, she explained that prior to President Coleman coming, we had been in gross violation of Title IX. When two women's sports were added, there was a huge expenditure that quickly brought us into compliance. She agreed that there should be a yearly reporting of the budget, and the amount appropriated to athletics should be determined yearly, so that if athletics has a great year they should give money back to the university. She reported that there are 700 varsity athletes. The University of Iowa supports athletics less than do ISU and UNI.

Completing Prof. Tachau's list of reasons why the Council struck the clause in the resolution, Prof. Westefeld added that there had been a third reason, which was more symbolic: if the door is 100% shut, what does that say about our relationship to athletics. Prof. Cox pointed out that reportedly there is an inverse relationship between success in fundraising and in athletics, contrary to what we usually hear. His point about the CIC resolution is that here is \$2.5 million that is going for the public good. Maybe that amount is too high, but the resolution demands that it be zero. We can't stop commercialism without putting some money into it. Prof. Colvin added that Iowa has had a long tradition of supporting women's athletics, unmatched by other similar institutions. One or two years ago we blended men's and women's athletics. Some faculty believe that as a result, women athletes have lost out. As General Counsel Schantz explained earlier, 99% of the \$2.5 million goes to two women's sports. Until we know that women's sports will have other sources of support, we must continue our support. Prof. Tachau responded that she appreciated the thoughtful comments that were made. She also agreed that there are important differences between local and national athletics. Warning that universities will remain likely targets of budget cuts for the foreseeable future, and having learned during this meeting that the General Education Fund is in fact providing ca. \$2.5 million to athletics (rather than the lower figure reported at the Council meeting), Prof. Tachau reminded the Senate that, according to information provided at the previous Senate meeting (December 4, 2001), the revised FY 2002 budget for faculty salaries is \$2.86 million less than the FY 2001 budget. This has already meant the loss of faculty lines. In the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, where, for instance, we're also losing TA lines, and science labs aren't getting renovated as they need to be, many of us fear that under these budget cuts we are about to sacrifice permanently both our teaching and our research missions. Urging that we keep in mind what the money now going to athletics could do for academics, Prof. Tachau proposed that in hard budget times, the athletic department not get any General Education Fund money. She asked: why don't we send the men's golf team on fewer trips? Prof. Hurtig added that any unit that knows that it has a protected pot of money won't look so carefully at how it is spent. The argument for merging was that there would be one budget, so you can't really argue that the General Fund money goes toward women's sports because technically it is simply going to athletics. Prof. Mangum asked what would happen if we cut General Fund support yet still complied with Title IX, and then called the question. Prof. Slatton answered that the university cannot not fund athletics. She added that whereas football and basketball bring in a lot of money they spend more. She reminded the Senate that we are trying to get a national resolution. With that we can lean on university presidents. Athletics can't do it alone, nor can faculty alone. What we can do is put pressure on presidents to restore sanity. Cost containment, rather than raising revenues, is the critical issue. Why can't we pay coaches less?

Prof. LeBlond seconded Prof. Magnum's:

**MOTION:** To call the question on voting for the substitute motion. *The motion carried.*

**MOTION** (from above): To restore the struck phrase to the resolution. *With 19 in favor and 25 against, the motion failed.*

Returning to the amended resolution, Prof. Lloyd explained why Prof. Cox's amendment was added. There had been sentiment that we did not want to imply that there would be no limit on General Fund support of athletics. Prof. Stanford observed that someone has to decide how much athletics will get, asking who that is and why a certain amount. Prof. Kurtz responded that it seemed to him that the Athletics department submits a budget to the Vice President for Finance, who confers with the President. Prof. Stanford responded that it seemed like this would be a nonissue for the Senate. President Bhattacharjee pointed out that Jessup Hall is very mindful of the actions of the Senate.

Prof. Cowdery moved and Prof. Westefeld seconded the following:

**MOTION:** To call the question. The motion carried.

**MOTION** (from above): To adopt the CIC resolution. *The motion carried.*

Prof. Tachau moved and Prof. Cowdery seconded the following:

**MOTION:** To adopt Prof. Cox's resolution.

Prof. Kurtz inquired what kinds of proposals are ever rejected by BICOA, or whether it is a rubber stamp. Prof. Colangelo answered that it is hard to give him the information he wants, as Athletics knows there are some things they just shouldn't ask for. Prof. Hurtig added that when he was on BICOA athletics would routinely ask for another game to be scheduled and BICOA would turn them down. Prof. Kurtz clarified that he didn't want the information immediately, just wanted to see a summary of what BICOA approved or did not approve. Prof. Slatton pointed out that a difficulty in providing this list could come from the fact that requests move through several committees, where they can be modified, so that usually by the time they make to BICOA they are in an acceptable form. Prof. Kurtz said that he just wanted to know what kind of control BICOA has. Prof. LeBlond did not want to see additional wording added to the Cox resolution: perhaps the Faculty Senate President could work with the Chair of BICOA to determine the format of the report. Associate Provost Clark asked whether such a report is already required. After further discussion Prof. Lynch suggested that the discussion be tabled in order to work out a nonfragmented resolution.

Prof. Lynch moved and Prof. Kurtz seconded the following:

**MOTION:** To table the discussion. *The motion carried.*

## VI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 5:17.

Respectfully submitted,  
Erin Irish  
Secretary

27 January 2002

To: Faculty Senate, University of Iowa  
From: Bob Eno, Indiana University  
Chair, CIC Faculty Ad Hoc Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics  
Subj: Resolution on Intercollegiate Athletics

Professor Bhattacharjee has let me know that the Resolution on Intercollegiate Athletics will be discussed at your January 29 meeting, and he's filled me in on some of the issues that have shaped the approach of Iowa faculty to the resolution to this point. I thought that it might be useful to write a letter touching on some relevant aspects of the matter. I'm an advocate of the resolution, but through discussions in the CIC and our experience here at Indiana, where I'm president of the faculty senate this year, I've come to appreciate how complex the issues surrounding the resolution are.

The resolution was prompted by a perception that I think is widely shared among faculty: that the role of intercollegiate athletics on campuses – never unproblematic – has become increasingly unstable. If current trends in expenditures, commercialization, media dependence, problems of conduct, and impact on campus life continue, there is a prospect that in a decade or so, universities will have lost control of athletics and of the ability to protect their academic identities and values. Control of these matters lies with the presidents of NCAA member institutions, and the goal of the resolution, building on the earlier one endorsed by Pac-10 schools, is to bring a national faculty voice to these matters that will help reform-minded presidents to gain leverage in these matters. In our discussions in Indiana, where there were a number of calls to modify the resolution to more closely reflect our local situation and views, we concluded that unlike campus policy documents, this resolution was a political statement intended to generate faculty interest and participation on a very broad level. If it were to be successful in having practical impact, it would only be after long negotiation among NCAA presidents, during which the very varied conditions and commitments of local schools will refine the direction reform ultimately takes. Given present conditions, it will require a very unusual degree of faculty persistence and unanimity of voice to lead to any meaningful reform at all. These arguments led our senate members to endorse the main resolution unanimously and also to adopt all appended items by strong votes. But I also described to CIC leaders a number of constructive amendments proposed, and noted that if an opportunity were provided for these and others to be incorporated through a subsequent round of votes, the Indiana senate would welcome it.

Professor Bhattacharjee has told me that at Iowa the most controversial aspect of the main resolution has been the phrase: "Athletics should not be subsidized by the academic side of the institution," and that the phrase has been deleted in the draft proposed to the Iowa senate. I understand that this has been prompted by an unusually strong tradition of commitment to women's sports at Iowa, and a concern that this commitment and Iowa's obligations under Title IX could be undermined if reallocations could not be drawn from the academic side.

I think most who support reform in intercollegiate athletics also support the principles of fairness reflected in Title IX and the obligations of institutions to come into compliance with the law.



This obligation is uncompromised by the resolution. As stand-alone budget entities, athletics departments would be responsible for fulfilling these provisions through intra-departmental cross subsidy and through cost-cutting measures in men's sports, such as reductions in the number of football scholarships. Any negotiation for reform among NCAA member institutions would necessarily require changing the contexts of competition that currently inflate the cost structures of men's revenue sports, so as to allow reallocation to women's sports without destroying the competitive balance in men's athletics that generates revenue. Currently, the level of competition is driven by the "arms race"; scaling back in a coordinated way will create greater opportunities to enhance non-revenue sports for both genders.

Just as the faculty senate at Indiana generated suggestions for ways that the resolution and addenda might be modified if an emended draft were circulated after the current one had been endorsed, the Iowa senate might indicate its view by suggesting that the third point be modified with the addition of a clause concerning Title IX, to conclude, for example:

Athletics should not be subsidized by the academic side of the institution, and athletics departments should operate under the same principles of budget accountability that characterize other units, *consistent with relevant federal regulations, such as Title IX.*

If the opportunity did arise for revision among institutions that had adopted the resolution, I expect such an addition would be non-controversial. In any event, were Iowa to modify the resolution in its current vote by such an addition, rather than by removing the initial clause, I believe it would be less likely to bring into question the degree to which endorsing institutions were, in fact, expressing a shared faculty voice.

Professor Bhattacharjee added one other point with which I have great sympathy. He indicated that Iowa senate members might feel they lacked the degree of expertise required to take responsible action. Faculty at Indiana raised the same concern, and I share it. At Indiana, our Athletics Committee, NCAA representative, and Athletics Director all participated in our discussion to provide information (and, as it turned out, strong support), but ultimately we acted with far less confidence in our knowledgeability than is normally the case (which may only mean that for once we were under no illusions). If faculty senates nationally do provide pressure for reform through such resolutions, this will generally be the case. Few of us have deep knowledge about these issues, but many of us share a sense that if we do not take concerted action, we'll be evading responsibility to address a destructive situation. Ultimately, senate members at Indiana decided to suspend their doubts, and we've learned that senates groups at Minnesota and Northwestern have also done so (unanimously in both cases). I hope that colleagues at Iowa will decide that they are able to join us, despite their very reasonable reservations.