

2003-2004 ANNUAL REPORT
of the
ATHLETIC COUNCIL
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Presented at the
635th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate
December 2, 2004

MEMBERSHIP LIST

Representing the Faculty

Carol Barr (Co-Chair)
Nelson Lacey (Co-Chair)
Frank Lattuca
M.J. Peterson
Patricia Vittum
Rodney Warnick
Ernest Washington
Marc Weinberger (Secretary)

Representing the Alumni

Robert Goodhue
John Goodrich
George Richason (Secretary)
Phil Roland
Ed Ward

Representing the Students

Marsha Bryant
Susan Hyams
Barry Kessler
Kelli Kurtz
Brian Long
L.A. Love
Daniel McGonagle
Christine Tocco

Ex-Officio Members

Ernest May (voting, Faculty Senate)
Ian McCaw/Thorr Bjorn/John McCutcheon (non-voting)
Glenn Wong (voting, NCAA Faculty Representative)

Submitted November 2004

I. ATHLETIC COUNCIL OVERVIEW

According to Section 3: paragraph 5-3-1 of the Bylaws of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst's Faculty Senate, The Athletic Council ...

“shall implement the “Statement of Athletic Policy” adopted by the Board of Trustees on February 14, 1957, and any resolution which the board may adopt thereafter. Consistent with present policies on admissions and academic standards, the Intercollegiate Athletic Program shall be developed to a point where it is representative of the best efforts of the University, with aims and ideals of achievement comparable to those expected of the academic departments. This development shall proceed in accord with policies and regulations of the NCAA, and all athletic conferences in which the University maintains membership. The Intramural Athletic Program shall be staffed and equipped to meet the needs of all students who desire to participate, and the University shall encourage participation through a varied program including sports with carry-over value for life after graduation. All athletic accounts shall be open to review by the President of the Student Government Association or a designee. This council shall submit an annual report both to the Faculty Senate and the Undergraduate Senate, which shall include a detailed breakdown of all athletic program budgets.

A. Introduction In accordance with its mission, the Athletic Council (hereafter the Council) held seven regularly scheduled meetings during the academic year 2003/2004 (the January meeting was cancelled due to inclement weather). Each of five subcommittees (Finance, Facilities, Compliance, Academics, and Equity) met outside the regularly scheduled meeting times to focus on issues within their purview. A sixth subcommittee (Visions) was inactive this year, but the athletic department was involved in strategic planning. A summary of each of the subcommittee reports appears within this report. The full subcommittee reports are attached as an appendix.

The Council's meetings were organized around an agenda that included but was not limited to (1) briefs from representatives of the athletic department, (2) discussion of items of current interest to the Council, (3) reports from the five sub-committees, and (4) reports from invited guests. Last year's athletic department representatives included three different Athletic Directors (Ian McCaw, Thor Bjorn (interim), and John McCutcheon), Bill Strickland (Associate Athletic Director), Elaine Sortino (Associate Athletic Director and Senior Women's Administrator), Bill Chaves (Assistant Athletic Director for Tickets & Operations), Jim Patulak, (Associate Athletic Director for Facilities), Michael Jenkins (Associate Athletic Director for Student Athletic Services), Betsy Mosher (Associate Athletic Director for Compliance), Charlie Bare (Interim Director of Media Relations), Robin Harris (Director of Health Enhancement), and Tim Kenney (Associate Athletic Director for Advancement). Last year's invited guests included Mike Gargano (Vice-Chancellor), Joyce Hatch (Vice-Chancellor), and John Lombardi (Chancellor).

In addition to issues that faced the Council on an on-going basis, four topics dominated the agenda over 2003/2004:

1. Athletic facilities including the recreation center project.
2. Priority registration for student-athletes.
3. Student athlete advising.
4. The NCAA division membership status of Umass football.

The Council also reviewed issues critical to all athletic programs including a strategic planning study, an alcohol and drug education and testing program, and a student athlete code of conduct.

B. Council Structure The membership list of the Council includes eight faculty members (appointed by the Faculty Senate), four members appointed by the Alumni Association, four ex-officio members (Director

of Athletics, NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, and a designee from the office of the Vice Chancellor for University Advancement) and eight student members (with one student slot reserved for the SGA president or designee, and one student slot reserved for the president of the Graduate Student Senate or a designee). The full roster of the Athletic Council appears on the cover page of this document. Each member of the Athletic Council is also appointed to one of six (6) subcommittees. These appointments are listed in this report.

C. Attendance Records. Attendance records for the 2003-2004 year (meetings attended/meetings eligible as member) for each member of the Council:

Faculty and Staff

Barr	7/7	Peterson.....	7/7
Bjorn.....	4/4	Richason.....	7/7
Goodhue	6/7	Roland	1/2
Goodrich.....	5/7	Vittum.....	6/7
Lacey	7/7	Ward	7/7
Lattuca	7/7	Warnick	6/7
Mattei.....	3/5	Washington.....	6/7
May.....	2/7	Weinberger.....	6/7
McCutcheon.....	3/3	Wong.....	7/7

Students

Bliss.....	5/8	Kurtz.....	4/4
Bryant.....	6/7	Long	0/7
Hyams	7/7	Love	0/7
Kessler.....	6/7	McGonagle.....	0/7

D. Meetings Schedule – 2003-2004 Academic Year. Council meetings took place on:

In 2003: Friday, September 5; Friday, October 3; Friday, November 7; Friday December 5; In 2004: February meeting cancelled; Friday, March 5, Friday, April 2; Friday, May 7, 2004.

II. OVERVIEW OF THE ATHLETIC COUNCIL’S 2003/2004 ACTIVITIES

The Athletic Council is responsible for making recommendations on policy and providing advice on general operations of the Department of Athletics at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. The Department of Athletics has long been visible regionally and nationally, achieving success both in the classroom and on the playing fields. The University maintains its long tradition of balance between academics and athletics.

The 2003-04 year was dominated by the resignation of the Athletic Director in September, the search for a new AD, and a report on the future of football at the University. After the appointment of Thorrr Bjorn as interim AD in September, and a relatively quick search process, John McCutcheon was announced as the sixth ever Athletic Director of the University in February 2004. Halfway through the academic year the University announced that it’s not the right time to consider a move to Division 1-A, although the report did not rule out such a move in the future. Lastly, the second-cycle NCAA Certification process, initiated in January, 2003, was put on hold. Recent reductions in the campus budget, and the cuts imposed on the department, have created

some concern about the certification process. The University asked for, and received, a two-and-a-half year delay.

III. ATHLETIC COUNCIL SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS

The Athletic Council has six sub-committees, with six to eleven members appointed (by the Co-chairs) to each. Each sub-committee meets, on average, once per semester, and more often whenever circumstances dictate a higher level of discussion or activity. The Visions sub-committee did not meet as a sub-committee during 2003-04, but the Athletic Department was undergoing strategic planning. Betsy Mosher, Associate A.D. for Compliance, worked with the athletic directors on this project.

Each council member served on at least two if not three sub-committees. In addition, at least one member of the Department of Athletics is assigned (by the Director of Athletics) to work directly with each sub-committee. Each of these department liaisons has been very co-operative and provided all information that was requested, as well as unsolicited information that could further enhance understanding of the items under discussion.

Final reports from each of the five active sub-committees appear here as attachments. In addition, the Strategic Planning document is also attached. Highlights of these reports are noted below.

A. Academics. {Membership: M.J. Peterson, Ernie Washington, Nelson Lacey, and Marc Weinberger {Chair}. Athletic Department liaison: Michael Jenkins {Associate Athletic Director of Academic Enhancement}}.

Role of the Academics Sub-Committee: The Academics sub-committee oversees the academic performance of team members. This includes team graduation rates, team GPA, and academic progress. The Academic sub-committee also addresses issues pertinent to the academic performance and support provided to student-athletes. The following highlights the issues brought before and discussed by the sub-committee over the academic year 2003-2004.

In brief the issue of priority registration arises because of the time restrictions that the University itself imposes on student athletes through practice and game demands that students face as they compete for the University. These demands restrict the times when students can take classes and have the potential for playing havoc with student athlete academic programs, progress and even eligibility.

The issue of advising arises because of the need for student athletes to remain eligible and to also get the best course and career advice from staff and faculty specific to their majors. In many cases student athletes have only received counseling from the staff in the athletic department. The

Council has supported a position that would urge or mandate student athletes to also have counseling from their academic major.

A separate meeting was set up to further consider these issues. The initial meeting took place in December consisting of the two Council co-chairs (Nelson Lacey and Carol Barr), Marc Weinberger (chair of the Academic Sub-Committee), Ernie Washington (member of the Academic Sub-Committee) and Mike Jenkins of the Athletic Department. General frustration over the lack of progress with the issues of priority registration and advising was expressed and commitments were made to make progress this year on both issues.

The Academic Sub-Committee chair suggested that he be responsible to follow up on both issues. To this end and in order to gather specific evidence about the extent and impact of athlete registration problems a survey was suggested. Marc Weinberger volunteered to develop a web-based survey of student athletes about registration. There was also agreement that a dual advising system be implemented.

A web-based survey was developed with input from Sub-Committee members and the Council Co-chairs. The survey link with a cover note from Mike Jenkins was distributed in late January via email to all varsity athletes. The results of that survey are attached as part of this report.

In early spring a meeting about dual advising was held between Pamela Marsh-Williams, Ernie Washington and Marc Weinberger. Soon after Marc Weinberger was invited to meet with the full undergraduate dean's council chaired by Pamela Marsh-Williams to discuss the desirability and feasibility of implementing a dual advising system for student athletes. There was broad and strong support for such a system despite resource limitations of the current on-campus academic advising system. The meeting ended with Marc Weinberger volunteering to meet with the Athletic Director to discuss dual advising.

In the early summer Marc Weinberger, Pamela Marsh-Williams, an advisor from her office, John McCutcheon (AD), Elaine Sortino (Associate AD) and Mike Jenkins (Associate AD for Students) met in the Mullins Center. The outcome of the meeting was to first make sure that all incoming students receive academic advising including students at risk, those undeclared as well as declared majors. This process will get underway as soon as a list is developed by Mike Jenkins and delivered to Pamela Marsh-Williams.

A second outcome of the meeting was that a sub-committee consisting of at least two members of the Athletic Sub-committee, two members of the Athletic Department (Elaine Sortino and Mike Jenkins), two undergraduate deans and Pamela Marsh-Williams be set up for late July or early August after all the new students programs are completed. The task of this sub committee will be to plan and implement a sustainable dual advising system for student athletes.

B. Compliance. {Membership: Carol Barr, Robert Goodhue, John Goodrich, Rod Warnick, Mark Weinberger, Ernie Washington, and Glenn Wong {Chair}. Athletic Department liaison: Betsy Mosher {Associate Athletic Director for Compliance}}.

Role of the Compliance Sub-Committee: The Compliance sub-committee reviews the Department of Athletics' efforts to comply with NCAA regulations and mandates. The sub-committee meets near the end of each semester to review the functions of the Athletic Department Compliance Office. That office (currently Betsy Mosher, Carol Ford) meets monthly to review student eligibility, reporting of possible infractions, record keeping, and communicating changes in regulations to coaches. Each member of each coaching staff must complete an annual exam that tests knowledge of recruiting regulations, along with other NCAA-mandated rules. A member of the Compliance Office and the Faculty Athletics Representative or a designee proctors this exam.

The Compliance Office meets regularly with the coaching staff of all sports to discuss and review NCAA legislation and compliance activities.

B1. Impact of Budget: Budget constraints have had an impact on the compliance office. However, the compliance area has maintained its service level despite the recent budget and staffing cuts. The core tasks of the compliance area moved forward, while initiatives such as the improving the coach's database and placing more items on line have been placed on hold. The delay in the NCAA Certification program discussed earlier lessened the administrative pressure. Open searches in the Fall of 2003 include a business manager, a position that carries Associate or Assistant Athletic Director status.

The final report concludes that the present compliance systems are adequate and effective, but challenges the institution to develop a plan to deal with the increased compliance workload and continue to evaluate its systems due to the rapidly changing landscape in compliance strategies and legislation. As before, the conference noted the commitment of the institution's senior-level officials to maintaining a compliant environment in UMass Athletics. The Institutional Summary of this compliance review is included in the full report.

B2. NCAA Special Assistance Fund Program: The 2003-2004 NCAA Special Assistance Fund Program is money that comes from the NCAA every year with the allotment per institution based on the number of students receiving a Pell Grant or receiving an athletic grant in aid the year before. Student-athletes eligible for assistance are encouraged to apply. The 2003-04 UMass allocation was \$54,179. As of May, 2004, \$57,288 had been utilized by 71 student-athletes who had applied for funding.

B3. Recommendations of NCAA Task Force On Recruiting: NCAA President Myles Brand, in February 2004, called for an appointment of an NCAA Task Force on Recruiting to review the NCAA rules and practices related to "official campus visits" and to propose appropriate changes

before the 2004-05 recruiting system. The final report is due to be released during the summer of 2004. The full announcement of the recommendation is included as an appendix to this report.

C. Equity. {Membership: Carol Barr, Marsha Bryant, Kelli Kurtz, Frank Lattuca, M.J. Peterson {Chair}, Ernie Washington, Marc Weinberger, and Glenn Wong. Athletic Department liaison: Elaine Sortino {Associate Athletic Director and Senior Women's Administrator}}.

Role of the Equity Sub-Committee: The sub-committee is responsible for monitoring and reporting on Title IX compliance, gender issues, and minority issues within the Athletic Department. Highlights from the subcommittee include:

Under Title IX, coeducational colleges and universities that receive money from federal student aid programs and maintain varsity athletic programs are required to ensure gender equity in sports and to report on their efforts in that regard. Reports on a particular academic year must be filed with the federal government during the following October, so the data before the subcommittee covered academic year 2002-2003.

Gender equity is defined in terms of participation in varsity athletics, distribution of scholarship money as between men's and women's teams, and distribution of certain categories of athletic support budgets as between men's and women's teams. The female/male ratios of all three are benchmarked against the gender ratio of the general undergraduate student body. This general ratio varies from year to year as admissions, graduations, and transfers in and out alter the number of male and female undergraduates. In 2002-03 the general undergraduate student body on campus was 52% (8,698) females and 48% (8,462) males; in fall 2003 it was 50.47% (8,698) females and 49.5% (8,363) males. Under current interpretation of the law, then, UMass athletics is "in compliance" with Title IX requirements for the 2003-03 year on any ratio between 53% female/47% male and 51% female/49% male and for fall 2003 on any ratio between 51% female/49% male and 49% female/51% male.

Participation runs close to what is required. In 2002-03 the campus came within compliance on total team members, with 360 females and 334 males (51.9% female/48.1% male) on team rosters, but a bit short on numbers of different participants (that is, counting any athlete on two or more teams only once) with 292 females and 316 males (48.1% female/51.9% male). In fall 2003, there the 337 female and 349 male total members of varsity teams (49.2% female/50.8% males) put the campus in compliance.

Allocation of scholarship money was within this band in 2001-2002, but fell outside during 2002-03 with the elimination of seven sports as in the general university retrenchment at the end of that year. Thus with \$1,841, 830 in scholarships for female athletes and \$2,365,470 in scholarships for male athletes in 2002-03, the ratio became 43.8% of the money to females and 56.2% to males. The campus administration was committed to restoring the ratio by transferring sufficient scholarships to remaining women's teams, but this intention was frustrated by the severe budget

reductions mandated by the Massachusetts Governor and Legislature in June 2003. The Athletic department is committed to securing these monies, but acknowledges that the current budget situation will make that difficult.

Reported spending to maintain varsity teams in 2002-03 totals \$12,045,310, of which \$4,185,439 supported women's teams and \$7,859,871 supported men's teams. That yields a spending ratio of 34.8% to women's athletics and 65.2% to men's athletics. A ratio in the area of 30% to the women's teams and 70% to the men's teams is common among Division 1 programs, and driven partly by the fact that football, ice hockey, and lacrosse teams have the largest rosters and two of those three are almost exclusively male sports. Such a distribution of team support budgets does seem to be in some with the notion of gender equity advanced in Title IX. At the moment, however, there does not appear to be a major federal push on the issue. Elaine Sortino did note in her presentation that interpretations of the participation and scholarships standards had tightened in recent years, with federal courts shifting from accepting rates within 5% of the gender ratio prevailing in the general student body to the current 1% band. The high expense, large roster, and popularity of football probably limit impulses to insist on close ratios in support spending. To the extent that the campus's better-than-national-average performance on support budgets stems from maintaining a Division 1-AA rather than a Division 1-A football team, the Athletic Council should monitor the situation to ensure that if the campus moves into Division 1A in football that move does not weaken efforts to promote gender equity in the campus's intercollegiate sports programs.

D. Facilities. {Membership: John Goodrich, Susan Hyams, Kelly Kurtz, Frank Lattuca, M.J. Peterson, George Richason, Ed Ward {Chair}, and Rod Warnick. Athletic Department liaison: Jim Patulak {Associate Athletic Director for Facilities}}.

Role of the Facilities Sub-Committee: The sub-committee is responsible for reviewing the condition of the various facilities, including all playing fields.

D1. Projects Completed: The sub-committee met to discuss issues regarding athletic and recreational facilities. Projects that were completed during 2003-04 include:

- a) Mullins Center Locker Rooms: Completed in the Fall of 2003, the Mullins Center locker rooms that house the men's and women's basketball teams and the men's hockey teams were expanded and upgraded.
- b) Lighting: New lights were installed at the football practice fields.
- c) Staff Offices: The marketing staff was moved from Mullins to Boyden.
- d) Reseeding: This year completed a three year project to reseed the lower Boyden practice fields.

D2. Ongoing/Delayed Project: Planning for the new track and field facility continues. The facility will be located next to the soccer complex.

D3: Planning Stage: The Council was informed that the fee instituted to fund a new campus recreation center was reallocated to support campus operations. Lack of funding has put the project on hold. Other planned projects consist of improvements in the football stadium and the turf at Garber field.

E. Finance, Development, and Tickets. {Membership: Bob Goodhue, Susan Hyams, Nelson Lacey, George Richason {Chair}, Ed Ward, Rod Warnick, and Glenn Wong. Athletic Department liaison: Al Rufe {Senior Associate Athletic Director}}.

Role of the Finance, Development, and Tickets Sub-Committee: This sub-committee reviews the distribution of funds from some of the sources of funding to the department (including state funds, trust funds, and student activity fees). This sub-committee also monitors the Development Office as well as ticket distribution policies. The obligation of this sub-committee is to correlate programs and financing, providing advice or recommendations as appropriate.

The Finance, Development and Tickets (FDT) Subcommittee met twice during the 2003-2004 year. The first meeting summarized the latest budget numbers that came out of the cutbacks made over the previous summer. Some of the discussion centered on how to generate savings in team expenses. The second meeting was with the new Athletic Director John McCutcheon. The AD discussed his evaluation of the budget.

IV. ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT BUDGET

Pursuant to our charge as a Council, the next pages report the most recent budget figures of the UMass Athletic Department. Provided are both the figures for FY04 and FY 05 projections.

V. OTHER ISSUES

A. Faculty Athletic Representative to the NCAA. The university continues to be fortunate to have Glenn Wong serving in the capacity of Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), a position mandated by the NCAA. Professor Wong, a sports attorney, keeps the Athletic Council (and the Department of Athletics) informed about the issues being discussed by FARs nationally, including such topics as freshman eligibility, refinement of core course requirements at the high school level, and various compliance issues.

B. Athletic Council Co-Chair Activities. In addition to preparing agendas and reports, the co-chairs are called upon to undertake additional duties during the course of the year. Brief highlights of each of these additional items are noted below.

1. Search Committee for Director of Athletics.
2. Representation at Athletic Luncheon for Honoring Academic Achievement by Student Athletes – Fall and Spring Semesters.
3. Letters of Congratulations to All-Americans, Academic All-Americans and Conference Achievements for Student Athletes and Coaches.
4. Preparation of Annual Reports and Presentation to Faculty Senate.

VI. SUMMARY

This report provides the “State of the Athletics Program” at the University of Massachusetts as seen through the eyes of the Athletic Council. While not a regulatory body, the Council is responsible for making recommendations on policy and providing advice on general operations of the Department of Athletics at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. The Council meets once a month throughout the year and is organized around six sub-committees. The dominant issue during the previous year was the budget and how impending cuts to state funding to the University would impact Athletics. In addition, priority registration for student-athletes, student advising, and the proposed (and funded via student fees) Recreation Center were also topics of discussion at numerous Council meetings. A full account of the work of the Council is included in this report.

Coming off yet another year of downsizing, budget cuts and leadership change, UMass Athletics continued its commitment to excellence. As a group, UMass student-athletes shine on and off the playing field. We are proud of their accomplishments as well as the coaches who continue to produce quality teams and are recognized for their efforts in being awarded Coach of the Year honors.

FULL SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Report of the Equity Sub-committee.
2. Report of the Academics Sub-committee.
3. Report of the Finance, Development, and Tickets Sub-committee.
4. Report of the Facilities Sub-committee.
5. Report of the Compliance Sub-committee.

Report of the Equity Subcommittee
10 May 2004

I. Summary of Meetings

The subcommittee met with Elaine Sortino on Friday, 26 March 2004 to discuss the gender participation statistics prepared by herself and others in the Athletic department and reported to the Federal government as required by law. It met again on Friday, 16 April 2004 to discuss the racial/ethnic composition data for varsity teams and Athletic Department staff prepared by Carol Ford. Members also continued discussion of issues raised during these sessions in subsequent e-mail exchanges.

The draft report was discussed, and helpful comments made, at the meeting of the full Athletic Council on Friday, 7 May 2004.

II. Data and subcommittee observations

A. Gender Equity

Under Title IX, coeducational colleges and universities that receive money from federal student aid programs and maintain varsity athletic programs are required to ensure gender equity in sports and to report on their efforts in that regard. Reports on a particular academic year must be filed with the federal government during the following October, so the data before the subcommittee covered academic year 2002-2003.

Gender equity is defined in terms of participation in varsity athletics, distribution of scholarship money as between men's and women's teams, and distribution of certain categories of athletic support budgets as between men's and women's teams. The female/male ratios of all three are benchmarked against the gender ratio of the general undergraduate student body, and must fall within 1% of that general ratio. This general ratio varies from year to year as admissions, graduations, and transfers in and out alter the number of male and female undergraduates. In 2002-03 the general undergraduate student body on campus was 52% (8698) females and 48% (8462) males; in fall 2003 it was 50.47% (8698) females and 49.5% (8363) males. Under current interpretation of the law, then, UMass athletics is "in compliance" with Title IX requirements for the 2003-03 year on any ratio between 53% female/47% male and 51% female/49% male and for fall 2003 on any ratio between 51% female/49% male and 49% female/51% male.

Participation runs close to what is required. In 2002-03 the campus came within compliance on total team members, with 360 females and 334 males (51.9% female/48.1% male) on team rosters, but a bit short on numbers of different participants (that is, counting any athlete on two or more teams only once) with 292 females and 316 males (48.1% female/51.9% male). In fall 2003, there

the 337 female and 349 male total members of varsity teams (49.2% female/50.8% males) put the campus in compliance.

Allocation of scholarship money was within this band in 2001-2002, but fell outside during 2002-03 with the elimination of seven sports as in the general university retrenchment at the end of that year. Thus with \$1,841,830 in scholarships for female athletes and \$2,365,470 in scholarships for male athletes in 2002-03, the ratio became 43.8% of the money to females and 56.2% to males. The campus administration was committed to restoring the ratio by transferring sufficient scholarships to remaining women's teams, but this intention was frustrated by the severe budget reductions mandated by the Massachusetts Governor and Legislature in June 2003. The Athletic department is committed to securing these monies, but acknowledges that the current budget situation will make that difficult.

Reported spending to maintain varsity teams in 2002-03 totals \$12,045,310, of which \$4,185,439 supported women's teams and \$7,859,871 supported men's teams. That yields a spending ratio of 34.8% to women's athletics and 65.2% to men's athletics. A ratio in the area of 30% to the women's teams and 70% to the men's teams is common among Division 1 programs, and driven partly by the fact that football, ice hockey, and lacrosse teams have the largest rosters and two of those three are almost exclusively male sports. Such a distribution of team support budgets does seem to be in some with the notion of gender equity advanced in Title IX. At the moment, however, there does not appear to be a major federal push on the issue. Elaine Sortino did note in her presentation that interpretations of the participation and scholarships standards had tightened in recent years, with federal courts shifting from accepting rates within 5% of the gender ratio prevailing in the general student body to the current 1% band. The high expense, large roster, and popularity of football probably limit impulses to insist on close ratios in support spending. To the extent that the campus's better-than-national-average performance on support budgets stems from maintaining a Division 1-AA rather than a Division 1-A football team, the Athletic Council should monitor the situation to ensure that if the campus moves into Division 1A in football that move does not weaken efforts to promote gender equity in the campus's intercollegiate sports programs.

Federal law also requires reporting on the genders and salaries of coaches and assistant coaches, though at this time specifies no benchmark gender ratio for them. The committee focused on the gender data. The report for 2002-03 indicates that men's sports have a total of 10 head coaches, of whom one (diving) is female (and also coaches the women's team), while women's sports have a total of 11 head coaches, of whom 4 are males. Nationally, few Division 1 men's teams have a female head coach and about 65% of Division 1 women's teams have a male head coach. Our female head coach of a male team is thus unusual, while our ratio of female teams with male head coaches is 36%. 24 of the 25 (96%) assistant coaches of male teams are male, and 4 of the 20 (20%) assistant coaches of women's teams are male.

B. Racial/Ethnic Equity

The NCAA requires member schools to track and report racial/ethnic composition data regarding athletes and athletic staff. These are reported according to the categories used in the US census, and result from self-reporting by student-athletes and members of the athletic staff. Carol Ford supplied the subcommittee with information regarding athletes and athletic staff during 2003-03 and 2003-04.

As with gender equity, one yardstick for performance is comparison to the composition of the general undergraduate student body. In both fall 2002 and fall 2003, minority enrollment on the campus was 17%. Table 1 provides the information for athletes in both years.

Table 1. Active Varsity Athletes

Athletes		2002-03							
	group total	Alas/NA	As/Pac	Black	Hispanic	Other	NonresAI	Group M	% minority
M teams	337	2	4	55	7	14	16	68	20%
W teams	360	0	5	27	9	12	15	41	11%
all varsity	697	2	9	82	16	26	31	109	16%

Athletes		2003-04							
	group total	Alas/NA	As/Pac	Black	Hispanic	Other	Nonres AI	G minority	Rounded
M teams	349	0	5	56	7	14	14	68	19%
W teams	338	0	3	29	8	16	22	40	12%
all varsity	687	0	8	85	15	30	36	108	16%

[note: minority totals and percentages include Other and exclude Nonresident Aliens]

The table suggests that overall minority participation in varsity athletics is close to the overall minority presence in the student body. We did not have data on the breakdown by more specific grouping for the general student body, so cannot comment on whether that is also similar to the general campus makeup.

The detailed figures reveal considerable variation among teams. One result, the 5% minority participation in baseball (men’s team), was the subject of some discussion in the committee since it stands in strong contrast to the current demographic of that sport in the major and minor leagues and to the proportion of minority males among the general student body.

Table 2 summarizes the results of staff reporting data for both years. These were calculated by MJ Peterson on the basis of racial/ethnic composition data provided by Carol Ford.

Athletic Department staff race/ethnicity data shows considerable variation by area, with an overall result showing relatively few minority staff as compared to other groupings of staff across the university. According to the *Affirmative Action Plan, 2002-2003* compiled by the campus Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity, the minority representation among all campus employees was 12.7%. At the various levels of staffing broken out in the *Plan*, minority employees accounted for anything from 21.1% in the service/maintenance (lowest paid) category and 16.2% in the executive/administrative/managerial (highest paid) category to 7.7% in the secretarial/clerical category and 5.7% in the skilled crafts category. The Athletic Department's overall 9% puts it towards the lower end of campus performance, and below the median of the campus as a whole.

It is difficult to assess just how severe the situation is because the yardstick for performance used in Federal equal opportunity legislation is availability of minorities in the workforce, with the workforce subdivided by job category to reflect the sectoral and job classification segmentation of national and local labor markets. This makes evaluation of the data supplied by the Athletic department somewhat more complicated for the subcommittee because we are not sure where the staff levels of the persons covered in the data fit in the current EEO-6 job categories used in the *Plan*. It is clear from Appendix 3 of that document that coaches are included in EEO-6 Category 3 (Professional Non-Faculty), but it is not clear how other sorts of staff would be classified. Further, when it comes to highly segmented parts of the labor market (such as positions

Table 2 Athletic department Staff Composition

Staff	2002-03								
	area total	Alas/NA	As/Pac	Black	Hispanic	Other	Nonres AI	minority	% minority
academic	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	25%
admin	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
baseball	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
basketball	10	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	
C rec	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	33%
cheerlead	0								
crew	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
f hockey	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	50%
football	12	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	17%
ice hockey	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
lacrosse	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ski	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	50%
soccer	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	25%
softball	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
staff	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	25%
strength	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
swim	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
tennis	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
trainer	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL	95	0	0	6	1	6	0	13	14%

Staff 2003-04

academic	4			1			1	25%
admin	20						0	
baseball	3						0	
basketball	11			3		1	3	27%
C rec	3				1		1	33%
cheerlead	1			1			1	100%
crew	3						0	
f hockey	2					1	0	
football	18			3			3	17%
ice hockey	3						0	
lacrosse	5						0	
ski	1					1	0	
soccer	4						0	
softball	2					1	0	
staff	7					2	0	
strength	3						0	
swim	3						0	
tennis	2						0	
trainer	4						0	
TOTAL	99	0	0	8	1	6	9	9%

in academic departments), the yardstick is workforce availability in the relevant specialty. This makes it difficult for the subcommittee to recommend any particular goals toward which the Athletic Department should be striving. The Athletic Department is in the process of formulating plans for recruitment and retention of minority staff, to be submitted as part of the currently-delayed NCAA reaccreditation process next year, and is aware of its situation.

The subcommittee wishes to call attention to another form of activity providing scope for action regarding another aspect of enhancing diversity among athletic staffs, both on campus and at other institutions – efforts to encourage minority students to consider careers in the field. It is clear that without continuing attention to building a racially and ethnically diverse pool of entry-level personnel, there will be no basis for continuing to diversify the workforce at higher levels. The campus participates in such programs in a number of disciplines. One of the larger is the Northeast Alliance for Graduate Education and the Professoriate, which seeks to enhance minority representation on science, mathematics, and engineering faculties through programs offering high school and college students an early exposure to the fields and encouragement to undertake advanced study. Even if no such formalized program exists in the discipline of sports administration and management, the Department of Sport Management, through its programs, and the Athletic Department, in its hiring of graduate assistants, have opportunities to help build a diverse entry-level pool.

III. Summary Observation

The subcommittee finds strong performance on both gender and racial/ethnic equity in the recruitment of student-athletes for varsity teams, and a commitment to redressing the current gender imbalance in scholarship allocations. The Athletic Department should be congratulated and encouraged to continue its good work. We find that at the coaching level the campus is doing better than national average in utilization of female head coaches, and hope this will continue. We note the weaker performance on promoting racial and ethnic diversity among the Athletic Department staff, and urge greater attention to this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

MJ Peterson, chair
Carol Barr
Frank Lattuca
Ernest Washington
Marc Weinberger
Glenn Wong
Marsha Bryant
Kelli Kurtz
L.A. Love

Report of the Sub-Committee on Academics May 2004

Issues related to academic matters began to surface in the main Athletic Council meetings in the late Fall 2003. The two items raised were priority registration for student athletes and advising for student athletes. We believe that significant progress was made in both areas though the final outcome is still to be determined

In brief the issue of priority registration arises because of the time restrictions that the University itself imposes on student athletes through practice and game demands that students face as they compete for the University. These demands restrict the times when students can take classes and have the potential for playing havoc with student athlete academic programs, progress and even eligibility.

The issue of advising arises because of the need for student athletes to remain eligible and to also get the best course and career advice from staff and faculty specific to their majors. In many cases student athletes have only received counseling from the staff in the athletic department. The Council has supported a position that would urge or mandate student athletes to also have counseling from their academic major.

A separate meeting was set up to further consider these issues. The initial meeting took place in December consisting of the two Council co-chairs (Nelson Lacey and Carol Barr), Marc Weinberger (chair of the Academic Sub-Committee), Ernie Washington (member of the Academic Sub-Committee) and Mike Jenkins of the Athletic Department. General frustration over the lack of progress with the issues of priority registration and advising was expressed and commitments were made to make progress this year on both issues.

The Academic Sub-Committee chair suggested that he be responsible to follow up on both issues. To this end and in order to gather specific evidence about the extent and impact of athlete registration problems a survey was suggested. Marc Weinberger volunteered to develop a web-based survey of student athletes about registration. There was also agreement that a dual advising system be implemented.

A web-based survey was developed with input from Sub-Committee members and the Council Co-chairs. The survey link with a cover note from Mike Jenkins was distributed in late January via email to all varsity athletes. The results of that survey are attached as part of this report.

A meeting of the Academic Sub-Committee was held on March 12th. In attendance was MJ Peterson, Ernie Washington, Marc Weinberger and Mike Jenkins. The agenda for that meeting was as follows:

Survey of student athletes.
Academic advising for student athletes
Summary of where we are
Steps to implement
Athlete Academic progress and issues if any.
Other

Discussion began with a look at the survey results and recognition of its limitations. Marc Weinberger pledged to contact Michael Gargano, Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs and the new Athletic Director John McCutcheon to attempt to move the issue of priority registration to consideration by the administration.

An extended discussion followed about dual advising. The Chair said he would contact Pamela Marsh-Williams to discuss the matter further.

After the March 12th Sub-Committee Marc Weinberger contacted Michael Gargano and Pamela Marsh-Williams. A copy of the survey results with a cover letter (attached) were sent to Gargano and the new Athletic Director. Conversations between the two about priority registration have begun. Further Sub-Committee input was volunteered as needed. As of June 2004 the issue is in the hands of the Chancellor Lombardi for his consideration.

On March 30th a meeting about dual advising was held between Pamela Marsh-Williams, Ernie Washington and Marc Weinberger in Pamela's office.

On May 8th Marc Weinberger was invited to meet with the full undergraduate dean's council chaired by Pamela Marsh-Williams to discuss the desirability and feasibility of implementing a dual advising system for student athletes. There was broad and strong support for such a system despite resource limitations of the current on-campus academic advising system. The meeting ended with Marc Weinberger volunteering to meet with the Athletic Director to discuss dual advising.

On June 11th Marc Weinberger, Pamela Marsh-Williams, an advisor from her office, John McCutcheon (AD), Elaine Sortino (Associate AD) and Mike Jenkins (Associate AD for Students) met in the Mullins Center. The outcome of the meeting was to first make sure that all incoming students receive academic advising including students at risk, those undeclared as well as declared majors. This process will get underway as soon as a list is developed by Mike Jenkins and delivered to Pamela Marsh-Williams.

A second outcome of the meeting was that a sub-committee consisting of at least two members of the Athletic Sub-committee, two members of the Athletic Department (Elaine Sortino and Mike Jenkins), two undergraduate deans and Pamela Marsh-Williams be set up for late July or early August after all the new students programs are completed. The task of this sub committee will be to plan and implement a sustainable dual advising system for student athletes.

Summary Statistics

Survey of Student Athletes

(Conducted via web-based survey January-February 2004)

A total of 557 varsity athletes were surveyed in January and February 2004 with an internet based survey: <http://intra.som.umass.edu/athletesurvey/> ; see also attached paper version. 146 athletes responded (26%). Students were not told anything about the intention of the survey

1. What academic year are you in?

Freshman	42	29%
Sophomore	32	22%
Junior	39	27%
Senior	28	20%
Fifth Year	3	2%
Total Number	144	100%

2. What athlete year are you in?

Red Shirt	7	5%
Freshman	45	31%
Sophomore	34	23%
Junior	34	23%
Senior	26	18%
Total Number	146	100%

3. Gender

Male	52	36%
Female	94	64%
Total	146	100%

4. What is your major?

College of Humanities and Fine Arts	15	10%
College of Engineering	4	3%
College of Natural Resources and the Environment	11	7%
College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics	16	11%
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences	33	23%
Isenberg School of Management	36	24%
School of Education	2	1%
School of Nursing	1	<1%
School of Public Health and Health Sciences	11	8%
Undeclared	17	12%
Total	146	100%

5. What varsity sport(s) do you play?

Football	6
Men's Basketball	2
Women's Basketball	1
Men's Lacrosse	7
Women's Lacrosse	12
Softball	11
Baseball	5
Field Hockey	8
Men's Ice Hockey	8
Cross Country	8
Track (outdoor)	27
Track (indoor)	25
Women's Crew	27
Swimming & Diving	15
Soccer	8
Skiing	10
Women's Tennis	5
Totals	185

(multiple sports)

6. When does your sport normally practice while in season and out of season?

	In- Season	Out of Season
Before 8:00 am	44%	62%
Morning after 8:00 am	9%	8%
Early Afternoon before 3:00 pm	35%	23%
Late afternoon after 3:00 pm	58%	38%
Evening after dinner	13%	4%
	100%	100%

7. Is there a day in particular that is a problem?

123 said no one day is more of a problem. 23 said yes with each day of the week receiving some votes.

8. Did you have problems scheduling and selecting classes and getting classes for last Fall 2003 and this Spring 2004 that were the result of playing and practicing for your sport?

	N=	%
Yes	63	44%
No	82	56%
	145	100%

8a. If yes, please answer below, if no, skip to question #9:

Was your problem because lectures, discussions or labs conflicted with game or practice times?

	N=	%
Yes	73	83
No	15	17
	88	100

Can you be specific?

I can not choose what classes to take and to graduate because it is during practice and games...coaches are more understanding in fall.

Most classes during the daytime were taken and it was hard to get into courses that were needed for my major.

I got closed out of them because of over enrollment.

Most of my classes are only offered at one time, and because I had to take some, I was unable to plan around practice.

Classes during practice times in general.

My classes that I have to take for my major are only offered either during the fall or the spring.

Our practice is dictated by intramurals which is tough because we are limited in the time frame in which we can practice. This makes it tough for the people who need to take labs and afternoon classes. We have to choose our majors according to the times in which most of their classes are. I personally wanted to have a nursing degree and was told that it could not happen since most of the classes were in the afternoon. So now I am an exc sci major who is going back to school to receive a nursing degree when I could already have one.

Our practice time revolve around intramurals therefore we are limited to the times we can get in there, and thus we have to miss the opportunity to take classes we need while in season.

Lectures and lab times always conflict with practices.

Some lectures were only given during my practice time and some labs as well.

Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday I had classes that I NEEDED to take in order to graduate on time and to gain Admission into the STEP program. I also needed to be at practice for 2:30 but I had these classes that only offered one section. So I ended up practicing at 6:30 AM so I could go to class, but I was always exhausted.

A lot of labs are in the afternoon when practice is.

Last semester I had two 4 hour labs for my major and i had to miss practice twice a week. This semester i have to miss two practices also because the course I have to take isn't offered any other time ever.

Practice time for us is at 2:30. i usually have a 4 hour lab at some point in the week from about 1-5pm. 4:00pm classes also interfere with the scheduled practice time.

My classes that involve my major are only scheduled during practice hours, so some days I have conflicts on getting to practice on time.

Some lectures that I need for my major are during practice times.

A lot of courses are only offered once a year or you need it as a pre-req or even just so you don't fall behind. Practice times definitely get in the way and make scheduling difficult.

The class was only scheduled for Wednesday afternoons when we practice.

They only offered the class at one time in the late afternoon when we have practice.

Getting morning classes in engineering is tough because there is not much choice with classes.

Labs mess up everything.

I needed to take organic chemistry lecture that was only offered in the spring at 8am, but I had practice till 9 and had to wait till the next year to take the class, which just pushed me behind in my requirements.

Labs and discus. we get the only thing available in the morning or early evening.

Organic Chemistry is always during practice. Other classes also are during practice or overlap with other classes I should have already taken.

I had to take a class that is mandatory for my major but was only offered in the late afternoon when I had my practice. That was the only time that class was offered.

one of the polsci class was scheduled in practice time therefore i could not take it

It is hard sometimes when you need a specific class, and there is only one section of that class.

Then the class becomes a conflict with the sport.

I had to schedule classes and labs around practice which on some days we had twice. Some classes were only offered during our evening/afternoon practice times as well.

I couldn't get into a comm class because it was at 3.35 while we had practice at 3

I tried to get some sports classes that are required, like Sociology of Sport, but it was during practice time so I couldn't. And there wasn't that many other sports classes offered for the spring that I could take.

My motor control class was during practice time this past fall. I was forced to take it this upcoming spring when it does not conflict with practice times.

My practices are between 6 and 8 in the morning some days and other days at 2:30. resulting me to move all my night to nighttime and not be able to take the classes I want to take in order to function properly.

All of the above, lectures, discussions and labs, were difficult to fit into my schedule, and I have not been able to take a class because of those reasons.

A lot of classes I was interested in taking were offered only in the afternoon or evening during the fall, both of which I was unable to enroll in because of games and daily practice.

We ski from 12:30- 4:00, so half the classes I have to take I can't.

The classes i need to take are offered during the time when i need to practice.

Class times in engineering are not easy to work around.

I tried filling up my Tuesdays and Thursdays, so I could ski Mondays and Wednesdays, but some lectures and discussions especially for economics and math 132 could only be scheduled at times that were not suitable for me. So now I'm running around trying to reschedule everything. Unfortunately every class is during the day. Ski team practice: 1-5pm.

A lot of classes I wanted to take were already filled for the times available before my practice times, leaving the only open lectures during practice times so I had to pick different classes just to fill my schedule.

Labs and discussions were during the early afternoon and the labs were very long (3+ hours).

There are classes that I need to take for my major that are only offered during practice time, so I had to wait to take them in a later semester.

Practice on Tues and Thurs was 11-1, and that's when most classes on those days were, so I had to take all Mon Wed Fri classes.

I was not added to my major until late so it restricted me from being let into some classes.

I had to take classes that were at a worse time, and the classes that I had to take during practice time made me have to have early morning practices instead.

I have basically just a very specific window of when I can take my classes so that they do not conflict with my practice/lifting schedule and my traveling schedule.

All my classes have to be between 8am and 3pm so I won't miss practice. Some classes are outside those times every semester.

It is hard to make it to 8am classes, because we usually don't get back in time.

Macroeconomics and a math class I wanted conflict.

A lot of the classes that I wanted to take were offered during my practice time so I didn't take them.

There aren't enough classes offered for times before 2:30. Often there will be very few MWF classes and too many TuTh classes. In the past, I've not been able to take various classes because they are only offered at 2:30 or because they are offered at the same time as the rest of my classes. A lot of the classes I wanted to take met at the same time I had practice, which I cannot miss. I had to give up sociology minor because of that.

I cannot take any classes (lectures, discussions, etc) that are before 9:30 and after 2:30 due to my practice times.

Classes for major were times of practice sessions.

There were labs that lasted all afternoon, when practice was held.

All of the classes for my major (education and English) are mostly offered during practice times.

We have practice at 2:30 every day which had to be moved to 6:30 am because there were class conflicts among many on the team. I had to take my junior writing and I was only available for the 2:30 time slot.

We cannot have 8:00 am classes because we do not get back to campus in time to take them. I could also not take late afternoon classes in case we had practice. I also tried not to have classes on Fridays because I did not want to miss a lot of classes from traveling to meets.

One of my classes was at the same time as practice. i was able to take the course the following semester, though.

8b. Was your problem caused by classes or sections too full before you could register?

	N=	%
Yes	29	46
No	34	54
	63	

Can you be specific?

Many of the requirements for my major are full every time I go to register for them. And the only ones that are open are during practice time, so I have to delay taking the class, which makes it extremely difficult for me to graduate in four years every semester this happens. (three semesters in a row now)

Some classes were full because I had the last sign up date and I couldn't take some classes because of practice.

This semester I tried scheduling around practice time, but all classes are full right now these were the only times the classes were offered.

It's hard to get gen eds that fit into your schedule with practices and everything...and sometimes the only classes that fit you cant get into because they are full.

The gen eds that everyone wants to take fill up the fastest.

Typically there is only one section of class for the classes required for my major so i sign up for them first. Then i have to find a gen. ed. that doesn't interfere with my major classes or practice. Often times the convenient dis. sections of the gen. eds. (which are smaller) fill up fast, and then i can't take the lecture because the discussion interferes.

Class we full before i could register so i couldn't get the times i need to work around my practice schedule.

Sometimes the only time you have available in your schedule of a class you need is already full.

Some classes were full in during the times i need them to fit around my sport, i ended up not being able to take them so i could practice.

I was at practice during times when i could register and by the time i made it back to register, some of the classes i wanted were full.

This was a significant problem being a Sophomore.

No, just the combination of classes that I wanted to do, not a huge selection of a variety of times.

I had trouble getting into writing 112 but I was just able to get into because someone dropped it.

8c. How severe would you say your scheduling and course selection problems have been:

	N=	%
1 Severe(forced me to change courses or delay program)	8	10
2	15	18
3	28	33
4	23	27
5 Minor	10	12
		100%

8d. How often have you had scheduling problems?

	N=	%
1 Every Semester	17	21
2	9	11
3 Half the Time	23	28
4	18	22
5 Occasionally	15	18
	82	100%

What do you think would help solve the scheduling and course selection problems you have faced?

If athletes were allowed to pick their courses before other students. Our schedules are more time consuming, it is like having a full time job that you cannot change the hours from week to week. Other schools do it. **EXAMPLE CALIFORNIA BERKELEY**

If student athletes had the same scheduling dates as seniors or juniors. We're not like regular students... we have more stress due to our athletics; scheduling classes should not be an issue at our institution that we are competing for.

Most colleges give athletes priority to pick classes first I feel that would be the best option.

If a student athlete has a conflict with a class that is only offered when they can take it they should be able to get into it.

If we had lights on our field, and did not have to share time with baseball and lacrosse for the same area to practice.

Make it so that varsity athletes have priority in gym scheduling times, or in some cases open classes to athletes first so that they can get into classes they need.

Not having budget cuts; more classes available; professors being able to teach at different times of the day; Having teachers specifically for athletes.

Athletes should get first pick because we have more demanding schedules to work with.

More sections for classes, or different practice times, perhaps later, rather than earlier.

give athletes special privileges to register before other students.

There's really no way around these types of problems unless every team practices at 6 am

I think that if athletes had the chance to pick their courses before everyone else that would help.

Letting athletes register for classes before others. Friends of mine at other schools who are student athletes register early and it helps them a lot.

having all ME courses end at or before 2:30, and giving me first dibs at the gen eds.

give athletes more of an edge to get into particular classes.

Have classes scheduled before the afternoon so that athletes are able to make classes and practice on time.

More flexible class offerings.

Hire more teachers for ACCT 221

Have at least 2 offerings for each class during the semester(1 in morning, and 1 in afternoon).

If athletes were allowed to select classes before other students so that they could get classes around their practice schedule. that would help a lot.

Allowing athletes to be first to schedule classes would definitely help! coaches being cooperative and realizing you are here for academics first, not athletics.

I think student-athletes should be able to schedule classes before other students. It is so stressful having to schedule around practice. I couldn't take some of the classes I would've liked to just because the class time was during practice. The student-athletes make up such a small percentage of the students at UMass so I think it shouldn't be a problem having an earlier scheduling period.

If athletes could pick classes before other students, and maybe more sections of labs offered different practice times.

If there were someone to help set up my schedule according to my major and what GenEd's i have to fulfill.

Being able to register for classes earlier so that the classes i have to take aren't filled first.

Make classes offered in the morning and afternoon. Make sure all of athletes classes are taken by a certain time so they don't have to miss practice.

Student athletes should have precedence when scheduling classes.

Nothing...what are you going to do?....you have to practice sometime.

Priority over other students to select the classes we need.

No recommendations, it is tough to be a student-athlete, especially with a year round sport.

We get priority on times maybe a week or two in advance.

Some classes should be offered more than once each semester.

different practice or class time

What might help is if there are more sections of classes that don't have conflicts with sports teams.

Some colleges have a scheduled time in the evening/afternoon when no classes meet and such activities as varsity sports have practice. I think that that would help immensely. This would solve many problems.

Give the athletes in the school a separate time slot for registering that is a little earlier than the other students.

I solved the problem by taking it this semester.

More sport classes being offered in before 1p.m. in the spring.

Nothing could really help. This was the first time I've ever had a scheduling problem!

Have every team have a certain schedule so your practice times wont be different times each day making it easier to schedule classes.

Having the opportunity to be able to choose courses in the beginning, so I wouldn't have the problem of running into full classes.

I don't know how it could really be helped, I guess being on a team is a sacrifice one makes to be on the team.

Maybe if athletes get to sign-up for classes first.

Have more times offered in certain classes.

More class times/options

Let athletes with scheduling conflicts be able to get into classes they need to even if they are already full or offer the same course but with more different times. Too many of the same courses and lectures are bunched up at the same time with different teachers...probably because its easier for the teachers to do this.

I think athletes with their very busy schedules should be getting first priority on registration for classes. we have specific times to take classes and if we aren't lucky enough to be the first wave of students to sign up for a class its tough to get into what we want.

Have more times available to choose from.

I am not sure there is anything that can be done. Student-Athletes have the responsibility of making sure they get all the required courses done, and the ones that can't be done in season must be taken in the off-season. You can't expect the university to schedule classes around the athletes, it wouldn't be possible.

It seems that the spring semester offers fewer class choices at fewer times than the fall, and in order to be able to work around practices the more times offered the better if we were able to chose classes before most students.

Student athletes should have access earlier to help schedule around practices before classes get full and before certain time schedules are unavailable.

Have more sections of the class offered throughout the day instead of just one period.

Have an alternate small section of certain classes that are rigid with schedule times.

Flexible practice schedules.

having more classes available at different times, not just one class available to all students in the major.

More selection.

I don't really know how my problem could be solved. You can't really change when the classes were scheduled. but if there was more facilities available for my team then we wouldn't have to practice in the middle of the afternoon, when most classes are offered. I think my problem with scheduling would be made easier if classes of the same major were made at different times. Often I'll see classes for my major that are all at the same day and time and another class for my major. With this problem coupled with the fact that I can't take any classes after 2:30, I often sacrifice taking a good class.

Have different sections at extremely different times of the day so we have a choice and it will not conflict with practice.

Try to have the bigger and more popular classes (there's more than one section) have different times so at least there's a chance I would have been able to take it. Maybe having classes change times every semester so if one semester it's bad, the next semester it would have a better time.

I'm not sure if there is any way to solve them.

Help from the coaches, who didn't seem to want to help me.

Not so many classes all scheduled for the same time slots (most popular are late morning early afternoon. some of us don't mind getting up earlier in the day.

Thus far I have been able to find classes to fit into my schedule that fulfill requirements, they have not always been my first choice, but there have been enough classes offered at different times for me to find classes to take. But non-athletes also have to find classes that fit into their personal schedules too, if they have to work or commute or have other commitments.

After i got the hang of the spire system, i was fine with the scheduling system...it is much more efficient than the telephone registration.

To allow athletes to register before the other students.

If I could have picked the course earlier than my appointment time...it's especially hard when your a freshmen and have last pick at everything.

8 f. Has scheduling and course selection caused any eligibility problems for you?

	N=	%
Yes	6	7
No	34	93
	84	

9. By comparison to non-athletes at UMass, scheduling and course selection for athletes is:

	N=	%
1 Much more difficult	55	39
2	53	37
3 Same Difficulty	27	19
4	5	3
5 Less Difficult	3	2
	143	100%

10. What impact has the new SPIRE system had on your ability to register for courses?

	N=	%
1 Major Negative Impact	5	3
2 Minor Negative Impact	22	16
3 None	52	37
4 Minor Positive Impact	40	28
5 Major Positive Impact	22	16
	141	100%

This survey was developed by Marc Weinberger, Chair of the Academic Sub-Committee of the Athletic Council with assistance from M.J. Peterson, Nelson Lacey, Carol Barr, Ernie Washington and Mike Jenkins.