

**UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE**

MINUTES: In the absence of Presiding Officer Frank Hugus, Acting Presiding Officer Ernest May called the 598th Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on Thursday November 15, 2001 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall 227.

**A. ANNUAL REPORT
2000-2001 Annual Report of the Athletic Council, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 02-006.**

Acting Presiding Officer May remarked that senators were only presented with an excerpt, since the complete Athletic Council report fills a two-inch binder! He praised the Athletic Council as a well-organized and hard-working council of the senate, covering very substantive and controversial issues.

Nelson Lacey, Co-Chair of the Athletic Council: I'm Nelson Lacey, Associate Chair of Finance at the Isenberg School of Management and Co-Chair of the Athletic Council. Rod Warnick is the other co-chair, and he will also be making a presentation to you this afternoon. Our Council's 2000-2001 report was turned over to the Faculty Senate Office, copies were made, and all senators were given a copy of that report. It's a rather long report, as Ernie was saying; there's a lot in there. I don't know whether all senators have had the time or the inclination to read it all. Rod and I thought we would present some of the highlights of our 2000-2001 year to you today.

Our 19-member Council had perhaps its busiest year in recent memory. We operate with six subcommittees, and a lot of the work of the council is done in those subcommittees. Their reports have been filed, and they're part of the annual report that is in front of you now. One of the new features of our council is something called "Meet the Coach." This was instituted because a lot of our Council members have not had an opportunity to learn and understand about the full breadth of the athletic program here on our campus. The new feature, "Meet the Coach," was instituted so the Council could hear from those people, the coaches, that lead our 29 intercollegiate athletic teams. UMass Athletics is more than basketball, football and hockey. I know that that is sometimes the thinking. When you come to ask what is UMass Athletics, that's what you think about. We have 15 intercollegiate women's sports programs, and 14 intercollegiate men's sports programs. Twenty-nine programs ranks us fairly high against other universities, so we have a lot going on, in terms of the kinds of activities and sports that happens inside athletics.

One area that continues to receive attention from our Council is facilities. If you ask the question about how our facilities rank or compare to our competition, the answer would be, "We are *not* in competition." I can give you many, many examples of that, but I'll give you two. Water polo: Our teams have no home pool advantage. Reason being, our swimming pool here on campus does not meet with NCAA regulations, so all of our water polo events, men's and women's, have to occur off-campus. Second example, Track and Field: We have no indoor track facility here on campus. OK, not every school has an indoor track. Many of them do, but not all of them do. What makes us unique is we *also* don't have an outdoor track. We are one of the few programs that lack both indoor and outdoor facilities. You may think that we do. You know we have a track that's down there by the Mullins Center, but that track has so many gaps and gashes on it that it cannot be used in competition. So, our Council has taken the position that we have to try to improve the athletic facilities on campus. Our tactic has been to think about a way to combine both a facility that would meet some of our athletic needs and a facility that would meet our campus needs. We've talked about a recreation center, and we have done work over the last three years to try to push that agenda forward. For example, three years ago, we commissioned SARIS here on campus to survey our students and ask them how they feel about our athletic facilities here on campus. The answer we got from them is that, once again, we are not in competition. They talk to their friends. They know what's available elsewhere, and we aren't even in competition. These same students have said in a majority voice--actually a large majority voice--that they would be willing to pay a fee to get an athletic facility built here on campus. We hope that our efforts have actually done some good. Just yesterday in the *Daily Hampshire Gazette* there was a front page article that talked about some positive movement to maybe get a recreational facility built here on this campus. We hope that's done, and we hope it's done fairly quickly.

Student athletes: We look upon our 850 or so student athletes as ambassadors to our campus. When those people put on uniforms that say UMass, they represent us. Our position on the Council is that we want to do everything and anything we can to help them as they matriculate through our university. We want to try to make sure that they continue to graduate at the high rates they are graduating and to continue to keep G.P.A.s up at the levels they have been at. One thing that we try to do is to lobby the Registrar's Office every year to do what they can to help our athletes. We have the Registrar come to our Council meetings, and we ask her, "How can we make life easier for our athletes to get them in classes?" Here's an example: Let's suppose that football practice is every afternoon, Monday through Friday in the fall semester. Let's suppose that calculus is taught only Monday, Wednesday, Friday afternoon. There's nothing we're going to be able to do to help them. But let's suppose there are two sections, an early section and a late section. Wouldn't it make sense to try to reserve some spaces in the early section for our student athletes? That's what we've been trying to do. Our track record is certainly not a hundred percent there because the registrar gets lobbied from a lot of different constituents, but we try. And we'll continue to try to help them out.

Budgets: I know that people on campus are talking about budgets, and so are we in the Athletic Council. Our Council believes that there's an appropriate question to ask, and the question is this: "When you think of UMass Athletics, what do you want UMass Athletics to be? What do *we* want UMass Athletics to be?" Departments and schools all over campus ask the same question. We at the Isenberg School ask that all the time. We took a fresh look at our MBA program, and the question was, "Where would we like to aspire to be in the rankings of MBA programs across the country? Where do we want to show up on the rankings?" And once we have the answer to that question, maybe then we can decide what kind of effort we have to put forth to try to get there. I'll just mention that the University of Maryland decided a few years ago that they wanted to crack the top 25 business school rankings, and their dean took some measure and put some resources out there to try to do that. I mention University of Maryland only because they are one of our peer group that is talked about a lot in the comparison study that was in front of this group about a month ago. Athletics is no different. They want to ask the question, "What do you want us to be?"

The University has said to the Athletic Council, for example, "For Title IX compliance (Title IX is something that grew out of the Civil Rights acts in the 1960s and applied to athletics in the Education Act of 1972) that women athletes must have the same opportunity as men athletes at universities." The question then, to universities that are not meeting those requirements, is how to meet them. For example, at our university, women number about 51 percent in terms of men and women on our campus. So, Title IX would say about 51 percent of the resources in athletics should go to women. Now how do you do that? Some schools, faced with that decision, have said, "That's easy; we're going to cut men's programs. If we cut men's programs, then we can comply with Title IX." Our university has said, "We're not going to do that. We're not going to be compliant with Title IX by cutting men's programs. We're going to build women's sports programs," and that's what we've done. We were one of the first universities to be compliant with Title IX. Our Council has had a unified voice on this issue. We want to be compliant with Title IX, but not by cutting men's sports. That's the message that I believe we'll continue to bring forward out of our Council.

The second thing I want to mention on the question of budgets is the Sears Cup. I don't know how many of you know anything about the Sears Cup. The Sears Cup sometimes is thought of as the all-sports sweepstakes. It's a ranking of on-field performance of all sports programs at the universities. All universities are ranked with all their sports programs. For example, Stanford wins the Sears Cup year after year after year. I think five years in a row they've won, and if you know anything about Stanford, that's probably consistent with their view. They put a lot of effort and resources in their athletics. UMass, actually not too long ago, maybe four years ago, three years ago, we were around 50. Why is that an important number? At 50 we're probably the first school on the list that doesn't have a division I-A football program. If we weren't the first school, we were probably the second. We were very proud of that in the Athletic Council; that's a big accomplishment. That was three years ago. We've slipped. Two years ago we were 109. Last year we were 103. We are not a top 100 athletic program anymore. The question is, "Do we want to be a top 100 athletic program?" If the answer is 'yes,' then let's look at a plan that has resources that will bring us to a top 100 program. If the answer is 'no,' let's all understand what that means. So, UMass Athletics, what do we want to be? We think that's a pretty important question to ask.

Rod Warnick, Co-Chair of the Athletic Council: Thank you Nelson.

My mission today is to speak to some of the issues surrounding the Comparative Study Report and the numbers in that report about the Athletic Program. We, as a Council, have had only one meeting in which this report was reviewed and addressed and it was not the focal point of our annual report from 2000-2001. We added it as a “working document” and we do feel obligated to respond. This is a topic of on-going discussion.

Some of the questions coming out of this discussion might be the following:

Who are we athletically? Are we a T25, T50 or T100 program? Are we a 'public ivy' or a 'great state university'? What do we want to be as a university? Do we want to be a T25, T50 or T100 program? What do we value? Is Athletics a 'good value' for the dollars spent? Are these truly our athletic peers and how do we stack up?

Let's focus on the last of these questions first. Are these our athletic peers? The answer is 'NO'. A number of these schools have comparable-sized athletic programs with similar team numbers and athletes served. However, the one real difference in the majority of these peer institutions is that they have D-1 football programs and belong to BCS Conferences. Bowl Championship Series is a select set of championship conferences, which compete in football for the national championship. They have access to large sums of money.

Let's be clear about the nature of these peer institutions. Intercollegiate athletics at UMass includes a total of 29 varsity teams at a total cost of \$16-17 million. Two of the peer schools mentioned in the report, Penn State and Rutgers; offer the same number of teams with budgets of \$30 million and \$23 million, respectively. UMass' cost per FTE, \$754, is the lowest of all of these “so-called” peer institutions. Rutgers is \$777 per FTE and Penn State's is \$798. University of Nebraska, the highest in the peer group spends \$1870 per FTE. Of all of the “peer” programs included in the report, only the University of New Hampshire maintains a smaller athletic budget (\$11.4 million for 22 sports). New Hampshire's FTE cost of \$921 per FTE -- a full \$167 higher than UMass' cost per FTE. The university often lists as our direct competitor, the University of Connecticut. UConn offers 24 varsity sports at a cost of \$24.9 million at per FTE cost of \$1,351 -- a full 80% higher than the UMass figure.

For example, the Athletic Programs of Penn State University and University of Nebraska are substantially larger than UMass' program. These schools play major college Division I-A football; belong to revenue-producing and equity-sharing conferences; play in stadiums with home attendance in excess of 100,000 and 75,000, respectively; receive shares of conference bowl money in the range of \$15 to \$20 million per year; and also benefit by receiving shares of television contracts which exceed \$20 million per year per conference. In fact, as a case in point to these comparative institutions, the University of Nebraska, with a Division I-A football program, has an annual football budget which is larger than \$16 million or the entire UMass Athletic Department budget. One home football game at these schools probably nets more revenue than we do in two full seasons of home games.

What is a reasonable level of support? The Council is concerned about the way the comparative report classified “athletic support” and the perceptions that such a classification could create. UMass' support is identified as carried through “athletic support”, which includes state funding and student fees. Not all of the athletic budget is state supported...large portions come from student fee support and from athletic department revenue generation. State support of athletics was \$6.4 million in FY 99 or 39% of the entire Athletic Department's budget, covers primarily staff and coaching salaries and a portion of scholarship aid to student athletes. Student fees contributed another \$3.9 million (\$3,954,383), or 24%, to Athletics. Non-state support sources (athletic department revenue generation) contribute \$6,449,872 or 39% of the total \$16.4 million. The Athletic Department collected \$2.3 million in ticket sales and approximately \$1.1 million in gifts in FY 99. The remaining income to the department comes from advertising, A-10 revenue sharing, concessions, endowments, NCAA funding, game guarantees, parking, TV and radio, investment income and program sales (score cards). This program is “state-aided”, not state-supported. If we are to answer what is a reasonable level of support; then we must identify state-supported or state-aided programs.

On the expenditure side, spending for the high profile sports of football, basketball and ice hockey account for nearly \$7 million (\$6,955,906) of all operating expenses or 42.3% of the entire budget. Of these major revenue sports, only basketball returned a profit after expenses. Consequently, without the major revenue sports generating excess profits, the department is faced with being more dependent on state support to meet its commitments.

Who are our athletic peers? Who should be our group of athletic peers – should it be top 50 or top 100? Should there be a mix of state-aided schools? Who are they? Is there a list of comparative others? Let's be realistic if we want to head down this comparative trail. While the administration and the Lazare Report have developed this list of peer academic institutions, it makes sense that the list of schools be comparative from an athletic standpoint, too.

Athletics has never cut programs. Another concern we have heard expressed is that Athletics has not cut any programs. Not true. Athletics did and did attempt to reduce scholarships a number of times over the last decade. UMass Athletic Department has either reinstated or added seven sports after they were cut or proposed to be cut (women's lacrosse, women's tennis, women's volleyball, men's ice hockey, men's soccer, and men's tennis were reinstated and women's rowing was added). These reinstatements were also linked to threatening legal challenges brought on by U.S. Office of Civil Rights Title IX Compliance for gender equity. Thereafter, the University has sought to carry out its objective of being recognized as a national leader in Title IX compliance for women's sports. UMass was the first D-1 school to be fully compliant. However, each of these women's programs has required additional resources while providing few opportunities for new revenues. UMass suspended or reduced programs due to budget shortfalls. But, when attempts were made to reduce their programs, the programs were reinstated.

The figure which seems to have attracted so much attention in the press and by the Faculty Senate is the \$521 support per FTE number which is \$351 higher at UMass than the peer average. Well, if these schools are not athletic peers; then the figure is likely meaningless. UMass Athletics has fewer revenue sources, no cash cow like D-1 football and must cover salaries and scholarship aid to athletes from state support or from student fees.

Does UMass spend more on Athletics than it does on Academics? The answer is 'No.' The Office of Financial and Cost Analysis Report clearly indicates that this is not the case. Of the \$19,008 FTE uses of FY 1999 funds, \$8,808 per FTE goes to academics whereas only \$521 per FTE goes to athletic support. This is a ratio of about 17 to 1 on academics to athletic support. Furthermore, additional support for scholarships is nearly four (4) times the support of athletics, and student services and institutional support is twice that of athletics. FTE use of funds for academic support is more than three times that of athletics. (Office of Financial and Cost Analysis, "A Comparison of Revenues and Expenditures at the University of Massachusetts Amherst and Six Peer Institutions", Table 3, page 7).

Finally, a comparison of the Athletic Department to the six peer institutions in this study does not represent true athletic peers of UMass. Unfortunately, there are few if any athletic peers for UMass which are land-grant universities, flagship schools of a state university system, and/or offer the breadth of athletic programs. Most all land-grant institutions offer major revenue sports (i.e., I-A football and basketball) and/or are located in major urban areas. Without I-A football, UMass would probably be more comparable to its Atlantic 10 opponents with I-AA football as athletic peers or smaller state supported institutions with I-AA football. But, this still does not answer who we want to be--only who we are like!

The Athletic Council believes to provide a true comparative study of UMass Athletics, one must select comparable peer institutions or a range of typical schools. We now know how we compare athletically to the six peer institutions. There really is no comparison here. Factually, we do have the most state support; the lowest FTE cost of all those peers, much lower overall budgets, but a much larger number of athletic teams.

Perhaps it would be useful for a new group of peer institutions for athletics to be identified. If Faculty Senate wants to continue this comparative process; then direction and identification of peer institutions are needed. However, more importantly, the Athletic Council believes the Athletic Department needs to be directed from a strategic planning standpoint.

The Athletic Council wishes to make one point clear: the Amherst campus, the University at large, and the Commonwealth are receiving great value from UMass Athletics. By value we speak of what we get (output) versus what we spend (input). We offer 29 sports, we are diverse in our offerings, we are compliant and by all measures have a great group of student athletes who are excelling in the classroom. For most of the 90s, we were in the top 50 of all programs. We have slipped in recent years. Why? We are being outspent probably in women's sports by D-1 schools with large football programs and big time D-1 schools expenditures. You have learned that in the past year athletics at UMass has produced 11 Conference championships, 7 NCAA appearances, 6 teams ranked in Top 20, 13 All-Americans Athletes, and 51 All-Conference Athletes. We won the national championship in football in 1998 and made it to the Final Four in basketball, holding the top rank for most of the season as the #1 team for nearly 10 weeks. Our minor sports also have been extremely successful, especially our women's sports teams. And that's

looking only at success on the field. You'll then feel good about the fact that UMass complies fully with Title IX and we did it not by cutting men's sports but by adding women's sports, that UMass student athletes have consistently graduated at a higher rate than the general student body (65 percent compared to 60 percent), that for six consecutive semesters, over 40 percent of the student athletes have achieved at least a 3.0 GPA and that 92% of our student athletes graduate who exhausted their eligibility. In fact, this past year, UMass captured the Atlantic-10 Conference Commissioner's Cup for top athletic programs in terms of both athletic and academic performance for both men's and women's athletic programs and the first time this had ever been accomplished in the conference. UMass Athletics is a great value by all of these measures.

We on the Athletic Council understand that we enter this arena at great risk, that some will interpret our efforts as a defensive mechanism to shield criticism. But if we may offer a sports analogy – it's not defense we're playing here but offense. Let's not allow this peer review study lead us to incorrect conclusions or cloud our thinking. And, more importantly, let's not allow the current campus climate to deteriorate into battles between different campus constituencies. Let's be focused here on what we are comparing and talking about – 3.1% of our overall budget goes for athletics. And, \$6-8 million of direct state-aided support. This \$6-8 million is about 1% of our overall budget. Let's provide some direction and strategic thinking here.

Athletics is about building community; about building exposure for our university. John Calipari said is well – "Athletics is the front porch to our university." It keeps us in the public arena. It gives us exposure. How else are we to promote, to create awareness about our university? Remember we are also talking about our students here. They are part of the "living values" which Chancellor Williams is talking about. Each of our 29 teams is made of players – student athletes who are our students -- our community, who have majors, who have families, friends and classmates who will become alumni and play in the competitive arena nearly everyday of the academic year; who are ambassadors of our state university, who live out the values of making this a great community on a daily basis. These athletes are students with special gifts. We have invited them here to demonstrate their special talents as our representatives. We should take great pride in those talents and that demonstration.

It is very difficult in a large university to create community. Ceremony does that and sports are a real part of creating that community and that ceremony. The Athletic Council believes that UMass should have a vibrant and competitive program of intercollegiate athletics. Rest assured that UMass is providing just that program now -- at great value.

We welcome your feedback and direction.

QUESTIONS

Senator Arthur Kinney asked Professor Lacey what it means for the athletic program to rank below 100, both for the program and also for the rest of the campus.

Professor Lacey answered that a top 100 ranking is a result of the amount of money spent to support an athletic program.

Senator Marta Calas noted that, academically, the University invests money in programs that bring excellence to the University. She suggested that the Athletic Program be handled in the same way. She thought sports programs should be evaluated based on their performance and their ability to bring excellence to the University, and that only the successful programs should warrant investment.

Professor Lacey asked if Senator Calas was speaking about on-field performance.

Senator Calas answered yes.

Professor Lacey pointed out that the resources for the 29 sports teams are not divided evenly. Funding depends on whether the team is competing at a regional or national level, and that is one reason why some teams perform better than others.

Senator Brian O'Connor congratulated Professors Lacey and Warnick on an excellent report. He then addressed concerns over Title IX and the idea that certain programs can't be cut for fear of violating a civil rights law, but, at the same time, departments are cut and vacancies remain unfilled. "It seems to me," Senator O'Connor stated, "that the Athletics Department is the *only* department in the University in 10 years that has *grown*."

Professor Warnick replied that Title IX is something that is looked at closely. By federal law, if there are cuts, they have to be equal across the board. He then stated that athletic programs have been cut in the past, but they were later reinstated. He didn't know how or why those decisions were made.

Senator Roland Chilton noted that page 4 of the report indicates that over the last three years, shortfalls have totaled \$150,000, \$1,220,000, \$1,700,000 and that there is another shortfall estimated for this year (2001-2002). Page 5 indicates that in order to respond to these shortfalls, the department has non-base allocations that will be used now and in the future. He then suggested that, at this time of budget decreases, the Athletic program should reduce its expenditures just as academic programs are expected to.

Professor Lacey responded that the University can't have a top 50 athletic program with reduced expenditures, and explained that the Athletic Department has never operated with a balanced budget or a budget surplus. The money that the department spends is not equal to sources of revenue.

Senator Chilton explained that the report states that money has been transferred from other budgets into the Athletic budget. This has resulted in a decreasing faculty, and constantly decreasing support for academics, the core mission of the University. He suggested that the Athletic Department cut expenditures so as not to take money from academic programs.

Professor Warnick stated that the Athletic Department has a set budget, but the problem arises in the projection and the amount of revenue that comes in to the Athletic Department. The shortfall comes from ticket sales, contributions, and corporate sponsorships that are not meeting their revenue projections. According to the report, a large portion of the shortfall came from downturns in revenue from men's basketball and from contributions to the Athletic Fund. Expense increases are also hurting the athletic budget, such as increased expenses to operate the Mullins Center for each game, and the increase in out-of-state tuition.

Senator John McCarthy stated that every department at the University has aspirations for itself, but that the question departments and deans are asking is "What's the minimum we can get away with?" rather than "What do we want to be?" He suggested that the Athletic Department begin to ask that same question.

Senator Jenny Spencer stated that the report seemed to indicate that Division I-A football could financially carry all the other sports in the athletic program. "Does that happen at other schools?" she asked, and "Does that mean that all 29 sports would be fully funded?" She then mentioned that it's important that our comparison schools are in the Northeast because athletic culture in the Northeast is different than that in the Midwest, South and West, especially around football.

Professor Lacey responded that Division I-A football would not carry all the sports in the program, but that many of the schools UMass was compared with in the report are Division I-A schools that do carry the rest of their sports. He then described some problems with comparing "state funding per FTE" between these schools and noted that it is important to compare UMass with schools that are truly their peers before the Athletic Program can be further evaluated.

Senator O'Connor asked about the Board of Trustees' vote to add a recreation complex to the McGuirk Alumni Stadium. At the last Trustee meeting he attended there was a vote to work on a plan for a recreational facility, but he left the meeting with the idea that it was just a vote to plan, and that it would be added on to Boyden Gym, not to the stadium. He wondered if the plan to improve the stadium by way of adding the recreational facility would be an effort toward Division I-A football.

Professor Warnick stated that he was not at the Board of Trustees meeting, but his understanding was that a component of the McGuirk expansion program is a training facility for all athletics, including a campus recreation facility. He did not believe that there was a decision made to expand McGuirk Stadium, but there was talk of building the facility where Boyden is now.

Senator Mokhtar Atallah asked if it is true that 70 percent of student athletes have three points or higher?

Professor Warnick responded that the report said 40 percent achieved a GPA of at least 3.0 in one semester, and that 30 percent have maintained a GPA of 3.0 for more than one semester.

MOTION 06-02: That the Faculty Senate authorize the Program and Budget Council to review such issues as have been presented in the Annual Report of the Athletic Council, including but not necessarily limited to:

- (A) **UMA athletic expenditures compared to athletic peers;**
- (B) **The balance between athletics and academics;**
- (C) **Possible increased costs of I-A Football due to projected raising of NCAA minimum requirements.**

The Program and Budget Council is requested to report its findings to the Faculty Senate early in the Spring 2002 semester.

This motion was seconded.

Senator Chilton stated that given the previous discussion, it might be impossible to find athletic peers to compare with UMass. However, whether UMass is compared with athletic peers or academic peers, the point of the comparison is to see how other schools are handling decreasing budgets.

Senator Craig Moore: As chairman of the Program and Budget Council, I think it might be helpful to respond. I sent an e-mail out to the membership of the Program and Budget Council when this motion was proposed, and I'm simply going to read it to the Faculty Senate:

As you may know, the council is likely to be asked to review the report of the Athletic Council and the athletic budget following the Senate meeting this Thursday. I want to share a few thoughts with you prior to the discussion of the motion at the Senate meeting.

First, there seems to be a great deal of emphasis on making comparisons of our programs and budget with peer institutions. While it is often helpful to make such contrasts, especially with academic programs, it may be of more limited importance here. I say this because I'm not sure that the peer group used for comparison is representative of what we should be doing on this campus. It may be that the average per student expenditure of a group of other universities is not typical of any of them or that it represents a standard we should be striving for. If the group of peers is very diverse with regard to athletic policies and spending, the average of them may not provide a good benchmark. It may make more sense to examine other peers as case studies and adopt the best practices we find or a successful model that we can accept. The best practices approach rather than just using a peer approach is one, of course, that is used in industry all the time and frequently with much better results.

Second, it is obvious that the faculty is more concerned with academics than sports. It is also clear that many trustees share a vision of this campus that include big-time athletics as a key ingredient in boosting our public image as a flagship campus. This is a matter of difference in vision that cannot be rationalized with budget figures. It is a political decision that the board will ultimately make. What may be useful to underscore is the impact of continued expansion toward high-profile sports on campus programs and to emphasize that current programs are at risk. I'm not sure that the trustees have a good picture of the costs in terms of this impact on the quality and breadth of education, only the perceived benefits of big-time athletics.

Finally, it might be useful to examine the strategic question regarding the continued popularity of major sports in the future and whether or not it is a wise investment. There seems to be evidence that baseball and football are declining in popularity with younger people and that a whole new set of activities

and sports are more interesting to them. If the long-term market for sports is shifting is the expansion of football, for example, a wise investment? Are we investing in an area that has already peaked and has a declining future? What role will athletics play in shaping the perceptions regarding the public reputation of the University in the next 20 years? These are not questions that can be answered by looking at the current budget or short-term projections. They are strategic in nature, and must be approached, as a long-term investor would analyze the stock market. What is the present value or reasonably expected cashflow from I-A football over the next 10 years? Is it greater than or less than the campus would have if it invested in other things? What are the risks that are involved? What kind of a discount rate would be appropriate, given those risks? This analysis would be difficult, but the discussion would emphasize the long term, rather than the short term, and would maybe shift the spotlight on where we should be looking.

I think this is to a large degree a political question. It's a difference in vision. And one of the real problems we have here on this campus is that this faculty has not been able to come to any kind of consensus about a vision for this campus or what it wants to be. The trustees seem to be moving toward a vision, but I'll be damned if we are. And we're not going to draw their attention toward what our priorities are unless we point out these costs. We do have programs here at risk. We *have* been losing faculty. We *have* been seeing a diminution in the quality and quantity of courses offered, in the kinds of activities faculty can be engaged in. There are programs, there may be *colleges*, at risk on this campus. And now we're going in to the context of that talk about continued expansion of athletic programs. Well, if there is a plan that strategically says, "Yes, if you were to invest this money now that in the long run the present value of that investment is greater than it would be in other kinds of things." If, in fact, we could support all of these programs with zero cost because it would generate so much revenue, well then maybe people would be convinced that in fact, it's a good investment. Hell, maybe we should sacrifice a college for that! I don't think so. If this motion's asking the council that I chair to go through some kind of a budgetary analysis and come up with ratios and graphs and some budget figures that's going to answer this question, I think we're wasting our time. I think what we have to do is look at this in a way that points out that this *is* a zero sum game. That when you do make one piece of that pie a little larger, everybody else's piece of the pie is a little bit smaller. And P.S., the pie's shrinking. And I think we'd better take a look at the costs, not just the benefits. And I think that's the kind of analysis that's got to be done and presented. And that's what I'd suggest we might do.

Secretary May pointed out that the motion says, "including but not necessarily limited to." He then stated that he looked forward to additional points being addressed in the Program and Budget Council.

Senator Chilton spoke for the motion, suggesting that even if it passes, the Program and Budget Council is free to decide which questions are the most important to look at. He then stated that it's important to look at the issue and figure out what the problem is in comparing UMass with other institutions athletically.

Senator Jack Tager stated that it wouldn't be appropriate to ask the Program and Budget Council to take on this task.

Senator Surinder Mehta asked why the Program and Budget Council wasn't consulted before the Rules Committee put forth a motion concerning the Council. He then asked if the Program and Budget Council would like to take on the review to suggest changes and ask questions.

Senator Moore: I'm not necessarily against the motion. I spoke before to make several points that I thought were important to make to the Faculty Senate regarding this issue and the way it had to be approached. As Ernie May points out, the motion does give us the latitude to look at this in a number of ways. As Jack Tager points out (he's absolutely right), we do not have the kind of resources to undertake what I'm suggesting here. For example, if we really wanted to look at successful models and ask, "What is the best practice? What kind of models, as we look around, we might adopt as the best model for us?" And what other institutions have done that's been successful and take various parts from those programs, that would take some travel, and would take some investigation and would take more than just looking at some numbers and doing some graphs. It would take resources and time, and we'd have to have people involved in it. I really wanted to make the point that if what the Senate is expecting us to do is get involved in another debate about "Is this the right group of peers?" and "Let's look at these ratios; that should tell us the

truth;" or "this should point us in terms of what we should do or shouldn't be doing" it's not going to work. We have to decide what we want to be. We have to decide what the vision of this campus is, not just with respect to athletics, but in total. We have not had that happen. The faculty does not have a vision of what this campus should become. And I'm just using the debate on this motion to make those points because I think it's important for this Senate as a body to grapple with that set of bigger issues. Yeah, I talk to the people on the Rules Committee; they're not a bad bunch of people.

Secretary May stated that he didn't actually interpret Professor Moore's remarks as speaking against the motion, although he considerably modified the potential intent or effect of the motion with his remarks.

Senator O'Connor: For over six years I've sat in the Trustee meetings and I've heard the word 'accountability' used--that we as faculty have got to be accountable to the trustees, and I don't argue with that. But, I think this is an opportunity for them to be accountable to us, or else we're going to have Division I-A football. And we're going to have a lot of other types of sports, perhaps at the expense of academics. And I think if we let this ride, we have no one to blame but ourselves, because I fear that (and I think Jenny Spencer hit the nail on the head), they don't understand the sports culture of Western Massachusetts. I've been here for 33 years. I've seen the stadium filled *once*, when we played Holy Cross. And there were more Holy Cross fans than UMass fans. So, my feeling is that if we let this go and quibble over whether we should have peers—I agree, to hell with the peers—let's just have a mission. The Rules Committee is trying to come up with a mission on the academic end, but I think we've got to have a mission as to where athletics should be on this campus, because, as I've said three times already, they have not been cut. Every one of us has. How long are we going to take this?

Secretary May: I think that at the end of this report from the Athletic Council it says we have the most state support, the lowest FTE cost of all peers, and lower than average auxiliary and fund support, and that the Athletic Department needs to be directed from a strategic-planning standpoint. That's a very serious set of conclusions, and I think it deserves deliberation by more than one Faculty Senate council or committee. That was the intent of this, that when something important comes before the Senate, it usually has reports from more than one council or committee. The motion of the Rules Committee was intended to get another council or committee looking at the facts. It is a huge prospect to go into a complete study of this; that's not what is intended.

Senator Atallah stated that if the Senate is going to charge the Program and Budget Council to examine the [athletic] mission of the campus and where we should go, I think that there are some other councils that should be involved in that. He then added that that task will require effort and support beyond the Program and Budget Council.

Senator Mehta stated that he thinks the Senate should vote positively on this issue, and ask the Program and Budget Council to identify the problems they might have with taking on this role. He then pointed out that other councils and committees could present their own reports to the Senate, even if they weren't charged with doing so.

Senator Chilton congratulated the Senate on conducting a debate. He stated that this is an important issue, and he appreciated the healthy discussion surrounding it. He then urged all present to vote in favor of the motion.

This motion was adopted by voice vote.

B. BYLAW CHANGE: First Reading

Special Report of the Council on University Service, Public Service and Outreach concerning A Bylaw Change, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 02-007 with Motion No. 07-02.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Bylaw Change, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-02 02-007.

There were no questions or discussions regarding the Bylaw Change following this reading.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary May congratulated the Senate on holding serious debates of controversial issues. He then announced that the new issue of the Faculty Senate newsletter would be out soon, in which there were several important documents referenced on the Senate website, including a complete transcript of the last Senate meeting's discussion of tenure at the UMass' Worcester campus by professor John Walsh.

2. The Chair of the Rules Committee

Rules Committee Chair Roland Chilton announced that by-election ballots would be going out, and asked all senators to talk to their friends in other departments and districts to urge them to run for the Senate.

3. The Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees

Faculty Delegate Brian O'Connor stated that the Board of Trustees was on campus the previous Tuesday and Wednesday. During that time they conducted presentations on UMASS ONLINE by Jack Wilson, and a report on CVIP which has grown dramatically in five years, with the Medical School in the forefront and the Amherst Campus close behind. He then mentioned that it was interesting to hear Trustee Mahoney talk about fundraising: How the trustees themselves are actively involved in fundraising, and how they would pledge at least 1,000 dollars apiece to start the fundraising going.

The 598th Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:02 p.m. November 15, 2001.

Respectfully submitted by Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate.

The proceedings of this meeting are available on audiotape at the Faculty Senate Office dated November 15, 2001.