

on the educational issues of underrepresented student populations. At IU she has served as the coordinator for the Afro-American Tutorial Program and is currently providing academic advising services for students who are on academic probation. Mary plans on pursuing her Ph.D. in Higher Education, with an emphasis on community colleges.

Larry D. Polley graduated from the CSPA program in 1996. He received a BS in business from IU in 1973. After graduation, he worked with a Big Six accounting firm and was a financial controller for a number of companies. He has been with the central administration of IU for 13 years and has developed and taught basic accounting seminars for IU staff. He is currently the Director of Treasury Accounting at IU.

This article is a condensed version of a larger report on this study. For a copy of the complete report, please contact one of the following:

Alan Rose, 26 Sullivan Way, East Brunswick, NJ 08816

Mary F. York, 1600 N. Willis Dr. #160, Bloomington, IN 47404

## The Role of Faculty in the Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics

Katrina Ross

*This paper discusses the role of faculty in intercollegiate athletics by tracing the evolution of the faculty athletics representative (FAR). Weaknesses surrounding the FAR's current position and governance responsibilities are identified, and implications for the present and future are offered.*

Institutional control of intercollegiate athletics has been the source of considerable controversy since they began in 1852 (Frey, 1988). The governance of college sports in the United States has changed hands several times over the last 100 years as students, alumni, college presidents, faculty, and athletic directors have all enjoyed periods of control (Berryman & Hardy, 1982). But since their early involvement, faculty members, especially those appointed as a representatives of athletic interests, have attempted to find their place in relation to the educational function of athletic programs (Ramer, 1980). This paper discusses the role and place of faculty athletics representatives (FARs) in intercollegiate athletics by tracing their evolution since the beginning of intercollegiate athletics, describing the weaknesses surrounding their positions and their relation to athletic departments, and providing implications for the present and future.

### The Evolution of Faculty Control in Intercollegiate Athletics

One of the most surprising factors revealed in the study of college athletics is the historical absence of effective faculty governance of the athlete's educational experience (Weistart, 1987). The role of the faculty in controlling intercollegiate athletics grew from the traditional relationship between faculty and students in extracurricular activities. When student control of athletics became chaotic, it became necessary for faculty to assume control (Shea & Wieman, 1967). In the case of intercollegiate athletics, students developed sports programs without regard to academic and safety concerns, and this perceived lack of responsibility led to faculty action (Smith, 1988).

College athletics began as student pastimes that were intramural in nature. By the 1820s, however, contests were established as vehicles for determining class honor. When these class rivalries became bloody and somewhat violent, they drew the attention of administration. Still, little structured governance existed. This all changed with the introduction of intercollegiate athletics (Berryman & Hardy, 1982).

In the early days of intercollegiate competition, governing bodies were student-run and initiated. Students saw to administration and governance without direction or encouragement from faculty. The faculty's attitude was one of indifference, not opposition, as they became aware of the growing popularity of sports on campus, and chose to do nothing to control its growth (Smith, 1973). Faculty members were caught between their belief that exercise was of value to student health and their fear that uncontrolled athletics would lead to educational abuses. A tension existed between students' affection for athletics and faculty concern for educational integrity (Smith, 1988).

Although students were effective managers at the start, as teams' schedules grew and the desire to win increased, the students in charge employed questionable practices that included financial mismanagement and inadequate treatment of injuries (Smith, 1973). Student governance became threatened as faculty groups began to express alarm over students' questionable practices. Five areas of abuses caught the attention of faculty: the move from amateurism to the professionalism of athletes, increasing size and management of finances, lack of sportsmanship, the emphasis of athletics over academics, and other concerns associated with athletics, such as drinking and gambling (Berryman & Hardy, 1982).

A struggle over the appropriate control of intercollegiate athletics existed from 1874 until 1898 because of the inability and unwillingness of students to control their own athletic programs (Miller & Newman, 1994). During the early part of the 20th century, the administration realized that new measures needed to be put into place. Student governance was no longer practical nor adequate. In an attempt to gain control, most institutions added faculty members to their boards in control of athletics, and in time faculty members made up a majority on these boards (Shea & Wieman, 1967). Berryman and Hardy (1982) said that as early as 1882,

Harvard's president appointed a three-man committee of faculty members that dismissed the baseball coach and developed five rules regulating competition. Similar faculty committees started at other colleges during the 1880s and '90s, such as the committee at University of Wisconsin created in 1889 with the charge of putting athletics under control (Berryman & Hardy, 1982).

Smith (1973) noted that among the patterns of early athletics administration, none received more notice or spread more quickly than the system of faculty control. In 1915, Foster (as cited in Smith, 1973) published an article that listed the goals of intercollegiate athletics as finding advertising, making money, and winning, and asserted that these ambitions were in sharp contrast to the goals of university faculty. The term "faculty control" implied that the university could take control and fix the apparent problems with intercollegiate athletics (Smith, 1973).

Some of the faculty committees were responsible for scheduling and finances, while others were in charge of monitoring participant eligibility (Smith, 1973). Students complained about these intrusions, but to no avail. The new groups differed from the student-run associations in several ways. The faculty groups possessed horizontal control that blanketed all sports, not just one. Their chief concerns were not rules and championships, but limiting competition and monitoring eligibility. By 1910, students had lost their authority over intercollegiate athletics, but did continue to be represented on various joint athletic boards (Berryman & Hardy, 1982). In 1929 the Carnegie Foundation determined that the most popular type of board included a balanced representation of campus constituents, including faculty, alumni and students (Smith, 1973).

College presidents were at the center of the changes in governance structures surrounding college athletics. These individuals felt the squeeze from students, alumni, and trustees to promote institutional visibility through athletics, but they could not ignore the serious issues surrounding intercollegiate athletics (Berryman & Hardy, 1982). The faculty were in no position to manage the athletic programs that students had initiated because they lacked time and knowledge. About all they did was check excesses and prohibit aspects that they considered harmful (Smith, 1988). Concerned

presidents and faculty looked for other forms of restraint (Berryman & Hardy, 1982).

Berryman and Hardy (1982) noted that by the mid-1890s, the interest in faculty-run associations grew in popularity with the development of academic federations that set common standards for such issues as admissions and degree requirements. Athletic counterparts to these groups soon developed (Berryman & Hardy, 1982). The Southern Intercollegiate Athletics Conference was founded in 1894 (Berryman & Hardy, 1982). In 1895 the Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives was formed. Slaughter (1989) noted that the conference developed rules and regulations concerning eligibility, recruiting, and payment of athletes. The early 1900s saw the development of many other conferences around the United States (Slaughter, 1989).

While faculty members had some early control, this power did not ensure the transformation of athletics into a partnership with the academic mission. The faculty lost an opportunity to provide effective oversight to athletics when they refused to acknowledge the educational value of athletics (Smith, 1973). Faculty indifference inhibited them from securing a position of control during the rise of intercollegiate athletics.

One case study offers insight into successful athletics governance by faculty. In the Pacific Coast Conference (PCC) the faculty athletic representative (FAR) controlled the governance of the conference from 1946 until 1959. A description of the FARs in the PCC is a group of respected faculty members who were both talented and responsible. This group of individuals was not weak and indifferent to the athletic program, but instead was committed and informed. Media put the blame for conference controversy on the FARs. When administration attempted to dilute the power of the faculty, the conference dissolved (Thelin, 1994).

### **Weaknesses in the Structure of Faculty Governance**

Early conferences insisted on faculty control of eligibility in terms of educational standards and this event marks a significant development in the evolution of athletic governance (Berryman & Hardy, 1982). The creation of faculty committees for athletics helped to bring athletic programs under institutional control and they continue to be successful in inhibiting abuses

regarding scholastic eligibility and admissions procedures. The faculty committee as an instrument for controlling the overall governance and policy-making of athletics has not been successful (Shea & Wieman, 1967). Faculty oversight of athletic programs is no longer effective at most institutions (Thelin & Wiseman, 1989).

The position of faculty representative for athletics has existed for more than a quarter of a century at half of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) member institutions (Ramer, 1980). Since its founding in 1906, the NCAA has produced guidelines for institutions and has evolved into a vehicle for discussing problems facing intercollegiate athletics (Smith, 1988). The NCAA's guidelines regarding the FAR is an example of such activity. The NCAA (1994) defines the FAR as a member of the institution's faculty or administrative staff who is appointed by the chief executive officer to represent the institution and its faculty in its relationship with the NCAA and conferences. Since 1989, the NCAA has mandated that an institution designate an individual to serve as its FAR and that the individual may not be an administrative or coaching member of the athletic department (NCAA, 1994).

On most college campuses, the FAR assists when needed and serves as an advisor on athletic issues. The FAR also certifies athletic eligibility and serves as a delegate to the NCAA and the institution's conference (Ramer, 1980). The FAR is put in place "to maintain intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the educational program" (Thelin & Wiseman, 1989, p. 86). The function of the FAR and faculty committees has been to serve an advisory role, usually to approve routine procedures for administration purposes (Shea & Wieman, 1967). The specific duties of the FAR are assigned by the institution, but a core set of responsibilities are understood to be: a) maintenance of a relationship with the NCAA and the conference office; b) maintenance of intrainstitutional relationships with faculty, administration, and the department of athletics; and c) demonstration of concern for the academic and athletic performance and the well-being of student-athletes (Cooper, 1992). These individuals have not been given authority to assist in the direction of the athletic program (Shea & Wieman, 1967).

Several problematic issues surround faculty involvement in the governance of athletics. The faculty's role has evolved into one of preventing athletics from becoming too big and detracting from the academic mission. Because of this assignment, faculty tended to exhibit authority over and place distrust in anyone connected with intercollegiate athletics (Scott, 1982). For many faculty members, athletics is a secondary priority, and they must rely on others to provide information regarding athletic interests (Shea & Wieman, 1967). Colleagues on their campus may not know about the role of the FAR. For some FARs, association with the athletic department can threaten their credibility as a faculty member. At most large universities, the FAR is not assured to represent the broad faculty sentiment, and colleagues may therefore mistrust them. Others deal with the belief that the FAR is co-opted by the athletic department and cannot represent the academic point of view fairly (Thelin & Wiseman, 1989).

Lederman (1991) identified that other criticisms of the FAR deal with the perks associated with the role. Choice tickets, special parking, and transportation to away events are becoming factors that define the role in ways that are in the interest of the athletic department. Such association leads to the belief that the FAR is an appendix of the athletic department (Lederman, 1991).

The FAR is subjected to pressures from the athletic director, coaches, and president, despite the alleged autonomy of the role. Although the FAR is put into a position of governance and advising, no one is obligated to listen to the faculty member. The lack of governance and power is not an indication of a lack of concern or interest on the part of the FAR. However, traditionally the role is superficial, so the FAR may choose not to expend valuable time and energy toward the position (Thelin, 1994). Conversely, if a FAR spends too much time fulfilling athletic obligations, the individual is inhibited from fulfilling the duties of a full-time faculty member (Thelin & Wiseman, 1989).

Faculty at many universities can claim that their athletic departments have been organized to purposely operate at a distance from the normal channels of faculty governance (Weistart, 1987). The institutions where faculty representatives have had the most voice and authority (Big-Ten and

Pac-10 institutions) are ones with a tradition of strong general faculty governance (Lederman, 1991). Most universities' organizational charts bypass faculty control altogether (Thelin & Wiseman, 1989). Faculty acting as a legitimate regulatory force would result in an extremely time consuming task, which translates into a limited prospect for success (Weistart, 1987).

There has been a call for faculty control and involvement, but usually policy statements directing the FAR have been weak when put into practice. Recent major studies on the governance of intercollegiate athletics have omitted analysis of the faculty as a factor (Thelin & Wiseman, 1989). Some groups have argued that the FAR and faculty committees have been part of the problems surrounding college athletics, rather than part of a viable solution (Lederman, 1991). The chair of the Knight Foundation Commission on the Future of College Sports observed:

Of all of the people testifying before the Knight Commission, the most disappointing, the least impressive, were the faculty (athletics committee) reps. They seemed to have no idea what their role was. Their role is obviously to represent academic interest, but they seem to have been co-opted by the athletic departments. (Thelin, 1994)

### Summary

The abuses and scandals surrounding athletic departments in recent years have caught the public's attention. Faculty are crucial to the cause of ethics in athletics (Boyer, 1989). Athletics and higher education share the same concern because all aspects of the university have had examples of disregard for ethical standards (Gerdy, 1992). Faculty have a particularly important role in shaping an institution's academic program and ensuring its integrity (Weistart, 1987).

The role of the FAR has changed through time, and at many institutions it has deteriorated. Faculty members are being urged to assume a larger role in athletic governance (Cooper, 1992). Although their record of governance has been weak, they must move into a position of responsibility and active leadership (Boyer, 1989). The shame of college athletics is how these intelligent yet compliant people rationalize their irresponsibility. Faculty members act as if the negative issues surrounding the athletic department

are none of their business (Ericson, 1993). Since reform is the operative word in the arena of intercollegiate athletics, the higher education community faces a unique opportunity to redefine the role of athletics. Faculty members can and should play a role in the process (Gerdy, 1992).

Faculty must accept athletics as an inevitable and potentially positive aspect of higher education (Gerdy, 1992). Then faculty can become a voice of candor and independence that adds important balance to the discussion of reform. It is doubtful that faculty alone will refocus the priorities of major athletic programs. However, it is the obligation of faculty to ensure the emphasis of academics in an institution's athletics programs (American Association of University Professors, 1990). But skeptics point out that faculty will have to show a willingness to make tough decisions and become more vocal about the need for change (Lederman, 1991). As Weistart (1987) noted, "the moving force (behind the revelation of improprieties) is much more likely to be a newspaper reporter than a concerned faculty member" (p. 12). Faculty can become the force behind enhancing not only student-athletes' academic experiences, but also the entire collegiate experience. As a part of the process, faculty should call on peers, institutional administration, and athletic departments to advocate the inclusion of educational goals into intercollegiate athletics.

### References

- American Association of University Professors. (1990). The role of faculty in the governance of college athletics. A Report of the Special Committee on Athletics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 316 155)
- Berryman, J. W. & Hardy, S. H. (1982). A historical view of the governance issue. In J. Frey (Ed.), *The governance of intercollegiate athletics* (pp. 15-28). West Point, NY: Leisure Press.
- Boyer, E. L. (1989). Foreword. In Lapchick, R. E. and Slaughter, J. B. (Eds.), *The rules of the game: Ethics in college sport*. (unnumbered). New York: American Council on Education, Macmillan.
- Cooper, A. W. (1992). The role of the faculty athletic representative. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 74, pp. 39-43.
- Ericson, J. (1993). Real world, pretend universities. *Educational Record*, 74, 43-48.
- Frey, J. H. (1988). Institutional control of athletics: An analysis of the role played by presidents, faculty, trustees, alumni and the NCAA. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 11(1/2), 49-59.

- Gerdy, J. R. (1992). Faculty and collegiate athletics reform: Seizing the moment. *Educational Record*, 73, 44-49.
- Lederman, D. (1991, November 13). Faculty athletics representatives urged to redefine their role in movement to reform college sports. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. pp. A41-42.
- Miller, M. T. and Newman, R. E. (1994). A study of historical academic control measures in intercollegiate athletics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 374 710).
- 1994-95 *NCAA Manual*. (1994). Overland Park, KS: National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Ramer, E. M. (1980). *Athletic committees and faculty representatives*. Shawnee Mission, KS: National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Scott, H. A. (1982). New directions in intercollegiate athletics. In J. Frey (Ed.), *The governance of intercollegiate athletics*. (pp. 29-39). West Point, NY: Leisure Press.
- Shea, E. J. and Wieman, E. E. (1967). *Administrative policies for intercollegiate athletics*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Slaughter, J. B. (1989). Where was the president? Presidents' responsibility for change in intercollegiate athletics. In R.E. Lapchick and J.B. Slaughter (Eds.), *The rules of the game: Ethics in college sport* (pp. 179-191). New York: American Council on Education, Macmillan.
- Smith, R. A. (1988). *Sports and freedom: The rise of big-time college athletics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, R. E. (1973). *Analysis of the role behavior and role expectation of faculty athletic committees and faculty athletic representatives in National Association of Intercollegiate Athletic colleges and universities*. (Dissertation for the Florida State University College of Education).
- Thelin, J. R. (1994). *Games colleges play: Scandal and reform in intercollegiate athletics*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Thelin, J. R. and Wiseman, L. L. (1989). *The old college try: Balancing athletics and academics in higher education* (Report No. 4). Washington, D.C.: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.
- Weistart, J. C. (1987). College sports reform: Where are the faculty? *Academe*, 73, 12-17.
- Katrina Ross graduated from the HESA program in 1997, and served as an academics assistant in the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics at IU. Previously, she worked for four years as Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference (Metro Conference) in compliance and communications. She*

*received a B.S. in broadcast journalism from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 1990.*

## **AIDS/HIV and Higher Education**

*Jeffrey Spahn*

*HIV and AIDS are affecting college and university campuses. Because the majority of infections occur among young adults, institutions have the opportunity to significantly impact infection rates through educational programming. This article presents a brief overview of the issues involved with HIV/AIDS and higher education while offering suggestions for continued programming efforts.*

Should universities and colleges participate in Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) and Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) education? For educational institutions, the simple answer is yes. However, the difficult question then becomes what type of education should be encouraged. In addition to informational resources, should colleges and universities educate and provide physical resources for AIDS/HIV education? Campuses supply their students with physical resources for health and well being, such as recreational facilities. Should they provide students with safer sex resources such as condoms, dental-dams, and lubricants with preventative agents like non-oxynol-9?

The purpose of this paper is to present student affairs professionals with an overview of issues related to HIV/AIDS education and to recommend appropriate methods for addressing these difficult issues. First, a discussion will focus on the need to support AIDS/HIV education. Second, this article will address institutional responsibility to provide safer sex resources. Third, criticism of such programs are explained as a critique of current safer sex education. Finally, recommendations for new programs are offered in order to improve programming efforts at institutions which lack effective AIDS/HIV education.

### **Need For AIDS/HIV Education**

To date, there is still no cure for the fatal AIDS virus. Prevention is the only method available to combat future infections. HIV education is extremely important to undergraduate student populations because traditional-age students are engaging in more sexual activity than in