

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting of 19 January 1987

ATTENDANCE

Present: Bassett, Bissell, Borcherts,  
Brewer, Briggs, Burdi,  
Chudacoff, Cohen, Lady,  
Craig, Debler, DeCamp,  
Dobbins, Eggertsen, Glover,  
Gray, Haefner, Hanks,  
Hook, Lehmann,  
Lenaghan, Leonard, Lougee,  
Ketefian, Malvin, Margolis,  
McCarus, McClamroch, Meyer,  
Miller, Moerman, Nadelman,  
Singer, Oleinick, Olsen,  
Olson, Reed, Muirhead,  
Rosenthal, Ross, Hudson,  
Rutledge, Sargous, Seidler,  
Stapp, Stebbins, Thomson,  
Borer, Wiseman, Berent,  
Blass

Absent: Arnett, Ascione, Barlow,  
Vorus, Checkoway, Dandekar,  
Durrance, Ard, Gage,  
Goldberg, Yang, Han,  
Hollingsworth, Larson,  
Lavoie, Lewis, Lockwood,  
Lorey, Loup, Manis, Moore,  
Moran, Mosher, Pierce,  
Sanders, Schauer,  
Schteingart, Shannon,  
Silverman, Nystuen, Weiler,  
White, Yocum

CALL TO ORDER; MINUTES; ANNOUNCEMENTS

The meeting was called to order at 3:19 p.m. by Professor Stebbins. The minutes of the meeting of 15 December, 1986, were approved. Professor Stebbins announced that only three responses had been received to SACUA's request for information from Assembly members about the telephone system. He also announced that the phone system

is on the agenda of the Financial Affairs Committee for 20 January; Professor Moerman is SACUA's liaison with this committee.

REPORT OF THE BOARD IN CONTROL OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS,  
DON CANHAM

Professor Don Canham, Director of Athletics, reported on the University's athletic program. He began with some data about the growth of the program since the first of his 19 annual reports to the Assembly. The budget has increased from \$3 million to \$16 million, facilities have been vastly improved, the women's athletics program has come into existence, the number of employees in the Athletic Department has increased from fewer than 100 to more than 200, the scholarship fund has grown from half a million dollars to more than \$2 million, etc. He emphasized that Michigan's achievements in athletics have all been attained within the rules; in contrast to other universities, we have had no problems with ethics.

Professor Canham went on to discuss several issues that have arisen recently in connection with athletics:

- (1) Deregulation has decreased television revenue per game and thus increased pressure to televise more games. We are resisting this pressure and also pressure to alter the starting times of games for television;
- (2) Scandals like those at Maryland and Tulane reflect on all of intercollegiate athletics. They are one of our big concerns;
- (3) Suggestions for a playoff in college football seem to have no support from anyone in academics. In particular, the presidents are opposed. If the NCAA were to approve such a playoff, the Big Ten and Pac Ten conferences may refuse to participate;
- (4) We are concerned about the length of sports seasons and are making efforts to minimize loss of class time;
- (5) Michigan may be the only school in the U.S. that uses no student fees for athletics, but the next Athletic Director may need to be a more aggressive fund-raiser;
- (6) For years, we have opposed freshman eligibility. We may have enough support now to abolish it, but this is by no means certain. A close vote is expected in July;
- (7) Recruiting problems are the most serious ones we have. The President's Commission has imposed some restrictions on recruiting, but more restrictions are needed;
- (8) Some members of the Presidents' Commission (including President Shapiro) are very active in trying to reform athletics, but too many others only pay lip service to reform. There is concern that not enough presidents will attend the NCAA meeting in July.

DISCUSSION

Professor Briggs asked whether elimination of freshmen eligibility would leave students with three years of eligibility or four. He was concerned that the time commitment required by athletic participation would force many student athletes to take five years to graduate. Professor Canham replied that he would prefer a five year program with eligibility in the last four years. He added that there should be no "red-shirting," lest the students take too long to complete their studies.

In reply to a question from Professor Stapp about the academic load taken by athletes in major sports, Professor Canham said that the Big Ten rule on progress toward the degree requires athletes to take at least 12 credit hours per semester.

Professor McClamroch asked about equity for the women's program in terms of both funding level and competitive success. Professor Canham replied that the women's athletic program gets equal treatment with the men's in travel, equipment, facilities, and funding. It has not been as successful in competition as the men's program, partly because women do not seem to be as enthusiastic for athletics here as at, for example, Eastern Michigan. We do very well in some women's sports, like swimming, but not in others, like field hockey (which is practically non-existent in Michigan high schools).

A question from Professor Meyer about admissions standards for athletes was deferred to Professor Gikas's report. Professor Canham commented that the two basketball recruits who failed the new NCAA eligibility requirements had been recruited under the old system and seem to be doing reasonably well; one had a B average last term, the other a C average. He mentioned some other star athletes who were academically weak when admitted but who have done well.

REPORT OF THE CO-REPRESENTATIVES TO THE BIG TEN CONFERENCE -  
GWEN CRUZAT AND PAUL GIKAS

Professor Gwen Cruzat reported on some recent decisions by the NCAA and the Big Ten that affect the University:  
(1) The grade point average requirements for eligibility were raised to 1.8 (from 1.7) after the first year, 1.9 (from 1.85) after the second year, and 2.0 for the last two years. Michigan requires a 2.0 average at all levels except by special dispensation from the Committee on Academic

Performance; (2) The baseball season is limited to 60 games, which can be played in either Fall or Spring; (3) 1987 is the last year in which ACT scores below 15 can be compensated for by a higher grade point average; in future years, Rule 48 will be fully in effect; (4) The SAT or ACT on which initial eligibility is based must, for Division I schools, be taken by 1 July; (5) A student disqualified by Rule 48 for the freshman year has only three years of eligibility thereafter; (6) An Ivy League proposal to let Rule 48 non-qualifiers participate in club sports failed; (7) A Big Ten proposal on academic progress failed for the fifth time, but by a smaller margin than before; (8) A Pac Ten proposal eliminating a loophole in the computation of grade point averages passed; (9) Divisions will vote separately on academic and financial matters; (10) Recruiting contacts by athletic representatives other than athletic staff were prohibited; (11) Proposals on cost containment and freshman eligibility were referred to a special convention of presidents.

Professor McClamroch asked how the University decides on its position on issues before the NCAA or Big Ten. Professor Cruzat said that the representatives are instructed by the Board in Control of Intercollegiate Athletics, that major issues are discussed with President Shapiro, and that, if new information becomes available at the NCAA or Big Ten meeting, then the representatives vote their consciences.

In reply to a question from Professor Nadelman, Professor Cruzat said that the minimum scores for freshman eligibility are 700 on the SAT or 15 on the ACT, with a minimum of 11 specific core courses (Mathematics, English, etc.).

In reply to a question from Professor Wiseman, Professor Cruzat said that Pell grants are limited to \$900 for athletes. A Big Ten proposal to remove this limitation was withdrawn at the last NCAA meeting but may be reintroduced later.

Professor Cruzat showed slides with data on the distribution of athletes among the schools and colleges; most are in LSA. She also reported that of 593 athletes (393 men, 200 women), between 26 and 30 fell below the required 2.0 grade point average and therefore had to be seen by the Committee on Academic Performance.

Professor Paul Gikas continued the report by presenting data on graduation rates of athletes. The five-year

graduation rate for athletes entering the University in 1980 (not counting those who left in good academic standing before graduation) was 76.4%; the corresponding rate for all students was 85.6%. He also presented data subdivided according to sex, sport, and academic major.

Professor Stapp asked whether the data used in preparing this report are generally available. Professor Gikas described how and for what purpose the data were collected.

In reply to a question from Professor Thomson, Professor Gikas said that his data included only athletes with athletic scholarships and that the four-year graduation rate was above 70%.

Professor Gikas added that it is embarrassing when recruited athletes fail the NCAA requirements, but that this situation is unlikely to continue now that high schools have got the message. These students are smart, and the high schools can educate them but have not done so. By giving enough academic support, we can admit a small number of marginal students, without whom we cannot have a competitive program.

Professor Meyer asked about the academic status of tendered athletes in comparison with NCAA criteria and with the average for our student body. He also asked how the particular marginal students to be admitted are chosen. Professor Gikas said that there are no specific University-wide discussion criteria; admission is based on the whole picture, including talent not evident in the academic records. He mentioned that the Music and Art Schools also admit talented but marginal students, and that some athletes that the coaches want are not admitted.

Professor Gikas reported that, in the NCAA pre-bowl drug testing of athletes (for both performance-enhancing drugs and recreational drugs), our athletes were completely clean. In response to a question from Professor Moerman, Professor Gikas explained that anabolic steroids increase lean muscle mass and aggressiveness, giving athletes an unfair advantage but also presenting physical and mental hazards. Reliable methods for detecting them have been available for only a short time and are still expensive and difficult; the only laboratories that do this testing are at the University of Quebec and at UCLA.

Professor Margolis asked whether the help needed by marginal students is greater in LSA than, for example, in

Physical Education. Professor Gikas replied that the need is actually greater in Physical Education, since the weakest students enroll there.

Kathy Hulik, in the audience, asked what percentage of the decision to admit a marginal student is based on compassion ("bring them in to give them a chance") and what percentage is based on the need for building a competitive team. Professor Gikas replied that he could not determine percentages, but he added that affirmative action is often a factor also.

Professor Briggs said that admissions decisions concerning football players tended to rely on the student's character and family, not just athletic ability, and the result has been a good academic success rate. Professor Gikas agreed and added that letters of intent are signed before final grades are in, and, although scholarship offers have escape clauses in case final grades are too low, it is embarrassing to invoke these clauses.

Professor Nadelman asked what percentage of athletes have some kind of financial aid. Professor Gikas was unsure, but thought that almost all do; later, someone in the audience said that the percentage was lower, but no figure was given. Professor Gikas added that the University, unlike some other schools, does not terminate students' athletic scholarships after two or three years to be able to offer more scholarships to new students.

Professor Berent asked whether the Athletic Department's objection to night football games had an academic basis. Professor Gikas saw no academic issue, since the games are on weekends, but said that it was a matter of keeping attendance high and preserving tradition.

Professor Singer asked whether anything could be done about interruptions of games for commercials. Professor Gikas replied that if we want the TV money, we have to put up with the advertisements.

In reply to a question from Professor Gray, Professor Gikas estimated that perhaps one percent of our student athletes leave before graduation to enter professional sports.

Professor Gikas said that difficulties with Rule 48 should decrease since coaches won't keep taking students who can't play in the first year; of course, elimination of freshman eligibility might interfere with this.

Professor Moerman asked whether elimination of freshman eligibility would entail a need for more scholarships. Professor Gikas said that it would, and that other questions would also arise, for example, whether the elimination applied only to major sports or to all sports.

#### REPORTS FROM SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Professor Lenaghan reported that LSA's top priority is the undergraduate curriculum. A proposal to create a Council for Collegiate Studies, to oversee the curriculum of the first two years, was discussed and generally supported by the faculty, but will be made more precise before final action is taken. Also discussed was a proposal to strengthen the foreign language requirement, by eliminating the option of satisfying it by four years of a language in high school. This proposal will be voted on in February.

#### OLD BUSINESS

Professor Stebbins reminded the Nominating Committee for SACUA that it is to meet at 4 p.m. on 23 January.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Andreas Blass  
Acting Senate Secretary