

December 21, 2011

LINDA P.B. KATEHI
Chancellor

Re: Summary Report of the Recruitment Advisory Committee for Director of Athletics

Dear Chancellor Katehi:

We are pleased to provide you with this summary report in response to your charge letter to the Recruitment Advisory Committee for the director of athletics. In your Oct. 5, 2011, letter, you asked the committee to summarize input and advice from the UC Davis community on: the best future direction for our Intercollegiate Athletics program; the community's sense of our strengths and challenges; the desired qualifications, experience and vision of our next director of athletics; and reaction to the "UC Davis Athletics Strategic Audit 2011," prepared by consultant Cedric W. Dempsey. You also asked the committee to gather perspectives and discuss the Eight Core Principles of UC Davis Intercollegiate Athletics, in order to help our university define a vision of excellence for the future of our athletics program.

You initially asked the committee to provide its input by Nov. 7. However, committee members were grateful when, in your subsequent Oct. 24 letter, you granted an extension for input through Nov. 30. This extension proved valuable in that it allowed for additional town hall meetings and input from many more constituents.

We have worked diligently to create a fair and balanced report of the various perspectives. It was difficult to summarize input on a topic that evokes passionate views among so many, and which involves such a wide range of perspectives. In order to capture this passion and diversity of views, and to provide some sense of the levels of agreement or consensus among constituents, we used illustrative quotes in the report when appropriate to help convey a commonly expressed sentiment.

We also want to express our sincere thanks to the hundreds of members of the broader UC Davis community who wrote e-mails, spoke at town halls and met with committee members to discuss this important topic. The vast majority of input was extremely thoughtful and articulate. Those e-mails are provided for your review.

We hope this summary is helpful to you as you consider both the future of our athletics program and the important characteristics you would like the committee to identify in UC Davis' next director of athletics. While the committee looks forward to beginning our review of the applications for the director of athletics we will now pause before taking the next steps in the recruitment process until we receive further direction from you, which we understand will occur sometime in February after you receive input from the Academic Senate's Special Committee on Athletics.

Thank you again for the opportunity to serve the campus in this important effort.

Sincerely,

Fred Wood, Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs (Chair)

Emily Galindo, Associate Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs (Vice Chair)

Linda Bisson, Chair, Academic Senate

John Campbell, Director, Campus Recreation

Scott Carrell, Chair, Athletics Administrative Advisory Committee

Wendi Delmendo, Chief Compliance Officer (Title IX Officer)

Bruce Edwards, Foundation Member and Alumnus

Kevin Johnson, Dean, School of Law

Paul Sallaberry, Foundation Member and Alumnus

Babs Sandeen, Chief Regional and Community Engagement Officer

Sandy Simpson, Former Head Coach, Women's Basketball

Laura Sunday, Officer, Student Athlete Advising Committee

Shahzeeb Syed, Chair, Campus Unions and Recreation Board

Adam Thongsavat, President, Associated Students of UC Davis

Jeff Weidner, Director, Physical Education

Dan Wilson, Chair, Academic Federation



Summary Report of the Recruitment Advisory Committee
for Director of Athletics

DECEMBER 2011

I. INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the comments, observations and recommendations collected by the Recruitment Advisory Committee that Chancellor Linda P.B. Katehi appointed to lead the search for a new director of athletics.

This summary includes the input and recommendations of the members of the committee, those who met with committee members, as well as the input the committee received from those who provided written and oral comments in e-mail correspondence and at four town hall meetings in October and November 2011.

On Oct. 5, 2011, the chancellor announced her appointment of the recruitment advisory committee to lead the search for the new director of athletics.

UC Davis' "Intercollegiate Athletics program is at a crossroads," she wrote in her charge letter to the committee. "Whichever future direction we take—and whomever we choose to lead athletics in that direction—will help define the overall reputation of UC Davis as a world-class public research university."

At the time, the chancellor wrote that she was "very proud of our Intercollegiate Athletics program and I am convinced that it was the right decision to make the move to Division I, especially for our future. Yet even within Division I intercollegiate athletics, there are different paths open to UC Davis for that future. We must work together to choose the best fit for our university and our student-athletes, and to choose the best director of athletics to lead the way."

II. BACKGROUND

To begin its fact-finding effort, the committee launched a website (http://chancellor.ucdavis.edu/initiatives/athletics_director/index.html) that included, among other things: the chancellor's charge letter to the committee; a link to an electronic version of the report, "UC Davis Athletics Strategic Audit 2011," by Cedric W. Dempsey of CDC Consulting LLC; and the announcement of an e-mail address—athletics@ucdavis.edu—for individuals who wanted to share their perspectives with the committee on the Dempsey report, the future of UC Davis Intercollegiate Athletics, and their preferred characteristics of the next director of athletics.

The campus also publicized the launch of the recruitment and the availability of the materials in *Dateline UC Davis*, an electronic newspaper, *Friday Update*, a weekly electronic newsletter sent to all staff and faculty, and on the campus homepage. Additionally, about two weeks later, on Oct. 24, the chancellor sent a reminder letter to the campus community in which she drew additional attention to the effort and requested broad input, and announced that she had extended the deadline for comment to Nov. 30.

The chancellor also called on the committee to schedule town hall meetings to receive input. A series of four such meetings was announced on both the campus website and in other ways to encourage broad participation from interested students, staff, faculty, alumni and other members of the UC Davis community. The chancellor also asked the committee to review the Dempsey report and to then provide her a summary of what the committee and the broader UC Davis community believed to be:

- The best "vision" to guide UC Davis Intercollegiate Athletics into the future, and
- The desired qualifications, traits and experiences of UC Davis' next director of athletics.

This summary report is a compilation of that input. The chancellor, per her charge letter, will review this report and any additional input as needed and then, in a subsequent letter, will “set a course for achieving excellence in our program and our student-athletes.” The committee will then use the chancellor’s vision to help guide the recruitment of a new director of athletics. Once hired, the new director of athletics will be expected to use this information to design a strategic plan to move UC Davis Intercollegiate Athletics forward.

The town hall meetings were important opportunities to gather comments, concerns and recommendations. As mentioned, the website and chancellor’s letter helped publicize the date, time and place of the four town halls (including one organized by the ASUCD to focus on student input) that the committee hosted to receive input and guidance on the future of intercollegiate athletics at UC Davis and on the preferred qualities and characteristics of UC Davis’ next director of athletics.

In all, approximately 500 students, students-athletes, staff, coaches, faculty, alumni and members of the broader UC Davis community attended the four town hall meetings in October and November 2011. As many as 10 to 18 individuals spoke at each of the sessions.

Everyone who requested to speak at a town hall meeting was given an opportunity to present at least once, and several were able to speak more than once. At the final town hall meeting on Nov. 16, time limitations required that first-time speakers be given priority, which precluded some who wanted a repeat opportunity to speak again. However at each town hall, all speakers and attendees were encouraged to submit their thoughts in writing to the publicized e-mail address. The following are the dates of the town hall meetings, with the approximate attendance and number of speakers at each event:

- Thursday, Oct. 13 (70 attendees, 12 speakers)
- Wednesday, Oct. 26: (125 attendees, 10 speakers)
- Wednesday, Nov. 2: (200 attendees, 18 speakers) (Organized by ASUCD)
- Wednesday, Nov. 16: (100 attendees, 13 speakers)

In addition, the committee received nearly 300 e-mails, with approximately half the e-mails going directly to athletics@ucdavis.edu, and the other half sent to the chancellor and/or Vice Chancellor Fred Wood, chair of the recruitment advisory committee.

The *Sacramento Bee*, *Davis Enterprise* and *California Aggie* provided news coverage of the outreach effort and, in some cases, the actual town hall meetings.

Those who spoke at the town hall meetings and those who e-mailed comments were passionate and thoughtful in their remarks, which presented an extraordinarily wide range of opinions. Consider, for example, the matter of athletic conferences. Some said, “stay put,” while others told UC Davis to “move up” to a higher conference, and still others were equally committed to UC Davis moving back to Division II, or to dropping intercollegiate athletics entirely.

Many shared with the committee their concerns about the accuracy of certain statistical portions of the Dempsey report and expressed criticism of the report’s approach to the Eight Core Principles of UC Davis Intercollegiate Athletics. At the town hall meetings, a sizable share of these critical voices came from individuals who either felt threatened by the possible future elimination of more sports, or were the parents and supporters of the four sports that were cut in 2010.

Indeed, the initial Dempsey report included an “athletics profile” page about UC Davis that was based on the statistics available at the time and that reflected the program before the 2010 reduction in sports, but that erroneously listed the reduced number of teams (23 instead of 27). We have requested CDC Consulting to provide updated “athletics profile” pages when the most recent data is available and this information will be posted to the website.

Some also provided the committee with additional articles and documents about intercollegiate athletics to help support their perspective. Many directed attention to the often-cited Knight Commission and its 2010 report, *Restoring the Balance: Dollars, Values, and the Future of College Sports* (<http://www.knightcommission.org>), which among other things reported no correlation between increased spending and improved win-loss records. Others shared a recent article, from the October 2011 issue of the *Atlantic* magazine, “The Shame of College Sports,” by Taylor Branch (<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1969/12/the-shame-of-college-sports/8643/>).

At the same time, some shared materials that were supportive of a more high-profile intercollegiate athletics program. Those materials included a 2009 article from the *Southern Economic Journal*, “The Impact of College Sports Success on the Quantity and Quality of Student Applications,” and news media coverage of that journal article, which related football and basketball success to increasing the quantity of undergraduate applications (Pope, Devin R. and Jaren C Pope, “The Impact of College Sports Success on the Quantity and Quality of Student Applications” *Southern Economic Journal* (2009) 75(3), 750-780). The following is a link to a *USA Today* article on the study: http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2008-03-23-1566731202_x.htm.

III. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The number of individuals providing written and oral comments, coming from a variety of backgrounds and representing different points of view, suggests that one thing is clear about intercollegiate athletics at UC Davis: The program ignites a burning passion in Aggies and non-Aggies, and in sports fans and non-fans alike.

And, with few exceptions, many agree with the chancellor that the appointment of UC Davis’ next director of athletics will be a decision that is important to the success of the university’s athletics program and that will in turn impact the overall reputation of the university.

With such a wide divergence of beliefs, comments and recommendations, it is difficult to identify and summarize many consensus conclusions about the preferred future direction of athletics at UC Davis or the preferred characteristics of new director. That said, the committee has identified some general themes that have arisen from the chorus of voices that care so deeply about the university and these matters:

• **The future of intercollegiate athletics at UC Davis:**

- Intercollegiate Athletics must establish as its top priority the academic integrity of the program itself. Intercollegiate Athletics must be viewed as an extension of the academic experience at UC Davis, with an emphasis on the academic credentials of student-athlete recruits and a subsequent emphasis on the performance of student-athletes in the classroom and in academic success measures (e.g., graduation rates).
- The program must adopt a financial model that is sustainable for the long term. While not shared by all, there seemed to be considerable concern that the current financial model for Intercollegiate Athletics at UC Davis could not be sustained in this budgetary climate. In addition, there was general agreement that students should not be asked to provide additional funding for the program through any additional fees. Thus, a new financial model must have a more intensive focus on fundraising, marketing and promotions, and there seemed to be a consensus that this needed to be accomplished in order to meet the goal of a sustainable model.

- Just as important, the operations and the budgeting of Intercollegiate Athletics must be conducted in an open, transparent manner. Faculty, staff, students, alumni and supporters need a clearer understanding of the Intercollegiate Athletics budget and the related challenges. And, in particular, the university needs to do a better job of explaining and publicizing to the student body its important role in the financial support of Intercollegiate Athletics.
 - The program must renew and strengthen its commitment to the health and welfare of the student-athlete, including academic advising and support, compliance, counseling, sports medicine, strength and conditioning and athletic training.
 - And very importantly, campus leadership, in coordination with Intercollegiate Athletics and other constituents, must reach an understanding on the definitions of the words “success” and “excellence,” in the context of intercollegiate athletics.
- **The characteristics of the next director of athletics at UC Davis:**
 - The director must make a strong and unequivocal commitment to ensuring that academic integrity and academic excellence are mainstays of the Intercollegiate Athletics program and that these principles will not be compromised.
 - The director of athletics must be of high integrity and strong moral character, generally reflective of the UC Davis community, a person who can be trusted to “do the right thing” and be committed to operate the department and implement the budget in an open, transparent manner.
 - The director must be someone with very strong financial acumen who must create and implement a sustainable financial model where one does not now exist. As one student-athlete said: “We need an AD who’s going to solve this” financial quandary.
 - The director must have a proven track record of being entrepreneurial and creative when it comes to fundraising, marketing and identifying other innovative approaches to generating revenues. The director must openly embrace this as a fundamental responsibility of the job.

IV. THE FUTURE OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS AT UC DAVIS

A. THE EIGHT CORE PRINCIPLES

When UC Davis embarked in 2003 on its transition from Division II to Division I athletics, campus officials established eight core principles to guide the campus through the process and future Division I competition:

- *UC Davis must offer a program that does not compromise the university's focus on the academic integrity of student-athletes.*
- *Admissions and graduation standards must in no way be specially altered or amended for student-athletes.*
- *There can be no "tiering" among UC Davis sports, with some sports and their athletes receiving a better standard of treatment than others.*
- *UC Davis cannot retreat from its Title IX (gender equity) progress, but must continue to expand its efforts and compliance.*
- *UC Davis cannot reduce its broad-based program, but rather must seek to add sports.*
- *The athletics program cannot depend for its financial survival on its record of wins and losses.*
- *Permanent core funding must come from students and the institution, rather than from a dependency on external sources.*
- *The athletics department at UC Davis must maintain a formal connection to the mission of the university, including preserving the current teacher/coach role.*

Today, eight years later, many of those who submitted written comments and spoke at the town hall meetings were strident in their defense of the principles. Two alumni who are also parents of a UC Davis student-athlete, said: "Tossing [the principles] in exchange for a business or any other model that sacrifices these principles is not acceptable. We ask that the student-athlete model be retained and re-energized, as the very best set of operating principles, and that excellence be defined in a manner consistent with those principles."

One alumna said: "PRINCIPLES are what make 'world class' organizations and people. To abandon the principles and 'The Davis Way' at this perceived crossroads constitutes a breach of faith with the student population and an affront to the honorable traditions of our past."

At one of the town hall meetings, one professor emeritus asked: "But are not honor, integrity, care, concern, and protection for our student athletes suitable for all intercollegiate programs—whether at Division I, II or III? Why should UCD be like other Division I institutions—perhaps other Division I institutions should be more like UC Davis!"

Many in this group pointed to The Knight Commission report, *Restoring the Balance: Dollars, Values, and the Future of College Sports*. "The Knight Commission goes to a lot of trouble to help colleges and universities nationwide to get sports right," wrote one alumnus who is also the parent of former UC Davis student-athletes. "It's funny, but they seem to like what UC Davis already has."

Several pointed to the "Principles and Recommendations" on page 10 of the 2010 Knight Commission report, highlighting that they tie directly to the priorities so often discussed at UC Davis—maintaining academic integrity, engaging in responsible spending and ensuring transparency. There was strong interest in this report citing those principles and recommendations as being consistent with UC Davis' goals and priorities.

Others, again referring to the Knight Commission report, pointed out that the business model does not always turn out to be a successful model. A member of the faculty of the Graduate School of Management argued that the NCAA's business model is in fact "a failed business model," and urged the committee "to maintain our 'educational model' of intercollegiate athletics as the only viable model for our institution."

What's more, one UC Davis alumna said, "Now is not the time to make athletics a priority with academic needs going wanting."

On the other hand, many others who provided written and oral comments contended that some of the eight core principles of "The Davis Way" should be revisited if UC Davis is to be successful in intercollegiate athletics. At a town hall meeting in November, one student-athlete asked: "We have a unique opportunity, but the question is, are we willing to take that step? I'm here to say let's [take it]... Just because we adjust our principles, does not mean we are losing the 'Davis Way.' We should not look at a business model as a negative model, but rather a model that opens new doors to new involvement, new streams of revenue, and new opportunities."

Many believed that the principles need to evolve in response to the changing budgetary environment, and that the athletics program would need to evolve going forward. Within this group there were subsets of voices that advocated that some principles were more important than others. Specifically, they pointed to those principles that directly relate to academic integrity as the most important to the future of the program and to the selection of the next director of athletics.

B. ACADEMICS AND ATHLETICS

Today, there is widespread agreement among all constituents that UC Davis is first and foremost an academic institution and that whatever the future direction of Intercollegiate Athletics, academics should remain the top priority of the program. To that end, there is also general consensus that UC Davis should not consider or embrace any compromise of the first two principles regarding the academic integrity, admissions and graduation standards for student-athletes.

At the same time, there are varying levels of disagreement among individuals as to the six other principles and how they define the manner in which academics is viewed as a priority.

In written comments and at town hall meetings, some argued that one way for academics to thrive is for UC Davis to excel in athletic competition. That would bring increased publicity, which would in turn spur increased philanthropic support—for academics and athletics—and spur an increase in applications from potential students and student-athletes alike.

Several in this camp pointed to a study published in 2009, "The Impact of College Sports Success on the Quantity and Quality of Student Applications," which indicates that athletic success leads to increases in undergraduate applications.

Others expressed their passionate belief that academic excellence and athletic excellence do co-exist and can continue to co-exist at UC Davis, and that they are not mutually exclusive goals. They said the university can and must continue to employ a "true" student-athlete model, with an emphasis on academics.

At the same time, there were those who said that UC Davis must not abandon its current "educational model" for the "business model" that focuses on bolstering "revenue-generating" sports like football and basketball. In their minds, the eight core principles must remain unaltered to ensure the academic integrity of the program.

Indeed, law school Dean Kevin Johnson, a member of the Recruitment Advisory Committee, pointed out that several deans with whom he has discussed the topic “suggested the need to be cautious and careful in moving forward.” A number of deans “noted the concern of moving toward the business model of Division I athletics,” Johnson said, “and wanted to remain committed to academic excellence.”

Still others—and this group was admittedly the minority—urged that UC Davis abandon intercollegiate athletics altogether—or at least leave the athletics director slot vacant.

“Would you consider foregoing hiring a new athletic director and instead invest money towards academics?” said one critic of athletics spending. Added another: “As a land grant university, our mission has always been teaching, research, and public service. I have never heard of athletics as being part of our core mission. I believe the time has come to take a fresh look at priorities and phase out intercollegiate athletics.”

C. ATHLETIC CONFERENCE AFFILIATION

There was considerable support for UC Davis to stay where it is in terms of athletic conferences. Clearly, based on the Dempsey report, UC Davis would require significant increases in annual funding of Intercollegiate Athletics and significant capital improvements even to contemplate a move to a higher level of competition.

Related to conference affiliation, Professor Jeff Weidner, a member of the Recruitment Advisory Committee, said his conversations with several fellow faculty members, three sitting deans and others led him to conclude that, “given the current budgetary climate the university faces, UC Davis athletics should remain in the two main conferences in which we currently compete, the Big West Conference, and beginning next fall the Big Sky Conference in football... .”

The consensus of those Weidner interviewed was that UC Davis should “strive to provide the support to foster competitive success at that level before even considering a move to more prominent and costly conferences.”

Furthermore, asked an Intercollegiate Athletics staffer, “If the program was to take a ‘next step,’ where will the funding come from?” This was a major concern among coaches and many others who pointed to scenarios outlined in the Dempsey report of UC Davis moving to other conferences.

Echoing that concern was a graduate student on campus who said that the recent economic downturn, coupled with “internal management issues” in Intercollegiate Athletics, “highlights the critical importance of identifying a proper funding method BEFORE any changes are embarked upon (to be clear, by funding method I am specifically referring to a model that has actual dollar amounts and the sources of where those dollars will be generated).”

D. “TIERING” AND A BROAD-BASED PROGRAM

There was widespread support to continue to operate a broad-based program of intercollegiate athletics that includes the existing 23 teams. While not as universal, there was support for “tiering,” or differential funding of athletic teams, given the desire to maintain a broad-based program in the face of ongoing budgetary limitations.

Supporters of this differential funding at UC Davis see it as both a short-term economic necessity and as a preferred alternative to eliminating sports. In the minds of those closest to the program, this differential funding raises questions of whether budgets are tiered, scholarships are tiered, or both are tiered.

Many saw a link between two of the eight core principles—the requirement for a broad-based program and a prohibition against tiering of resources among teams. Sandy Simpson, a member of the Recruitment Advisory Committee and former head women’s basketball coach, said: “It is a strongly held position among a majority of coaches that tiering would be acceptable only if it ensured maintenance of a broad-based sports program.”

“It would be tragic to not explore all options for all sports so none are eliminated,” said one alumnus student-athlete who is also the parent of current and former UC Davis student-athletes.

An open survey of students conducted by the ASUCD showed that an “overwhelming plurality want no change at all” to intercollegiate athletics because they fear any changes would result in the elimination of sports, according to ASUCD President Adam Thongsavat, who is a member of the Recruitment Advisory Committee. (A description and summary of the poll’s results are provided in the appendix to this report).

The ASUCD-sponsored survey of 4,076 students indicated that 1,427 students—the largest number—felt that UC Davis should “Maintain all current intercollegiate sports (23) and distribute money to those sports equitably.” For comparison, only 400 students selected the next most popular option: “Maintain all current sports, but reduce funding for some sports to provide more funding for others.”

Meanwhile, a rather large group of students on campus were emphatic that they are opposed to any efforts to redistribute the student fees they pay each year in such a way that the football and basketball teams would receive more money while other sports budgets would be cut. A typical UC Davis student pays more than \$600 in fees annually to support UC Davis Intercollegiate Athletics.

The recent “Petition to Save UC Davis Intercollegiate Athletics and Physical Education” was signed by 2,059 students. By signing the petition, the students were expressing concern that such a tiering approach could—according to the petition language—result in the elimination of more sports, change the way physical education classes are taught and funded, and could eliminate free student admission to athletic events.

At the same time, “Tiering is a reality of what we will have to do,” said one member of the Intercollegiate Athletics staff at UC Davis. “What most sports do not realize is that the long-term effects of tiering could actually bring more money into their program,” as sports teams at the upper tiers—typically football and basketball—invest their increased resources, build more success, generate more revenues and then share those increased revenues directly or indirectly with the teams at the lower tiers.

To be clear, many others expressed strong skepticism about the success of such an approach. Many wrote of the failed examples of such investments and challenged the idea that college sports at UC Davis’ level would generate substantial popularity and revenue. Some referred to such investments as a high-risk gamble, based on examples at other institutions, and wondered why UC Davis would consider a “model that does not work.”

In addition, many commenters indicated that neither the students nor the community has ever shown the level of interest in athletics necessary to make such a model successful. In addition, some suggested quite the opposite, that dropping football was the best path to a sustainable financial model. Football should be the first sport dropped, they contend, if UC Davis finds itself needing to cut more sports.

E. SOURCES OF FUNDING

There appeared to be a unanimous belief that students cannot and should not be asked to fund a greater portion of the Intercollegiate Athletics budget. Also, many indicated that tiering alone would not solve the chronic budgetary problems of Intercollegiate Athletics, and that only a heightened fundraising effort—perhaps in coordination with some limited amount of differential funding—could create a sustainable financial model.

There was a general consensus, perhaps due in part to the current budgetary situation and higher education financial climate, that a successful fundraising program was indeed critical to creating any sustainable financial model for Intercollegiate Athletics.

Of course, increased pressure to raise philanthropic funds brings with it other concerns. Dan Wilson, chair of the Academic Federation and a member of the Recruitment Advisory Committee, said of his fellow federation members: “There is a perception that the pressures for winning and for fund raising have often led to behaviors/decisions at other universities that would be considered questionable, especially here. Integrity is a unique and cherished characteristic of UC Davis.”

F. THE TEACHER-COACH MODEL

UC Davis might be one of the few Division I intercollegiate athletics programs where head coaches teach classes (mainly physical activity classes, but also a few lecture courses), in addition to their coaching responsibilities.

Many, including a majority of head coaches, believe that a Teacher-Coach Model must be maintained in some form—even if it is modified for coaches of some sports—to maintain the academic integrity of intercollegiate athletics at UC Davis. However, there was a range of reactions to how such a modification should be carried out.

For example, when students conducted focus groups of fellow students on this matter, the students participating did not see much if any benefit to having a head coach teach an activity course that is unrelated to his or her specialty and questioned whether that was the best use of coaches’ time, considering the other important demands on their time.

Supporters contend that the model is important to enhance the coach’s relationship with student-athletes—with a focus on the “student”—and enhances the positive influence and impact that coaches have on the student-athletes.

Many, including the broad-based Athletics Administrative Advisory Committee, said the model has a deeper value at UC Davis: coaches contribute directly to the core academic mission of the university through their faculty appointments, contributions to university service and teaching non-student-athlete undergraduates in for-credit academic classes.

“This is an important point in that it demonstrates a direct academic connection between UC Davis’ Intercollegiate Athletics program and the general undergraduate student body,” said Jeff Weidner, director of the Physical Education program and a member of the Recruitment Advisory Committee. “It underscores the commitment of the campus to academic integrity in its broadest sense, and not simply as the NCAA defines it as it pertains to student-athletes.”

Those coaches who favored the continuation of the model cited, as reasons, enjoyment of teaching, desired contact with the general student population and maintaining the ability to proctor exams, among other positive aspects of the model. But others said it interfered with scheduling staff meetings, fundraising and other duties.

Some point out that from a budgetary perspective, maintaining the academic connection would provide the chancellor with a potential vehicle to direct discretionary funding back to Intercollegiate Athletics/Physical Education in support of the coaches' teaching responsibilities, as had been done during more favorable budgetary times in the past.

V. GUIDANCE FOR RECRUITING A NEW DIRECTOR OF ATHLETICS

Many agree with the chancellor that the appointment of UC Davis' next director of athletics will be a decision that transcends intercollegiate athletics: It will impact the reputation of the university as a whole.

"At a time when the job market is becoming increasingly competitive, excellence in athletics will boost the UC Davis brand and breed greater exposure for the University locally and nationally," wrote Aggies for Excellence, a group claiming "around 500 members" that is committed to showing support for the growth and betterment of Aggie Athletics.

"Increased success in athletics can be an avenue through which Davis can showcase its other amazing accomplishments to the general public," the group wrote. "Greater recognition means each degree issued to an alumnus becomes more valuable in the job market. It also means attracting bright, sought after high school seniors and prospective graduate students that might otherwise be lured away."

The consensus of the Recruitment Advisory Committee, based on oral and written comments received, its own review of those comments and its review of the Dempsey report, is that the next director of athletics needs to have great strength in both moral/ethical integrity and business acumen. And the new director must be someone who would be committed to the belief that academic excellence is a mainstay of the Intercollegiate Athletics program at UC Davis.

In addition, the director must not only be comfortable with fundraising but must also display strength in fundraising and openly embrace it as fundamental to the success of the program, along with marketing and promotions.

The director of athletics must be a person who can be trusted to "do the right thing" and be committed to operating the department and creating and implementing the budget in an open, transparent manner.

To that end, there is consensus that the new director of athletics must be a proven visionary who can create and implement an effective strategic plan. The new director must be capable of launching a planning process that begins with a thorough review of Intercollegiate Athletics' current operations, and then culminates with a strategic plan that clearly defines the program's future mission, scope, objectives and goals. The plan must be one that all coaches and staff can embrace and be dedicated to, to ensure the program's success.

Those who spoke at town hall meetings or submitted comments in writing said the new director of athletics also should have experience having built an endowment or having led successful efforts to build new athletics facilities, particularly those that support student welfare (e.g., academic support, strength and conditioning, and athletic training).

There is a strong preference, overall, for someone with athletics experience (preferably who supports and has experience with a broad-based program), as opposed to an individual who primarily has a business background. Some believe the new director should be someone who has either coached or played intercollegiate athletics.

In fact, committee member Sandy Simpson said his conversations with campus staff and others lead him to believe that the best candidate would be someone who actually has had a variety of experiences in an athletics program similar to UC Davis. "Someone with Division I experience is preferable, but not neces-

sarily from a BCS-level school,” Simpson wrote.

A handful of individuals suggested that UC Davis would be better off if the next director of athletics were an alumnus, because of the uniqueness of the UC Davis Intercollegiate Athletics program. “Hiring a non-alum, they are starting from zero,” one alumnus said at a town hall meeting.

Even if the new director is not an alumnus, he or she should be someone who understands and appreciates “The Davis Way,” the “culture” of UC Davis and UC Davis’ unique town-gown relationship with the city of Davis and the region. As one community member put it, these people represent “a partnership for life” with the university.

Put another way, the future UC Davis director of athletics must be a good “people person” adept at establishing solid, trusting relationships, whether it is with student-athletes, coaches, staff or faculty members across the campus, or with the alumni and supporters who make up the broader UC Davis community.

It is especially important that the next director of athletics work directly with students and student-athletes. It is important that student-athletes in all sports develop a strong relationship with the new director of athletics so that they can develop greater pride in the entire program. The director of athletics, in turn, needs to show an interest in all teams. It is also important that the new director of athletics develop strong relationships with the entire student body: they are ones paying for three-quarters of the Intercollegiate Athletics budget each year.

The students on various fee-related committees—including the Student Services and Fee Advisory Committee, the Campus Unions and Recreation Board (CURB) and the student-only CURB ICA Budget Review Sub-Committee—need to be kept fully apprised of the budgetary issues and receive regular updates from athletics. Finally, it is very important that the director of athletics create a strongly collaborative relationship with the students as a whole to create greater visibility for Intercollegiate Athletics on campus and in the student culture. The new director of athletics will need to take responsibility for obtaining student input regularly from a wide range of students and student groups. It will be important for the new director of athletics to clearly indicate an understanding of the support that students provide to the athletics program, and to help develop a sense of ownership and pride within the student body.

She or he must be a leader who will learn and value the history of the program, understands where UC Davis is now and can show the campus community where it can go. And, related to obtaining the funding needed for a successful future, “This person must not be afraid to ask alumni to reach into their wallets,” said one commenter.

And the new director must understand that UC Davis is NOT like other athletic programs. “UC Davis is different,” wrote one commenter. “Getting the candidates to understand this in the short amount of time they have to consider the job will be critical.”

“I understand the value of the amazing community that comes from being a part of an ICA team, as well as the privilege to compete for the school, but don’t think that should come ahead of academics,” wrote a recent student-athlete graduate. “That is, after all, what UC Davis is about—education.”

And, with few exceptions, many agree with the chancellor that the appointment of UC Davis’ next director of athletics will be a decision that is important to the success of the university’s athletics program and that will in turn impact the overall reputation of the university.

APPENDIX

ASUCD SURVEY: STUDENT OPINIONS ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS AT UC DAVIS

BACKGROUND

This ASUCD-sponsored survey represents the opinions of 4,076 students. All undergraduate students could access the survey during the period of October 27, 2011, and November 4, 2011, through the MyUCDavis portal. Care should be taken in interpreting the results of this survey because not all students use the MyUCDavis portal. In addition, the survey was not restricted to a random sample and any student that wished to participate could do so.

Students were first asked the following question:

As UC Davis plans to hire a new athletics director, the administration is gathering feedback on the direction of our athletics program. The ASUCD Executive Office is conducting this survey to get student feedback on priorities for the future of the athletics program (background information [link to Chancellor's initiative page]). Generally speaking, what do you think would be the best option for our intercollegiate athletics program?

The available options are listed along the top of the accompanying table and are highlighted in yellow. Students could select only one option. After selecting one, they were asked a second question:

Which of the following statements do you agree with? (Check all that apply)

The available options for this question are listed along the side of the table and highlighted in blue. They are intended to capture student sentiment about the core principles of the Intercollegiate Athletics program.

Notable Results—“Best Option for ICA” (Question 1)

- 1,427 students felt that UC Davis should “Maintain all current intercollegiate sports (23) and distribute money to those sports equitably.”
- The next most popular option (with 400 students selecting it) was to “Maintain all current sports, but reduce funding for some sports to provide more funding for others.”
- The two options that addressed reducing sports garnered 402 votes (combined).
- 1,187 students felt that they were not informed enough to choose an option.

Notable Results—“Principles” (Question 2)

- Currently, student fees make up the vast majority of revenues for the Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) budget. However, only 217 students felt that ICA “should be funded by student fees NOT ticket sales, media rights, etc.” In addition, 1,527 students indicated that ICA “should be funded by ticket sales, media rights, etc., NOT student fees.”
- 1,861 students want to maintain the student-athlete model and 1,300 want ICA opportunities open to as many students as possible.
- 906 students felt that coaches should not be required to teach classes, while 708 felt that they should.
- 1,057 students felt that we should not fund sports based on likely revenue, while 785 felt that we should.
- 906 students are satisfied with how our teams perform, while 805 are not.

ASUCD—SPONSORED UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT SURVEY ON ICA

	1st question (select one)											
2nd question (select many)	Totals	1427	1187	400	396	285	203	185	117			
We should keep the student-athlete model, balancing academic and athletics performance of athletes	1861	938	357	276	66	117		51	56			
ICA should be funded by ticket sales, media rights, etc, NOT student fees	1527	517	310	234	110	206		89	61			
ICA opportunities should be open to as many students as possible	1300	767	235	165	35	37		38	23			
We should NOT fund sports based on how much revenue they are likely to bring in	1057	697	154	98	23	9		44	32			
Expenses for ICA should be kept about the same	975	674	132	80	27	28		17	17			
I AM satisfied with how our ICA sports perform	906	582	134	106	25	23		11	25			
Coaches should NOT be required to teach classes so they can focus on coaching	906	343	144	174	22	147		23	53			
I AM NOT satisfied with how our ICA sports perform	805	217	92	164	15	191		55	71			
We should fund sports based on how much revenue they are likely to bring in	785	142	121	163	36	249		31	43			
Coaches should be part of the faculty and have teaching duties along with coaching	708	389	99	78	38	44		32	28			
Winning games is more important in some sports than the number of students that play	535	119	66	117	8	164		17	44			
ICA should be funded by student fees, NOT ticket sales, media rights, etc	217	144	13	28	3	8		8	13			