

REPORT

The Committee's report is organized as follows:

	Page
I. Introduction	1
II. Process	2
III. Findings	4
A. Charge Items	4
B. Original Task Force Report and Former President Coleman's Response	16
IV. Recommendations	17

I. Introduction

In August of 2000, the University of Iowa's men's and women's athletics programs were consolidated pursuant to former President Mary Sue Coleman's action based on recommendation of an ad hoc Task Force examining this issue. In the fall of 2004, President David J. Skorton called for a review of that merger and appointed the Athletics Merger Review Committee ("Committee") for that purpose. He charged the Committee to use the August 30, 2000 Task Force Report Recommendations and former President Coleman's September 8, 2000 Response (both attached) as a guide for the review, and also to address the following issues:

- Climate assessment for female athletes, staff, and coaches in the women's programs;
- Operational integration of equitable treatment (e.g., salaries, participation of women in athletics programs, access to facilities);
- Assessment of authority exercised by the position of Senior Women's Athletics Administrator, as proposed by the original Task Force Report;
- Assessment of leadership of athletics in serving as clear advocate for women's programs;
- Assessment of the role of women in the leadership/organizational structure of the department;
- Equitable allocation of financial and other resource allocation to women's programs;
- Equitable processes used to make decisions about resource allocation and use of discretionary funds within the department, and whether those processes have the same impact on men's and women's programs;
- Equitable access to high quality services, for example, access and use of the new learning center;
- Consider how often subsequent reviews should be conducted; and
- Assessment of the internal grievance procedures that address Title IX complaints.

President Skorton encouraged the Committee to interview extensively in the course of its work, and to gather information and feedback from the full spectrum of the University community and beyond. He specifically cited a number of groups as potential sources of information: departmental leadership, coaching staff, student-athletes, alumni and friends of the athletics programs, co-chairs of the former Task Force, current members of the Presidential Committee on Athletes, and other relevant constituencies among faculty, staff, and students. On August 30, 2004, President Skorton issued a news release describing the formation of this Committee, its membership, and charge. This release was posted on the University's website and distributed through the Office of University Relations.

II. Process

The Committee originally convened in August. With a few exceptions, the Committee as a whole met on a weekly basis until the close of the Fall Semester. The Committee re-convened in mid-January, and again met on a weekly basis until the middle of April. The Committee's initial meetings were devoted to organizational issues and work assignments. In addition to the weekly meetings of the whole Committee, committee members worked during the week, individually and in teams, on a variety of tasks (e.g., constructing interview protocols, completing interviews, reviewing materials provided to the Committee).

Seeking to maximize the time available, and to obtain the full spectrum and intensity of views, the Committee considered which individuals should be invited for interviews. The Committee reviewed comprehensive lists of Department of Athletics personnel and constituent groups. Ultimately, Committee members agreed to interview each senior administrator and several lower level administrators; each head coach and many associate and assistant coaches; selected representative departmental professional and scientific staff and merit staff; team captains or other team representatives; and representatives of each constituent group. In addition, the Committee agreed to invite the input of anyone who contacted a committee member for that purpose.

The Committee identified certain key individuals who would meet with the Committee as a whole, to provide their views of the merger and to address the issues denoted in President Skorton's charge to the Committee. The following persons met with the full Committee: Dr. Jane Meyer, Senior Associate Director of Athletics; Ms. Ann Rhodes, Assistant to the Provost and University HIPAA Officer, and Dr. Yvonne "Bonnie" Slatton, Associate Professor, interviewed individually as co-chairs of the former Task Force that recommended the merger; Mr. Michael New, President of the University of Iowa Foundation; Dr. Christine Grant, former Director of Women's Athletics; Mr. Robert Bowlsby, Director of Athletics; Mr. Douglas Young, Director of Financial Management/Budget and University Secretary and Ms. Mary Jane Beach, Assistant Vice President and Director, Business Services, from the University Office of Vice President for Finance & Operations, interviewed together; and Mr. Robert Payne, Financial and Business Services Consultant, and Mr. Michael Finnegan, Special Assistant to the Vice President, of the University's Office of the Vice President for Finance & Operations – Business Office, interviewed together.

Because of time constraints and the total number of interviews to be completed, the Committee could not conduct all of its interviews before the full Committee. Instead, all but the

above individuals were interviewed by no fewer than two members of the Committee. [Due to scheduling conflicts, only one committee member was able to be present for a small number of the interviews.] Committee members conducting these interviews would make their notes available for review by the remainder of the committee members by submitting them to a central location. To maintain interviewees' confidentiality, identifying personal information was removed from the notes before such submission. This approach allowed the necessary number of interviews to be conducted in a timely fashion, while guarding against selective filtering of the information by any one committee member. In addition, to ensure that all Committee members were exposed to the full complement of perspectives, each Committee member was scheduled to interview individuals from the full array of representative groups. For example, no Committee member would interview only coaches, or only staff.

In September 2004, the Committee sent individual letters to each member of the Athletics Department, including all administrators, coaches, staff, and student-athletes, explaining the Committee's charge (copy attached). In this letter, the Committee encouraged those not invited for interviews to contact any member of the Committee for an interview if they so desired.

The Committee began interviews in mid-September. Jan Ricklefs, Administrative Associate, in the Office of the Vice President for Finance & Operations managed the scheduling process. The Committee is very grateful to Ms. Ricklefs for her professional -- and very patient and accommodating -- assistance in this endeavor. From late September until Winter Break, the Committee interviewed 124 individuals. In addition to the 10 individuals interviewed by the Committee as a whole, this number included 34 coaches (including head coaches, associate coaches, and assistant coaches); 44 staff members (including senior administrative staff), 36 student-athletes, 1 University administrator, and 9 members of external constituencies including the University of Iowa Foundation, the Alumni Association, the Faculty Senate, the Staff Council, the Women's Athletics Development Board, and the Office of the Ombudsperson.

The Committee formulated standard questionnaires for use in each of the interviews, tailoring questions appropriately for the following groups: coaches, staff, external constituents, and student-athletes. Through this consistent approach, the committee members hoped to avoid biasing responses by the wording of the questions. In addition, this approach afforded all interviewees opportunity to address the same issues.

The Committee's charge included an assessment of the department's internal Title IX grievance processes. To provide the Committee members with a better understanding of Title IX and its requirements for the University, the Committee requested that Charlotte Westerhaus, Assistant to the President and Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity, and also a Committee member, make a presentation on that subject. In addition, because of many references to a "business model" made during the course of the Committee's interviews, the Committee also asked Jude West, Professor Emeritus in the Department of Management and Operations at the Tippie College of Business, to provide background information on various business models and related information.

When the Committee re-convened in mid-January, members had reviewed the full complement of interview notes and related materials and documents provided by individuals interviewed and by the Department of Athletics. The Committee had also extensively toured

athletic facilities. The Committee began its deliberations, focusing on the issues presented in its charge, and noting additional themes that surfaced during the course of its work. For some issues, the Committee has formal recommendations contained in the concluding section of this report. For other issues, the Committee offers informal suggestions contained in the text of the report related to Findings.

III. Findings

The Committee's Findings are stated below. First, the Committee addresses the specific items delineated in President Skorton's charge. These findings are followed by the Committee's comments on the original Task Force Report and former President Coleman's response.

A. Charge Items

1. Climate assessment for female athletes, staff, and coaches in the women's programs.

The Committee received different assessments of climate from various component groups in the department. Female student-athletes, for example, reported good morale and general satisfaction with the climate. Male student-athletes also reported good morale and a positive climate. In contrast, staff reported low morale and general dissatisfaction. [For this report, the term "staff" includes both professional and scientific staff and merit staff.] Notably, this group is comprised predominantly of women, although both men and women staff members reported low morale. The Committee identified several causes for the low morale among staff members:

- Stressful *workload*, quantitatively and qualitatively;
- Perception of a *shift in emphasis* toward business concerns; and
- *Disrespectful interactions*.

Workload: The Committee perceived an overall misdirected allocation of staffing resources. Some staff members are burdened by increasing workloads, as attrition has taken its toll and replacements were not hired for positions left vacant. Many staff members fulfill multiple functions, some of which previously had been assigned to others who are no longer with the institution. At the same time, other staff members fulfill a single function, one that appears to Committee members to consume relatively little time and effort. The merger provided the opportunity to deploy staff to support all programs, and more importantly, to elevate programs that need such efforts; the Committee has concluded that that opportunity wasn't realized.

Staff members feel stress from their particular responsibilities. A number of critical functions within the department can be performed only by the one staff member designated for this function, and no one is trained or otherwise capable of substituting in that role. As a result, some staff members bear significant pressure to be available at all times to perform critical functions.

Department of Athletics staff members also are relatively isolated from their counterparts throughout the University. Despite the apparent encouragement for such activity in the Department's Policy Manual (Article XI. Human Resources, Staff Development), staff members do not participate in opportunities for interaction and professional development, such as Staff Council. Staff members might benefit from greater integration into the University community and the Committee suggests that this integration be more explicitly endorsed and encouraged.

Shift in emphasis: Several changes since the merger have been described as a shift toward a "business model." Members of all groups interviewed by the Committee noted an annual marketing memorandum, cited as part of the business model, as a significant negative factor in the department's climate. This memorandum, which designates tiers among sports for marketing purposes, identifies no distinction between the men's and women's programs. Instead, it differentiates among sports on bases that are not clear to the Committee nor clarified in interviews. Many interviewees acknowledged that, before the memorandum, they may not have expected their sport team to have a top ranking for marketing, but seeing their sport tier in writing and knowing it was widely disseminated tied the "tier" of their sport to their morale. The Committee could not verify criteria, other than revenue, on which tiering decisions were made, although it appears from the actual memorandum itself that other criteria come into play because of the lack of revenue differentials between sport teams in different tiers.

Because of wide-spread dissatisfaction with the marketing function, the Committee wishes to add a few additional observations based on interviews which revealed a series of problems, some small but some larger. Generally, coaches feel cut off from marketing decisions, which appear to be made with no input from coaches or student-athletes. Because tickets are not sold for many competitive events, coaches feel helpless to alter their status as a revenue versus non-revenue sport, a distinction that appears to drive many marketing decisions. Since no attendance figures were available for competitive events, neither the Committee nor coaches are able to understand the basis for marketing decisions. Additionally, because marketing resources are allocated unequally, there is a self-fulfilling perpetuation of the distinction that some sport teams are revenue producing and others are not. There is generally a lack of interpersonal interaction around marketing issues that disenfranchises coaches and appears to contribute significantly to reports of low morale.

The restructuring of the department's reporting lines has also affected climate. Coaches who previously had reported directly to the Athletics Director no longer do so and feel distanced as a result. This change, the lack of regular staff meetings, and the issuance of the marketing memorandum, contributed to descriptions of the department as "running more like a business now." There was a sense of a hierarchy among persons that had not existed prior to the merger in either the men's or women's program. As an example, coaches noted that they

are not involved in meetings related to facilities in which they will be competing; rather, their views are represented, sometimes not accurately, by an administrator.

Those familiar with the climate of the women's department before the merger sense an additional loss, since the merger, of the "culture" of women's sports. While it is hard to define this culture, the sense of its loss is widespread among persons inside and outside the department who had contact with the women's programs before the merger. Such a perception might be inevitable in the face of a merged department. Yet the loss appears to contribute to the negative climate in some women's sports.

Disrespectful interactions: Interactions in the Department are not consistently respectful toward women. Conversations among staff members, and between staff members and visitors, frequently include subtly sexist language used under the guise of informal camaraderie. Terms such as "honey" and "girl" were reported to be employed in conversation, by both men and women, in reference to female staff members. No analogous terms are applied to male staff members.

2. Operational integration of equitable treatment (e.g., salaries, participation of women in athletics programs, access to facilities).

Compensation: Committee members considered all aspects of compensation, including salaries as well as perquisites ("perks"). On the whole, the Committee concluded that salaries had become more equitable since the time of the merger. The salaries of men and women performing comparable job functions for a comparable duration were increasingly similar. The Committee is aware that the Equity Sub-Committee of the Presidential Committee on Athletics has conducted several salary reviews since the merger.

Based on the interviews conducted, Committee members concluded that women were generally aware of salary adjustments that had produced increased equity. The women in the department understood the rationale for the adjustments, and they appreciated the adjustments. While the men also were aware that adjustments had been made, Committee members detected no similar appreciation of the underlying rationale for these adjustments. The Committee surmised that the department might not have communicated that rationale effectively to all its members.

In contrast with its conclusions regarding salaries, the Committee determined that non-salary benefits and perks (e.g., courtesy cars, cell phones) were distributed inequitably in the department. While understanding that individuals within a free market system can negotiate contracts as they wish, the Committee believes that it is the responsibility of senior athletic administration to ensure gender equity in provision of non-salary benefits and perks.

Facilities: The Committee also considered the operational integration of equitable treatment with respect to facilities and equipment. Most notably, the Committee observed that the department had produced no list of facilities needing maintenance, repair or replacement that used gender equity as one of the organizing principles. While recognizing the facilities are undergoing rapid change, and that the following remarks may include facilities that are targeted for renovation and/or replacement, the Committee wished to comment on two specific examples of facility inequity.

First, the women's basketball locker room is significantly smaller in size than the men's basketball locker room. Committee members were unable to formulate an explanation for this disparity.

Second, the Department of Athletics maintains one weight room dedicated to the football team, one weight room dedicated to the wrestling team, one weight room in Carver-Hawkeye Arena for use by all remaining teams, and one weight room in the Recreation Building for use by all remaining teams. The football weight room, which is considerably better equipped, is not used at all times. Interviews revealed a number of scheduling issues concerning the use of the non-football weight room in Carver-Hawkeye Arena which appeared to the Committee to be the primary weight room for other teams. Because of the number of teams and team members using that one facility, sport teams were scheduled for weight training at very early hours (e.g., 5:45 a.m.). Student-athletes raised concerns about their safety in traveling to and from the facility at that hour. Moreover, Committee members believed there were additional safety issues from an injury standpoint. More student-athletes could complete their weight training during optimal times if all weight rooms were made available to all athletes. The Committee would suggest that use of the football weight room by other sport teams be explored within the department, giving priority to football but allowing access to other teams at nonpriority times. If this suggestion is not feasible, then another weight room should be provided to address concerns of student-athlete safety.

Participation: With respect to participation, the Committee concluded that equitable treatment has not been attained. Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act "EADA" reports reveal that, for 2003 (the most recent data available), the University of Iowa reports the greatest disparity of the Big Ten Conference schools in athletics participation by students of each gender as compared with that gender's proportion of the student body. That is, women are under-represented in athletics, based on the proportion of women in the student body; and men are over-represented in athletics.

The Committee attempted to determine the reasons for this disparity. Some disparity may be due to coach preference. For example, women's coaches have been reported to prefer smaller squad sizes because of the administrative burdens placed on them by walk-on players. It was also reported to the

Committee that female student-athletes did not remain on teams in a non-playing or even non-starting role (in contrast to male student-athletes who apparently do).

Another possible reason for the disparity is that the University of Iowa, alone in the Big 10 Conference, does not impose minimum sizes on female sport teams nor maximum sizes on male sport teams. This policy of no team floors/caps presents a cost issue, as all team members (scholarship and walk-on) benefit from tutoring services, health care, and other perks. This policy also presents an obvious equity issue. The Committee is confident that team floors and caps, set at a reasonable level, would promote more equitable participation, without disadvantaging teams.

3. Assessment of authority exercised by the position of Senior Women's Athletics Administrator, as proposed by the original Task Force Report.

The original Task Force Report characterized the Senior Women's Athletics Administrator as the "Chief of Staff." Former President Coleman, in her September 8, 2000 letter to the University of Iowa community, referred to the position as both a "Chief of Staff" and a "Chief Operating Officer." This description, however, was not borne out in the job description for that position [which was titled Senior Associate Director of Athletics/Senior Women's Administrator] (attached). The merged department's organizational chart (also attached) also fails to reflect such a characterization. All of the Associate Athletics Directors are shown at the same level on that chart, and each reports directly to the Athletics Director. The chart does not depict the Senior Associate Director of Athletics/Senior Women's Administrator at a higher -- or different -- position than the other directors in the department.

Further, the Committee's interviews with department members did not detect unanimity within the department that Dr. Meyer operated as a "Chief of Staff" or "Chief Operating Officer" although she is acknowledged to be in charge in Mr. Bowsby's absence. The Committee spent considerable time discussing Dr. Meyer's role and function within the department. The Committee concluded that some disparity among perceptions of Dr. Meyer's role may be founded in communication style. The Committee heard from many individuals that Dr. Meyer maintains a "united front" with Mr. Bowsby when communicating within the department. While such an approach does achieve solidarity between the two of them, the Committee believes that it may prevent issues from being discussed openly within the senior management team or more widely within the department. Moreover, departmental staff members do not witness interactions between Mr. Bowsby and Dr. Meyer in which Dr. Meyer asserts views contrary to Mr. Bowsby's. As a result, they might not be aware that she does so from time to time, which the Committee views as essential for the position to be considered one of influence.

The perception of Dr. Meyer's position held by constituencies external to the department is not consistent. For example, groups such as the Council on the Status of Women focus on the position as one of advocate for gender equity. This role is addressed under the following charge item. Other constituencies collaborate with Dr. Meyer in other capacities. When managing athletics facilities projects, an aspect of her responsibilities, Dr. Meyer is reported to present an assertive management style and an impression of authority.

Facilities oversight surfaced as an issue in connection with the role of the Senior Associate Director of Athletics/Senior Women's Administrator that the Committee discussed at length. Many interviewees and some Committee members recognize that managing major athletics facilities bolsters the respect accorded Dr. Meyer. Only persons with such experience would be considered for the position of Athletics Director at major institutions nationally. As a result, these duties likely comprise an important part of Dr. Meyer's position. Also, if a candidate were not given responsibilities that would enhance experience for subsequent administrative positions, the position would not attract the most highly qualified candidates in the future. Some interviewees and some Committee members, who oppose this facilities oversight role, argue that it reduces substantially the time available for Dr. Meyer's other, more aptly assigned, duties. They question whether the University should "groom" its Senior Associate Director of Athletics/Senior Women's Administrator for a position of Athletics Director, particularly if doing so operates to the detriment of important aspects of the University's athletics program.

4. Assessment of leadership of athletics in serving as clear advocate for women's programs.

Before her retirement from the position of Director of Women's Athletics, Dr. Christine Grant fulfilled the role of advocate for gender equity. Her reputation in this area was and continues to be widely recognized on a national scale. At the time of Dr. Grant's retirement, the two athletics departments at the University merged, and the new position of Senior Associate Director of Athletics/Senior Women's Administrator was created. Some external constituencies perceived the role of gender equity advocate to reside within this new position. This expectation likely derived from Dr. Grant's significant advocacy before her retirement. The new position, however, is not formulated in the same way, and the men's and women's programs are no longer separate.

The Committee concluded that gender equity advocacy is not perceived to be part of the job function of the current Senior Associate Director of Athletics/Senior Women's Administrator. Indeed, the Task Force Report does not include such a role in its description of the position, nor does the position's job description include it. As a matter of practice and perception, the Senior Associate Director of Athletics/Senior Women's Administrator is not the sole advocate for gender equity. Indeed, it is the Committee's perception that

Dr. Meyer's other duties would make it very difficult for her to find the time to fulfill such an advocacy role.

Rather, interviews revealed the perception that, within the department, the rhetoric concerning gender equity advocacy follows a common theme: "it is everybody's job." Many holding key positions expressed this view during Committee interviews. To the extent that departmental leadership embraces this view, a culture of gender equity advocacy could be achieved within the department. Difficulties arise with shared responsibility, however, as tasks designated as "everybody's responsibility" can become "no one's responsibility." The Committee also wishes to note that not everyone interviewed believed that gender equity advocacy should belong to everyone; about 50% of those interviewed believed that a specific person should have the responsibility of such advocacy although there was widespread discrepancy on who or what position was identified as best fulfilling this role.

The Committee examined the extent to which departmental leadership has embraced the role of gender equity advocacy. The Committee discovered that the departmental Policy Manual, available on the department's intranet, makes no mention of gender equity. The same manual fails to address Title IX. The Committee reviewed job descriptions for each of the directors, and discovered that none refers to gender equity. The Senior Associate Director of Athletics/Senior Women's Administrator, however, must "have knowledge of Title IX," and the job description for the Director of Administrative Services also makes reference to Title IX.

When the men's and women's departments were separate, the University's General Education Funds were directed to certain women's programs to achieve funding equity. Recently, because the programs have merged into a single department and because of the reductions in state funding, women's sport teams have primarily used departmental support. The men's revenue sports continue to enjoy substantial revenue generation, leaving the men's non-revenue sports somewhat behind since the time of -- but not because of -- the merger. Consequently, women's sports are perceived to be "costing" the department. This perception fosters resentment among some of the men's sports, particularly the men's non-revenue sports, that compliance with Title IX harms men's non-revenue sports.

Departmental leadership could address this perception, explaining it and nurturing a culture of equity. The distinction between revenue and non-revenue sports obscures the gender equity issue. Title IX seeks to address historical and present gender discrimination, not to solve all financial inequities. It is the Committee's belief that advocacy for gender equity should be a goal of the department, as was stated by former President Coleman: "I am committed to building on Christine's achievements and accelerating our momentum toward the achievement of full gender equity in Iowa intercollegiate athletics."

5. Assessment of the role of women in the leadership/ organizational structure of the department.

The Committee determined that women are well represented numerically in the athletics department. Women are employed throughout the organizational structure. The Committee is not entirely convinced, however, that women in leadership positions wield the same level of authority as do men in analogous roles. To evaluate this charge item, the Committee attempted to consider questions that are difficult to answer on the basis of interviews. Examples are “what is the leadership role of women in the department,” “what influence do women administrators have other than over the sports that report to them,” “can women change things in the department,” and “have women increased their professional visibility in the department, profession, and National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA).”

As one way to evaluate this issue, admittedly not the only or best way, the Committee focused on employees who control the department’s financial operations. Of these, Dr. Meyer has the most visible role, and the Committee concluded that she has authority in this realm. Other than Dr. Meyer, however, the Committee was not able to identify many women in leadership positions who controlled financial operations. The Committee also examined fundraising operations. It noted that the Associate Director of Athletics for Donor and Patron Services, who bears responsibility for this function within the department, has no specifically assigned responsibilities regarding the women’s programs. His job description makes no mention of those programs, although specific references to men’s programs do appear in the job description. The Director of Development, Intercollegiate Athletics, Major Gifts and Women’s Programs does have considerable responsibility for fundraising for women’s programs, but is an employee of the University of Iowa Foundation rather than the department.

The Committee is not able to formulate a firm conclusion on this charge item, and would suggest that this issue be placed at the forefront of the department’s internal mechanisms. It might be that reassignment of responsibilities would be in order. Currently, most, but not all, senior staff also administer sports. It might be better for women’s influence if sport administration were either completely shared or clustered within a few individuals’ portfolios.

6. Equitable allocation of financial and other resource allocation to women’s programs.

The department maintains and assesses financial data as necessary for its internal purposes (e.g., managing the budget on a sport-by-sport basis) and its reporting responsibilities to the State of Iowa Board of Regents, the Conference and the NCAA. However, the department did not respond fully to Committee requests for a comprehensive financial report with actual results for fiscal years 2000 to 2004 and projected information for fiscal year 2005, and detailed information about specific aspects of its operations. Therefore, drawing on

expertise and assistance from the University's Business Office, the Committee was provided with data in a format enabling an assessment of the department's data with respect to this charge item. The Committee concludes that the data appear to reflect equitable allocation of financial resources to women's athletics programs. However, the Committee notes that the department would have not have been able to demonstrate that this goal was met on the basis of the way financial information is organized in departmental reports.

Overall, the men's and women's programs' total expenses have increased at the same average weighted annual percentage (10.9%) since the merger. The financial data reflect clear distinctions between revenue and non-revenue sports, regardless of gender, with average weighted annual percentage increases ranging from 22.1% to minus 1.1%. This distinction was the subject of discussion in many interviews during the course of this review. Despite that distinction, however, the increase in funding of the women's program overall is equivalent to that for the men's program. In addition, without the impact of football and basketball (men's and women's), the remaining women's sports' expenditure budgets increased at a rate that is 3.5 greater than the men's non-revenue sports between fiscal years 2000 and 2005. The women's non-revenue sports received budget increments of \$975,000 or 78% of the increments provided to the direct operating expense of all non-revenue sports. [It should be noted that the Committee's conclusions about total expenses for men's and women's programs do not reflect the cost of scholarships, medical expenses, trainers, or administrative support, which are not allocated or reported by sport.]

The Committee noted no reserve fund in the department's data. Such a fund would seem prudent, given the many variables involved in balancing the department's budget. One of the major expenses for both programs is facilities construction and renovation. The Committee was informed that, through the financing of Kinnick Stadium, a reserve is being developed for athletics facilities for all teams (men's and women's) in the future. The Committee noted a corresponding concern, which was that less money would be available for other athletics or academic purposes in light of the considerable fundraising going on for the Kinnick renovation.

One aspect of the department's allocation of resources that came to the Committee's attention is the support that the University of Iowa Foundation provides the department. Although the men's and women's programs have merged, no analogous consolidation has occurred with the Foundation's management of donations for the programs. The Committee learned that donations made to the University's intercollegiate athletics program (with no gender designation or specific program reference) are not placed into an account for intercollegiate athletics. Rather, such funds are divided equally between the men's and women's programs. In addition, donors attempting to use the Foundation's online donation mechanism cannot make a gift to the merged department; donors using that medium must specify either the men's or women's program for their donations.

The Committee acknowledged the Foundation's responsibility to honor donor intent, and therefore, recognized the difficulties inherent in imposing gender equity principles in this realm. Still, the Committee concluded that little effort has been exerted to this end. A proportion of donations are need-driven, and it is the responsibility of the development officer to make the case for that need. The Committee concludes that considerably more could be done by the Foundation on behalf of gender equity in particular.

The Committee discussed at length whether fundraising should simply be on behalf of the department as a whole, perhaps with an option to designate gifts to specific sport teams. There is a widespread belief among the constituent groups that currently donate to "women's programs" that their gift would be misused if given to the department as a single entity. The Committee considers that mistrust as a deeply significant and worrisome sign. If there were a single person designated as an advocate for women's programs, as is recommended by the Committee later in this report, such a person could have responsibility for ensuring equitable allocation among all sports of externally-raised funds.

7. Equitable processes used to make decisions about resource allocation and use of discretionary funds within the department, and whether those processes have the same impact on men's and women's programs.

The department's resource collection and allocation processes are quite detailed and involve a large number of variables. As noted above, processes are driven to a large extent by the functions for which data are compiled. For example, the department uses an internal budgeting system that provides each coach with a tool to list the details of a proposed operating budget for that coach's sport each year. That proposed budget is folded into a departmental analysis report that the department uses to manage all expenses. Monthly reports are provided to each coach and administrator at a detailed level. These reports include projections of year-end actual amounts for each major revenue and expense item and related variance from budgeted amounts.

This sport-by-sport process does not require consideration of gender equity in the allocation of resources. One of the expectations at the time of the merger was that merging the separate departments would increase funding for the women's program on a more reliable basis. Presumably, a process would have been implemented to measure achievement of that expectation, yet the Committee detects none. Nevertheless, as noted above with respect to Charge Item 6, the results have been equitable. Both programs have enjoyed overall growth at virtually the same rate. Planned or not, the process has had similar impact on the men's and women's sport teams.

Although the impact has been equitable with respect to the two programs overall, the Committee observed disparities between similar women's and men's sports in each program that had no apparent rational basis. Disparities of this type

occurred before the merger, as well. They are not the result of the merger, but rather remain despite it. Incorporating into the financial processes of the department a consideration of the relative impact of each budgetary decision on gender equity could reduce the frequency of these disparities.

The Committee also notes that there are ways to support less visible sports that do not require a financial commitment. As an example, the Committee would suggest that press conferences could be structured so that a revenue coach (e.g., football) is paired with a non-revenue coach in his or her competitive season (e.g., rowing). Neither the department nor the University can impose equity on the reporting world, but they can endorse it to positive effect.

8. Equitable access to high quality services, for example, access and use of the new learning center.

The Committee received numerous and consistent reports of resounding success regarding Athletics Student Services, particularly the Gerdin Athletics Learning Center. Interviewees across the board have been very pleased with access to, use of, and the quality of the Learning Center. The reports from coaches and from students were equally positive. From the coaches' perspective, the Learning Center not only provides excellent services for their athletes, but also serves as a recruiting tool. From the students' perspective, the Athletics Learning Center is a haven of equity. Students perceive no favors or advantages through Student Services on the basis of revenue/non-revenue distinctions. They report no difference in access to or quality of services provided to men as opposed to women.

It is clear to the Committee that, because of the Department of Athletics' ability to provide student services like those performed by the Athletics Learning Center, this University has provided outstanding opportunities to a number of outstanding athletes. The Athletics Learning Center clearly stands out as one of the department's "crown jewels," of which the University should be very proud.

In some ways, however, the Learning Center's success has placed heavy burdens on its staff. Increasing numbers of students use the facility because of its excellent services and reputation. As more students use the facilities, resources become strained. In addition, teams have been added to the roster of those entitled to the Center's resources (e.g., dance team, scout team members). These additions have increased the already heavy burden on the staff. Some student-athletes reported having been discouraged because of overcrowding from using the Athletics Learning Center if they do not need help with their academics.

In order to maintain the excellent quality of services that the Center provides, and to ensure the Center's continued accessibility to all student-athletes, some preventive measures should be implemented to reduce staff workload. The Committee noted that, of all the administrative functions (Administration, Support Services – i.e., Marketing, Student Services, Medical Expenses, Trainers, and

Satellite Facilities), the Student Service function has the lowest weighted average annual change (2.7%), with the range across all functions of 2.7% to 9.6%. It is the Committee's view that Student Services, which enhances the general experience for all student-athletes, is under funded and needs additional support.

9. Consider how often subsequent reviews should be conducted.

The Committee perceives little benefit in conducting further reviews of the merger itself. As time distances the merger, the consolidation of the men's and women's programs no longer presents an issue. Still, this review of the merger will produce recommendations for the President's consideration. To the extent that the President accepts any of these recommendations, or calls for action as a result of the Committee's findings, there may be basis for a more focused review in the future. Such a review could examine the implementation of recommendations accepted by the President, as well as the department's management of Title IX.

The time frame for such a focused review should take into account other reviews conducted regularly by the department. These would include regular NCAA certifications and other departmental reviews. The Committee received no evidence that the Department of Athletics has been the subject of a regular departmental review such as those performed by other University departments. It is not clear to the Committee why the department has not been reviewed as other University departments.

10. Assessment of the internal grievance procedures that address Title IX complaints.

Interviews conducted by Committee members revealed that senior administrators all are aware of and understand the implications of Title IX. The Committee anticipates, however, that coaches, rather than administrators, would be the likeliest recipients of complaints or concerns regarding Title IX. It is not clear to the Committee whether all coaches comprehend Title IX sufficiently to field a complaint should one be made. In fact, few coaches and virtually no student-athletes could articulate the correct Title IX complaint process.

Coaches and others in the department need to understand three points concerning Title IX:

- Is a particular concern a Title IX grievance?
- What is the appropriate process for a Title IX grievance?
- Who is the Title IX coordinator?

Education in this regard should be encouraged. For example, coaches could be informed about Title IX during the required annual compliance workshop. If regular coaches' meetings were held, such meetings could be used as an opportunity to provide this information as well.

No formal departmental procedures currently address Title IX; and neither the Department of Athletics Policy Manual nor the Department of Athletics websites (neither on the hawkeyesports.com site nor through the athletics link on the University site) refer to Title IX complaints. Discussion concerning Title IX does appear in the minutes of the Presidential Committee on Athletics. Training in formalized procedures regarding Title IX complaints would help to clarify Title IX requirements for all members of the department – and the University community. It also would provide guidance and direction to anyone concerned that a particular situation might have Title IX implications.

B. Original Task Force Report and former President Coleman’s Response

One other aspect of the Committee’s charge was to “evaluate the merged athletics department using the August 30, 2000 Task Force Report recommendations and former President Coleman’s September 8, 2000 response as a guide....” Thus, the Committee also considered what goals were originally intended to be reached as a result of the merger and whether, in our opinion, these goals have been fully, partially, or not at all attained in the current department.

The original Task Force report envisioned several general needs for women’s athletics that a merged department would better meet. First, a merged department would allow access to increased financial resources. Second, a merged department would eliminate duplication in operations and thereby achieve a source of additional revenue that could be directed toward enhancing women’s sport teams. Third, a merged department would provide a better mechanism for reaching top tier levels in all sports. Thus, one could define the goals for the merger for the women’s sports as more secure funding, better funding, and better athletic standing.

The Committee observed that the security of funding for women’s sports could be characterized as mixed. For example, the University has had to dramatically reduce its commitment of General Education Fund support. That commitment had been made to the Women’s Department, and under a non-merged structure would not likely have been withdrawn. While the loss of funds has affected both women’s and men’s sports, it has clearly resulted in less secure funding. However, the funding for women’s sports could also be characterized as more secure. Merging the departments has given women’s sports a “place at the table” along with all other sports from which to argue for support from departmental income and funds. As outlined earlier in this report, the increase in women’s sport program operations suggests that their financial improvement has been real. To the degree that the entire department is experiencing increased financial health due to certain sources of revenue, the funding for women’s sports is more secure.

As noted earlier in this report, the increase in operations for women’s sports matches the increase in operations for men’s sports since the merger. This finding suggests that funding for women’s sports has not worsened. However, the expectations that (1) duplication would be eliminated and those savings redirected to women’s sports; and that (2) increased revenues from NCAA and Conference media contracts would be

redirected toward women's sports, have not been completely fulfilled. The department itself acknowledges that it realized no savings from the reduction of "duplication."

Last, the Committee analyzed the department's standings by comparing the rank in the Big Ten Conference for all sport teams before and after the merger. Apart from some fluctuations in individual team standings, the men's teams and the women's teams showed virtually no overall change in their rankings in the Big Ten Conference after the merger as compared with their rankings before the merger. There may be other metrics that could be applied, but that was the most available one for the Committee. Thus, the merger did not result in better athletic standing for women's sport teams (nor did the merger lower men's sports' overall standings). Further, the Committee noted that virtually all programs finish in the lower half of the Big 10 Conference, a finding that does not correspond with the goal of the merger of reaching the top 20 in all sports stated by former President Coleman.

One clear intent of the merger was to create a single department with a shared and unified goal. The Committee notes that virtually every student-athlete participating in this review was enthusiastic about a merged department. From the students' perspective, there would be no advantage to separate departments; they enjoy and benefit from having both male and female colleagues. The Committee views their perspective as the most important since the department exists to provide student-athletes with high quality competition within an outstanding academic context.

IV. Recommendations

It is clear to the Committee that the merger of the men's and women's programs has produced positive effects overall. Student athletes, coaches, and staff members regard the merger as the appropriate structure for the department as it moves forward. As the department strives toward continuous improvement, the Committee presents for the President's consideration the following recommendations:

With regard to *climate*, the Committee recommends the following:

- The department should promote better morale and cohesion within the department, incorporating both bottom-up and top-down communication mechanisms. Regular coaches' meetings should be scheduled with administrators. During these meetings, administrators should be available for open and frank discussion about departmental management issues.
- Staff should be encouraged to participate in campus-wide development opportunities. Staff also should be cross-trained to reduce stress on those with responsibilities for which there is no trained substitute.
- Staff should be added to the Gerdin Athletics Learning Center and/or to Student Services more generally.

- The Department should foster a culture of “teamwork,” permeating all its constituent parts and emphasizing the importance of each sport to the department as a whole.
- The Department should utilize existing campus resources to implement workplace effectiveness reviews and recommendations. These resources can also assist in evaluating the distribution of workload and responsibilities that appear unequal to the Committee.
- The Department should allow all sport teams to charge admission (even if only \$2.00 per ticket). Doing so would provide an accounting of the spectator numbers, and also would improve morale for coaches and student-athletes. Re-invigorating the “Gold Card” plan was also discussed by the Committee.
- Marketing personnel should meet with each team or representative, so that the team can participate in the determination of the marketing plan for that sport. Each team should be advised of the specific amount it may spend on marketing, what options are available, and what the marketing experts recommend as the best application of the available funds for that sport. This process would involve teams in the development of a marketing plan, and thus should reduce the feelings of alienation that seem to derive from marketing decisions imposed on teams.

With regard to operational *integration* of equitable treatment and with regard to the *role of women* in the leadership/organizational structure of the department, the Committee recommends the following:

- The department should develop job descriptions for all positions. Doing so would help identify comparables to promote gender equity, and also would provide a basis for compensation decisions generally.
- Decisions regarding coach (head, associate, assistant) compensation (compensation and perquisites) should be scrutinized for equity on a regular basis.
- Facility decisions should be made with constant reference to gender equity. Other campuses have added a review committee to consider facility decisions due to the importance of this point. It is of great concern to the Committee that there is no systematic method currently in place to understand how individual facility decisions have contributed to or have eroded gender equity.
- The establishment of minimum/maximum squad sizes should be a priority.

With regard to the *position* of Senior Associate Director of Athletics/Senior Women’s Administrator and with regard to the leadership of athletics in serving as a *clear advocate* for women’s programs, the Committee recommends the following:

- The job description for the Senior Associate Director of Athletics/Senior Women’s Administrator should be clarified. Specifically, that person’s role – if any – in gender equity advocacy should be stated expressly.

- The University should designate a specific individual to serve as advocate for gender equity in athletics, and that person's job description should expressly specify such a role. The Committee was not of one mind on whether that person should be the Senior Associate Director of Athletics/Senior Women's Administrator. More generally, the Committee was in agreement that the person holding such a position should demonstrate passion for its stated objective and be equally sensitive to minority concerns. An advocate for gender equity must be able to devote considerable time to this function, and yet must garner the authority necessary to implement gender equity principles. Unless the individual holding this position possesses the passion and personal charisma to infuse it with power in its own right, as Dr. Grant was able to do, the position will remain vulnerable to the perception of impotence and will be disregarded. The Committee realizes that, in an ideal world, such a position would not be needed but concluded that, in current circumstances, the position is needed to keep gender equity as a major achievement of University of Iowa athletics.
- Regardless of whether there is a designated gender equity advocate, the law assigns the gender equity oversight role to all athletic leadership, and University policy imposes on all administrators a gender equity advocacy role. Accordingly, job descriptions for all of these positions should state these responsibilities clearly, and performance evaluations should genuinely address this job component.

With regard to equitable *allocation* of financial and other resource allocation and equitable processes used to make *decisions about allocations*, the Committee recommends the following:

- The department should develop a strategic plan that will serve as its guide in the allocation of all resources. This plan should be related to the overall strategic plan of the University of Iowa. Such a plan should identify the specific business model that will guide the department as well as goals and objectives for each sport and each department division. It would direct the prioritization of funding, facilities construction and maintenance, and sport development. One of the plan's goals should be gender equity.
- The department should add financial management capabilities to provide for the coordination between strategic plans and financial plans. These capabilities include budget preparation, financial reporting, revenue and expense analysis and projection, and capital projects. The department should formulate a capstone document for financial overview of the entire department. Data included in it should allow for ready analysis of gender equity and general financial planning.
- The department should implement development of a reserve fund that comprises an integral part of the department's financial planning process. The planning process should include the generation of forward looking budget projections in the range of five years, including all funds controlled by the department.

- In the course of its planning, every major budgetary decision should be made only after considering impact on both men's and women's sport teams, so that gender equity may be achieved.
- Fundraising efforts on behalf of the department should be carefully considered in the context of gender equity. Donors might, for example, be afforded an option to donate to intercollegiate athletics in general, or to a sport they designate. Every major donor should be provided a report stating how the donor's funds were allocated.
- Marketing resources should be allocated among all the sports in an effort to retain the popularity of the revenue sports, while at the same time promoting the other sports. Each sport, however, should receive a threshold level of marketing services. Marketing success should be evaluated in part by the level of increased participation in sports not already popular. Sports should receive marketing resources to stimulate the participation interest necessary to address Title IX considerations.
- The Department should clarify its expectations for all coaches in terms of athletic achievement, academic achievement, spectator support, and the like and evaluate all coaches on their achievement of goals within these categories.

With regard to equitable *access* to high quality services, the Committee recommends the following: The staffing levels of Student Services, generally, and the Gerdin Learning Center specifically should be increased.

With regard to subsequent *reviews*, the Committee believes that consistent adherence to current University policies would be best and therefore recommends the following:

- The Department should be reviewed on a regular basis under the same format as all University units.
- If recommendations from this report are adopted, a focused review should be done in three years to determine the success of the implementation of these recommendations.

With regard to *Title IX complaints*, the Committee recommends the following:

- The department, with the assistance of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity, should implement Title IX training for all administrators and coaches.
- This training should educate athletics personnel on the law's requirements, the process to be followed in the event of a complaint, and existing resources at the University that may provide guidance and assistance in the event of any question.

While noting areas for improvement, the Committee wishes to acknowledge the genuine commitment among Department staff, coaches, and administrative staff to providing student-athletes with a sound education and well-conceived competitive athletics programs. The University of Iowa has an excellent tradition that will form the foundation for reaching the goal

articulated for the merger by former President Coleman: To accelerating our momentum toward the achievement of full gender equity in Iowa intercollegiate athletics.

The Committee would be pleased to provide any additional materials or information the President may require.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Altmaier, Chair
Athletics Merger Review Committee
Faculty Representative to the Big Ten and NCAA
Professor and Interim DEO
Psychological & Quantitative Foundations

For the Committee:

Daniel Anderson
Professor
Mathematics

Margaret Burchianti
Graduate Student
Anthropology

Mark Kresowik
Undergraduate Student
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Rodney Lehnertz
Director, Campus and Facilities Planning
UI Facilities Management

Lola Lopes
Associate Provost
Undergraduate Education

David Manderscheid
Professor and DEO
Mathematics

Pamela Trimpe
Curator, UI Museum of Art
and Pentacrest Museums

Charlotte Westerhaus
Assistant to the President
Director, Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity