



The Globalization of Intercollegiate Athletics: Challenges, Opportunities, and Advice for Those Seeking to Emulate the U.S. Model of College Sport

Erianne A. Weight , Jonathan A. Jensen  and Barbara Osborne 

Sports Administration, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

ABSTRACT

This special issue targets an audience of scholars and practitioners across the globe to advance research, enhance practice, and facilitate policy-making decisions among those interested in emulating and/or learning from US intercollegiate athletics. We begin with a panel of practitioners and academics who comment directly on the discussion of the globalization of intercollegiate athletics. Together with the articles included in this issue, those interested in the advancement, fortification, reform, and development of global intercollegiate athletics can draw upon a variety of critical perspectives and hundreds of years of combined experience in the field. Panelists in this dialogue include a variety of experiential lenses, institutional affiliations, and oversight responsibilities. Current and former titles include those of coach, president/chancellor, director of athletics, professor, senior woman administrator, faculty athletics representative, consultant, and NCAA chief executive officer. Through these lenses, our panelists tackle questions that emerged through foundational literature and global dialogue.

校际体育全球化：学习美国大学体育模式过程中面临的机遇、挑战及对策
尽管美国的校际体育运动极具特色，许多国家正计划着在自己的市场中建立校际体育系统。因此，与《全球体育管理杂志》内容相一致，本期特刊着眼于全球学者和从业者，以推进实践研究，促进良好的决策制定。基于此目标，我们与从业者和专家学者直接就校际体育全球化进行讨论。对全球校际体育运动的进步、强化、改革和发展感兴趣的学者和从业者可以借鉴本期特刊文章中各种批判性观点以及在该领域积淀了数百年的综合经验。本次访谈邀请到的讨论组成员来自于各行各业，经验丰富，现任或曾任体育教练、校长、体育主任、教授、资深女性管理人员、教师代表、体育顾问以及全国大学生体育协会首席执行官等。凭借他们多年积累的经验，本期讨论组将致力于通过基础文献和全球对话解决问题。

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 8 July 2019
Accepted 15 July 2019

KEYWORDS

College sport;
intercollegiate athletics;
interview; reform;
practitioner perspective

关键词

高校体育；校际体育；访谈；改革；从业者视角

1. Introduction

During the twenty-first century, the system of intercollegiate athletics in the United States (U.S.) has evolved into a multibillion-dollar enterprise. However, fundamental differences remain in how the system is organized, governed, and marketed compared to for-profit entities and many other non-profit sport organizations, requiring specialized experience, knowledge, and skills. Since its inception, there has often been an ever-present tension between U.S. intercollegiate athletics and the universities in which they are housed, as the commercial pressures that fund the system are often in direct conflict with the academic missions of the institutions.

While intercollegiate athletics in the U.S. is unique, numerous countries are exploring plans to develop a system of intercollegiate athletics in their own markets. Accordingly, and consistent with the scope of the *Journal of Global Sport Management*, this special issue targets an audience of scholars and practitioners across the globe in order to advance research, enhance practice, and facilitate good policy-making decisions. Specific to this aim, we begin the special issue with a panel of practitioners and academics to comment directly on the discussion of the globalization of intercollegiate athletics. Panelists include the following:

Brad Bates

Vice President, Consulting, Collegiate Sports Associates; Adjunct Professor of the Practice, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Former DI Director of Athletics

Janna Blais

Deputy Director of Athletics, Administration and Policy, Northwestern University

Anson Dorrance

Hall of Fame Soccer Coach of 22x NCAA women's soccer national champions, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; 8x National Coach of the Year; Coach of the 1991 FIFA World Cup Champions.

Mark Emmert

President and CEO, National Collegiate Athletic Association; Former NCAA DI University President

Robert Malekoff

Teaching Assistant Professor/Consultant, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Former NCAA DIII Director of Athletics

Nicki Moore

Director of Athletics, Vice President, Colgate University

Christine Plonsky

Executive Sr. Associate Athletic Director, Chief of Staff and Senior Woman Administrator, University of Texas

Todd Turner

Founder and President, Collegiate Sports Associates; Former NCAA DI Director of Athletics

Erianne Weight

Associate Professor and Co-Director, Center for Research in Intercollegiate Athletics, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Together with the articles included in this issue, scholars and practitioners interested in the advancement, fortification, reform, and development of global intercollegiate athletics can draw upon a variety of critical perspectives and hundreds of years of combined experience in the field. Panelists in this dialogue include a variety of experiential lenses, institutional affiliations, and oversight responsibilities. Current and former titles include those of coach, president/chancellor, director of athletics, professor, senior woman administrator, faculty athletics representative, consultant, and NCAA chief executive officer. Through these lenses, our panelists tackle questions that emerged through foundational literature and global dialogue.

2. Questions

2.1. What is Your Advice for Global Sport Leaders Seeking to Implement a College Sport Governance System in Their Own Countries? How Would You Advise Them to Strategically Navigate Some of the Issues the U.S. Has Grappled with since Inception Relative to Rules Enforcement, Athletic Scholarships, Financial Sustainability, and/or Academic Integrity?

Emmert: Whether just launching an intercollegiate athletic program or leading an already extant one, the paramount objective is the same: keep your focus on the success and well-being of the student-athletes, not just in their athletic performance but also academically and socially. Competitive pressures constantly pull on coaches, administrators, and the students themselves to prioritize athletic prowess over all else. Winning and performing at the highest level of sport are what drives every serious athlete. But college sport occurs *within* the context of higher education, not independent from it. All programs must determine their academic and developmental goals are as well their athletic ones. Program leaders need to state clearly and strongly what is expected from all involved – athletes, coaches, administrators, schools – in terms of performance in the classroom as well as on the field. Measures of success regarding health, well-being and academics need to be monitored as closely as team scores. Students and their families must know what will be expected of them and what they in turn can expect from a school and its athletic program. All involved need to recognize that college sport is about much more than the games.

Malekoff: My advice would be to very intentionally endeavor to integrate intercollegiate athletics with the academic and student life dimensions of universities. Too often in our intercollegiate sports system athletic programs take on characteristics resembling something of a silo-like separate entity. In terms of strategically navigating some of the challenges prevalent in our college sports system, it becomes difficult/impossible if competitive success too emphatically trumps all other goals (e.g. academic primacy, student personal growth). I wouldn't necessarily change relevant bylaws, but I would put some teeth into legislation/guidelines regarding how much time athletes are required to spend on their sport. This is not only an academic issue in terms of balance, but it is increasingly a mental health issue. We – the NCAA and

its member institutions – say we prioritize athlete mental health, but we schedule students that participate to a degree where they are afforded little/no discretionary time and – in too many cases – feel constantly under pressure.

Bates: Every policy decision should start with the question ‘in what ways does this help our students grow?’ While the ideology of the American model is noble and has the potential (when done right) for holistic student-athlete development, global leaders can learn from our mistakes: compromised university admissions, compromised curricular rigor, meaningless degrees, salaries greater than presidents, shoe and apparel sponsorships directly with coaches, and excessive commercialization to name a few.

Moore: Consider your endeavor that of establishing a new profession, and ensure you thoughtfully get the foundation in place first. That is, at minimum, deliberate over the following questions and become as certain as possible about your answers ... then, as you continue the process of developing your governance system, revisit the questions multiple times to ensure you are both on-track, and that your answers really were sincerely aligned with your intent:

- What set of diverse perspectives should be included in our deliberations?
- Why do we exist?
- Who do we serve primarily?
- Who do we serve secondarily?
- What are aspirational ethical principles?
- What do we specifically intend NOT to do?
- How will we create checks and balances, as well as governance processes in the system to deal with the inevitable exceptions to our policies?
- What are the limits to our governance?
- How will we protect ourselves from ourselves (ethically)?
- How will we protect ourselves from external entities (legally)?

Dorrance: Foreign countries trying to replicate and imitate what the United States is doing with their collegiate player development platforms in all sports is going to be very difficult, and that is because the American collegiate model is supported by two extraordinary revenue streams. One of these being American football (and that is not American soccer football, i.e. American football, the throwing and catching football) and men’s basketball. Because of the revenue streams from those two sports through gate receipts and TV contracts, the extraordinary way they are marketed, and a culture that supports this model, it puts the United States in an extraordinary position to fund all the other sports. So, from that perspective, it will be tough to replicate this in other countries because that model doesn’t exist. So I am not sure this can be replicated. In fact, what we are seeing in countries like England, for example, when a young girl wants to get a college degree while she is playing professionally, the professional club will sign her to a professional contract and then just enroll her at a local school nearby so she can get the education while she is competing. This is a completely different experience that a young athlete would get in a collegiate environment in the United States where there are professional coaches, professional support systems, and extraordinary facilities that are a part of this structure built by American football and men’s basketball revenue in the collegiate environment.

The issues mentioned in the question are something the character of the local leadership will have to navigate in the right way. I don't think this will be an impediment to that evolution abroad, and I don't think the issues would be a reason why intercollegiate athletics will fail internationally.

2.2. What are Some distinguishing Features of U.S. College Sport That Differentiate it from a Traditional Sport Business?

Dorrance: Your priority at the collegiate level has to be human development. This sports piece is only an element of their evolution and is not the most important element. The most important element is human development.

Emmert: College sport has become so fully embedded in American higher education that it is typically considered an integral part of the college experience, whether playing, attending games, or following your teams in the media. Colleges and universities allocate a significant part of their annual budgets around supporting sports. Campus leaders view their athletic departments as an essential part of what the school does, much like any other program of the college. The student-athletes are provided remarkable opportunities to continue playing sports they love while attending school. The broader campus community gets to enjoy attending games, sharing in school pride, binding together all members of the community in a way that is very hard to do with traditional academic programming. Indeed, it is hard for most Americans to envision a college without a sports program.

This relationship between American colleges and sport is now over a century old. It has morphed and grown during that time and will likely continue to do so for the next century. What has remained constant during the 115-year life of the NCAA is the recognition that American intercollegiate athletics is fundamentally in the human development business. Yes, some sporting events are dramatic, iconic American traditions producing very impressive TV revenue. Yes, a handful of coaches make very large salaries, predominantly because they win so much. Yes, some very small fraction (under 2%) of college athletes will play professionally, some for even bigger salaries. But, the vast majority of the nearly half million NCAA student-athletes don't play in front of massive crowds, don't play professionally, and don't get shoe company deals. The policies of all intercollegiate sport organizations need to focus on these latter students, the ones who will gain a college education and earn a living like all the rest of us. The American intercollegiate athletics is built around this premise: It exists to provide an opportunity for students to grow and develop in all aspects of their lives.

Plonsky: The U.S. is the world's only nation in which access to higher education is tethered to a competitive scholarship to participate in sports as a co-curricular campus activity. Students voluntarily commit to NCAA participation, and with that, the governing rules in place at the institutions, states, and conferences. This is not a 'forced' activity. But the acceptance of sports within the U.S. educational system from junior high to high school to college is historic. There are few comparables to earning a collegiate athletics scholarship. This system is opportunistic for talented and motivated men and women. However, economically, the funding sources are usually required to be self-derived, especially in NCAA Division I.

The need to generate revenue from ticket sales, fundraising, food and beverage, sponsorship, licensing, television, etc., creates the optic that collegiate sports mirror professional sports. However, the participants are full-time students on their campuses. It is this reality of participants being students that – in this writer’s opinion – foster the support from fans and alumni. Regardless of the ‘professionalism’ of the ‘business’ part of collegiate athletics, the students indeed are students and must matriculate toward a degree in order to participate. Many student-athletes are first generation college attendees in their families, which is another motivation for donors to provide support and access. Truly philanthropic individuals with capacity for giving relish the opportunity to give others a pathway to success.

Blais: This question gets to the very foundation of why I chose to make intercollegiate athletics my career. U.S. college sports is rooted in higher education. There is really nothing like it! On a daily basis, we strive to provide the types of opportunities and experiences that assist in developing the whole person within the framework of our outstanding colleges and universities. Simply put, we change lives and shape the futures of so many young adults! It is extremely rewarding work.

Our student-athletes develop life skills through these opportunities and experiences at a critical and unique growth point in their lives. They are allowed to fail and learn from that failure in an environment that supports their well-being at every turn. Problem solving and understanding the importance of being a true team player in life are lessons that are taught every day in the context of our work. Our student-athletes learn these lessons in a diverse and inclusive environment. Their ideas and beliefs are stretched and challenged in ways that can only happen in this supportive and safe setting.

We are committed to our student-athletes from their first day on campus, and this commitment carries on well beyond their graduation day. The strong bonds that are developed during their time on our campuses can last a lifetime. For so many of us working in intercollegiate athletics, we thrive on the bonds that we form with our student-athletes and gain great satisfaction in seeing them mature into well-rounded and well-informed young adults. For whatever complicated issues our industry faces, the positives I have described far out-weigh the negatives.

Bates: Academic requirements, amateurism, developmental system for professional sports, gender equity, disparities in participation by race, operating in the red.

Malekoff: One obvious difference is that participants are required to make progress toward a college degree. That said, there are many similarities between professional sport and intercollegiate ‘amateur’ sport – with perhaps the most obvious the pressure on coaches to demonstrate competitive success in order to remain employed. And this – the link between winning and job security – is increasingly the case at the Division II and III levels.

2.3. Would You Advise Global Leaders to Recognized Athletics Formally as an Educational Pathway (Similar in Form to Music, Dance, or Theatre), or Should Athletics be ‘Extracurricular’ and Not-For-Credit? Why/Why Not?

Moore: It should be as an educational pathway. Sport is a legitimate, global industry and could use more intentionally trained professionals to enhance it, from the

youth level through professional and senior levels. Presently, if sport is truly a student's passion, he/she has to 'jury-rig' an educational pathway to approximate what might be helpful as a professional foundation.

Bates: If the endeavor is surrounded by ethical policies of enforcement (admissions, distribution of majors, faculty oversight) guided by the overarching aim of 'how does this help our students grow' and is open to all students, a for-credit model is worth contemplating. However, as long as job security is heavily weighted toward winning the context for compromise is too great and compromised values that ultimately have negative ramifications on students will occur. Regardless of whether it is for-credit or not, athletics has an inherent curriculum with coaching pedagogy and teaching methodology.

Dorrance: I would love for us to move in the direction of music, dance, and dramatic art because I genuinely feel we have enough valuable pieces to learn about life in the commitment, and the athletic evolution, that the people can benefit through athletics. And I think, certainly at the collegiate level, that should be a part of the mission. To have as a priority the aspects of athletics that can contribute to your human development, and as Erianne Weight knows so very well, we can design curriculums to continue to help this aspect of athletics evolve.

Weight: Research has consistently demonstrated that athletes who graduate are generally more satisfied with their lives, and have higher work engagement, job satisfaction, salaries, and physical health measures than their non-athlete graduate classmates. Athletes also report tremendous transferrable lessons from their elite athletics experiences. These outcomes could be the result of certain types of people drawn toward and succeeding in athletics, or the result of years balancing the full-time demands of athletics and academics which set them up for success in other rigorous environments. An alternative yet complimentary conclusion is there is tremendous inherent educational value in the collegiate sports experience. Athletics facilitate a laboratory of learning nearly unmatched wherein athletes can fail, train, garner tangible results, interface with the media, and work, travel, and experience emotional highs and lows with a team.

Supporting this laboratory is a foundation of sciences that could be paired with the on-field experiences athletes have: physiology, nutrition, psychology, leadership, communication, and analytics, to name a few. I believe that if the pursuit of excellence in athletics was viewed as an academic endeavor similar to the pursuit of excellence in music or dance, many of the philosophical and structural issues that have plagued the integration of athletics in the academy would be addressed and ameliorated. Certainly in some athletics cultures, pressure to specialize in athletics may limit the alternative academic opportunities athletes currently are able to pursue. The educational experience in these environments, however, is often sub-par, and the transparency of academic opportunities and limitations from school to school might enhance the alignment of athletes and available academic programs and experiences.

Malekoff: One could make a case for offering for-credit athletics, e.g. at some schools participation on an intercollegiate team counts as a Physical Education credit.

And while – when conducted in a balanced fashion – there are many educational lessons students can take from being part of an intercollegiate team, the pursuit of competitive success and all it is thought to entail most often takes precedent over any educational benefits students might realize. This is not to say coaches or athletic administrators are ‘the bad guys,’ but rather that, at the end of the day, our intercollegiate athletic system often rewards winning (lucrative multiyear contracts) and punishes losing (dismissal). The incentives most often encourage (require?) an emphasis on winning above all else.

Plonsky: These talented students enjoy their training and skill set, much as a musician or an artist loves to practice a craft. There is a fine line between required activities and allowing talented students to do what they feel they need to do to perform at the highest level. The balance between academics and athletics is something administrators and coaches are highly sensitive to fulfilling in the best interests of the students. Every institution must make the decision about the role athletics plays on its campus. This ultimately is about institutional control and decision-making regarding the place of sports within individual campus settings.

2.4. According to the Most Recent NCAA Revenues and Expenses Report, only 24 Division I Institutions Showed Positive Net Generated Revenues (Profits), while the Rest Show Median Annual Losses between 10-20 Million Dollars. These Financial Shortfalls are Increasing Annually for all Schools not in the Top-Tier of Generated Revenue. Would you Recommend Emerging Governance Structures Implement a Formal Revenue-Sharing Structure to Maintain Competitive Equity and Avoid the Increasing Divide between the ‘Rich’ and ‘Poor’ Schools? If So, What Model of Revenue Sharing Would You Recommend?

Malekoff: Let me answer that question by posing one. Should universities with endowments in the billions subsidize less financially healthy universities through some form of revenue sharing? The arms race we see in athletics is not altogether dissimilar from the arms race we see in academics and student life. Schools build palatial athletic facilities to gain an advantage in recruiting the best athletes. Likewise, schools build terrific academic and student life facilities to attract the best students. Of course, one could make a strong case in support of spending that is focused on a university’s stated core missions – research and teaching. In too many cases, the problem is schools with limited resources trying to regularly compete athletically with schools that have significant resources (ex. mid-majors playing football against Power 5 schools). Once in a blue moon, a mid-major upsets a Power 5 and – like a gambler that hits the occasional jackpot – the mid-major doubles down by continuing to spend in order to ‘stay in the game.’ This is not a fiscally sustainable course of action for schools outside the Division I, Power 5 orbit.

Turner: The revenue and exposure being generated by the football programs at the Power 5 level has forever changed the landscape of Division I athletics. The governing body of intercollegiate athletics is the NCAA, yet the Association has no

control over Division I FBS football other than through the services it provides its members for compliance, enforcement, and legislative services. With the advent of the College Football Playoff and the extraordinary media contracts primarily driven by football, unprecedented resources have come that separated the Power 5 institutions from the rest of Division I. This has created a series of challenges that now define college athletics at the highest level, namely legal challenges linked to ‘pay for play’ for student-athletes, extraordinarily high salaries for some coaches, and increased commercialization. If the traditional collegiate model is to be preserved, it may be time to federate college football at the highest level which would allow the Power 5 football programs to operate independent of the NCAA, while the remaining sports programs remain under the NCAA banner.

The current NCAA governance model allows the Power 5 institutions weighted influence over voting on issues that impact all of Division I. In the federated football model I am suggesting, the FBS/Power 5 group could keep all the money and make use of it as they see fit. Hopefully, their distribution formula for FB generated money would include allocation for academic achievement and carve out extensive dollars to support student-athlete health, safety, and well-being. The existing NCAA model would remain for all other sports with revenue sharing to be determined by the full DI membership using the unweighted one institution one vote model. The federated football group could, as an option, contract with the NCAA to provide for a fee certain services related to football such as eligibility determination, compliance and enforcement, and other legislative/administration services.

Bates: This model already exists and works within a capitalist society with antitrust laws and is called the NCAA divisions and autonomy (Power 5)/non-autonomy conferences. The challenge is that competitive success is so highly valued that the 24 schools with net profits tend to be the most competitively successful and their expensive actions (arms race, coaches’ salaries, international tours, non-regional competitions, staff expansion, recruiting travel) contributing to their competitive success compel others to follow their expensive lead. The quick answer is that the vast majority of schools are operating at a deficit and their presidents and athletic directors need to assume leadership roles as the majority and make policy decisions that a) maximize student-athlete development, while b) balancing budgets in competitively equitable ways (i.e. scholarships, travel, recruiting, staff size, playing and practice seasons, time demands, eligibility, facilities).

Moore: I don’t believe such a system would be able to exist within our national system of capitalism. Universities don’t have governors to try to keep them ‘competitively equitable,’ and so we would be ill-fitted within the systems in which we operate. If it were possible, it would be interesting to explore how FBS and FCS conferences could partner to create a revenue sharing system within conferences by expanding to more schools. For example, the ACC could partner with the Patriot League and create a revenue sharing system whereby the FBS schools get a larger cut, but the FCS schools get some sort of cut. Perhaps this could also expand interest, reach greater markets, and create better scheduling opportunities.

2.5. The 2015 NCAA Goals Study Reported the Median Amount of Time Football Players Report Spending on Athletics per Week is 42 hours, with an Average of 34 hours/week for All Athletes. This Athletic Time Commitment Combined with an Average of 35 hours per Week spent on Academics Leads to an Incredibly Packed Schedule Wherein Athletes are Often Mentally and Physically Exhausted. Some Athletes Who are Incredibly Capable, Simply do not Have the Time to Devote to Their Studies That They Would Like To. Scholars Have Labelled this 'Pragmatic Detachment,' which Reinforces the 'Dumb Jock' Stereotype. How Might Emerging Sport Governance Systems Address the Issues of Athlete Time Commitment?

Bates: With every activity engaged there are activities not engaged. Students choose to be in fraternities/sororities, student government, work, journalists for the school paper, sing in musical groups, perform in student theater ... and through those activities their collegiate experiences are enhanced. Yet with those choices they compromise other areas they engage and dilute the time, they can excel as scholars. Student-athletes are no different: When done well, their athletic experience is a catalyst to enhancing their development and collegiate experience. However, as with any students engaging an endeavor of passion and interest, success is often the by-product of practice and preparation and the time spent on extracurricular activities is time not spent on academics. It is extremely hard to excel in both domains of academics and athletics for Division I student-athletes. However, the athletic experience can be inherently developmental when done well so administrators and coaches must perpetually be evaluating time-demand policies that always serve their overarching aim: in what ways does this help our students grow.

Malekoff: The overwhelming number of college presidents and athletic administrators would probably like to see the athlete time commitment reduced. Not to be redundant, but coaches – whose job security often depends on competitive success – understandably believe that they have to outwork the opposition, and this means more practice, meetings, film study, rehab, etc. In at least some cases, presidents and athletic administrators – often influenced by trustee/boosters more concerned with winning games than classroom excellence and discovery through research – have limited power to influence the coach in this regard.

Moore: While there are costs to student-athletes who choose to engage in this balancing act, I believe we often get well over-focused on the negative impacts and forget to take a balanced look at the positive impacts of the student-athlete experience. As a reminder, that in life which is easy, often has few benefits. A recent study indicated that student-athletes, on average, have better mental health than their non-athlete peers. The article speculated that it may be a result of having better access to support services. I would also posit that the competitive-curricular cauldron that student-athletes endure actually builds their resilience and prepares them better for life beyond college.

Thus, my advice for emerging sport governance systems would be to circle back to your foundation that you laid in the initial question ... and hopefully you have identified student-athlete health, safety, development, and well-being as one of your purposes. If that is the case, then certainly consider reasonable time commitment standards, such as those the NCAA has recently refined. However, depending upon what you're aiming for (e.g. fun? Then restrict, restrict, restrict ... excellence? Be more liberal), find that fine line between too much and just right for challenging athletes appropriately, based upon your purposes.

Finally, consider truth in advertising. That is, wherever you land, ensure that athletes and families go in eyes wide open for what they are choosing to do. Then, provide them with support and guidance as they navigate the challenge ahead.

Dorrance: I can't make a general comment, but I can certainly share this: Women's soccer is allowed a 20 hour a week model, and we don't get anywhere near that. Even in our most active weeks, we are underneath 15, which is why I genuinely feel that we have huge potential in men's and women's soccer to have a perfect, and mutually beneficial, relationship with the academic platform, because we don't need to meet that often. We don't need to train that long, and we can still serve the two masters: the academic master, which should always be the primary priority in college, and the athletic master, which won't have such an extraordinary time commitment that the academic mission will be compromised.

2.6. If You Could Enact One Change to the Governance Model in the Current U.S. College Sport System, What Would You Propose?

Moore: I would include more practitioners (e.g. coaches and administrators) in actual decision-making positions. Presently, we have presidents who try to understand the profession, but don't quite. Yes, they should be heavily involved; however, I believe true self-governance would begin to solve some of our issues.

Bates: Oh, there are so many. If forced to choose just one, I would create a competitively fair system of need-based scholarships within a model of competitive equity. Others that come to mind include time demands, non-competitive playing seasons, admissions index, distribution of academic majors, and coach-to-student ratios.

Dorrance: I only have the expertise to address my sport. I would love to play a split season for women's soccer. In other words, play the fall season they currently have, but go down to one game a week. Then, have a 3-month break from December to February. During that 3-month break, have a regional futsal collegiate season, and then play another 4-month season to start in March, and extend into the summer. And that would be an extraordinary platform for player development for us. It would also conform to the educational demands of an effective college education since you could schedule to never miss class, so you would only be playing 1 game a week. It would cut down on injuries, and every conceivable respect, it would benefit young women academically, athletically, and socially, and that would be fantastic.

Weight: I believe we have let fear of the unknown and fear of anomaly cases dictate a lot of the decisions that limit all of our athletes, and we have become tremendously over-regulated. Many of the rules that have been implemented over the years are quick fixes to symptoms of problems rather than a diagnosis and proper treatment of the true problems at their root. This approach – 'whack-a-mole management' as Todd Turner has described it – has led to a 450-page rule book with much of the legislation driven by issues in football that are not truly in the best interest of our athletes or administrators. If a data-driven approach were taken to reconceive and simplify our governance structure, we would see dramatic changes in playing seasons, scholarship allocation, eligibility formulas, championship qualification, and recruiting.

The true foundational issue in intercollegiate athletics at the heart of most of the problems we see is a lack of organizational congruity between athletics and the universities which house them. Athletics is largely integrated into the academy in name only, and through marketing efforts and some financial streams. True integration of athletics within the academy would help to alleviate the constant tension between the two often conflicting missions. Integration will only be possible if the pursuit of excellence in athletics is recognized as an academic endeavor by faculty, and massive deregulation in athletics administration is made possible. Currently, the intricate and convoluted athletics regulations require administrative expertise and special treatment that drives a wedge between any attempts at integration. With deregulation I would like to see athletes have the same opportunities as any other students within the university environment to be entrepreneurial and capitalize off of their unique talents, ideas, and university platforms. We shouldn't limit our athletes' abilities to generate revenue.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on Contributors

Erianne A. Weight (Ph.D., Indiana University, U.S.) is an Associate Professor of Sport Administration and Director of the Center for Research in Intercollegiate Athletics at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Her research is directed by a vision to increase opportunities for athletic participation and education through understanding the financial, educational, and administrative impacts and opportunities for growth within intercollegiate athletics. She is a Research Consultant for Collegiate Sports Associates within Division I U.S. intercollegiate athletics with a focus on athletics and higher education organizational culture, climate, and student well-being.

Jonathan A. Jensen (Ph.D., The Ohio State University, U.S.) is an Assistant Professor of Sport Administration in the Department of Exercise and Sport Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. His interests span sport marketing and sponsorship analytics, as well as sport consumer behavior. He is a North American Society of Sport Management (NASSM) Research Fellow, has twice been named a finalist in the research papers competition at the MIT Sloan Sports Analytics Conference, and was named an Emerging Scholar in Sport Marketing by the American Marketing Association's Sport & Sponsorship-Linked Marketing Special Interest Group.

Barbara Osborne (J.D., Boston College, U.S.) is a Professor and Coordinator for the Graduate Program in the Sport Administration specialization at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill with a joint appointment at the School of Law. Prior to her appointment at UNC in 1998, she worked for 14 years as an athletics administrator in intercollegiate athletics. She also has experience as a coach, public relations coordinator, television sports commentator, publisher, and sports information director. Osborne's line of research focuses on legal issues in college athletics, Title IX, and discrimination and sport.

ORCID

Erianne A. Weight  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2368-6730>

Jonathan A. Jensen  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9949-077X>

Barbara Osborne  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6415-6184>