

DANIEL COVELL
SHARIANNE WALKER

MANAGING INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Third Edition

MANAGING INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Managing Intercollegiate Athletics is the leading introduction to the management and governance of college sport.

Now in a fully revised and updated third edition, this book reveals the inner workings of athletic departments and the conferences and governing organizations with which they work, offering insider perspectives to help prepare students who are interested in pursuing a career in collegiate athletics management. Written in a user-friendly style, and containing real world cases, data and examples in every chapter, the book introduces the key managerial concepts that every successful professional needs to know, and takes the reader through the core management process and functions, from goal-setting and strategy to recruiting, finance and change management. With a strong focus on practical skills, the book also encourages critical thinking and includes interviews with successful practitioners in every chapter. This new edition includes a brand-new chapter on professional development and expanded coverage of ethical issues, diversity and social justice in sport. It contains new case studies and examples throughout, and has been updated to reflect changes to NCAA bylaws and legislation.

This is an essential textbook for any course on intercollegiate athletics and invaluable supplementary reading for any courses on sport management, sport marketing, sport fundraising, sport governance or higher education management.

The book is accompanied by updated online resources, featuring Power-Point slides and an instructor manual.

Daniel Covell is Professor in the Department of Sport Management at Western New England University, USA.

Sharianne Walker is Dean of the College of Business at Western New England University, USA.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

THIRD EDITION

Managing Intercollegiate Athletics

**DANIEL COVELL AND
SHARIANNE WALKER**

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
NEW YORK AND LONDON

Third edition published 2022
by Routledge
605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158

and by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2022 Daniel Covell and Sharianne Walker

The right of Daniel Covell and Sharianne Walker to be identified as author of this work has been asserted by them in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

First edition published by Holcomb Hathaway, Publishers, Inc. 2010
Second edition published by Routledge 2017

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Covell, Daniel, 1963– author. | Walker, Sharianne, author.

Title: Managing intercollegiate athletics / Daniel Covell and Sharianne Walker.

Description: Third Edition. | New York: Routledge, 2021. |

“First edition published by Holcomb Hathaway, Publishers, Inc. 2010.

Second edition published by Routledge 2017”—T.p. verso. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2021013112 | ISBN 9780367722104 (Hardback) |

ISBN 9780367722111 (Paperback) | ISBN 9781003153894 (eBook)

Subjects: LCSH: College sports—United States—Management. |

Sports administration—United States.

Classification: LCC GV351 .C68 2021 | DDC 796.04/30973—dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2021013112>

ISBN: 978-0-367-72210-4 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-367-72211-1 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-15389-4 (ebk)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003153894

Typeset in Sabon
by codeMantra

Access the Support Material: www.routledge.com/9780367722111

CONTENTS

- 1 Introduction to the Management of Intercollegiate Athletics 1**
- 2 The Role of National Governing Bodies in the Contemporary Sport Management Environment 35**
- 3 The Role of Conferences and Developing Goals 82**
- 4 Institutional and Departmental Mission and Goals and Strategic Management 113**
- 5 Designing the Organization and Human Resource Management 138**
- 6 Finances and Operational Planning 169**
- 7 Recruiting and Decision Making 197**
- 8 Compliance, Enforcement and Performance Motivation 231**
- 9 Academic Standards and Managing Change 262**
- 10 Reform Efforts and Ethical Concerns 305**

Index 335



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

CHAPTER 1

Introduction to the Management of Intercollegiate Athletics

Key concepts to keep in mind while you read the chapter:

- The historical elements that influenced the development of intercollegiate athletic management.
- The concepts of organizations and management in the context of intercollegiate athletics.
- The view that management is the shared responsibility for performance of sport organizations, and why effective management is essential for the success of contemporary sport organizations.
- The development of management theories and an explanation of how these theories have impacted the management of intercollegiate athletics programs.

Introduction

From before the inception of intercollegiate athletics, and since the very first contest between teams from different schools, the appropriate role of athletics in higher education has been actively debated. While students first initiated and organized athletic programs for health and fitness reasons, the focus quickly shifted away from participation-based programs toward institution-maintained programs that sought to achieve primacy over rival institutions. Proponents of the development of “big-time” athletic programs, as embodied today by those at many National Collegiate Athletic Association’s (NCAA) Division I institutions, cite the ability of these programs to create a sense of community among campus constituencies and to promote the institution in

2 CHAPTER 1 ► Introduction

general, while critics note that academic integrity is often sacrificed in the pursuit to athletic success, and that institutional resources are misdirected away from academics to support athletics.

Whatever your point of view, it is clear is that intercollegiate athletics in the United States has evolved to mean different things to different stakeholder groups: Students, faculty, administrators, coaches, parents, boosters, alumni and the general public. These diverse collections seek varied outcomes from intercollegiate athletics, including entertainment, a way to create bonds with the institution, a chance for physical activity and an opportunity for professional advancement.

This book will introduce you to specific functional areas of the unique and ever-changing enterprise that is American intercollegiate athletics – as well as to the organizational and managerial concepts, practices and skills required for a career in managing intercollegiate athletics. To achieve this realistic yet challenging goal, each chapter will contain two kinds of information:

1. Specific information about one of the major operational areas specific to intercollegiate athletic management, including a segment profile and a discussion of some of the key developments and important issues relative to these areas, and
2. Consideration of one of the critical responsibilities – planning, organizing, quality, decision making, change, etc. – for intercollegiate athletic managers.

This dual focus found in each chapter will enable you to enhance your understanding of both the important functions and issues relative to intercollegiate athletic management, and the challenges and best practices of managing these programs and departments. This approach will be reinforced through an end-of-chapter managerial exercise with discussion questions that explore the relevant important legal, marketing and financial implications. What makes the management of intercollegiate athletics programs so challenging is that, regardless of the size of the school and the number and success level of programs, most institutions expect that their athletic programs meet the expectations of all stakeholders and all anticipated outcomes. What we will seek to understand in this chapter is how the system was created and evolved in light of these expectations so that those who work in the industry can understand how the unique qualities that characterized the formation of the intercollegiate athletics enterprise impact and influence its management and operation.

The Establishment of the American Intercollegiate Athletics Enterprise

From its earliest inception at Harvard College (now University, located in Cambridge, Massachusetts), American institutions of higher education sought to integrate all facets of life into the collegiate experience. Turner

(1984) found that Harvard's founders intentionally chose the English collegiate system where students and teachers lived, ate, studied, worshipped and played together rather than the European or Scottish model where students lived and boarded in the community rather than on what we would call a residential campus. This choice was based first on academic and religious principles to form a sense of community within the school. In much the same manner, intercollegiate athletics would later be used to build and promote school loyalties. This institutionalizing of non-academic student life would inevitably give rise to the college's involvement in sponsoring, at least by virtue of its responsibility of *in loco parentis*, the extra curriculum, those non-academic activities that were emerging on college campuses.

Nearly a century before the advent of intercollegiate athletics, students formed literary societies and Greek-letter fraternal organizations, and organized on-campus "intramural" athletics. However, faculty usually decried athletics, as evidenced as early as 1787, when Princeton (New Jersey) University's faculty forbade students to participate in "shinny," a form of hockey, because it was "low and unbecoming gentlemen and scholars" (Rudolph, 1990, p. 151). Nonetheless, an annual junior class versus sophomore class shinny game there was quite popular, and students there also played "baste ball," an early form of baseball, as early as 1786 (Sheldon, 1969; Seymour, 1989). Smith (2011, p. 17) points out that colleges had always "had lists of things forbidden ... refusing a variety of activities thought to be harmful to moral character, learning or safety," including "card playing, drinking, smoking" and sports, and that a student at Kings' College (now Columbia University, located in New York City) was punished for swimming off campus and sentenced to confinement to his room and commanded to translate Latin for a week.

But students persisted, for the most part because, as one Amherst (Massachusetts) College student of the day noted, such activities "served to vary the monotony, and relieve the dryness of college duties" (Smith, 1988, p. 15). Students participated in exercise regimens as a precipitate of the gymnasium movement of the 1820s, with colleges opting then to formally incorporate such programs by mid-century. Amherst was the first school to add a Department of Hygiene and Physical Education in 1860, in hopes to channel student activity to these areas. Soon, though, the movement was perceived by students as "so mechanical, so business-like" (Rudolph, 1990, p. 153). Even some presidents criticized the movement, as Paul Chadbourne, president of Massachusetts Agricultural College (now the University of Massachusetts), sniffed: "I would rather a man spend an hour digging out a stump than in rolling over in a shed and calling it gymnastics" (Rand, 1933, p. 129).

The First Intercollegiate Athletic Contest

In response to the disinterest in gymnastics but a continued and growing interest in physical activity, students chose instead to compete in sports such

4 CHAPTER 1 ► Introduction

as baseball, crew, track and football. At Yale University in New Haven, Connecticut, undergraduates formed a boat-racing club in 1843. As sport grew on campus, students began to look beyond the campus boundaries for challenges. But before Army-Navy, UCLA-USC, Auburn-Alabama, Ohio State-Michigan, Texas-Texas A&M, DePauw-Wabash and any of the other hundreds of the rivalries that populate the intercollegiate athletic landscape, there was Harvard and Yale University. And in what sport was this notion of rivalries born? Not in football, nor basketball, nor baseball, but in a crew race, and not on the Charles River just a stone's throw from Harvard Yard, nor in New Haven harbor close to the Yale campus in Connecticut, but at Center Harbor on New Hampshire's Lake Winnepesaukee in August 1852. Why there? The offer to sponsor the race came from James Elkins, a superintendent for the Boston, Concord and Montreal Railroad. Elkins and the railroad company believed that spectators keen on watching such a race would secure passage on the train to the site, so they paid for the travel and week's lodging for the two teams, who saw the junket as a "jolly lark" that was staged "for the gratification of the townspeople" (Smith, 2011, p. 1). The company's speculation proved correct, as about a thousand spectators, including future U.S. President Franklin Pierce, watched the Harvard boys guide their boat, the *Oneida*, to a win in the morning's 1.5-mile practice race. After a respite of lunch, mineral water, ale, brandy and cigars, the Harvards won the official two-mile afternoon race as well. For their efforts, the victors took home a handsome pair of black, silver-tipped walnut oars (Smith, 1988). Other crew regattas would follow, as would expansion into intercollegiate events in other sports as well. By 1870, Sheldon (1969, p. 195) reported, "athletics had won a recognized place in college life," and by 1900,

a greater portion of the public know(s) a college almost exclusively through its athletic records, for three fourths of the news items concerning student life deal with sport ... intercollegiate contests play by far the largest part in the daily life and talk (of undergraduates).
(p. 230)

Rudolph (1990, pp. 154–155) aptly summarized:

For the American college student the gymnasium, the boat club, the baseball team (and before long the track team, the football team, the cricket team) were necessary for the fullest enjoyment of life. They were the institutions in which the student embedded his values, the values of worldly success; institutions in which he clarified the nature of distance that stretched between his view of life and the view that the college purveyed ... At last the American college and university had discovered something that all sorts of people cared about passionately.

Defining Organizations and Management in Intercollegiate Athletics

An organization is a group of people working together to achieve a common purpose. Organizations exist to achieve goals that individuals can't achieve on their own. Intercollegiate athletic departments exist because the operations are far too complex, with far too many related products and services and necessary tasks, to be performed by a single individual working alone.

As shown in Exhibit 1.1, the traditional definition of management is the coordination of human, material, technological and financial resources needed for an organization to achieve its goals. Management gathers the resources – the people, money and equipment – required to make work and workers more productive. Management designs the tasks and organizes the work to be done. It ensures the skills and the coordination necessary for the kind of cooperative effort that is the essence of sport organizations. Finally, it provides the sense of direction and purpose that can unify diverse people in a productive enterprise.

Early Intercollegiate Athletic Management

Student-run organizations operated athletic programs well into the early 20th century at many schools, paying for programs through dues-assessing athletic associations, fundraising drives, alumni donations and gate receipts. The games on the field were initially run by team captains, but over time, student efforts were augmented and eventually supplanted by support and direction from paid or unpaid coaches. The end of the era of student-run teams and programs began in 1864, when Yale hired the first professional

Exhibit 1.1 Organization and Management Defined

Organization

- Any group of people working together to achieve a common purpose or goals that could not be attained by individuals working separately.

Management

- The coordination of human, material, technological and financial resources needed for the organization to achieve its goals.
- Responsibility for performance.

coach. William Wood, a New York City gymnastics and physical education instructor, was brought to the New Haven campus to train the school's crew team. The move to professional coaches helped Yale become the dominant athletic power in many sports well into the 20th century, although Cornell University crew coach Charles Courtney and Harvard football coach Bill Reid were other early notables, some earning more than the highest paid professors at their schools and becoming better known than their school's president (Smith, 1988). The off-field managerial aspects still were run by students for a far longer period.

In the 1860s and 1870s, school administrators would only impose their will on athletic programs when they perceived that athletic matters were infringing upon students' academic activities, but, by 1881, Princeton formed the first faculty committee to gain control of college athletics from students (Smith, 1988). One of the reasons for the formation of this committee was concern over the injuries and deaths in football, but another was the potential for publicity and cultivation of off-campus constituencies. Football in particular became popular on campuses, as "it reinforced elite standards within an educational setting ... (and) stood as a means of expressing, or even inculcating, the qualities of strength, endurance, and valor deemed highly honorable by generations of cultural commentators" (Miller, 1997, p. 292). At Harvard, without the support and over the objections of President Charles Eliot, intercollegiate athletics, specifically football, was engaged as a tool for creating "manly" students. Ira Hollis, professor of engineering and head of Harvard's athletic committee, noted that football "teaches some of the manly virtues admirably, and it exercises a moral restraint upon a large body of youths who might without it drift into all kinds of dissipation." Even though Harvard physical educator Dudley Sargent promoted a comprehensive physical education program as more beneficial for creating his ideal of a Harvard man, "a gentleman who was well balanced and self possessed," this was, as Townsend notes, not in step with the growing commercialization of intercollegiate athletics. Harvard was spending \$112,000 on team sports for 200 athletes, while spending only \$12,000 for physical education programs for the entire 2,000-man student body (1996, pp. 107, 110–111).

As noted above, intercollegiate athletic departments exist to perform tasks that can only be executed through cooperative effort. Although these efforts were seldom specifically identified as "management," the responsibility for organized performance of intercollegiate athletic departments was very much part of the demands of operating these programs. Not long before that first Harvard-Yale rowing event, the ideas which formed the basis for what we now call "management thinking" began to emerge. The following sections describe the evolution of management thinking, and more specifically, the ways in which these concepts apply to the formative decades of intercollegiate athletic management.

Case Study: Fayol, Mintzberg and Managing Violence in Football

By the end of the 19th century, football had become the dominant sport on college campuses. For decades prior, annual contests such as “Bloody Monday” at Harvard were loosely based on soccer but in reality nothing more than an opportunity for hazing freshman by the beatings of upperclassmen. These “games” evolved into intercollegiate contests, the first of which was joined in 1869 by teams from Princeton and Rutgers University in New Jersey, with Rutgers prevailing, 6-4. A version of the game closer to rugby emerged at Harvard, with rules allowing players to carry the ball rather than just kick or punch it. The Harvard version eventually won converts at Princeton and Yale, and by 1876, the three schools, along with Columbia, formed the Intercollegiate Football Association (IFA) to adopt standard rules. The IFA’s annual Thanksgiving Day championship game became the seminal event toward launching the sport into the nation’s consciousness, drawing tens of thousands of fans to the contests held in New York City (Smith, 1988). Yale, under the direction of Walter Camp, emerged as the dominant football program of the sport’s formative era, and Yale squads lost only 14 games in the 34-year span from 1876 to 1909 (including a record of 124-3-3 from 1886 to 1895, with the 1888 team outscoring opponents 698-0). Camp had captained the Yale team as an undergraduate and then stayed aligned with the program as coach and advisor. Camp was also a powerful force on the national scene, lending his influence toward shaping the rules and tactics of the game on the field (Smith, 1988; Gems, 2000).

In the mid-20th century, Henri Fayol, a French engineer, provided a job description for managers. Fayol suggested that there are five functions that define the manager’s job. His definitions were so clear and concise that they evolved to define management for decades. According to Fayol (1949), management must perform five key functions to ensure organizational success:

Exhibit 1.2 Fayol’s functions of management

1. Planning the work that needs to be done.
2. Organizing the work and the workplace to ensure that the work is productive.
3. Commanding or leading and directing the workers.
4. Coordinating the efforts of everyone performing the work.
5. Controlling or monitoring to ensure that performance is consistent with the plan.

Exhibit 1.3 Mintzberg's ten roles of managers

1. Figurehead – representing the organization at events and ceremonies.
2. Leader – exercising influence with people and events.
3. Liaison – interacting with other organizations.
4. Monitor – receiving information critical for performance.
5. Disseminator – sharing information within the organization.
6. Spokesperson – presenting information outside the organization.
7. Entrepreneur – initiating change to improve performance.
8. Disturbance handler – dealing with issues and crises inside and outside of the organization.
9. Resource allocator – determining where the organization's human and financial resources and technology will be used.
10. Negotiator – bargaining to arrive at agreements with groups and individuals both within and outside the organization.

Later, in the 20th century, management researcher Henry Mintzberg (1980) offered a slightly different perspective on management. After carefully observing what executive managers actually do with their time, Mintzberg suggested that management might be defined more effectively in terms of the roles that managers perform, as listed below:

Together, these two models provide an important understanding of the wide variety of functions and roles that managers are called to perform. However, since Mintzberg's research, our understanding of the tasks, functions and roles of management in general, and intercollegiate athletics specifically, has changed significantly. But intercollegiate athletics has always been a complex and immiscible enterprise, as the following application of the theories of Fayol and Mintzberg reveals.

The developments related to the rise in the popularity of football were identified by historian Michael Oriard (2001), also a former football player at the University of Notre Dame. Oriard concludes that:

From the initial discovery ... that college football games could attract thousands of spectators with no direct connection to the competing universities, football served disparate interests. For many university officials, building a big-time football program meant ... prestige and growth in return for surrendering control of the sport to the demands of popular entertainment.

(p. 67)

One of the elements that proved difficult to control was on-field, in-game violence. At the turn of the 20th century, such violence seriously threatened the existence of college football. The contributing factors were dangerous game tactics (including momentum plays such as the flying wedge and lineman lining up in the backfield and mass plays where teammates pushed and pulled a ballcarrier down the field – even picking up and hurling one through the air was legal), the lack of the forward pass and rules that called for ballcarriers to verbally call themselves “down,” allowing defenders to pile on until the “down” call was made), as well as the inability or unwillingness of the sport’s power programs and managers to curb these tactics. As a result, severe injuries were frequent and fatalities common (in 1905, at least three men died and 88 were seriously injured playing college football, although some contemporary press reports put the death toll at 25). U.S. President Theodore Roosevelt, a Harvard grad and parent of a son who suffered a broken nose during a frosh game at his alma mater that year, was an unabashed supporter of the sport. “I would rather see my boys play it than see them play any other,” said Roosevelt. “The rough play, if confined within manly and honorable limits, is an advantage” (Miller, 2011, p. 150). However, in response to the controversy over violence, in October of that year, the president summoned coaches from Harvard, Princeton and Yale to the White House to lobby these leading programs to reform the sport. Notwithstanding Roosevelt’s efforts (he ultimately had no power to compel changes in the game), the death of Union College player Harold Moore by cerebral hemorrhage after making a tackle in a November game against New York University (NYU) would prove to be a seminal occurrence (Yaeger, 1991; Gems, 2000; Watterson, 2000; Miller, 2011).

In response to Moore’s death, NYU Chancellor Henry McCracken, who had witnessed the incident, sought to convene a meeting of school leaders to discuss the reform of the sport. The so-called “McCracken Group” met twice in New York City the next month, with 13 schools represented on the 9th, then with 68 on the 29th. In a letter to a colleague, Nicholas Butler, president of Columbia, stated that the efforts were “the first step in a general overhauling of the whole athletic situation in American colleges.” The conference delegates would later name their conclave to reflect these lofty aims: The Inter Collegiate Athletic Association of the United States (ICAAUS). The ICAAUS would be renamed the National Collegiate Athletic Association in 1910. Eventually, rules changes were instituted which allowed for the forward pass, a neutral zone at the line of scrimmage with a minimum of seven men required on the line, and the elimination of mass (pushing and pulling ballcarriers) and momentum (e.g., the flying wedge) plays. These alterations helped create a more exciting game and to usher in decades of growing popularity for college football (Smith, 1988; Gems, 2000; Watterson, 2000).

Case Study Questions

1. Identify and explain how intercollegiate athletic management of the time complicated efforts to control on-field, in-game violence in college football.
 2. Explain how school presidents would adapt the ten managerial roles identified by Mintzberg to help manage the transition in rules.
 3. Explain how an individual college president would use Fayol's functions of management to assure that the school's football program was dealing correctly with the issue of violence in football.
-

Applying Other Key Management Theories

The Learning Organization and the Experiences of Women

An extension of the continuous improvement approach to management is the concept of the learning organization (Senge, 1990). This approach integrates the principles and practices of continuous improvement with an emphasis on continuous employee learning and development. That is, a learning organization works to facilitate the lifelong learning and personal development of all of its employees while it transforms itself to respond to changing demands and needs. Facilitating lifelong learning involves constantly upgrading employee talent, skill and knowledge.

In answer to the question of how to improve performance, advocates of the learning organization approach emphasize solving problems and changing to meet demands and needs by focusing on learning. This involves learning from organizational experience and history, learning from others (benchmarking and customer input and feedback) and ensuring that the newly acquired ideas and skills are transformed into superior organizational performance. We will investigate Senge's ideas further in Chapter 10.

Understanding Early Women's Athletics Management

The early decades of intercollegiate athletics were mostly the preserve of the affluent, white male. This is hardly surprising given the fact that, well into the 20th century, only five percent of American men went to college. By 1920, however, nearly half of all college students were women, but while the number of women on campuses was significant, their opportunities to participate in intercollegiate athletics were far fewer and usually quite restricted. Gems (2000) notes that the entrée of women into the previously masculine sphere of physical activity was seen as threatening by many males (especially since

football was seen as the antidote to an encroaching effeminacy hastened by the lack of physical challenges available in the modern world). It was this mindset that averred that a woman's role in athletics was to serve as a supporter to brothers, sons and boyfriends. Women's sports were also retarded by the notion that strenuous physical activity was severely detrimental to the delicate constitutions of women and could cause debilitating injuries to them, thereby rendering them unable to rear and raise children, the purpose for which many thought women were foremost put on this earth to do (for, as Suggs [2005] points out, a myth held commonly well into the last century warned that "being athletic could cause a women's uterus to fall out" [p. 20]). As a result of these and other concerns, Suggs summarizes that women's programs were kept "low key" because female teacher-coaches "wanted to preserve young women's modesty and accommodate their perceived daintiness," and because of "a general suspicion of competition, particularly as it was being practiced in men's sports" (p. 23).

But, in spite of these restrictions, many women, like their male counterparts decades before, sought more exciting pursuits, and the sport of basketball became a popular activity for collegiate women, forming what Grundy deemed to be "a central part of student life at many women's institutions" (2001, p. 41). Initially, the sport was seen by males to be less physical and therefore less threatening to them if women chose to play it. At Smith College in Northampton, Massachusetts, physical educator Senda Berensen devised a version of the game where movement was more limited than for men (the floor divided into three sections with players not allowed to move into the other two, with no player allowed to dribble more than once).

To many, however, the idea of young women running, jumping, sweating and yelling in a public forum was highly distasteful and borderline immoral (this during a time when a woman's sexual reputation was called into question if her skirts failed to touch the ground), so much so that men were barred entry from many of these early contests lest the passions of the moment cause all parties irreparable harm to all parties. Grundy reports that this notion of propriety was even more strongly held at African-American women's colleges, where women not only had to adhere to roles deemed appropriate for women but also had to appear all the more upright to gain approval from the dominant white cultural expectations. African-Americans were still seen as "highly sensual and with little control over their impulses" (2001, p. 63) by whites of the time, so the idea that African-American women would be damaged further by the unrestrained activities of sport were a concern of their teachers, who sought to help their charges become successfully integrated into white society.

So what has been learned by intercollegiate athletic managers concerning women's athletics? These factors listed above were combined with a mindset held by many early female physical educators that the commercial model of men's intercollegiate athletics was inherently corrupt and damaging to its participants and therefore was a blueprint to be ignored when shaping the appropriate programs for women. As a result, in 1924, the Women's Division of the National Amateur Athletic Federation, one of many such organizations

comprised of educators and coaches that existed at the time, created a series of guidelines for what they deemed to be the proper direction for women's athletic programs, which called for programs "stress enjoyment of the sport and the development of sportsmanship, and to minimize the emphasis placed on individual accomplishments and the winning of championships" (Suggs, 2005, p. 25). This mindset would serve to de-emphasize the model of intercollegiate competition for men's sports in lieu of the "play day" concept, where groups of women from various schools would convene at a campus site and create teams comprised randomly of women from all in attendance, with the teams then competing in various sports such as field hockey, basketball and volleyball. A concept that valued the social element of sport as much as the competitive, "play days" became popular in the 1930s, and were common well into the 1960s (Suggs, 2005).

Unlike the NCAA, which, early in the last century, established its position as the preeminent governing body for men's intercollegiate athletics, gradually strengthening that position over time, several such organizations were involved in fostering the development of women's programs, with much of the debate and focus centering on how best to deal with the prickly issue of postseason championship contests. Suggs (2005) points out that in 1957, several such organizations formed the National Joint Committee on Extramural Sports for College Women to sanction events and championships for varsity-style teams, but this organization proved unwieldy, and in 1965, its functions were ceded to the Division of Girls' and Women's Sports (DGWS) of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (AAHPER), a group that itself had been formed from a merger of the American Physical Education Association's Committee on Women's Athletics and the Women's Division of the NAAF. In turn, the DWGS created the Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CIAW) in 1967 to deal with the issue of national championships for women.

The Emergence of Title IX The growth of women's programs was aided in large part to the passage of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, a federal law that sought to increase equity for women in federally funded educational programs. One of the initial impacts of the Title IX federal legislation was an increase in the number of females participating in collegiate athletics. In the 1971–1972 academic year, before the passage of Title IX, the number of female athletes participating in college athletics totaled 29,977 compared to 170,384 male athletes (and only about one percent of the average college or university athletic budget was expended on women's programs [Smith, 2011]). In comparison, in 2018–2019, there were 221,042 NCAA female student-athletes on 10,783 teams and 284,191 NCAA male student-athletes on 9,351 teams (*NCAA Sports Sponsorship and Participation Rates Report 1981–82 – 2018–19*, 2019).

Application of the Law to Intercollegiate Athletics Title IX of the Educational Amendments Act of 1972 states that, "No person in the United

States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance” (20 U.S.C. § 1681). Although signed into law in 1972, the enforcement and compliance of this legislation was not a straightforward affair. With the initial passage of this legislation came much debate as to whether Title IX applied to intercollegiate athletic departments. Language within the legislation was not specific, only referring to application within education program or activities receiving Federal financial assistance. Various groups and individuals such as U.S. Senator John Tower (Texas) and the NCAA itself used a variety of different approaches arguing against Title IX’s applicability to intercollegiate athletics. As a result, when Title IX was first passed, numerous athletic directors and college presidents did not feel that athletics was included within the law, and therefore, they did not need to comply with the legislation.

At the time of the law’s passage, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) was the government agency responsible for overseeing the enforcement of Title IX. In 1974, while HEW was preparing to finish its first draft of regulations to assist institutions in how to interpret and apply Title IX, Senator Tower proposed an amendment that would have exempted “revenue-producing sports” from being counted when determining Title IX compliance. Tower argued that intercollegiate athletic departments relied on the revenue-producing sports of football and men’s basketball to fund sport programs and opportunities within the whole department. He worried that the HEW rules would undercut revenue-producing sport programs damaging the overall sports program of the institution. In his words, “Were HEW ... to promulgate rules which damaged the financial base of intercollegiate sports, it will have thrown the baby out with the bath water” (Suggs, 2005, p. 68).

When HEW released the final regulations concerning the applicability of Title IX in 1975, revenue-producing sports were not excluded and institutions were provided with guidelines to follow to determine whether equal athletic opportunities for members of both sexes were being provided. Although these 1975 regulations helped lay the groundwork in terms of how intercollegiate athletic departments should implement the law, there was still much confusion among athletic administrators in terms of what they were required to do to maintain compliance with Title IX. Intercollegiate athletic administrators moved slowly, if at all, in making changes to accommodate more fully female student-athletes. As a result, in 1979, HEW released Title IX policy interpretations to explain how the law would be applied within college athletics. These policy interpretations address three areas:

- the provision of athletic scholarships,
- the effective accommodation of student athletic interests and abilities (i.e., sport participation),
- and the benefits and opportunities provided to each sex (i.e., equipment, facilities, schedule, etc.).

The interpretations are still in place today and have guided the enforcement efforts surrounding Title IX compliance.

With the Title IX regulations and policy interpretations in place, intercollegiate athletic administrators could now act, such as performing internal Title IX compliance audits to determine how close (or far) their departments were toward complying with the law. It is important to note that Title IX is a federal statute with failure to comply ultimately leading to institutions realizing penalties such as withdrawal of federal funding. In 1980, HEW separated into two departments with the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) within the newly organized Department of Education taking on the role for enforcing Title IX.

Early Limits on the Scope of the Law As with any new regulations or policy interpretations, there was still much confusion among athletic administrators and even the OCR investigators themselves in the application of the policy interpretations and in determining Title IX compliance, but the action that limited Title IX's application to college athletics came with the 1984 Supreme Court decision in the *Grove City College v. Bell* case (*Grove City College v. Bell*, 5 U.S. 555 [1984]).

In 1977, Grove City (Pennsylvania) College, a private institution founded in 1876 to promote Christian values (now with a current full-time undergraduate enrollment of 2,500 and a member of the NCAA Division III Presidents' Athletic Conference), refused to produce a gender-equity plan as required by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. HEW determined that the college received federal money through a financial aid program for students, the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOGs) program, and therefore needed to comply with Title IX. The school took the position that it did not need to comply with the law as it was a private institution. In response, when HEW initiated plans to cut off the federal financial aid provided to these students, Grove City College and four of its students sued (Wong, 2002). The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 1984 that only those programs receiving direct federal funding needed to comply with Title IX (often referred to as the "programmatic approach"). At Grove City College, this meant only the financial aid program, which received federal funding to support the BEOG program, needed to comply with Title IX. No other department on campus, including athletics, needed to comply with Title IX. This ruling effectively took all the enforcement muscle out of Title IX's application to college athletic departments, for athletic departments do not receive *direct* federal funding but rather receive indirect funding via allocations within their institution. As a result, the OCR dropped numerous active Title IX investigations against athletic departments because they could not establish that the athletic department received direct federal funding. Once again, athletic administrators found themselves in a confusing position regarding how to determine the applicability of Title IX to college athletics.

Governmental Responses to *Grove City v. Bell* This limitation on enforcement of Title IX lasted until the passage of the Civil Rights Restoration Act in 1987. This measure served “to restore the broad scope of coverage and clarify the application of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972” (Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, PUBLIC LAW 100-259-March 22, 1988). This new interpretation, referred to as an “institutional approach” to Title IX enforcement, meant that if any department or program within an institution received federal funds, then all programs at the institution – including intercollegiate athletics – needed to comply with the statute. The OCR’s enforcement muscle to investigate Title IX violations and complaints was restored as now all programs and activities within a college or institution receiving any sort of federal funding, even if the institution itself saw itself as private, were now subject to Title IX compliance.

Title IX received additional scrutiny in 2002 when the then-Secretary of Education Rod Paige formed the Commission on Opportunity in Athletics, a federal advisory panel created to study the law. This Commission was composed of members from NCAA Division I athletic programs, athletic conference offices, women’s groups and former and current athletes. The Commission was charged with studying Title IX including the collection of information by the OCR during investigations, the analysis of issues surrounding Title IX, the topics of debate with Title IX enforcement, and to solicit public input with the goal of improving the application of current federal standards for measuring equal opportunity under Title IX (*Open to All*, 2003).

Overall, the Commission found strong and broad support for the original intent of Title IX, but also heard a great deal of confusion and debate over how the law should be enforced. Many of the recommendations put forth by the Commission were met with opposition from two of its members, Donna de Varona and Julie Foudy, who submitted a minority report expressing their concern. This report summarized the concern that most of the recommendations put forth by the commission would weaken Title IX standards and enforcement procedures, which, it was feared, would lead to reduced opportunities for women and girls in sport (de Varona & Foudy, 2003). However, in July 2003, the administration of the then-President George W. Bush endorsed Title IX as it currently existed, serving to eliminate any significant changes made to the enforcement methods used for compliance (*Further Clarification of Intercollegiate Athletics*, 2003).

The NCAA and Title IX In 1972, the CIAW became the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW), composed of physical education teachers to promote better coaching and competition, became the most prominent governing body and promoted competition within the bounds of higher education and amateurism. The AIAW’s Policy Statement, adopted in 1974, stated the importance of “The enrichment of the life of the participant is the focus and reason for the existence of any athletic program,” and that “Separate but comparable teams should be provided for women and men.”

Suggs commented that while the AIAW “wanted their fair share of funding, they really wanted to maintain the independence to conduct their own sports programs with their own values” (2005, p. 51).

This growth, when combined with the AIAW’s stated desire for both equity with and separation from men’s programs, led to an inevitable conflict with their male counterparts and the NCAA. When Title IX was first introduced and started to impact intercollegiate athletics, the NCAA did not embrace the federal statute. The Association, in fact, brought the first legal challenge to Title IX in the mid-1970s in *NCAA v. Califano* (the defendant, Joseph Califano, was the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare). The NCAA asserted that HEW, in issuing the regulations, exceeded its authority under Title IX; that some of the regulations were arbitrary and capricious under the Administrative Procedure Act; that some of the regulations were unconstitutionally vague; and that some of the regulations created a sex-based quota system in violation of Title IX and the Fifth Amendment. The NCAA stated that the enforcement of the Title IX regulations would injure the NCAA and its members (*NCAA v. Califano*, 622 F.2d 1382 [10th Cir. 1980]). The lawsuit eventually died in 1980 when the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit ruled that as an independent association, the NCAA did not have legal standing to sue HEW (*NCAA v. Califano*, 622 F.2d 1382 [10th Cir. 1980]).

The AIAW permitted athletic scholarships in 1973 and began national championships in 1978 to keep members from moving to the NCAA, but in 1980, the NCAA began holding championships in women’s sports, with the membership voting to expand committees and allocate positions to women. The AIAW sued the NCAA to prevent it from starting championships, asserting that the NCAA was exercising an illegal monopoly over intercollegiate athletics, but the lawsuit failed. Legendary women’s basketball coach Pat Summit, who began her career at the University of Tennessee in 1974, had this to say about the two organizations:

I definitely saw (the AIAW model of governance and recruiting) as restrictive. Players had to come to you ... (Recruiting in the NCAA) has really brought about an opportunity for (female) student-athletes to have choices, because they can, regardless of financial background, select colleges of the greatest interest, visit, and have their way paid. It just opened up the door of opportunity.

(Suggs, 2005, p. 65)

So, the concepts of the learning organization seem to have brought the women’s intercollegiate athletic participation experience back to a more “male” model for the enterprise. In fact, institutions such as Tennessee, which for years operated separate departments for men’s and women’s athletics, have dropped the bifurcated system for a unified one (see Chapter 5). The comments of Summit would seem to indicate that current model where

female athletes can benefit from the same access to education and financial assistance is, even with some of the potential drawbacks of the “male” model of operation, a preferable system, and one adopted much in the manner of Peter Senge’s learning organization.

Systems Theory and the Experiences of Ethnic and Racial Minorities

Biologist Ludwig von Bertalanffy introduced a theory of general systems suggesting that everything in nature is interrelated. According to von Bertalanffy (1951), every entity is part of a larger system. He pointed out that in nature nothing is totally independent and self-sufficient. Every living organism is part of a system and is affected by what happens both within and outside that system. Management thinker Herbert Simon (1965) extended systems thought to organizations by viewing them as systems that make decisions and process information.

Traditionally, organizations were thought of as fairly closed systems. Organizations generally were perceived from within as mostly insulated or protected from whatever was happening beyond their boundaries. Individuals within these distinct organizations tended to think that the events most critical to their success were those that occurred inside those boundaries. This was assuredly the case in the early decades of American intercollegiate athletics, for as noted above access to the enterprise was restricted to affluent white males. The trials faced by ethnic and racial minority student-athletes, both males and females, in their efforts to participate in intercollegiate athletics were significant. Sport involvement, both as participant and spectator, has always served as a way for recent immigrant groups to integrate into the greater American society. To play American games like baseball and football meant to be fully a part of the American experience. Intercollegiate athletics were less accessible initially due to the comparatively small number of American who had the means to attend schools. In fact, a sense of elitism was actively pursued by early football’s progenitors. Their game was supreme because it was played by amateur gentlemen, and for years, college football coaches vehemently denounced the professional version of the game as corrupt, seedy and loutish (Oriard, 1993; Gems, 2000).

The emergence of the land-grant college (those schools founded with public funds as decreed under Federal law during the Civil War to provide greater access to higher education – initially, mostly in agricultural and technical studies programs) coincided with the increasing acceptance and proliferation of intercollegiate athletics, and that “both were in a sense manifestations of democratic trends in 19th century American education,” and that land-grant schools were “probably the greatest beneficiaries of the sports movement” as they “could compete in these area as equals with the traditional colleges” (Turner, 1984, pp. 158–160). A school need not

acquire the strongest faculty, the most pristine and agreeable campus and grounds, nor conjure up a litany of athletic successes. A school needs only the chance for its students (not necessarily undergraduates or apt scholars) to knock heads against those from another institution.

The land-grant movement also diminished the air of privilege that had permeated most campuses, which helped change attitudes around athletic excellence and professionalism. Industrial expansion, changing demographics and expanding cities also created markets and demand for leisure and entertainment opportunities. Both professional and intercollegiate athletics filled these needs nicely. Many institutions were founded by towns in the Midwest and West in the 19th century to promote emigration and local development. As a result, as noted with the linkage of the land-grant ideal and athletics, in 1924, seven of the top nine schools in football attendance were non-Eastern schools (Notre Dame, the University of Michigan, the University of California-Berkley, Ohio State University, the University of Chicago, the University of Illinois). Ninety thousand patrons witnessed that year's grid battle between California-Berkeley and Stanford University, and in 1928, over 120,000 fans – still the largest college football crowd ever – packed Chicago's Soldier Field for the game between the University of Notre Dame and the University of Southern California. From 1924 to 1940, four Eastern teams and 37 non-Eastern teams were considered as possible football national champions (Sperber, 1993; Lester, 1995; Sack & Staurowsky, 1998).

The democratization of higher education occurred as European ethnic minority groups – Czechs, Germans, Italians, Irish, Polish – slowly gained admittance to higher education institutions, and the shift in the balance of athletic power was also hastened by the influence of these groups in contests. Some emerging powers, such as Notre Dame, a small, Catholic school in South Bend, Indiana, earned the moniker “Fighting Irish” because the school attracted the sons of Irish (and other European immigrant groups) from throughout the Upper Midwest. But, perhaps, the greatest player of the football's early era was Jim Thorpe, a Native-American Sauk and Fox tribe member from Oklahoma, who played for the Carlisle (Pennsylvania) Indian Industrial School, one of several such institutions nationally founded for the purpose of helping Native-Americans shed their tribal ways and transition into white culture. Carlisle, a boarding school founded 1879 to teach trades, English language and other skills to males and females, housed as many as 1,200 students from 76 different tribes. Teams led by Thorpe, Albert Exendine (part Cherokee, part Delaware, also from Oklahoma), Joe Guyon (from the White Earth reservation in Minnesota) and others, under the direction of renowned and innovative head coach Glenn “Pop” Warner, became one of the country's strongest programs in the early 20th century. During the peak years of the program – 1911 through 1913 – Carlisle went 38-3 against the era's toughest foes, utilizing the newly legalized forward pass as a key component of its offensive arsenal. A similarly strong program was initiated in the 1920s at another school for Native-Americans, the

Haskell Institute in Lawrence, Kansas (Sperber, 1993; Gems, 2000; Oriard, 2001; Jenkins, 2007; Schmidt, 2007). The integration of these ethnic and racial minority groups is a striking example of the effects of systems theory, where schools that attracted a group of student-athletes new to the talent pool were able to compete with those who either chose not to or were slow to adapt.

For African-Americans, the effects of systems theory were not felt with the same rapidity. Because of racist attitudes held by managers and administrators at most colleges and universities, the athletic experiences of African-Americans occurred in separate spheres: at segregated schools (very much part of a closed system designed to separate them from the white athletic system) and, gradually in the early and mid-20th century, as significant minorities at mostly white schools. At segregated historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs), located mostly in the Southeastern United States, local and state laws did not permit HBCUs to play non-HBCUs, where programs developed at HBCUs such as Johnson C. Smith University (Charlotte, North Carolina), Howard University (Washington, DC), Lincoln University (Oxford, Pennsylvania) and Livingstone College (Salisbury, North Carolina). The first intercollegiate football contest between HBCUs occurred in 1892, when Johnson C. Smith played cross-town rival Biddle Institute. The first conference alignments developed in 1912, when the Colored (now Central) Intercollegiate Association (now an NCAA Division II conference) was formed by Howard, Lincoln, Hampton Institute (Hampton, Virginia), Shaw University (Raleigh, North Carolina) and Virginia Union University (Richmond, Virginia). The next year, 11 schools formed the Southeastern (now Southern) Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (now an NCAA Division II conference that retains only two of its founding members: Clark Atlanta University [nee Clark College] and Tuskegee [Alabama] University) (Schmidt, 2007).

As for the meaning for intercollegiate athletics at HBCUs, Oriard (2001) noted that a few early HBCU educators and intellectuals saw these activities as a way to prepare young black men for the challenges they would face in mainstream society, while Grundy noted that “officials at black colleges had looked to sports to build race pride and solidarity ... at the same time athletic contests gave community cultural endeavors a place within the symbolically potent sphere of educational pursuits.” As late as the 1960s, these issues were still powerful for HBCUs, as reported by former NBA player and coach Al Attles, a 1960 graduate of North Carolina A & T State University in Greensboro (which now enrolls approximately 9,000 full-time undergrads with athletic programs members in the NCAA Division I Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference): “The most important aspect, I feel, was the pride of this small segment of the educational world showing what Black people can do with their own energies and determination” (Grundy, 2001, pp. 179–180, 184). However, unlike the programs populated by minority Native Americans at Carlisle and Haskell, predominantly, Caucasian schools refused to participate against HBCUs, creating what historian Raymond Schmidt

called “a very separate though similar universe, almost completely unknown or ignored by the mainstream sporting culture” (2007, p. 131).

Significant challenges faced those first African-American athletes who played in integrated programs. At predominantly white schools in the North, a few football players gained prominence, including William Henry Lewis at Amherst (who later became an Assistant U.S. Attorney General). In the early 20th century, other followed, such as Fritz Pollard at Brown University and Paul Robeson at Rutgers, the first African-Americans to be named All-American, but African-American players were not often allowed to suit up against teams from Southern schools, many of which fielded all-white squads into the 1970s (the 1969 University of Texas squad was the last all-white team to be named national champions in football) (Fitzpatrick, 1999). Many Southern politicians, most notably Alabama Governor George Wallace and Mississippi Governor Ross Barnett (see Chapter 4), saw this issue as a way to make political hay with their state’s segregation-minded constituents, but Georgia Governor Marvin Griffin found out that he was on the wrong side of public opinion when he sought to bar the Georgia Institute of Technology of Atlanta from playing the University of Pittsburgh and their African-American star Bobby Grier in the 1956 Sugar Bowl. Griffin, who had once said of the integration movement:

The South stands at Armageddon. The battle is joined. We cannot make the slightest concession to the enemy in this dark and lamentable hour of struggle ... There is no difference in compromising the integrity of race on the playing field than in doing so in the classroom ... One break in the dyke and the relentless sea will rush in and destroy us

pressured Georgia Tech’s trustees to keep the team from playing, but thousands of Tech students, relishing the opportunity for national recognition, demonstrated in the streets of downtown Atlanta, many toting “To Hell with Griffin” placards. The school’s president allowed the team to go, but the state’s legislature still passed a law banning interracial contests within Georgia’s borders (Watterson, 2000, pp. 316–317).

In some cases, when integrated Northern teams played their all-white Southern rivals, the political battles turned into on-field violence, as experienced in 1951 by Johnny Bright, a running back at Drake University (located in Des Moines, Iowa). On the first play from scrimmage in a game against Oklahoma A&M (now Oklahoma State) University, while standing five yards behind his team’s ballcarrier, Bright suffered a broken jaw from violent forearm to the face from an opponent. At first, the A&M coach denied that play was dirty or racially motivated, but when the game film was made public, the evidence disproved this, and the coach apologized publicly (Watterson, 2000).

During the 1960s, when civil rights issues began to inch into the nation's consciousness, pioneers such as Wilbur Hackett at the University of Kentucky, Darryl Hill at the University of Maryland and Jerry LeVias at Southern Methodist University (in Dallas, Texas) were among the first African-Americans to integrate Southern football teams. The process was far from easy. These players were shunned by most of their teammates, faced death threats from supposed assassins and endured racial taunts from opponents and teammates alike (Watterson, 2000; Wolff, 2005).

The experience of an African-American integrating a white program is especially well related by former Auburn (Alabama) University football player, Thom Gossom, Jr. Auburn's men's basketball team was integrated by Henry Harris in 1968, and the next year James Owens joined the football team, making each the first African-American players in their sport at a prominent program in the so-called "Deep South" (Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi). At the time Henry was being recruited, the school's president, Dr. Harry Philpott, told the school's board of trustees of his impending matriculation. One trustee responded, "Oh, we can't do that. The state is not ready for that." When others in the room said to him that the move was inevitable – especially as Auburn's Southeastern Conference rivals were doing the same (another telling example of the effects of systems theory), the recalcitrant trustee said, "All right. I won't say anything more. It probably is time." Owens was followed the next year by Gossom, who came to the school as an unrecruited "walk-on," hoping to make the team and earn an athletic grant-in-aid (a.k.a., a scholarship – see Chapter 7). At his first day of practice, Gossom described what happened: "There was one water break ... We were still only a few years removed from legally designated 'white and colored' water fountains ... After I drank, two (white) guys behind me decided they were not thirsty" (Gossom, 2008, p. 44).

Once he made the team, earned a grant-in-aid and became a starter, Gossom gained the respect of his teammates and coaches, but became close friends with only one Caucasian teammate. Gossom described the team's composition this way: "We had a few hardcore racists. These guys I avoided. At best we were teammates." Gossom explained that for most of these "hardcore racist" teammates, their prejudices were a result of "ignorance and their sheltered upbringings," and the fact that they had never played with, socialized or even knew any African-Americans. One such player, who Gossom described as a country boy who kept to himself and didn't bother anybody, would never sit next to an African-American teammate in the team's dorm dining hall. Gossom attempted to sit next to him once, and the player got up and moved, without a word. Gossom notes that over time the player and he "never became friends, but we became friendly ... He had a long journey to travel. He came a long way" (Gossom, 2008, pp. 125–126).

Nonetheless, Gossom still endured more subtle forms of racism. Players would call other African-Americans "niggers" in front of Gossom, apologize,

but continue to use the derogatory term. At the end of the third quarter at home games, Gossom noted:

the players and fans would stand at attention. The band would play “Dixie” as the Confederate flag flying over the stadium with the U.S. flag was lowered. Most of the fans stood with a hand over their heart. It was a moment right out of the old South. Once the flag was lowered, the place erupted into cheers. Whenever we got to this moment in the game, I became terrible uncomfortably, if not pissed ... I never made a deal out of it to anyone, but I would not, could not honor the tradition. I would not put my hand over my heart. I would not look up at that flag.

(2008, p. 143)

As a result, Gossom participated in campus protests calling for better treatment for African-Americans on the campus. When asked of his experiences at Auburn, Gossom notes that he was asked many times, “Well, why didn’t you leave?” The simple answer is that we were on a mission. We believed we could make a difference.” Gossom reinforced this notion when he described another scene from home football games, when the team passed the seating section reserved for the all-African-American members of the school’s buildings and grounds staff:

The men’s eyes were always riveted on (my roommate) and me. Many of the men reminded me of my dad and the men from my neighborhood. Not only were we getting an opportunity they’d never had, they had to sit and watch us on bleachers that were the equivalent of them sitting on the back of the bus. (My roommate) and I represented their opportunity. Many times I felt I carried the weight of their dreams on my shoulders.

(Gossom, 2008, pp. 71, 143)

After his Auburn career, Gossom was selected by the New England Patriots in the 14th round of the 1975 NFL Draft.

The specific experiences of individual African-American student-athletes aside, the event that stands out to many as the seminal moment in the struggle for racial equality in intercollegiate athletics occurred in men’s basketball, on March 19, 1966, at Cole Field House on the campus of the University of Maryland. It was the final of the 28th NCAA men’s basketball championship. Before the opening tip, scheduled for 10 p.m., University of Kentucky coach and future Hall of Famer Adolph Rupp was preparing his Wildcats to take on the decidedly underdog Miners from Texas Western College (now the University of Texas-El Paso), led by head coach Don Haskins. Historian Frank Fitzpatrick (1999) describes the scene moment before the tip:

A confederate flag can be seen amid the tightly packed rows of mostly white shirts. The crowd appears to be entirely white. So are the two officials and all the reporters on press row. After Kentucky's three white coaches wrap up their final instructions, the Wildcat starters, five white players in white uniforms, walk toward midcourt. And then, moving casually toward them with the slow stride of history, come the Texas Western starters ... All five of them are black.

(p. 24)

Fitzpatrick notes that recent NCAA championship teams had started three and even four African-American players, but "no major college team had broken the invisible barrier by starting five" (1999, p. 25). Given that fact, the game took on an added meaning since Texas Western's opponent was mighty Kentucky, which was all white (and included future NBA coach Pat Riley), and led by Rupp, whom most considered to be an avowed racist (Rupp had coached an African-American player, Don Barksdale, when Rupp served as the assistant coach to the 1948 U.S. Olympic men's basketball team. Grundman [2004] pointed out that some of the committee that named the team – of which Rupp was a member – opposed naming Barksdale to the team on racial grounds).

The Miners, who had five whites on its 12-man roster, had to take on more than Kentucky that night – they had to face the stereotypical perceptions that African-Americans, while seen as stronger and more athletic than whites, couldn't play a team-oriented game, were undisciplined, ignorant, and would give up if they got behind. In the locker room before the game, Rupp told his team – made up mostly of kids from Kentucky and Indiana – that they would never be able to show their faces again back home if they let five blacks beat them. Once the game began, Fitzpatrick describe the action:

No great drama is evident. The Miners grab an early lead and maintain it with stiff-legged determination. The game produced no future NBA stars ... and no memorable performances. The shooting is erratic. There's no dazzle or flair. And the pace, certainly by contemporary standards, is numbingly slow.

(1999, p. 23)

The game stayed close until the seven-minute mark of the second half, when the Miners, who shot well from the foul line, took a nine-point lead, finally winning by a 72-65 score. After the game, TWC guard Bobby Joe Hill's brother Virgil congratulated him, telling him the win was an historic one. "What do you mean?" Bobby Joe asked his brother.

Virgil said, 'It's the first time five blacks had beaten five whites in a game like this.' I hadn't thought about that until then. All I could

do was smile and say, ‘Wow’ ... (but) everyone got it wrong. That’s the thing. The story is messed up. It was Kentucky that was different, not us. We didn’t make it white against black.

A long-time friend of Rupp put this perspective on the game:

Adolph hated each and every loss in his career. But that one hit him like a ton of bricks ... The man was under pressure for not recruiting blacks, he was being criticized for that even at his own school. Then he goes out and loses the NCAA championship to an all-black team ... He was repudiated.

(Fitzpatrick, 1999, pp. 217–218, 220)

If the TWC game was powerful enough to impact the infamous Rupp to this degree, then it is hardly an exaggeration to call it historic.

Given the impact of the move to integrate schools that had either banned African-American from playing or had minimal interest in their recruitment did impact some schools negatively, specifically, the HBCUs. Oriard (2009) points out that schools like Florida A&M University, Grambling State University and Southern University in Louisiana, Morgan State University in Maryland, and Jackson State University in Alabama (which had 11 players drafted by NFL teams in 1968) now were losing their prized recruits to schools like Alabama and Auburn. Some African-American players were also criticized by their friends and community members for turning their backs on the HBCUs, “regarding them as Uncle Toms and wondering why historically black colleges like Grambling, Prairie View and Florida A&M suddenly weren’t good enough” (Wolff, 2005, p.67).

The result of the developments outlined above is a telling example of the impacts of systems theory. Intercollegiate athletic teams today are far more representative of the demographic make-up of the nation as a whole than those of a century earlier, and that a far greater number of Americans can access the stated benefits of intercollegiate athletic participation. Many of these changes were made through great personal sacrifices by those who sought these enhanced participation opportunities.

Summary

Students first initiated and organized athletic programs for health and fitness reasons, but the focus quickly shifted away from participation-based programs toward institution-maintained programs that sought to achieve primacy over rival institutions. Intercollegiate athletics has since evolved to mean different things to different stakeholder groups: students, faculty, administrators, coaches, parents, boosters, alumni and the general public. These diverse collections seek varied outcomes from intercollegiate athletics,

including entertainment, a way to create bonds with the institution, a chance for physical activity and an opportunity for professional advancement.

Since the establishment of Harvard College in 1636, American institutions of higher education have sought to integrate all facets of life into the collegiate experience. This institutionalizing of non-academic student life would inevitably give rise to the college's involvement in sponsoring intercollegiate athletics, emerging with a crew race between Harvard and Yale in 1852. By 1870, intercollegiate athletics had won a recognized place in college life. Student-run organizations operated athletic programs well into the early 20th century, but the era of solely student-run programs ended in 1864 with Yale's hiring of the first the professional coach.

By the end of the 19th century, football had become the dominant sport on college campuses. Many, including some school presidents, extolled the virtue of athletics, specifically football, but on-field violence seriously threatened the existence of the game. Eventually, pushed by the newly founded NCAA, rules changes were instituted, which helped to create a safer, more exciting game and to usher in decades of growing popularity for college football.

The early decades of intercollegiate athletics were mostly the preserve of affluent white males. By 1920, however, nearly half of all college students were women, but while the numbers of women on campus were significant, their opportunities to participate in intercollegiate athletics were far fewer and more restrictive. The growth of women's programs was aided in large part to the passage of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, a federal law that sought to increase equity for women in federally funded educational programs. The AIAW permitted athletic scholarships in 1973 to keep members from moving to the NCAA, but in 1980, the NCAA began holding championships in women's sports, with the membership voting to expand committees and allocate positions to women. As European minority groups slowly gained admittance to higher education institutions, their influence was soon felt in intercollegiate athletics, as was that of Native- and African-Americans.

Practitioner's Perspective: Katey Stone, Head Women's Ice Hockey Coach, Harvard University

Although the chapter indicated the important role Harvard University played in the founding of what had become American intercollegiate athletics, the school has since chosen to turn away from the more obvious commercialized aspects of big-time intercollegiate athletics. Harvard, along with the seven other renowned and well-established institutions (Brown, Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth College, Princeton, the University of Pennsylvania, and Yale), are members of the Ivy League, or more precisely,

the Council of Ivy Group Presidents, the league's official title. As noted above, these schools individually and collectively had a significant impact on the genesis and development of American intercollegiate athletics. But as the development of intercollegiate athletics programs accelerated into entertainment offerings for both on- and off-campus stakeholders in the mid-20th century, the Ivies elected to eschew this course. The Ivies chose instead to focus on fostering intercollegiate athletics on a scale targeted neither toward public entertainment nor inextricably linked with overt commercialism, and according to many, de facto professionalism, the contexts that defined the management of the majority of other intercollegiate athletic programs. The schools did this by banning athletic scholarships, restricting out-of-season practice and the affirming of the observance of common academic standards and eligibility requirements.

However, the Ivies are still members of the NCAA's Division I and still compete for national titles in many sports, but do so while trying to maintain a high number of participation opportunities. Today, Harvard maintains intercollegiate athletic programs in 38 sports for approximately 1,500 student-athletes. One of the school's most successful programs is women's ice hockey, led by head coach Katey Stone. Stone began her Harvard tenure in 1994, after graduating from the University of New Hampshire in 1989 with a degree in physical education. She was a captain and four-year letterwinner in both hockey and lacrosse there and was part of the lacrosse team's NCAA title run in 1985. Before coming to Harvard, Stone served as assistant athletic director and coach at private secondary schools in Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

As of 2020, Stone amassed 494 victories over her coaching career, and her Harvard teams have won six ECAC Tournament Championships, 11 Beanpot trophies, appeared in 11 NCAA Tournament appearances, 6 Frozen Fours, 4 NCAA title games and won an ACHA National Championship. Stone is just the fourth coach in women's intercollegiate ice hockey history to win 300 games and became the first to reach the 400-win plateau during the 2012–2013 campaign. Stone also served as the head coach of the U.S. Olympic Women's ice hockey team at the 2014 Winter Olympics in Sochi, Russia. As the first-ever female head coach of a USA Hockey team in the Olympics, Stone led the Americans to the silver medal ("Katey Stone," 2020).

What's it like to coach at Harvard, a school with such a long and influential history in relation to the initiation and development of American intercollegiate athletics?

Harvard is Harvard, and it has its associated myths and mysteries, but it's a cool place to be because there is so much diversity there. I think that's one thing that a lot of people don't realize. Every kid there is not rich. Every kid there is not a rocket scientist. One of the things that's so cool about Harvard

is that we sponsor 42 varsity sports, and our philosophy is “opportunity in athletics for all.” It’s the largest athletics program in the country. We have 1,500 student-athletes out of undergrad population of 6,200, where programs like Ohio State and Michigan have in the range of 600 or 700 in 17 or so sports.

So, there’s a lot of pride in that at Harvard. You walk around campus and see a lot of student-athletes, and the student-athletes do a great job at supporting each other, not just on big football weekends but through the entire year. I have chosen to stay there for all these years, and I love the kinds of kids we can get there. They want to be good, they excel and they’re energized.

As mentioned above, Harvard is a member of the Ivy League, and is not one of the so-called “Power Five” conferences we will be reading about later in the text. These conferences have recently been allowed to increase the level of financial aid and to prospects beyond what has previously been allowed under NCAA bylaws. How is that going to impact your program?

All the things that the NCAA membership decides on at one level eventually gets to our level. I’m not a big fan of these changes. I think it’s a slippery slope. I may be in the minority, but I believe if you have an opportunity to go to college on an athletic grant-in-aid, that’s pretty great. Should you be paid more for that? I don’t necessarily agree. It gets to a point where it’s the “haves” and the “have-nots,” and before you know it, you’ve got some schools being so good, and everyone else is going out of business. At some point, the changes will affect us more and more, but hopefully, I’ll be retired by then.

It’s surprising to learn that Olympic coaches don’t get medals if their teams win them, and you said you’re ok with that. So if it’s not about winning the “hardware,” what is the experience about, and how do you define success for your programs, and is it a different definition for your Harvard teams versus your Olympic squad?

My biggest piece of pride is developing our athletes, and not just as athletes bust as people, and seeing them attain their dreams. I’ve gotten to do everything I wanted to do as an athlete, and I’ve gotten to do everything I could have imagined doing as a coach. It’s been about creating a culture within our programs – whether at Harvard or on the Olympic team – where everyone buys in, everyone believes in each other, everyone puts the team before themselves. That’s a really difficult thing to do, and when you can get there, you feel incredible.

The other part of it is that I’m not a big goal-setter, but you have to have a place you want to go. So what we talk about is put yourself in position to win a national championship, or a gold medal, whatever that is. Because if that’s your ultimate goal, and you have a group of athletes buying in, then they’re going to achieve an awful lot along the way. If we say, “I hope we

win 20 games this season,” what happens when you get there? We don’t want to be satisfied, and we don’t want to settle. We want to set our heights high, but I think it’s really important to recognize the individual and collective efforts along the way. I’ve never had a team where everyone liked each other, but to work together toward success is the key.

One of your responsibilities as coach includes significant fundraising duties to cover all of your expenses. Can you describe those duties further?

We have 42 varsity sports, so the budgetary pie gets cut up pretty quickly. I’m fortunate because we get a lot of support, but there are certain costs that the athletic department doesn’t fund, such as a third of our equipment costs. A hockey stick is a \$180 now, a pair of skates over \$500 and they don’t last like they used to last. If you want to take an out-of-region trip – that trip will not be covered by the department and that’s a \$30,000 to \$35,000 trip for us to maintain the competitive level of schedule we want to be part of the national picture. We fly commercial, while some other schools will take charter flights depending on where they are.

Raising money is the hardest and worst part of the job. It’s the part that I dread. I don’t like asking people for money, so what I try to do is to put out a product that people will want to support. So, if we are doing well, people will be more inclined to support the program. We just had our annual golf tournament, which is a good fundraiser for us where everyone is having a good time, and hopefully, they are very generous at the end of the night. We do phone-athons, we have events in different places, like a New York City dinner, also in Toronto and Minnesota. It’s hard, but it’s not just us. Our football team has to raise more than twice what we do to be able to sustain what they want to do. And they have people who will give, but it’s hard. So, in addition to coaching, you’re flying around promoting your program and hoping that people will be really supportive. You need to talk about each player’s legacy, and what they do while they’re at Harvard, but what they are going to do later.

Harvard University’s endowment is over \$40 billion, so the school could pay for everything if it wanted to, right?

It could, and it could do it if they cut their varsity sports down to, say, 30. But that’s not fair either. I coach hockey and people love hockey, but some people love water polo, too. And some of these other programs do well and have great coaches, so you can’t even think about not having them.

You have about six first-year kids coming in this year. How big is the recruiting pool to start with to get those six?

It’s not big. The recruiting piece is a challenge. It’s exciting, but after 21 years, I’m happy to let my younger, more energetic assistants do it, and do the travelling associated. I’m kind of the closer. I’ll travel to see kids a little,

but I'm very specific about where I go. And we are lucky that, in our sport, the two governing bodies that are the best at providing the best prospects to get together are USA Hockey and Hockey Canada. We will visit and spend time at their events – their development camps and their competitions. They do the funneling.

The biggest things for us are obviously academics, but the first thing we look for is character. I talk to kids about this all the time. If you've played on teams or been in classes and worked on projects, you've been on teams where people are really smart, but some of them might be knuckleheads. When you're building that team, no matter how talented a person might be, if he or she is a knucklehead and going to sap the energy from the group, that kid is not worth your time. So that's why we look at character first. It's obvious to me to figure out whether a kid is a decent player and where the kid will potentially progress, but if the kid is not a good character kid and not willing to do what's best for your team and have the same work ethic and principles as the other kids, then it gets really difficult, and you end up focusing on the knuckleheads rather than the majority who are terrific kids.

So, we are looking at 20 to 25 kids a year, and right now, we're probably talking to about ten families for three years from now. Part of what we do when we sit down with families and talk to them about the education and the experience and why they should choose Harvard if everything works out academically is because it's really an investment in the next 45 years of a kid's life, not just the next four. And, unfortunately, the recruiting process starts so early now and so accelerated, we are sitting down with kids who are 14 and 15 years old. I don't like it, but for us to stay competitive, we have to do it. So, when we talk to families, the last thing a 14- or 15-year-old wants to hear is about the next 45 years after college. Just let me focus on the next four years and what kind of building I'm going to play in and what's my number going to be. So, it's a very different perspective, and trying to get kids and families to think longer term is ultimately going to make the difference. So, we encourage prospects to take the PSAT as soon as possible, then the SAT, just to get an indicator of their potential and ability.

Families differ when it comes to the decision-making process. We can't go out and talk to them when they are young, but they can come to visit campus on their own at any point. They will come with their families or come to our summer camp, which is great. The camp has produced a number of our top recruits over the past few years. And it gives the kids a chance to live the life and see what it's like on campus and in Harvard Square. A lot of parents say they want their kids to make the decision, but it doesn't always work that way. So when we interview the players, we also interview the parents because you have to be cautious about what you're going to get with families. We left a meeting with a family recently, and I knew the parents were excited about Harvard, but I wasn't so sure about the kid. We want to create a partnership with the family and don't want to create more pressure