

NATIONAL PRESS CLUB NEWSMAKER LUNCHEON WITH  
NCAA PRESIDENT MYLES BRAND

MODERATOR: TAMMY LYTTLE, NPC PRESIDENT

LOCATION: NATIONAL PRESS CLUB BALLROOM, WASHINGTON, D.C.

TIME: 1:01 P.M. EST

DATE: TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 2003

(C) COPYRIGHT 2003, FEDERAL NEWS SERVICE, INC., 1919 M STREET,  
N.W., SUITE 220, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036, USA. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.  
ANY REPRODUCTION, REDISTRIBUTION OR RETRANSMISSION IS  
EXPRESSLY  
PROHIBITED.

UNAUTHORIZED REPRODUCTION, REDISTRIBUTION OR RETRANSMISSION  
CONSTITUTES A MISAPPROPRIATION UNDER APPLICABLE UNFAIR  
COMPETITION  
LAW, AND FEDERAL NEWS SERVICE, INC. RESERVES THE RIGHT TO  
PURSUE ALL  
REMEDIES AVAILABLE TO IT IN RESPECT TO SUCH MISAPPROPRIATION.

FEDERAL NEWS SERVICE, INC. IS A PRIVATE FIRM AND IS NOT  
AFFILIATED WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. NO COPYRIGHT IS  
CLAIMED AS TO  
ANY PART OF THE ORIGINAL WORK PREPARED BY A UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT  
OFFICER OR EMPLOYEE AS PART OF THAT PERSON'S OFFICIAL DUTIES.

FOR INFORMATION ON SUBSCRIBING TO FNS, PLEASE CALL JACK GRAEME  
AT  
202-347-1400.

THIS IS A RUSH TRANSCRIPT.  
-----

MS. LYTLE: Good afternoon. And welcome to the National Press Club. My name is Tammy Lytle. I'm the Washington bureau chief for the Orlando Sentinel, and president of the National Press Club. I'd like to welcome club members and their guests in the audience today, as well as those of you watching on CSPAN or listening to the program on National Public Radio. The video archive of today's luncheon is provided by Connect-Live and is available through the National Press Club website at [press.org](http://press.org). For more information about joining the press club, please call us at 202 662-7511. Press club members can also access transcripts of our luncheons at our website. Non-members may purchase transcripts, audio and video tapes by calling 1-888-343- 1940.

Before introducing our head table, I would like to remind our members of future speakers. This Thursday Dr. Elias Zerhouni, director of the National Institutes of Health, will discuss "Is This the Biomedical Century? Challenges for a New Age". On March 12th, Senator Chuck Hagel of Nebraska will be our guest. And on April 8th, Ted Turner, CEO of Turner Broadcasting, will be our guest at the press club.

If you have any questions for our speaker, please write them on the cards provided at your table and pass them up to me. I will ask as many as time permits.

I'd now like to introduce our head table guests and ask them to stand briefly when their names are called. Please hold your applause until all head table guests are introduced. From your right, Christine Brennan, of USA Today, and a member of the Press Club; Mike Freedman, of George Washington University, and a member of the Press Club.

I've skipped over, I'm afraid, Mike Tackett, from the Chicago Tribune, and a member of the Press Club; John Peterson, a former board member of the National Press Club and former Washington correspondent for the Detroit News; Danita Edwards, vice president for public affairs at the NCAA and the guest of our speaker; Sylvia Smith, Fort Wayne Journal Gazette, and secretary of the National Press Club; Wally Renfro, senior advisor to Myles Brand of the NCAA, and a guest of our speaker; Bill McCarren, of U.S. Newswire, and vice chairman of the NPC Speakers Committee.

Skipping over our speaker for a moment, Arthur Bernstein, president, United Sports Fans, and the Speakers Committee member who arranged today's luncheon; Abe Frank, director of government relations for the NCAA and guest of our speaker; Gordon Smith, of the Gordon Smith Company, and member of the Press Club; Steve Ginsberg, of Reuters, and member of the Press Club; and last but not least, Jonathan Salent, of the Associated Press, and member of our Board of Governors. (Applause.)

As a graduate of Indiana University, I'm especially pleased to introduce today's guest, former IU president Myles Brand. Dr. Brand also is known as the man who fired Bobby Knight, IU's successful but temperamental basketball coach. That decision drew protests from some basketball fans but also kudos from fellow educators and others.

A few months later, Dr. Brand made a nationally recognized speech from this podium, titled "Academics First: Reforming Intercollegiate Athletics." Brand charged that the imbalance between sports and education was out of whack, jeopardizing the mission of universities and endangering academic integrity. He called for major changes, such as less advertising in college arenas, and limits on when games are played.

His message struck home. The universities that were the subject of Dr. Brand's concern decided he was the right person to deal with these difficult issues. They chose him as the head of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, a position he assumed on January 1st of this year. When he was named to the job five months ago, he promised to be a, quote, "change agent." Today, we will get to hear how he plans to do that.

Dr. Brand earned his Bachelor of Science degree in philosophy from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in 1964, and his Doctorate in philosophy from the University of Rochester. His career stops since then could fill up an entire conference: University of Pittsburgh, University of Illinois Chicago Campus, University of Arizona, Ohio State, University of Oregon, and then Indiana. I guess we could call it the "Brand Big Nine" or something. (Laughter.)

Dr. Brand also has served on numerous national boards, such as the Association of American Universities and the American Council on Education. He's a philosopher whose academic research investigates the nature of human action. He also has written extensively on various topics in higher education, such as tenure and undergraduate education.

At Indiana, Dr. Brand oversaw the largest single privatization effort in the institution's history -- the consolidation of the IU Medical Center Hospital and Methodist Hospital to form Clarion Health Partners. He helped Indiana University become a leader in information technology, and he led the largest and most successful endowment campaign in the university's history.

Dr. Brand is married to Peg Zegman (sp) Brand, a faculty member in philosophy and gender studies at Indiana University, Bloomington. He has one son and two granddaughters.

Just in time for "March Madness," it is with great pleasure that I present Dr. Miles Brand, president of the NCAA. (Applause.)

MR. BRAND: Thank you for that nice introduction. I appreciate it. And it's a great pleasure for me to be here with you today.

As you heard, I had the privilege of making a presentation to this august group approximately two years ago. A great deal has changed in my life since that time. My interest in the future of intercollegiate athletics has grown enormously, and I moved from the presidency of Indiana University to the presidency of the National Collegiate Athletic

Association, the NCAA. Many have wished me good luck on my new assignment. Actually, they say, "Good luck." (Spoken with a certain emphasis.) (Laughter.)

Since assuming this post on January 1st, I've learned much from many good people and have deepened my understanding of the nature of intercollegiate athletics. I've come to appreciate the complexity of the enterprise and the goals of the key constituencies and stakeholders. Most often, these goals are complementary, but there are some that are in tension, even direct conflict. I've come to understand the need to create partnerships even as strong leadership is necessary for productive change.

But the core principles with which I entered the fray have remained the same: I continue to believe strongly that intercollegiate athletics must be integrated into the academic mission of universities and colleges. I continue to believe strongly that academics must come first, and that the success of student athletes both on and off the field is (a/the ?) defining characteristic of college sports.

Today I want to discuss the future of intercollegiate athletics, or rather several possible futures. This is a crucial time in the history of college sports. It's not an exaggeration to say that intercollegiate athletics is at a crossroads. It can easily degrade into a cultural embarrassment that serves only those with selfish and uncomplementary motives. Some would say we've already moved far down that pathway. Or intercollegiate can be a vital force in America's culture, exemplifying the positive spirit and values of our way of life.

The future, unlike the past, is not fixed. By our own action or inaction, we shape this future. Clearly, I should like to follow the second, constructive pathway.

In my talk to this group two years ago, I admonished us all to lower the volume but not turn off the game. Some commentators interpreted this to mean that I wanted to diminish college sports, to return to an era -- a mythological one, in modern times -- in which college sports were mere avocations of university clubs without serious alumni or fan interest. Nothing can be further from the truth. I meant then, and I reiterate now, that intercollegiate athletics is inherently good and it has an important role to play on campuses and among fans. I include all its manifestations, from Olympic sports undertaken at small colleges and lonely gyms, to Saturday football games at major universities attracting over a hundred thousand loyal fans and broadcast nationally.

My concern two years ago, rather, was to dissuade us from taking advantage of the popularity of college sports in a way that degrades the integrity of the game and shamelessly manipulates student athletes. Only those whose cynicism has overwhelmed their good judgment or have been consumed by avarice should object to this perspective.

I've come to learn that to have a good future, intercollegiate athletics must successfully complete the academic reform movement underway. And we must put aside our cynicism and reaffirm the positive values of intercollegiate athletics. We have to live

up to the best hopes for college sports and we have to recognize that these best hopes are valuable to higher education and society as a whole.

As I see it, the NCAA's role in this process is to assume a leadership position in academic reform and in the advocacy of the positive attributes of intercollegiate athletics. At the same time, the NCAA must establish a foundation of clear accountability for college sports.

The reform movement now underway is traceable to the first Knight Commission Report, published in 1991. The most important recommendation of this report is the need for presidential control. Presidential control of intercollegiate athletics applies at both the local and the national levels.

On the campus, the president or chancellor is directly -- is to directly oversee athletics. Every college and university president knows -- and I was certainly aware of it when I served in that capacity -- that intercollegiate athletics can create significant visibility for the institution as well as profound problems. Failure or not, the president bears the responsibility for the problems, and thus, he or she has the obligation to assure that the athletics program is governed by sound principles.

On the national level, presidents have the obligation to assure the rules of fair play, the welfare student athletes and the proper role of intercollegiate athletics within higher education are firmly established. The primary means for accomplishing these goals is through the presidential participation in the NCAA. My appointment to the NCAA, as a sitting president at the time, is a further assertion of presidential leadership at the national level. A secondary but critical means is through the coalitions of presidents, mainly the athletic conferences.

Given the role of the presidents, it's not surprising that their attention is focused initially on academic issues, and here good progress is indeed being made. Several NCAA committees have been hard at work on core issues. A critical catalyst is the group of representative presidents from the major six Division IA conferences. Having been involved with this group since its inception, I know that they're passionately committed to academic reform. The hard work, expertise and commitment to of their athletic administrators and faculty representatives has been invaluable.

One result this past year was NCAA legislation strengthening initial and continuing eligibility standards. The number of required core high school courses was increased from 13 to 14. The long-range goal, in my view, is to move to 16 core academic courses. Though not uncontroversial, high stakes entrance exams such as the SAT are emphasized less than performance in academic courses throughout the student's high school career.

Research has shown that success in academic courses over the four years of high school is the best predictor of performance in college, especially in the critical first year. Reliance primarily on entrance exams, moreover, has a disparate effect on



underrepresented minority students. Division I, continuing eligibility, was also strengthened to include higher minimal GPA scores and greater progress towards graduation requirements.

While these changes were made on the basis of highly reliable evidence, the NCAA will monitor their effects to ensure that the desired results are, indeed, achieved. These new requirements place additional responsibilities on some high schools who offer sufficient core academic courses and assure academic performance in these courses. This is an example of the salutary effects on high schools by strengthening college admission requirements.

There are several other elements to academic reform. One is to hold athletic programs accountable for athletes' academic performance through a system of incentives and disincentives. This past year student athletes in Division I graduated at an average rate of 60 percent, according to the federal standard. That's 2 percent higher than the general student body. But Division I football players graduated at a lower rate, only 52 percent, and men's basketball players in Division IA at an unacceptable 36 percent.

In contrast, there were individual programs whose student athletes significantly surpassed the predicted graduation rates. In order to reinforce the importance of graduation, it's necessary to institute sanctions for poor performance as well as rewards for success.

The first step in creating a fair system of incentives and disincentives is to develop a better measure of academic success. The federal system now in use provides six-year graduation data, treats all students who exit a program in the same way, whether they leave in good academic standing or not. A better approach is to use annual or maybe semester-by-semester measurement of academic progress and to adjust graduation rates according to where the student athletes who do not graduate leave a program in good standing. Moreover, graduation rates for student athletes must be considered within the context of the graduation rate for all students at that university. An NCAA committee has been hard at work developing this new academic progress rate and in a short time will present its findings for comment and then formal acceptance.

Simultaneously with the work on the new annual academic progress rate, another NCAA committee has been focused on specifics of the incentive-disincentive system. There's good understanding that major deviations from the norm are at issue, not minor permutations. Moreover, no matter the institutional context, there must be a base below which academic performance is unacceptable.

Under no circumstances can it be acceptable not to graduate any men's basketball players in five years, which unfortunately has recently occurred at 36 Division I schools. Sanctions should be progressive. The goal is to motivate schools to do better, not simply to punish them. It may be best to use an approach that involves a sequence of penalties: a warning, a modest sanction such as loss of scholarships, and then, if necessary, a severe

sanction such as loss of eligibility to participate in post-season and championship competition.

To encourage high academic performance, the assets distributed by the NCAA should be utilized. Currently, distribution of funds from the NCAA-(CBS ?) contract is based half on athletic success and half on other factors, such as the number of teams a school sponsors. Academic performance should be taken as a relevant factor in this latter category.

However, there has been resistance to this approach of incentives and disincentives by some, including some coaches. They're concerned primarily with fairness in applying sanctions and rewards, and with fielding competitive teams. We should do everything in our power to assure fairness in the rules for incentives and disincentives and their applications, and I fully expect we'll be successful here. Athletic competitiveness must operate within the context of acceptable academic performance.

We're talking about college sports, and college sports are to be played by college students, those young men and women who are engaged in a college education. It's true that if there were no limitations on who can participate in intercollegiate play, some teams would increase their competitiveness. But student athlete academic success is crucial, even if that means some athletes will not be able to compete.

My advice to those coaches who are concerned that sanctions for poor academic performance will disadvantage their teams is to recruit student athletes who are academically capable, and to send a clear message to those who have athletic talent to apply themselves earlier in their studies in high school and even before. Once enrolled, universities have the obligation to attend to the welfare of student athletes, including providing adequate financial resources. Low-income student athletes, including those on full scholarships, may lack the financial resources for a reasonable college experience. Fortunately, there are federal programs, such as Pell Grants, which provide up to \$4,000 a year, and various state programs that could help fill the gap. There are also opportunities for earnings during the off season.

The NCAA provides approximately \$10 million a year for special assistance funds for student athletes with need. Additionally, the NCAA distributes \$15 in academic support, and the new Student Athlete Opportunity Fund is \$17 million annually. The latter fund will increase by 13 percent a year throughout the life of the current basketball contracts. Over this period, the NCAA will directly provide approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars nationally to student athlete welfare.

There's another element to the reform movement which is exceptionally difficult to know how to resolve. It's the rapidly increasing costs for a competitive program, especially in Division I- A. This problem has been labeled in the media and other quarters as "the arms race." Costs are escalating because of bonded indebtedness for new facilities; because of investments in improving existing facilities, such as locker and weight rooms; support personnel for video, public relations, donor cultivation, and so on.

There is concern too that the salaries of head coaches, especially in men's basketball and football, are problematic. The coaches' salary issue is part perception and part reality. The power coaches -- those with national reputations -- earn a million dollars or more annually. But these contracts include monies from TV shows, apparel and shoe contracts, summer camps, speaking engagements, product endorsements, which come from sources other than the university. In this regard, these coaches resemble faculty members from medicine, business and other professions, who receive significant fees for clinical activities and consulting, or faculty members in the sciences whose discoveries result in large royalty checks or profits from their business start up. Nonetheless, the base pay for power coaches, plus the guarantees on outside earnings, far exceed the earnings of the average faculty member. Moreover, the salaries for assistant coaches and for athletic administrators, such as athletic directors, have increased dramatically in recent years, further contributing to the escalating costs.

No single university can unilaterally withdraw from the arms race without putting its athletic program in an uncompetitive position. Like everyone else, salary and earning guarantees matter to coaches, and facilities do play a role in student athlete recruiting. It's been suggested that universities band together and agree to salary limitations and facility construction. Conferences are likely not a large enough group to be effective. It would take several conferences, or likely, all the Division IA schools organized through the NCAA to make a difference.

This approach, however, suffers from being illegal. Antitrust laws prohibit institutions from engaging in constraint of trade. When the NCAA tried to restrict the earnings of assistant basketball coaches several years ago, it was sued, lost the case, resulting in a \$55 million settlement. Some have suggested that the NCAA seek an exemption to the antitrust laws in much the same way that professional baseball enjoys an exemption. Despite the enthusiasm of advocates for this approach, preliminary investigation shows that it's highly unlikely that there would be support for federal legislation to this end. And even if there were legislation, it would be inadequate to address the problem fully. In the end, this approach is simply too unlikely to succeed to be the primary response to the arms race.

It's also unlikely that intercollegiate athletics will find new sources of uncapped revenue sufficient to cover its runaway costs. While donors have been generous and gate receipts have generally increased, new sources of revenue are finite. Increasing commercialization of the game is definitely not the answer. Sooner or later, it will be necessary to adjust the philosophical approach to funding college sports in Division I.

As the university president of two Division IA schools with competitive athletic programs, I believed strongly that the athletics department should be self-sustaining; that it should balance its expenditures with its own revenues. In fact, only about one-third of Division IA schools do so now, and that number is decreasing. The question before us soon may be whether the ingrained presumption that athletics departments should be self-sustaining is justified.



There's a truth about universities that's rarely spoken about in public: Namely, internal budgeting involves massive cross- subsidization. Research and graduate education is subsidized through undergraduate tuition. Federal indirect costs for research fall short of the actual expenses. Some academic programs are subsidized by others. For example, service courses in English, math and psychology help support music and classics departments. This is perfectly acceptable since a university must offer a wide range of subjects to be viable as an educational and research institution.

Is the next logical step to openly cross-subsidize athletic programs within the larger university budget? If we believe these programs have educational and developmental values in ways similar to a number of academic programs, should they enjoy the same type of financial security as these academic programs? An approach that openly includes athletics in cross-subsidization would undoubtedly mean less autonomy for athletics departments. Intercollegiate athletics would assume greater integration with the rest of the university by virtue of its new reporting lines and its budgetary review through the normal academic process. There would then be an opportunity to apply constraints to the vicious spending- on-demand cycle in which intercollegiate athletics is now trapped. Athletics, in this case, will be truly integrated into the academic structure of the university. It is not useful simply to harangue athletic administrations about increased expenditures; we need to be constructive and explore new approaches, even if initially they make us uncomfortable.

I offer this provocative question about cross-subsidization and the resultant direct control of intercollegiate athletics as a point of departure for future discussion. I myself have not reached the point at which I can embrace the concept. But the key point is this: Some new approach is needed; the current one does not work.

Academic reform is only half the battle. The other half is advocating for the positive values of intercollegiate athletics. Intercollegiate athletics is based on fair play, teamwork, persistence, respect for others, respect for one's self, learning to lose and to win with grace, and always striving for excellence. It's about goals yielding to hard work. Young men and women athletes internalize these virtues when they participate in high-visibility sports or not.

During this past Christmas season, CBS presented "NCAA On Campus," a show which featured championships in Divisions II and III. I found it moving to watch young women and men strive to be national champions, often without much fan interest. They did so for their teammates, for their schools, and for themselves. While I certainly enjoy and applaud the excitement of the Final Four or a major bowl game, these other contests made apparent the heart of college sports.

Yet there's hardly a day when a reporter or a commentator does not dwell on some problem in intercollegiate athletics; a player or team, a coach or administrator is alleged to have committed heinous offense, it is made to appear if this rule is not changed or if that coach is not dismissed, the world as we know it will implode.

Blaming the media, however, is too easy and too simplistic. The media responds to cultural currents as well as reinforces them. It is, rather, that there are elements in our culture which enjoy and promote boisterous incivility and exaggerated behavior. This tendency among some increasingly pervades sports, including intercollegiate athletics.

Recently, the NCAA, in partnership with a group of six Division I-A commissioners and NCAA football, sponsored a national summit on sportsmanship and fan behavior. Good advice and dissemination of best practices resulted, which should help in containing inappropriate behavior. A report offering guidance to institutions will be issued in the near future.

A focus on the positive values is a counterbalance to this uncomfortable cultural trend of incivility. An emphasis on teamwork, on knowing that winning requires cooperation, can lead to commitment to the common good. An understanding that there are rules, not just the law, but social norms, can lead to diminished urges to act out. Striving for excellence is socially constructive. Intercollegiate athletics can and should serve to reinforce good citizenship. Of course, learning these positive values must begin long before college.

No doubt, there are difficult, perhaps intractable, problems in intercollegiate athletics. We should not neglect them, but face them forthrightly. However, let us simultaneously advocate for the positive values of athletics. Let us abstract from the positive values of intercollegiate athletics a new model for social interaction.

The future of intercollegiate athletics, in summary, should be shaped by the complementary goals of academic reform and advocacy for positive values. But there's one more element to consider. Achieving these goals requires a foundation of accountability. Accountability includes business practices and enforcement of the rules, but it also has an ethical dimension. There are ethical principles that must guide the future of intercollegiate athletics, and I want to focus on one such principle.

Participatory and leadership opportunities in intercollegiate athletics should be universal. Particularly, the opportunity to play intercollegiate athletics, the opportunity to gain a leadership position, such as a head-coach or athletic director, should not be limited by gender or ethnicity. In this regard, I want to briefly consider two specific issues, threats to Title IX and the paucity of African American head football coaches and athletic directors.

Allow me to make clear my position and the position of the NCAA on Title IX. Title IX is not broken and it does not need to be fixed. (Applause.) Title IX is one of the most pieces of federal legislation affecting higher education in the second half of the 20th century. It has already been successful in the areas of original intent -- namely, gender equity and higher education's professional programs, such as law and medicine -- but full equity has not been achieved in intercollegiate athletics. Nationally, undergraduate women outnumber men but participate at only at the 43-percent level. There's been

enormous improvement from the time of the bill's passage in 1972, when fewer than 30,000 women participated, to the present, when there are over 150,000 women engaged in intercollegiate athletics. Title IX needs to remain in place in its current form in order to achieve full gender equity.

Under the direction of President Bush, Secretary Paige assembled the Commission on Opportunity in Athletics to make recommendations about the future implementation of Title IX. The commission completed its work at the end of January and recently submitted its report. The commission did not recommend that Title IX itself be changed; rather, it proposes several changes and reinterpretations which threaten to weaken prospects for full gender equity.

I call on Secretary Paige to implement those recommendations that clarify enforcement, such as assuring all offices of civil rights use the same interpretation of Title IX, and reject new interpretations that weaken the intent of the legislation. My worst fear is that the result of this process will be to freeze participation for women at the current level and thus institutionalize discrimination against women.

It's been argued that Title IX has led to closing men's programs, such as wrestling. Rather, Title IX has been used as an excuse to close these programs; it is not the cause. During the mid-1980s, when Title IX was not being enforced, more than 50 wrestling programs closed. Institutions make decisions not to support some athletic programs for a myriad of reasons.

With respect to the appointment of Division 1-A African-American head football coaches, there's a distinct lack of progress. Last year there were four African-American head coaches. This year, after a great deal of publicity about this problem, there are again four coaches. The number of offensive and defensive African-American coordinators, positions that are often the pipeline for head football coaches, has not substantially changed, remaining at approximately a dozen. There are 117 Division 1-A football teams. The proportion of African-American players is 53 percent. The lack of African-American head coaches is completely unjustifiable.

One of the steps I took when I was appointed NCAA president was to fund a coaches academy that will systematically provide mentoring and opportunities for networking and skill improvement for black football coaches. The NCAA is also partnering with the Black Coaches Association to encourage hiring minority coaches and administrators.

Of course, individual institutions hire the coaches, not the NCAA. I do expect, however, that the steps the NCAA is taking will help bring talented African-American coaches to the attention of these hiring institutions.

I call upon all universities and colleges to design and implement search procedures for head coaches in all sports and other athletic leadership positions, such as athletic director, that provide full and fair opportunities for minorities and for women.

Universities are doing a reasonably good job in recruiting faculty and academic administrators who are women and persons of color. They need to do at least an equally good job for major athletic positions.

To return, finally, to my earlier point, intercollegiate athletics is at a crossroads. One road leads to further erosion of the integrity of the game. College sports becomes, essentially, third-rate professional sports. Young men and women use universities as minor leagues, not to obtain an education. Incivility reigns. Costs escalate. The problems multiply. The noise around the failures of intercollegiate athletics becomes pervasive.

That's not a happy future. Certainly it's one that we should all eschew.

Fortunately, that need not be the future. An aggressive academic reform movement is under way. Presidents are gaining control, both locally and nationally. Initial and continuing eligibility requirements have been strengthened. A fair measure of academic progress is being developed, which will support a system of incentives and disincentives. Student athlete welfare issues are beginning to be resolved, and control of costs is becoming a serious agenda item.

If academic reform can be successful and if complemented by advocacy for the positive values of college sports, and built on a foundation of accountability and fairness, the future of intercollegiate athletics will be secured. That is the road we must travel.

Two years ago, I presented a menu of problems facing intercollegiate athletics. Frankly, I was somewhat pessimistic about the future. But now optimism dominates my thinking. I now understand the road to travel and who must be my fellow travelers. I realize that there will be bumps in the road, but I also know that little that is worthwhile is accomplished without persistence in response to challenges. Two years ago, I said I wanted to turn down the volume, not turn off the game. Today I say eliminate the static so that the game can be heard.

And I thank you. (Applause.)

MS. LYTLE: Thank you. First question is, I know that you met today with Secretary Paige. Can you tell us a little bit about what he said and were you as forceful in your defense of Title IX with him as you were here today?

MR. BRAND: I did raise the issue with Secretary Paige, and indeed, I had other opportunities to meet with him in the past and raised the issue at that time, as well. The secretary is cognizant of the need to continue to move forward with Title IX and provide gender equity. But he's also very much concerned with ensuring that men's programs -- wrestling and so on -- are not closed. As we know, Title IX does not require that these programs be closed, and they're individual decisions made by institutions for financial reasons or otherwise. The secretary did not give any timetable of when he will reach a decision on how to proceed with Title IX.



MS. LYTLE: Will the NCAA ever be forced to reduce the number of sanctioned sports because of the combination of the Title IX and the budget crunches? And if so, which sports would be the first to go?

MR. BRAND: There's no discussion about decreasing the number of sanctioned sports. Individual institutions decide which sports they want to support. Individual divisions have a certain minimal number of sports in order to participate in Division IA or Division IAA and so on, and there's been no discussion about decreasing those numbers.

MS. LYTLE: One of our questioners asked why your remarks didn't include any substantive comments about women's athletics, and what does that mean in regards to your comments on the need for investment in women's athletics program?

MR. BRAND: Gee, I thought I said a lot about that. (Soft laughter.) I'm a strong advocate for Title IX, which includes full gender equity proportional to the number of women in the undergraduate class. I think women's sports have gotten extraordinarily exciting. I don't know when was the last time some people in this room have been to a women's basketball game or a women's lacrosse game. They compete very hard, it's rough sport, the athletes are in great physical condition and it's very exciting to watch. And I hope I expressed that view as I supported Title IX.

MS. LYTLE: Two Bobby Knight questions. The first is in retrospect, what is the public relations lesson that you learned from that saga? And the second is what do you think of the fact that four IU alums have raised \$100,000 for Bobby Knight's new school?

MR. BRAND: Bob Knight is doing well in Texas Tech, and I wish him well. I answered both questions with that statement. (Laughter.)

MS. LYTLE: What would you think of the idea of a college football playoff system?

MR. BRAND: That's an extremely interesting question. It has its pros and cons. You know, I was thinking, what would a college football playoff look like if it was this year? I guess we would play the Ohio State-Miami game over again a second time. (Laughter.) So, you know, I'm not positive it's needed. On the other hand, it might be very exciting. And in the past years there was some good reason to do it. That issue will be resolved one way or another in the next 12 to 24 months as the football contracts involving ABC and the BCS are -- need to be re-negotiated. The decision makers there are not the NCAA, because the NCAA has not engaged in football since the early 1980s, a court decision that the NCAA could not, at least at that level, engage in media contracts involving football under certain conditions. But rather, it will be the presidents of the BCS conferences, those 60-odd universities will get together, I assume with the NCAA and other interested parties, including the media networks, and decide what they want to do. But the presidents are the decisions makers.



MS. LYTLE: What is your position on the recent Supreme Court decision on affirmative action in the college admissions process?

MR. BRAND: That -- that's more a university question than intercollegiate athletics.

The Supreme Court is going to hear the Michigan case. That case has not yet been settled. As you know, the Supreme Court and the nation as a whole works under the Bakke decision, which allows race to be taken in as one factor in admissions, selective admissions, and in other cases as well. The Michigan cases involve both undergraduates in the law school and deciding whether the Michigan system of following the Bakke rule is permissible or not. I know the NCAA submitted an amicus brief in favor of the Michigan case.

MS. LYTLE: What should the NCAA be doing to encourage the development of Olympic athletes? And in light of the USOC's recent leadership problems, do you have any advice for them? (Light laughter.)

MR. BRAND: I dare not say anything about -- (laughs) -- the U.S. Olympic Committee. I certainly hope in short order that their leadership problems are resolved and we can move on to the most important part of Olympic competition, which is assuring that the Olympic athletes have the ability to compete on an international level. The NCAA and the Olympic Committee have relationships at least in this way, that a vast majority of the Olympic athletes come out of our institutions and receive their early training in these institutions. And so we've very much concerned that the Olympic Committee continue to be in a position to attract the very best athletes for international play, and that the United States becomes extraordinarily competitive, as it has been in the past.

MS. LYTLE: Given the threat of terrorist attacks, what has the NCAA done to protect security (sic) at both the Final Four and other sporting events?

MR. BRAND: That's a good question. We are very sensitive to that, and steps have been taken, and indeed, increased security will be at all our upcoming games. We are taking steps -- I prefer not to describe them in detail, for obvious reasons, but we are taking steps to provide for the safety of the fans and the players as well. It is an issue to which we are attending. It is an important issue.

MS. LYTLE: There's an increasing trend for young athletes, especially high school basketball players, to skip college all together and go to the NBA. What's the NCAA doing to limit this trend?

MR. BRAND: The most highly publicized case is LeBron James, out of an Ohio high school, a young man, approximately 18 years old, who is really a prodigy in basketball. He is purported to be -- will be a first-round NBA choice. My preference is

that he goes to the pros. I think he's made a decision that that's where his life lies. I don't see any advantage to him, and certainly no advantage, real deep advantage to a college to attract him for one year. I wish him well. And if I had a chance to give him some advice, I'd say take advantage of you God-given talent, but get a college degree. Sooner or later your basketball career will be over and you will need to have a college degree to have a happy life. There are lots of ways to get a college degree these days, other than going through the normal four- year process: electronic opportunities, opportunities going part-time. And so I would advise him to get a college degree, but take advantage of his professional opportunities.

MS. LYTLE: There's a bill in the Nebraska legislature to pay a stipend to Nebraska football players. After last season, the stipend may not be much, this says. (Laughter.) But what do you think of this idea in general of paying athletes?

MR. BRAND: I think pay-for-play is a terrible idea. I think it will ruin the integrity of college sports. There are opportunities for young men in football, women in other sports, to be paid for their play. It's called the professional leagues. And that's where they should go if they want pay for play.

We need to provide financial aid, grants and aid for talented athletes. We need to provide, as I described in my talk, opportunities to make sure that young men and women from low-income families have a full college experience. If you qualify in terms of financial need, you can supplement your athletic scholarship with \$4,000, and perhaps more, from state funds and other federal programs. There's a difference between the cost of attendance and the financial aid, and the full cost of attendance is estimated on average to be about \$2,000 above full financial aid. And so I think there is some room for improvement there.

If we start paying football players or others, we create both philosophical and pragmatic problems. Philosophically, we ruin the integrity of the game. We also begin to have players decide whether they want to go to the pros or stay in college. Clearly, the colleges are not going to be able to pay the same amount of money that the best players can make in the pros, so it's not going to stop that migration. What will happen to universities in that point, if they start to pay players, is that they'll become third-rate professional organizations rather than first-rate college teams.

More importantly, you can't just pay football players. Remember Title IX. You're going to have to pay the women. Moreover, why would you think that the other players shouldn't be paid as well? If you were going to use all the money from the CBS-NCAA contract, you would still be several billion dollars short if you started to pay all the players just \$100 a month.

MS. LYTLE: Why not ban freshmen from varsity sports and let them concentrate on academics?

MR. BRAND: We used to do that when I went to school. But at the same time, we didn't actually ban freshmen; they were ineligible to play varsity. They started up freshmen teams. I don't know if any of you are old enough to remember freshmen teams. The reason freshmen teams were stopped is because they were overly expensive. You need a whole new set of coaches, more facilities, more travel budgets. It actually makes worse the arms race, terribly so.

Moreover, in many sports, student athletes are really quite capable of succeeding both academically and athletically as freshmen. Remember the number I told you: on average, on average, student athletes do better in graduation rates than the general student body. So the vast majority of students can do both; they learn to manage their time well and succeed in the classroom. There are exceptions, somewhat in football, seriously in men's basketball. But by and large, student athletes do quite well academically.

MS. LYTLE: Why does the NCAA allow coaches to profit by wearing sweaters and other apparel that make them billboards for private companies? And why should teams be allowed to profit from shoe contracts?

MR. BRAND: Every member of the university community has the ability to earn money in consulting arrangements. The coaches, indeed, are in a good position to draw those kinds of returns. We see that also in faculty members who work in our hospitals; we see sometimes they're advertising their own particular private practice. We certainly see faculty members in the sciences talking about their own private enterprises. Business faculty are engaged in consulting. We allow that for all members of the university faculty, and there's no reason to take exception to the coaches and treat them adversely.

MS. LYTLE: So you're not in favor of any sort of cap on coaches' salaries?

MR. BRAND: A cap on coaches' salaries is illegal. The Sherman Antitrust prevents that. We cannot cap coaches' salaries whether we believe that should be the case or not. So I don't believe that's an open question. The marketplace determines the coaches' salaries.

And let me remind you what I mentioned before. Most universities will pay the power coaches a couple hundred thousand dollars a year. The rest of the money is earned by them in consulting and other contractual arrangements outside the university. And there's no reason why we should, again, adversely treat coaches this way when other members of our faculty and administrative staff don't have the same prohibitions.

MS. LYTLE: In your view, can the arms race ever really be fully addressed? I mean, doesn't the idea of competition always demand outspending the other guy?

MR. BRAND: That's a very important question, one I tried to address during the talk. We're going to have to think of things differently. We're going to have to think of trade-offs between the autonomy that the athletics department desires -- and treasures,

really -- versus financial security that's needed to conduct athletics on a competitive basis.

The question I asked, and I do not know the answer, the question I asked: Can we not tone down or eliminate the arms race by assuring that the budgets of the athletics departments go through the normal university budgeting process and are considered by the same advisory committees, consisting of faculty and others, in terms of budget preparation? That would help bring under control, and certainly in proportion to the rest of the university, athletic department budgets; but by doing so, the athletic department will run through the rest of the university and be totally integrated, and some autonomy will be given up.

Is that a good trade? Will the athletic department give up the autonomy that they enjoy -- not in every institution, but many institutions -- in order to see some financial security? I believe we have to have a serious discussion about that or some other means to control the arms race, because the current approaches are just not working.

MS. LYTLE: Are you satisfied with the current level of presidential intervention in athletics today?

MR. BRAND: The presidents have really taken control, not just in Division 1-A but throughout the NCAA. There was a reorganization in 1997 which divided the NCAA up into three boards of directors for each of the divisions, each of the three divisions, and presidential leadership became prominent in each. I am very impressed by the desire of the presidents to work together through the NCAA to get academic reform done. In fact, I would have had no interest whatsoever in this job unless I believed firmly that the presidents are committed to this goal, as I am, and are willing to work together in this environment to do it.

It's a big change from -- I had been a university president for almost 15 years. It's a big change from only a decade ago, when the issue was really how do you gain more money for your athletic program so you could be more competitive, to the point now where university presidents, at least all the ones I know, are working hand in hand to solve the problems and the necessity for academic reform.

MS. LYTLE: You have clearly a number of reforms that you'd like to make. If you had to pick just one, what do you think would have the most impact in restoring sanity to college athletics?

MR. BRAND: I think you have to do academic reforms sequentially, and the next big one coming up is the incentives/disincentives. It puts teeth into the various decisions that are being made now about student athlete success, graduation. And that'll take probably about a year, nine months to a year to work out. I'm watching very carefully, as I hope you are, to see if in fact that can happen.



Once you begin to talk about real sanctions and rewards for better academic performance of student athletes, you'll make a difference. And so I think the time is crucial. As I mentioned, we're at a crossroads right now, and that crossroads is upon us. It's not five years down the line. We're here right now, and I think the next big reform issue is the incentives/disincentives discussion.

MS. LYTLE: You said at the end of your remarks that you were more optimistic than when you stood at this podium two years ago. Is that because of the job change or something else?

Q (Laughs.)

Q (Off mike) -- that question.

MR. BRAND: I does depend on what seat you're sitting in, of course. But the fact of the matter is, I'm sitting in this seat because I believe that academic reform is real, that there's a genuine opportunity to make a difference right now. I do believe that progress could be made. I'm not so naive to think that all the problems are going to go away and some of the very difficult problems, such as cost containment and issues in gender and racial equity are all suddenly going to disappear. That's not going to happen. They're going to be difficult problems we'll continue to work on.

But I'm more optimistic now because I see the presidents coming together, and the presidents are the decision-makers. I see opportunities, too, on the national level for other groups coming together to make some genuine progress.

I think now's the time to do it. If we don't get this done in the next several years, I believe we will have a future in intercollegiate athletics about which none of us will be happy.

MS. LYTLE: What is the NCAA position on Ephedra?

MR. BRAND: The NCAA is clearly opposed to any enhancing drugs -- performance-enhancing drugs, and that includes precursors. We're working with the medical people on this set of issues, trying to identify which are the drugs that are most problematic and how best to stop them.

The stories you read about professional athletes being harmed are nothing compared to the stories you read and you know about the younger people that are being harmed as well, in high school and even younger than that.

This is a serious set of issues. The NCAA has been very straightforward and aggressive in working on this issue. People do cheat, and we do the best we can, in all arenas, both in terms of enforcement and education, to stop that cheating. Unfortunately, it's not possible to stop it all. The better we can get young people to understand -- college-age students and earlier -- how harmful this is to their lives, and how dishonest it



is in the sport themselves, winning with an enhancement drug is not the same as winning on your own accord. It ruins the integrity of the drug. It's socially and psychologically disruptive. And so to the extent we can bring that message forward, we will continue to do so in the strongest way possible.

MS. LYTLE: When you left IU, the board of trustees gave you a six-year leave of absence that will pay you \$300,000 in deferred compensation if you return. Although this is not generally the policy, can you comment on that at all?

MR. BRAND: I had deferred compensation, as a lot of people do. In fact, many of our faculty at the university have deferred compensation much larger than I do. I chose to leave it in the bank a while, hoping the stock market would improve. I may be wrong about that.

But the reason I asked for a leave of absence, which was granted by the trustees, has nothing to do with deferred compensation, which would have been available in other ways. It's when I finish up at the NCAA in five, seven, eight years, whatever it is, I'd like to go back to teaching. I enjoy teaching. I'm a philosophy professor at heart. And I thought I'd keep that option open, if I'm not too tired by that time.

MS. LYTLE: You're speaking to an organization that represents the media. How are we doing in covering college athletics? And do you have any problem with the increasing mention of point spreads in stories?

MR. BRAND: The point-spread issue -- let me address that one first. The NCAA is very strongly against sports wagering. In fact, we worked with SportsLine.com so that they would divest themselves of Las Vegas properties before they can partner with us, and we did that with the help of CBS.

We have been promoting bills on the Hill to prevent Internet gambling. And Senator McCain is also seriously considering re-raising a bill he has about wagering on college games in all states, including Nevada.

So sports wagering and anything that affects that and promotes it, such as bracketing and setting out odds in advance, is something that we're strongly opposed to.

How's the press doing? Well, it's exciting to read about all the problems in intercollegiate athletics. (Laughter.) It's exciting to read about coaches losing their cool, or coaches being fired, or this young player or that young player having a brush with the law. And it's exciting to hear that by some sports commentators on broadcast media as well.

Unfortunately, that covers up the most important part of intercollegiate athletics, and that's the positive values, the positive values that are represented by college sports, represented by all sports. We've got to keep in proportion the problems. They are real, but let's keep them in proportion and not lose sight of the positive values of

intercollegiate athletics -- of teamwork, of hard work, of persistence, of values, of sportsmanship. Let's keep that on the front burner and let's bring that back. Let's resurrect the reason why people compete in intercollegiate athletics and athletics in general, and that is because of the sense of winning and competition and striving for excellence.

I'd like to see more stories along those lines, and I cited one in particular which I found a very moving show, over Christmas, by CBS, in terms of looking at less than the high-visibility sports. But it happens in the high-visibility sports -- football, men's basketball -- as well. So we need to find a way to tell the human-interest, true-life stories about success as well as the problems.

MS. LYTLE: Thank you.

Before I ask the last question, let me just give you this appreciation certificate and a coffee mug.

MR. BRAND: Thank you.

MS. LYTLE: So now you have matched set, from your last visit.

And the last question is, who are your picks for the men's and women's basketball tournament this year? (Laughter.)

MR. BRAND: Now you know, the president of the NCAA has to be neutral. (Pause.) I pick the Indiana Hoosiers. (Laughter.) (Applause.)

MS. LYTLE: (Laughs.) Good answer.

I'd like to thank you all for coming today.

I'd also like to thank the National Press Club staff members Melinda Cooke, Pat Nelson, Jo Anne Booze, Melanie Abdow Dermott, and Howard Rothman for organizing today's lunch. Also thanks to the NPC Library for their research.

Good afternoon. #####

END