

Myles Brand

IN HIS OWN WORDS



INTRODUCTION

When the NCAA Executive Committee selected Indiana University President Myles Brand as the fourth chief executive officer of the Association in October 2002, it did so understanding that it was ushering in a new era in the history of the organization. Brand, who died September 16, 2009, was the first academic to serve in that capacity. As a result, everything about the way in which the Association and its president articulated the role of intercollegiate athletics was about to change.

Brand brought a perspective about intercollegiate athletics from “the other side of the campus” that was overly encouraging to the critics who believed he would ratchet back the impact of college sports and overly worrisome to the supporters who believed he would damage the unique position of college athletics in the nation’s love affair with sports in general. Both camps could point to his remarks two years earlier to the National Press Club when he told his audience, “I do not want to turn off the game, I just want to lower the volume.” For those who believed that so-called “big-time college sports” was overwhelming the reputation of higher education in America, these were welcome words. Surely, this meant that the NCAA was now headed by an individual who would put intercollegiate athletics in its proper place – a place that those who to a fault found no faults in the conduct of college sports feared would

relegate intercollegiate athletics to schoolyard play days. Neither side was correct.

In his first public speech 10 days after taking office as president of the NCAA in January 2003, Brand explained in his inaugural State of the Association address that he would be guided by the twin pillars of advocacy and reform. “Without genuine reform, the future of intercollegiate athletics is in peril,” he observed. “Without vigorous advocacy, the value of intercollegiate athletics will be unrealized.” It was clear from the beginning that Brand would set a middle course. He was fortified in his observations by a strong conviction that athletics participation added to the educational experience of student-athletes, but he fully intended to engage in such reform as would ensure the academic success of those same student-athletes. “The NCAA should position itself so that the future of in-

tercollegiate athletics benefits from both serious reform and strong advocacy,” he told the delegates in the 2003 speech.

With these words, Brand set off on a path from which he did not stray over the term of his leadership. He remained true to the “twin pillars.” In the process of doing so, of using his position as a bully pulpit, Brand exercised the power of language to move advocates to action and to convince cynics of his sincerity in believing that the intellectual and visceral can coexist. I remember asking him shortly after he had been hired what he hoped to accomplish as president of the NCAA. Without hesitation, he told me he wanted to change the way the public thought about college sports. He wanted intercollegiate athletics to be understood in the context of higher education. He wanted to realign the value of college sports with the values of the university experience.

No one was more prolific in the use of communication platforms to both advocate for the role of intercollegiate athletics and to argue for the reform of college sports. During the last seven years, Brand delivered speeches to groups within the NCAA membership as well as other audiences. He wrote newspaper editorials and op-ed pieces, articles that have appeared in various publications, and blogs on the Internet. Rarely did Brand turn down an opportunity to engage audiences across the country on the relationship between athletics and academics at member schools, to relate the success stories of student-athletes, to convince people through his experiences within higher education that the academy is the environment in which college sports must exist.

For example, he loved to remind audiences that student-athletes in Division I graduate on average at higher rates than other students. Indeed, one of his favorite anecdotes was to point out that while African-American male student-athletes graduate at significantly higher rates than African-American male students in the general student population, white male student-athletes graduate slightly below their counterparts in the student body. "I don't know how to explain this latter phenomenon," he would say. "On the other hand, female student-athletes consistently graduate at higher rates than males in either demographic; and, of course, I don't have to explain that!" He knew to pause be-

cause he invariably received laughter and a round of applause after the line. The point is he used data and statistics to involve audiences in an appreciation of the primacy of education as the central function of intercollegiate athletics.

Not only was Brand prolific, but his use of language elevated the national dialogue about intercollegiate athletics. It wasn't surprising. First, Brand was a philosopher. By both nature and training, he thought critically and articulated with logic. He had a deep appreciation for the complexities of college sports despite the often romanticized simplicity the enterprise enjoys in the minds of the American public. He was as quick to point out the shortcomings of intercollegiate athletics as he was to debunk the myths created by skeptics to diminish the value of college sports. For example, he as easily defended the need for commercial activity as a way to generate revenues that make participation opportunities possible as he would caution against the exploitation of student-athletes and the crass endorsement of such activity that might damage the reputation of the academy.

Along the way, he enriched his writings and commentaries with rhetorical gems that are worth remembering.

This small tome is a collection of quotations from Brand's speeches, letters, editorials, articles and blogs that touch on a broad range of topics in college sports. They both enlighten and inspire. They often boil down complex

ideas to understandable terms. As my father was fond of saying about words that got to the point, they are plain and simple and everyone can understand them. I have collected these quotations in this volume because I so often found myself commenting to audiences, "As Myles Brand would say..." These comments are not intended as some mystical truth about the mysteries of intercollegiate athletics, nor should they be considered a road map for the future of college sports. As Myles Brand would say, we can only address and try to set right the issues of our time. The next generation will have to do the same for its time.

These quotations are the reduction of more than a million words I estimate Myles wrote during the last seven years about the place of intercollegiate athletics in the context of higher education. Perhaps, they will serve the NCAA membership and others as a way to provoke discussion about that role. Nothing would make Myles Brand happier than to think that he in some way influenced the nature of discourse about college sports. His goal always was to put intercollegiate athletics in a place where athletics competition among student-athletes could be enjoyed as a function of higher education. As he told a National Press Club audience just three months after assuming the role of NCAA president, "Two years ago, I said I wanted to turn down the volume, not turn off the game. Today, I say eliminate the static so the game can be heard."

*Wallace I. Renfro, NCAA Vice President
and Senior Advisor to the President
November 2009*





AS MYLES BRAND WOULD SAY ...

A Collection of Quotations

“Intercollegiate athletics has become an integral part of college life and culture. Given the educational value of participation in athletics, it is important to not sell this great enterprise short. But it is immoral to sell it out.”

State of the Association, 2009

AMATEURISM

“[Cynics] argue that amateurism is dead because networks pay large sums for television rights and corporate relationships help underwrite the costs of doing business. Columnists lament that student-athletes are the only amateurs left in college sports. But, of course, they were always the only amateurs. Coaches were always paid, and facilities always cost money.”

University of Iowa, 2004

“While amateurism is the defining difference between the collegiate and professional models of sports, it has become the lightning rod for those who would relegate intercollegiate athletics to a third-rate campus version of professional sports. Amateurism is not about how much; it is about why. It is not about the money; it is about the motivation.”

State of the Association, 2005

“Today’s iteration of intercollegiate athletics is often criticized for having abandoned the concept of amateurism to commercialism and big paychecks while failing to include student-athletes in the perceived financial bonanza. The problem is we have romanticized the concept of amateurism as an unobtainable cross between its roots in the class distinctions of 19th century England, where sport was to be reserved for those whose wealth permitted participation as a leisure activity, and a halcyon ideal that college sports can operate without commercial support and indifferent to the realities of a modern business model.”

“In the past, and indeed currently, there is some ambivalence about business issues. To some extent, it is felt that it is improper, not quite right, for the NCAA to be engaged in business activity. Amateur sports should be above all that. Athletics departments need the revenue, but working too hard to generate revenue somehow taints the purity of college sports. Nonsense! This type of thinking is both a misinterpretation and a misapplication of amateurism. ‘Amateur’ defines the participants, not the enterprise.”

State of the Association, 2006

AMATEURISM

“Professional athletes are paid because playing sports is their job. Playing sports is not the job of student-athletes. They are amateurs at it.”

Blog, 2008

“But the idea that a market should be created for the employment of students to play sports because it is only fair would benefit only a few individuals in only a couple of sports on only a handful of campuses where revenues exceed expenses. Such a market would disadvantage all other student-athletes who would unquestionably be deprived of opportunities to participate so that revenues could be reallocated to compensate the lucky few. Nothing fair about that.”

Blog, 2009

“[The] generation of much-needed revenue does not justify the exploitation of student-athletes. We can – and we should – debate the nature of proper commercial conduct of intercollegiate athletics. However, one principle is not subject to debate: Commercial exploitation of student-athletes is not permissible. Period!”

State of the Association, 2009

STUDENT-ATHLETE EXPERIENCE

“In the end, it is all about the student-athlete.”

“Student-athletes must take personal responsibility for their own actions. We should not expect less of them, and they should not expect less of themselves.”

State of the Association, 2003

“Above all, intercollegiate athletics serves student-athletes well. There is no question but the vast majority of these students are changed for the better through their participation in athletics. Student-athletes are at the center of all that we do; and if we want our publics to believe that our core principle is to be supportive of student-athletes, we must be respectful of their situations and their needs.”

State of the Association, 2004

“To the degree that we permit our behaviors to be obsessed by factors other than the success of student-athletes, intercollegiate athletics misses the mark. It is off-center.”

“[Student-athletes] understand better than those who would lead the funeral procession for amateurism that participation in athletics is an aspect of the collegiate experience unique to the American campus, unique to those blessed with the opportunity to play, and uniquely suited to the development of attitudes and virtues that will serve them well throughout their lifetimes.”

State of the Association, 2005

“In the past, to be frank, the Association’s bylaws were interpreted and implemented with an emphasis on competitive equity. There was a tendency for the Association to apply its rules rigidly, including its academic standards. Now we place fairness in a priority position. That demands we look carefully at the context and the local environment, that we give student-athletics the benefit of the doubt, and that we focus on improvement within a program rather than punishment.”

State of the Association, 2007

STUDENT-ATHLETE EXPERIENCE

“A college education ... prepares students for a successful life by guiding them in forming attitudes and life plans that enable each of them to be excellent family members, productive contributors to their community and engaged citizens. A college education grounds young women and men by enabling them to internalize the values necessary for happy and fulfilling lives. These skills for life include especially the drive to pursue excellence, knowing how to lead and to follow, respect for others even when they are competitors, the commitment to hard work, learning how to focus, learning how to persist despite obstacles, and knowing the importance of team and group effort. ... Intercollegiate athletics leads to learning these life skills as well as any other alternative on campus, and indeed better than most and with a significant rate of success.”

“Here are young men and women – in the midst of preparing themselves for life – giving their full efforts to win the game for their home college. How can anyone resist identifying with that?”

State of the Association, 2008

“Intercollegiate athletics is not the entertainment division of the higher education business; it enhances the educational experience of student-athletes. Student-athletes are not a human resource in the great business machine of intercollegiate athletics; they are the object of intercollegiate athletics.”

Blog, 2008

“Student-athletes are amateurs, not paid professionals. That implies that they cannot accept payment for endorsing or advertising any commercial product or service. It also means they should not be put in a position in which the natural interpretation by a reasonable person is that they are endorsing or advertising a commercial product or service.”

“We must not be lured into forced algorithmic solutions, which merely present a puzzle to be solved by those who want to take unfair advantage of student-athletes. Rather, there needs to be a process by which experienced, objective and careful judgment resolves the issues.”

State of the Association, 2009

REFORM AND ADVOCACY

“The growing reform movement focuses on the challenges facing intercollegiate athletics. But we should not become so absorbed in these problems that we lose sight of our purpose, which is to reinforce the positive value of intercollegiate athletics, to advocate for the benefits intercollegiate athletics provide young women and men and the universities and colleges they attend.”

“Without genuine reform, the future of intercollegiate athletics is in peril. Without vigorous advocacy, the value of intercollegiate athletics will be unrealized.”

“Intercollegiate athletics must accommodate itself to the academic priorities of universities and colleges, and not vice versa.”

“Let us not permit our natural impulse to attend to problems and failures to hijack college sports. Let us freely admit and loudly proclaim that intercollegiate athletics has significant value. We should fix the problems, but we should not let them cast a pall over college sports.”

“As a great American institution, intercollegiate athletics, too, is always in the act of becoming. Sometimes we fall short of our ambitions, but we must always be prepared to resume the full pursuit of them.”

State of the Association, 2003

“Reform in intercollegiate athletics is a journey, not a destination. It is not the case that once new rules are adopted, reform is completed for all time. Over the approximately 100 years of the Association’s history, there have been a number of major reforms. But the environment changes, new problems arise, and old ones, which appeared resolved, re-emerge in an altered form.”

State of the Association, 2004

REFORM AND ADVOCACY

“If the bright, shining idea of intercollegiate athletics – sports for sports sake, the participant as student and athlete, the coach as teacher and mentor – has been tarnished, it has not been from the single atrocity or the one, horrible unspeakable act. It is the cumulative effect of neglect and often denial that concerns me the most.”

“Many are ready to embrace athletics reform, but few want college sports to change.”

University of Iowa, 2004

“It reminds me of the line a Russian farmer once used to describe the state-run farms under the former Soviet regime. He said, ‘The system works because we pretend to farm and the state pretends to pay us.’ In the case of intercollegiate athletics, there have been too many sports programs where athletes have pretended to go to class, and where some in higher education have pretended they are students.”

“To firmly establish the Collegiate Model in today’s environment requires nothing less than a cultural change. It requires a different way of thinking about and behaving within college sports. It requires a recentering of intercollegiate athletics.”

Carolina Leadership Academy, 2005

“Make no mistake: College sports are very, very good! I am an unabashed advocate!”

State of the Association, 2009

VALUE OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

“If you had followed me across America ... and visited with student-athletes and coaches and athletics administrators and presidents, you would come away uplifted. I have met countless individuals who believe that what they do or support on the field or court is critically important to the development of future citizens and leaders. And they are right.”

“What started simply enough in the 19th century and matured in the 20th century has become complex and complicated in the 21st century. Like the universities that sponsor the enterprise, intercollegiate athletics has taken on a life of its own in the American drama.”

University of Iowa, 2004

“Competitive athletics are by nature and definition committed to excellence. This is a shared value with higher education. But the relationship between athletics and education demands something more. It demands that the competitive process also educates.”

“The secret to [intercollegiate athletics’] longevity as a part of American higher education is that it provides educational value and is an essential part of the university and college experience. It is connected to higher education as surely as any academic department is and for the same reason – it helps educate.”

“When I hear the argument that the popularity of football and men’s basketball – or indeed all of college sports – has tarnished the reputation of higher education, I am reminded that eight of the oldest and most elite private institutions in the country are known collectively not by some academic appellation but rather by their athletic affiliation – the Ivy League. Somehow, they seem to have withstood the damage to their reputation.”

Hamilton College, 2007

VALUE OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

“Intercollegiate athletics occupies a central place in the American culture. It has become integral to many of our universities and colleges, institutions which are the guardians of our traditions and histories and the harbingers of our futures.”

“The reason America’s colleges and universities sponsor athletics – for more than a century and a half now – is the positive effect participation has on the lives of young men and women.”

“The underlying reason why universities support intercollegiate athletics at all is that it provides educational value for those students who participate. There are other reasons why universities sponsor intercollegiate athletics, such as morale building for the campus community and contributing to local economic development. But, in the end, the baseline reason for intercollegiate athletics is the value it brings to the education of student-athletes.”

State of the Association, 2009

COLLEGIATE MODEL OF ATHLETICS

“Athletic competition is a vital part of American higher education, but it cannot stand alone nor should it only minimally fulfill the primary mission of our colleges and universities. Rather, it must go hand in hand with their academic goals.”

State of the Association, 2003

“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 the defining characteristic of college sports.”

National Press Club, 2003

“Collegiate athletics is valuable both for student-athletes and their home universities and colleges. That value is diminished or lost entirely if intercollegiate athletics fails to respect and embrace the educational mission of the university or fails to meet the academic and social, as well as the athletic, needs of student-athletes.”

“Simply put, the Collegiate Model is education based. The Professional Model is profit based. The participants in the Collegiate Model are student-athletes in pursuit of an education. The participants in the Professional Model represent a labor force in pursuit of a negotiated salary. In the Collegiate Model, specific teams are necessarily attached to a college or university. The relationship between a professional team and its host community is far more tenuous. ... I do not mean to disparage the professional sports model. It has its place, and it is worthy of support. But college sports must not be allowed to be drawn to the Professional Model like a moth drawn to a flame.”

State of the Association, 2004

COLLEGIATE MODEL OF ATHLETICS

“If we are to reaffirm the Collegiate Model and sustain its future within higher education in ways that are valuable to universities, we have to focus on three objectives. First, we have to recommit to academic success as a primary goal of intercollegiate athletics. Second, we have to respect the concept that the student-athlete is central to the enterprise. And third, we have to reconnect athletics programmatically and financially with the rest of the university.”

State of the Association, 2004

“One of the important and distinguishing features of the Collegiate Model of Athletics is that education is the goal, not sports entertainment. On the whole, intercollegiate athletics – based on both available evidence and reform practice – meets that goal. That intercollegiate athletics is more about sports than college is a myth.”

State of the Association, 2005

“The Collegiate Model of Athletics rests on the principle that those who participate are university and college students. It is a student-centered enterprise. Student-athletes come first. This is the heart of the matter.”

“The central point is that intercollegiate athletics is embedded, is part of, the university. This is the most fundamental principle of the Collegiate Model. Everything else rests on it.”

“We want to maximize the number of student-athletes competing at a competitive level, and we do this because athletics participation enhances the educational experience and enhancing the educational experience of students is the goal of higher education. That is the Collegiate Model of Sports.”

State of the Association, 2006

FINANCIAL MODEL AND COMMERCIALISM

“I am not revealing any secrets when I note that a primary threat to the integrity of college sports is overcommercialization. The extraordinary value of intercollegiate athletics depends on its integrity, and that is lost when commercial interests overwhelm the game.”

“Universities, both private and public, cannot achieve excellence, including paying competitive faculty salaries and constructing necessary academic facilities, without individual and corporate support. ... Athletics programs, likewise, need corporate support to succeed. The irony is palpable when those who declare that university athletics programs – unlike business and music programs – should be self-supporting and should reject corporate funds.”

“Admittedly, there are no ironclad, specific criteria for judging when commercial interests overwhelm college sports. Smart people of good will can disagree on this point. For me, the judgment depends on whether the integrity of college sports is sustained or jeopardized. Good common sense and an open, unbiased perspective should be the tools by which we measure appropriate commercial involvement.”

“We must become more creative in how we gather and use resources to ensure that everyone who wants to participate has the opportunity to do so, and our focus should be directed toward opportunity-based results. No one should be left out because of gender.”

State of the Association, 2003

“What does it mean to be fiscally responsible in intercollegiate athletics? In part, it means containing costs and controlling the rate of growth. Athletics departments, like every other area of the university, must use resources efficiently and effectively. But cost control is a financial strategy. It is only part of fiscal responsibility. To be fiscally responsible, an athletics program must add value to the university’s missions.”

“We must recognize that the financial problems facing college sports today result from individual institutional decision-making in the context of external forces. Thus, the answer lies in individual institutions following a course of action that yields for each of them fiscally responsible athletics programs.”

University of Iowa, 2004

FINANCIAL MODEL AND COMMERCIALISM

“This escalation – this spiraling – of success demanding even more success has good people of noble intentions chasing both the carrot and their tails.”

“The strong, if mistaken, belief that spending more than your competitors will lead to increased winning has propelled athletics departments to increase expenditures ... no matter the facts. The behavior is irrational in light of the available evidence, but there it is, nonetheless.”

State of the Association, 2005

“We should not be ambivalent about doing the business of college sports. We should do it well, but always in conformity with the principles of higher education.”

State of the Association, 2006

“Almost every university subsidizes intercollegiate athletics. There is nothing wrong with such subsidies because intercollegiate athletics has educational value. But the amount of subsidy should not exceed the benefits that the athletics program generates for the university, educational and otherwise. That is the equation the president and the university board must solve.”

State of the Association, 2008

FINANCIAL MODEL AND COMMERCIALISM

“The central question then becomes: What is the balance point between too much and too little commercial activity, and how do we adhere to it?”

“In the case of commercial activity, the extremes of unrealistic idealism and crass commercialism are not the right courses of action, but between them – somewhere – there is an acceptable balance point.”

“Our ability to understand both the necessity of monetizing the assets of college sports and the potential dangers of commercialism gone wild ... and to find a proper balance that helps financially support as many participation opportunities as possible without swamping the principle of amateurism ... may either ensure the place of intercollegiate athletics in higher education and the American culture or relegate it in many instances to third-rate professional sports.”

State of the Association, 2009

SPORTSMANSHIP

“Only a deep, personal commitment to sportsmanship can best the urge to ... join the fray. This commitment, importantly, must be established long before it is tested on the field. Simply put, sportsmanship is essential to the proper conduct of intercollegiate athletics. It is the manifestation of good character within the context of competitive athletics.”

“Aristotle argued that one becomes virtuous by doing virtuous acts. That is, the underlying attitudes leading one to act virtuously begins by undertaking the right behaviors until they become habitual. The attitudes necessary for sportsmanship must be nurtured, taught and reinforced.”

State of the Association, 2007

TITLE IX

“Title IX is not broken, and it does not need to be fixed. Rather, it needs to be supported, enforced and allowed to finish the job it was designed to do – provide equal opportunities for athletics participation without gender bias.”

Title IX Seminar, 2003

“My worst fear is that recommendations will be accepted that will freeze participation for women at the current level and thus institutionalize discrimination against women and inhibit further growth.”

National Press Club, 2003

“The secretary [of education] made clear that it is a disfavored approach to meeting the requirements of Title IX to close men’s sports programs. That is as it should be. Opportunities for young men should not be diminished as we provide opportunities for women.”

State of the Association, 2004

“Title IX is one of the most important pieces of civil rights legislation in the second half of the 20th century affecting higher education. We must – all of us – do all that we possibly can to protect Title IX from those who seek to weaken or destroy it and to advocate for it to the very best of our ability.”

State of the Association, 2006

“Participation in athletics for young women, as it is for young men, provides opportunities for personal growth in terms of attitudes and experiences that lead to successful careers and citizenship. If we provide these opportunities for growth to young men, how can we, in good conscience, deny them to young women? Young women deserve all the opportunities afforded to young men.”

State of the Association, 2007

INTEGRITY IN COLLEGE SPORTS

“The norms of ethical behavior must guide all of intercollegiate athletics. ... That pertains, for example, to the way coaches treat student-athletes, the way student-athletes treat each other, to the way universities deal with student-athletes, and to the way the NCAA interacts with everyone.”

State of the Association, 2003

“Resolving problems of misconduct, however, removes only some of the barriers for successfully advocating for intercollegiate athletics. We also have to push past the tendencies of human nature to be assertive about those things that are wrong while passive about the things that are right.”

State of the Association, 2004

“We presume that the courses and majors offered are worthy of the university. If they are not, shame on the university faculty. If student-athletes are deliberately herded into courses and majors that do not allow them to emerge with an honorable degree or a quality higher education experience, shame on those who permit such practices.”

“When the public – both local and en masse – begin to believe that the value of the institution is to be measured by the success of its athletics teams, the core mission of the university is threatened.”

State of the Association, 2005

“The faculty is in charge of academic integrity on a campus. They own the curriculum and the standards for instruction. Certainly some courses on a campus are easier than others and so are some majors. But they are all open to all students – not just student-athletes. And if they don’t meet the standards of the college or university, they should not be available to anyone. I have great trust and confidence in the faculty that they will guard the integrity of their academic programs and do the right thing.”

Carolina Leadership Academy, 2005

INTEGRITY IN COLLEGE SPORTS

“Who we are as Americans – our attitudes and ambitions, our beliefs and interests – are influenced by the role of sports in society. ... Given the relationship between sports and culture, it behooves us to get it right.”

State of the Association, 2006

“Over the past 100 years, intercollegiate athletics has become a great American institution. Its successes considerably outweigh the problems and challenges. But there are responsibilities to the position accorded college sports both within higher education and society as a whole. We must continue to celebrate and honor the student-athlete. We must ensure the mission of educating student-athletes is primary. We must conduct intercollegiate athletics with fiscal integrity. And we must be committed to a guiding philosophy that in all our endeavors, intercollegiate athletics is fair.”

State of the Association, 2007

“[W]e cannot fault intercollegiate athletics for its own popularity. We should hold it accountable for delivering the benefits we seek from it, but we cannot damn it for appealing to mass audiences of interest.”

Hamilton College, 2007

“It is not a sign of weakness to follow the rules and act with respect for others; it is a sign of moral commitment.”

State of the Association, 2008

ACADEMIC SUCCESS

“There is little that frustrates me more than critics of college sports who get the facts wrong and make derogatory comments about the academic accomplishments of student-athletes. Overall, student-athletes graduate at higher rates than the general student body.”

State of the Association, 2007

“And yet, the idea persists that college athletes are little more than knuckle-dragging Neanderthals incapable of being real college students – dumb jocks. It’s an idea that should have gone the way of flappers, speakeasies and performing in blackface. Mostly, it’s just dumb.”

Blog, 2008

“The obligation of the athletics department is to provide a genuine opportunity for student-athletes to take advantage of the institution’s academic offerings, and to motivate and incent a commitment to academics.”

“We must, at all costs, refrain from setting up young players for failure. It is exploitive to bring young men or women into college sports when they have little or no chance for academic success.”

State of the Association, 2008

INTEGRATING ATHLETICS WITH ACADEMICS

“I suggest that the means to establishing fiscal responsibility on campus is the integration of athletics into the campus as a whole.”

“Integration entails more than embracing the rhetoric of education. It involves a genuine commitment to the academic goals of the institution and its student-athletes. Every member of the athletics department must understand, promote and be committed to student-athlete academic success.”

Carolina Leadership Academy, 2005

“It is far too risky to take athletics outside the normal lines of accountability at the university. When there are major problems or scandals in athletics, the entire university is affected. Athletics is too visible and influential to be ancillary and too enriching to the university experience to be ignored as a contribution to the mission of higher education. And if it has value in the university’s meeting its mission, it deserves to be supported, if needed.”

State of the Association, 2005

“The business of college sports is not a necessary evil; rather, it is a proper part of the overall enterprise. (But) we must not let the interest in the ‘business’ of college sports become so alluring or enticing that it diverts us from the primary purpose of intercollegiate athletics – providing athletics opportunities for students that enhance their academic experience. We must never lose sight of the academic purpose while we are conducting the necessary business of college sports.”

State of the Association, 2006

“Intercollegiate athletics shares with the university as a whole its commitment to social justice and to opportunity. Over the years, literally millions of low-income students were able to attend college and receive a degree because of athletics support. The intellectual talent that has been enabled to flourish because of athletics support is nothing short of phenomenal.”

State of the Association, 2008

DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

“Our decision-making must be based on evidence, rather than intuition or anecdote. It must be inclusive and ensure that all key stakeholders have the opportunity to have their perspectives heard and their supporting data presented.”

State of the Association, 2003

“The paucity of African-American head football coaches in Division I – as well as in Divisions II and III – and women in high positions from head coaches to athletics directors, is simply appalling. ... I can find no moral justification for excluding from serious consideration qualified persons who are not of the over-represented race or gender.”

State of the Association, 2005

“Diversity and inclusion are values of the university. They must also be the values and practices of intercollegiate athletics programs. ... We must also produce an inclusive climate that seeks out divergent opinions and experiences, that we go beyond a ‘head-count exercise’ and get to the real goal ... full involvement in the decision-making process.”

State of the Association, 2006

“We cannot ignore the lessons of history forever. Eventually, those who are being denied access will fight for the benefits that are simply assumed by others.”

“The work to ensure the civil rights of significant groups of American citizens is never done. There will always be issues that must be addressed and addressed aggressively. Most often through neglect but not infrequently as the result of prejudice and malevolence, the rights of minorities to the full range of benefits assumed by the majority are nearly always at risk.”

Blog, 2008

NCAA

“The NCAA should position itself so that the future of intercollegiate athletics benefits from both serious reform and strong advocacy.”

State of the Association, 2003

“As ambiguous as the term ‘NCAA’ can naturally be, I have also come to understand that there is deliberate confusion from time to time – created occasionally by the media but sometimes by the membership itself. The NCAA is handy cover for anything that appears to run counter to common sense or the interests of some person or group.”

State of the Association, 2004

“There are some who believe the NCAA national office should have oversight for commercial activity for all intercollegiate athletics contests. It would not be a good idea, however, for the national office to exercise campus-based control of commercialism for all its members.”

State of the Association, 2009

PERFORMANCE-ENHANCING DRUGS

“It is disrespectful to the traditions and code of conduct of a sport to compete on a drug-assisted basis. It shows the participant places personal success beyond all considerations, and he or she disregards the commitment to fair play.”

State of the Association, 2007

PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP

“Though critics and pundits, external commissions, and study committees may hope to influence the future course of intercollegiate athletics, the fact of the matter is that presidents are best positioned to change their campuses’ perspectives and behavior. When missteps in athletic programs occur, universities are open to criticism, and the presidents are the ones on the front lines. I know because I have been there. It is presidents who have the ultimate responsibility for setting standards and ensuring that these standards are followed.”

State of the Association, 2003

“There are strong forces driving athletics programs toward better and better athletics performance. That is understandable and good: Athletics is about winning.

“But it is essential that the response to these forces be made in a wider context of the mission of universities and colleges, which first and foremost are academic institutions. The champion for this mission must be the university president, and to him or her falls the leadership task of balancing the desire to win with both the education of student-athletes and the preservation of institutional integrity.”

State of the Association, 2004

“Let me emphasize that achieving fiscal responsibility in intercollegiate athletics will not happen without presidential leadership.”

University of Iowa, 2004



“I am more convinced than ever that the relationship between intercollegiate athletics and higher education has survived the test of time because those who went before us had the values right. It falls to us – all of us – to see that these values are preserved and that they direct our future actions.”

Myles Brand's State of the Association address, January 11, 2004

HIS LEGACY



Commitment to fairness and equality

More than just a casual observer of progress, Myles Brand was actively committed to advancing fairness and equal opportunity throughout intercollegiate athletics.

Brand was credited with much of the NCAA's recent success with diversity as he openly called for more patient and thorough hiring practices for administrators and coaches. He frequently was asked to address the dearth of ethnic minority football head coaches leading Division I Football Bowl Subdivision teams.

"One of the most egregious instances of this lack of access is the low number of African-American head football coaches and offensive and defensive coordinators in Division I-A," Brand said during his 2003 State of the Association speech. "The current situation is simply unjustifiable."

Describing the status quo as "unacceptable (and) unconscionably wrong" in an April 2007 NCAA News editorial, Brand strongly encouraged institutions to open their doors to talented, qualified ethnic minority coaches. However, he resisted calls for a collegiate version of the NFL's Rooney Rule, which requires teams filling head coaching vacancies to include a person of color among their interviewed candidates or face stiff penalties. Instead, Brand stressed the need for more hires, not more interviews.



"I am frustrated that in the midst of progress in so many other areas, higher education and intercollegiate athletics continue to exercise a hiring practice in college football that is embarrassing and simply would not be tolerated elsewhere on campus," Brand wrote in a December 2008 Huffington Post blog.

However, Brand did more than talk about diversity. He backed his words with action.

Brand created the office for diversity and inclusion at the national office in August 2005. The unit was assigned responsibility for leading efforts to develop and implement strategies, policies and programs that promote diversity and inclusion throughout the NCAA, such as the Diversity Education

Program, the Football Coaches Academy, the Expert Coaches Forum, and the Leadership Institute for Ethnic Minority Males and Females.

Brand also was the architect behind the Diversity Leadership Strategic Planning Committee, a panel of approximately 40 athletics administrators representing all three divisions that was tasked in 2006 with charting the Association's road map to achieving a culture of diversity and inclusion. The committee, which spent a year compiling research before presenting its recommendations at the 2007 NCAA Convention, focused on fostering diversity among student-athletes; promoting a climate of inclusion within inter-

collegiate athletics; enhancing equitable career opportunities for under-represented coaches, officials and administrators; and strengthening the support, integration and promotion of women's sports.

Brand's focus on diversity also extended to his work with university and college presidents. As part of its charge, the Presidential Task Force on the Future of Division I Intercollegiate Athletics, which was launched in 2005, examined diversity issues as well as academic values and standards; fiscal responsibility; presidential leadership of internal and external constituencies; and student-athlete well-being.

Leilana McKindra, The NCAA News

Commitment to academic reform

From the first weeks of his presidency, Myles Brand was a champion for the student-athlete, dedicated to enhancing the academic environment and eliminating the phrase “dumb jock” from the American perception.

His commitment to academic excellence changed the culture of college sports to emphasize the importance of classroom performance and competitive success.

Under Brand’s leadership, the NCAA created:

- A structure anchored by the Academic Progress Rate, a “real-time” metric designed to give a snapshot of how teams are performing academically, providing disincentives for poor academic performance and recognition for high performers.
- The Graduation Success Rate (Division I) and Academic Success Rate (Division II), new metrics that provide a more accurate measure of the graduation rate of student-athletes than does the federal calculation.
- Increased initial-eligibility standards, including requiring more core courses for prospective student-athletes and de-emphasizing test scores as a way to judge academic fitness.

These measures have produced results. The most recent APR data show almost across-the-board improvement in all sports and all demographics.

With the GSR and ASR in place, Brand set an unofficial goal of having 80 percent of all student-athletes graduate. Division I student-athletes have stepped closer to that goal every year, with the most recent data showing 79 percent graduating within six years. In Divi-



sion II, the number has climbed steadily to 71 percent. The strengthened initial-eligibility standards contribute to academic success in all three metrics.

While much of the media attention on academic reform has centered on the penalties for teams that don’t make the grade – and the low number receiving penalties – Brand always stressed that the program was about changing behavior, not dispensing punishment.

In 2007, Brand dedicated much of his State of the Association speech to the emerging success of academic reform, challenging the media at large to “get their facts right” in reporting on the academic success of student-athletes.

“A large majority of student-athletes are receiving a fine education and graduating from our colleges and universities. Let us give them and their institutions the credit

they deserve,” Brand said. He also touted the APR’s fairness, data-driven foundation and student-athlete focus.

Noting that some sports might need extra work with reform, Brand oversaw the creation of academic enhancement groups for baseball, men’s basketball and football. Only baseball’s reforms have been implemented, and early APR data indicate those efforts also will be successful.

Notable in Brand’s leadership on academic issues was his ability to withstand criticisms and attacks from those who sought to weaken the program. His example allowed the presidents to stand firm in their support of the student-athlete’s academic success.

Brand’s commitment to academic reform and emphasis on the integration of athletics with the academic mission of colleges and universities will be a centerpiece of his legacy.

Michelle Brutlag Hosick, The NCAA News

Presidential control of intercollegiate athletics

It wasn't surprising when Myles Brand, in his first speech as the NCAA's new leader in 2003, declared that "presidential control of intercollegiate athletics is essential." After all, he owed his own selection for the job to presidents' recently won control of the Association's governance structure.

Brand, however, did more than say how things should be. He developed mechanisms for encouraging presidents not only to practice control over athletics operations but also to provide leadership in establishing a proper place for sports in the academic missions of universities and colleges.

By virtue of his own experiences as a president at major academic institutions, Brand could capture colleagues' attention in a way that none of his predecessors – all athletics administrators – ever could have hoped to do.

"I think that probably Myles Brand, because he's widely known in that community of presidents and chancellors, may be effective in demonstrating to all of us the value of direct presidential involvement in the governance of the NCAA," Kansas Chancellor Robert Hemenway, at the time chair of the Division I Board of Directors, told *The NCAA News* after Brand's selection in late 2002.

"He has changed the audience to which he can deliver his message," Bob Bowsby, then director of athletics at Iowa and currently athletics director at Stanford, told *USA Today* in 2005. "Presidents listen to him, and I'm not sure, going back to Walter Byers, that presidents necessarily listened to the executive director or

the (NCAA) president in quite the same way."

However, Brand made clear in his first speech to the Association's membership during the 2003 NCAA Convention that presidents must exercise not only control over the national organization's operations but also leadership in preserving what he soon would term a "Collegiate Model" for athletics – a presidential role that he saw being distinct from control.

"University and college presidents are in the best position to provide institutional leadership, while taking into account the perspectives of student-athletes, coaches, fans, faculty members and governing boards," he said in articulating presidential control as a key principle for achieving reform of – and advocacy for – college sports.

"When missteps in athletics programs occur, universities are open to criticism, and the presidents are the ones on the front line," he continued. "I know because I have been there. It is presidents who have the ultimate responsibility for setting standards and ensuring that these standards are followed. The NCAA should make every possible effort to assist presidents in carrying out these responsibilities."

He set about providing such support, in ways large and small, from his first days in office.

Three months after the 2003 Convention, he asked the NCAA Executive Committee to approve a pilot, voluntary orientation program for newly appointed campus presidents and chancellors, in which a current or former university president would visit a campus not only to explain the operations of the NCAA but to

offer counsel on ways to manage athletics issues on campus.

"The program will provide an opportunity to emphasize the importance of presidential participation in the NCAA and garner support for the NCAA's advocacy and reform agenda," he told the committee in his proposal.

The program continues today to provide a valued resource for recently appointed presidents at NCAA member institutions.

More visibly, campus executives regularly have been tapped by Brand to lead task forces that have addressed key issues in intercollegiate athletics. Doing so put presidents in visible leadership roles, tackling the most pressing problems facing college sports.

"Presidential leadership, which is not the same as presidential control, adds vision and strategic direction, and does so in a way that engages the many constituents to find a solution that works for all," Brand said in announcing the creation in 2005 of the Presidential Task Force on the Future of Division I Intercollegiate Athletics. That group, composed entirely of presidents, ultimately produced recommendations for achieving fiscal responsibility in athletics, supporting academic standards, providing presidential leadership on campuses and championing student-athlete well-being.

During his NCAA presidency, Brand made clear that he wouldn't be satisfied serving as a voice for presidents. He moved quickly to build platforms from which they could speak more effectively for themselves.

Jack Copeland, The NCAA News



“In the end, it is all about the student-athlete.”

Myles Brand, 2003