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Specific Working Group Objectives

- Better define the components of engagement.
- Determine the metrics to measure engagement.
- Establish appropriate benchmarks to assess engagement.
- Develop best practices resources to enhance and sustain engagement.
- Collaborate with appropriate groups to ensure consistency, effectiveness and accountability.
Working Group Roster

- Brad Bankston, Commissioner – ODAC
- Kurt Beron, FAR – University of Texas at Dallas
- Les Canterbury, FAR - University of Redlands
- Ellen Faszewski, FAR - Wheelock College
- Dan Fisher, Commissioner – Landmark Conference
- Nancy Hubbard, FAR – Goucher College
- Scott Kilgallon, AD – Webster University
- Dennis Leighton, FAR – University of New England
Working Group Roster

• Rosa Riccobono, Student-Athlete – Eastern Connecticut State University

• Cheryl Stuntz, FAR – St. Lawrence University

• Karen Tompsoon-Wolfe, FAR – Westminster College (MO)

• Michelle Walsh, AD – Vassar College
WHAT WE’VE LEARNED
Three Levels of Engagement

Campus
National
Conference
Campus-Level Findings

• Little consistency in reporting lines.

• About half reported having a job description.

• FAR compensation and/or time-release is rare with 5% reporting release time from teaching obligations and 11% reporting some financial compensation.
Campus-Level Findings

• Approximately half reported tenures of four years or less.

• Nearly three-quarters reported spending between one and five hours per week on their FAR duties.

• Nearly half are not involved in the campus-level Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.
Campus-Level Findings

• Two areas deemed most important:
  1. Advocating for student-athlete well-being.
  2. Ensuring the academic integrity of the athletics program.

• Involved in a broad range of activities.
Conference-Level Findings

• Twenty-four of the 37 reporting conferences identified FARs as a key constituent.

• Twenty-two reporting conferences identified a specific role for the FARs in the governance of the conference.

• There was an FAR Committee or Council with varying roles and responsibilities in 15 conferences.
Conference-Level Findings

• More than half of Division III FARs are actively involved.

• One-third of FARs reported wanting more involvement in conference affairs. One-quarter of conference commissioners agreed.
National-Level Findings

• Attendance at the Division III FAR Institute has been uneven when examining the attendance by conference affiliation.

• 70% of Division III institutions have been represented by an FAR at one or none of national events out of the last 10 opportunities.
MOVING FORWARD
Key Areas of Focus

• Increasing the length of service.

• Involvement with the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee should be increased.

• Further examination of how FAR service is considered in light of campus-level service requirements for faculty members.
Key Areas of Focus

- Best-practices and/or policies related to release-time.
- Presidential leadership is vital to the success of their efforts. Multiple voices to boost the cause including directors of athletics and conference commissioners.
- A campus-first approach to engagement.
Next Steps

- Create an information sheet detailing the value added to the student-athlete experience through a highly engaged and long-tenured FAR.

- Develop an FAR best-practices guide to supplement the proposed information sheet.

- Develop a best-practices guide for conference commissioners related to FAR engagement at the conference level.
Next Steps

• Develop and implement a seamless education model to orient new FARs and support them through their tenure in the position.

• Explore potential legislation to further codify the expectations of the role of the FAR in the governance and operation of athletics at the campus, conference and national level.
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