

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS
OF THE
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE**

FRIENDS OF MIT CREW

OCTOBER, 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	III
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
CHARGE TO THE COMMITTEE	2
A BRIEF HISTORY OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ROWING AT MIT AND OF FRIENDS OF MIT CREW ...	3
SUMMARY OF THE COMMITTEE’S WORK.....	4
THE DATA: SUMMARY OF WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED	7
I. INTRODUCTION -- SUMMARY OF CRITICAL POINTS.....	7
II. INPUT FROM SPECIFIC SOURCES	8
<i>Coaches – Discussions With Head Coach Schmill:</i>	8
<i>Students:</i>	9
<i>Administration Concerns and Priorities:</i>	9
<i>Alumni/ae:</i>	9
<i>Other Programs:</i>	10
PRIORITIES FOR FRIENDS	10
I. APPLICATION OF WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED:	10
II. SPECIFIC PRIORITIES	11
<i>Competitively Paid Full-time Coaching Positions:</i>	11
<i>Friends Staff Person:</i>	11
<i>Gender Equity:</i>	12
<i>Funding for Trips:</i>	12
<i>Increase Funding for Equipment:</i>	12
<i>Boathouse:</i>	13
<i>Alumni/ae Involvement:</i>	13
IMPLEMENTATION: TASKS AND CHALLENGES.....	14
I. EVALUATING THE COST OF ACHIEVING THESE PRIORITIES	14
II. THE FUTURE OF FRIENDS.....	14
III. COORDINATING WITH THE ADMINISTRATION	15
APPENDICES	16
<u>APPENDIX A</u>	16
<u>APPENDIX B</u>	18
<u>APPENDIX C</u>	20
<u>APPENDIX D</u>	22
<u>APPENDIX E</u>	27

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As the Committee has met and worked together during the past year, we have been reminded of the energy and heart that undergraduates pour into crew, the dedication and care of the coaches, the interest and support of alumni of all ages, and the professionalism and concern of administrators charged with supporting MIT students in their efforts to excel in all they do. We wish to thank all of them for their contributions and continuing cooperative efforts to support MIT Crew.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Friends of MIT Crew (“Friends”) was established in 1985 to support intercollegiate rowing at MIT. The governing agreement, entitled *Rules and Regulations of the Friends of MIT Crew*, is attached to this report as **Appendix A**. This agreement provides for cooperation between MIT and Friends’ Managing Committee in the disbursement of funds raised by Friends.

Last fall, this Strategic Planning Committee (“Committee”) of Friends of MIT Crew was formed with the approval of the Athletic Department. The charge to the Committee was to identify priorities for Friends in order to provide more effective support for intercollegiate rowing at MIT in the future. The charge to the committee is attached as **Appendix B**.

MIT Crew has enjoyed generous support historically from a relatively small number of alumni/ae. Friends involved many more of us in supporting crew at MIT at a time when, as we have learned in the past year, the MIT Athletic Department budget has been flat. Friends’ assistance with equipment over the last 10 years has, for example, kept the crews in fairly new equipment. However, the crews need more help from us. The goal of the Committee is to prioritize the use of funds donated by alumni/ae.

The Committee has identified priorities by gathering and evaluating information about MIT’s rowing program and about other successful rowing programs. These priorities include: Competitively paid, full time coaching positions; paid staff to serve Friends; gender equity within crew; more up-to-date equipment; support for winter training trips and special trips when earned; adequate boathouse space; and taking steps to enable Friends to accomplish its goals. The Committee has met with MIT Chancellor Lawrence Bacow, Dean Rosalind Williams, Athletic Director Dr. Richard Hill and other representatives of the Athletic Department, and representatives of the Development Office to learn more about the priorities, restrictions and processes with which we, as an alumni/ae organization, must coordinate.

The priorities are intended to remove obstacles to our undergraduates’ efforts to row to the best of their ability. To achieve these priorities, we must build on Friends’ positive working relationship with the MIT Administration to increase Institute support for rowing. We recommend that Friends: (i) Develop a coordinated fund-raising effort to support the identified priorities; (ii) Continue to coordinate with the MIT Administration regarding support for the rowing program; and (iii) Continue to develop the Friends organization as a vehicle for the coordination of effective alumni/ae support for rowing.

We recommend Friends consider endowing funds to cover the selected priorities. Friends must reach agreement on future funding of MIT Crew with the MIT Administration. However, our current estimate is that Friends will need to raise an endowment of approximately \$10-15 million to accomplish our goals.

CHARGE TO THE COMMITTEE

The Strategic Planning Committee was given its charge in a letter from John B. Miller on behalf of Friends in October 1998. The full text of the letter is provided at **Appendix B**. A portion of the letter reads:

The specific charge of the Committee is this. What should the Friends be doing to support the intercollegiate rowing program over the next ten to fifteen years, both conceptually and specifically? How should the Friends position itself to keep the intercollegiate rowing program healthy and prosperous? What, if anything, should we be doing differently or more effectively to assist the intercollegiate rowing program at MIT?

The Committee has taken the charge broadly in the sense that we have invited comment on any issue and have discussed many aspects of Crew among ourselves and with others. At the same time, our purpose is to reach specific, achievable conclusions as to alumni support that incorporate lessons from other programs and are consistent with the unique character of MIT.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ROWING AT MIT AND OF FRIENDS OF MIT CREW

Since 1902, when MIT students borrowed a shell from Union Boat Club to practice on a still tidal Charles River, the rowing program at MIT has been fortunate in the level of support by many generous donors. In 1910, at the suggestion of MIT President MacLauren, a group of Chicago area alumni gave \$560 to underwrite the crew program. There were 5 races that year including one with Harvard.

After the dam was built creating the basin, the MIT crew competed with prep schools, Harvard, and had away meets with Navy. MIT, through the Alumni Advisory Council on Athletics, continued to provide support for the rowing program leading to the purchase in 1922 of the BAA boathouse which was used through 1965. A more complete (though still draft) history of rowing at MIT can be found at:

<http://web.mit.edu/afs/athena.mit.edu/activity/m/mitcrew/www/history/>

MIT provided solid support for the rowing program, and very generous benefactors provided many enhancements. Individuals and groups purchased boats and oars, and endowments were created to provide continual support for certain of the program's needs. Currently there are several endowments to support specifically named boats or expenses as, for example, in the case of the McCurdy endowments.

In the early 1980's, in order to increase the interest and support by alumni/ae, the "Friends of MIT Crew" (FOMITC or Friends) was formed. The first meeting took place October 1, 1984, at the Pierce Boathouse. Jim Bidigare chaired the meeting and explained the steps he had taken to establish the organization. Eleven others joined the discussion and reviewed the operation of the Friends of Harvard Rowing. The group decided to proceed with a draft plan of action. The consensus was that the Friends should target special projects and activities not traditionally funded by MIT.

After meetings in 1984-85, the *Rules and Regulations of FOMITC* was published in the spring 1985 newsletter (see Appendix A). The Rules closely followed the amended rules of Friends of Harvard Rowing, a group which had begun in 1951. The rules were simple and provided a minimal structure to accomplish the job. The objective was and is to involve any interested person in the MIT rowing program.

A managing committee of three was selected: Jim Bidigare '78; John Miller '74; and Roseanna Means '76. This committee jointly led the Friends through 1989, when Jim moved to Ohio. John and Roseanna continued through 1996, when Roseanna resigned. John continues to serve.

The first group of managers saw Friends grow rapidly. The support from alumni/ae was fantastic. Gifts to the MIT annual Fund drive designated to rowing topped \$11,000 in the first year. Each year support increased so that by the Spring of 1987 the total was \$70,000, and by

the Spring of 1988 the total was \$115,000. FOMITC purchased boats and oars in 1987, 1989, and 1990. As of November, 1998, contributions total \$1,037,000, of which \$570,000 remains available.

Participation has been very broadly based. The Friends mailing list is currently approximately 3,000 alumni/ae, including members of classes from every era still living.

Early on, the funds became sufficient to be handled by the MIT Treasurer as part of the MIT endowment. All contributions are therefore tax deductible, and MIT assumes the responsibility of handling the funds. All decisions concerning the spending of funds are to be made jointly by the Managing Directors of FOMITC and the MIT Athletic Department. The cooperative relationship has generally worked well.

Since 1986, FOMITC has sponsored an annual dinner on the evening before the Head of the Charles Regatta. Awards are presented to students who have rowed all four of their undergraduate years, and a large group of alumni/ae and coaches, as well as special guests, have an enjoyable reunion.

One of the objectives of the founders was to publish a newsletter about the rowing program, race results, and news of FOMITC. The newsletter, renamed *Squaring the Blade* in 1989, has been published 2 or 3 times a year since 1985. It is sent to all members of FOMITC, including approximately 3,000 rowing alumni/ae. There has been a continual effort to update mailing lists with the cooperation of the Alumni Office.

In 1990-91 a study was undertaken to consider the feasibility of expanding the boathouse, and plans for expansion were discussed with the Institute. All plans are on hold pending the MIT capital priority list, and a fund-raising drive was not initiated. The current boathouse appears to be adequate, but with about 300 men and women participants, the facility is stretched to the limit. Support for the program through funding the purchase of equipment has grown, with Friends taking the lead on some projects and supporting and providing a mechanism for other projects by individuals (such as the purchase of shells to honor specific people and to keep the Crew's fleet up to date).

The wide support shown by FOMITC has been consistent and continues even without a specific target. The loyalty of rowing alumni/ae to the crew program is obvious by their actions.

With this history and loyalty in mind, the Managing Director of FOMITC appointed a committee to make a strategic review and recommend a course for the future. The objective is to provide the best support we can to enable the rowing program to excel.

SUMMARY OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

The Committee has sought information to help us look behind the obvious but too-simple answers as to what Friends can do to help Crew (provide money and moral support) and identify specific actions that experience tells us will be most effective at enabling the intercollegiate

rowing program to thrive. We have also met with MIT administrators in an attempt to understand the process and constraints that may affect our ability to achieve our goals.

The Committee has met in person and by telephone numerous times to discuss the history of the program, what Friends has accomplished, what Crew means to us, the challenges that face a rowing program these days, what sort of rowing program we want MIT to have, why certain crews are doing better than others, and just about every other topic imaginable. We have used these sessions to discuss the input we have obtained from others throughout the process.

In addition to working through our ideas and considering the input of alumni/ae, we have gathered information about the MIT Crew program and other rowing programs in order to evaluate, as objectively as we could, what Friends might be able to do to help more in the future.

Our research tasks have included:

- Meetings and conversations with Head Coach Stu Schmill and soliciting feedback from other present and former MIT Crew coaches;
- Meeting with current students to discuss their rowing experiences and goals;
- Meetings and other communications with Athletic Director Dr. Richard Hill and other representatives of the Athletic Department;
- Meeting with MIT administrators -- Chancellor Lawrence Bacow, Dean Rosalind Williams and personnel in the Development office, in addition to Athletic Department managers;
- Seeking feedback from alumni/ae through personal contacts, Squaring the Blade, and a face-to-face meeting on Alumni Day in June;
- Direct contacts with interested alumni/ae; and
- Contacts with coaches and representatives of numerous other Friends organizations and intercollegiate rowing programs to learn from their experience; and
- Review the final report of MIT's Presidential Task Force on Student Life and Learning (1998), which can be requested in hard copy from the Office of Academic Services by calling 617-253-9419 or accessed on the web at:

<http://web.mit.edu/afs/athena.mit.edu/org/c/committees/sll/>.

The Committee's work can be summarized in terms of three tasks:

1. Learning from the input we have received
 - What has been important to MIT students and alumni/ae about rowing?
 - What type of intercollegiate rowing program should MIT have?
 - What does it take to achieve that level of competitive program?
 - How do other rowing programs succeed?
 - How can that information be applied at MIT?
2. Analysis and development of priorities
 - Distilling all of the above, what type of support from Friends can best support the intercollegiate rowing program at MIT?

- How can those goals be applied at MIT?
 - What is the cost of achieving those goals?
3. Looking ahead at implementation
- Should those costs be covered on an annual basis or through endowed funds?
 - What needs to be done to raise the funds?
 - What should be done to ensure proper use of the funds?

In summary, the Committee has sought to understand what has worked for MIT Crew and what is now working for other universities' rowing programs, and has taken a hard look at how that knowledge could be applied in the context of the unique characteristics and strengths of MIT. MIT's strengths include an uncompromising admissions process, a focus on excellence, an emphasis on self-motivation, and financial aid that is need-based. We believe that these characteristics fit well with intercollegiate crew; that MIT can compete successfully with our academic peers; and that a coordinated effort by alumni/ae and MIT to enhance our undergraduates' opportunities to succeed in rowing will benefit the individual participants and the teams.

THE DATA: SUMMARY OF WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED

I. Introduction -- Summary of Critical Points

Static Budget: The single most important fact we learned is that the budget for MIT athletics was not increased for 15 years. In essence, this represents 15 years of budget cuts at the rate of inflation. (We understand it has been increased this year, 1999-2000, for the first time in years. We applaud this step and hope this is only the first of a series of annual increases. We are extremely concerned that the Athletic Department budget has not been maintained at a level that can provide MIT students a quality experience.) Understanding this one fact alone underscores the need for alumni support -- and its importance in keeping MIT Crew going at its current strength. There are numerous other details that pertain to Crew as one of many sports at MIT, and we are attempting to engage the Athletic Department to learn more about this.

Increased Demand on Funds: At the same time, the Athletic Director is under pressure to accommodate the wide variety of interests of MIT students, and the number of sports at the Institute has grown even as the budget has remained stagnant. Further, many sports that, unlike crew, were traditionally one-season activities now increasingly engage in off-season training with a concomitant need for more supplies and coaching. In this context, holding the Athletic Department budget static has strictly limited the discretion of the Athletic Department to maintain support for Crew. Despite the need to do so to give our students an “even playing field” in comparison with other schools with which we compete, Athletic Department funds increasingly have gone elsewhere.

Crew Misunderstood as a “Favored” Sport : There is an erroneous perception that Crew receives a disproportionate amount of Athletic Department resources. We think much of the money spent on Crew is donated funds, not Institute funds, and believe that a closer look at the financial figures will correct this misunderstanding.

Crew is the Single Most Important Undergraduate Experience for Many: Crew has contributed to the lives of alumni/ae in significant ways, including keeping them at MIT through difficult times, providing an outlet to balance academic rigors, teaching critical lessons that have served them well after graduation, and developing lasting friendships. We have been surprised by how often alumni/ae, even those who did not win many races, told us Crew was the single most important part of their undergraduate experience.

Alumni/ae and Students Want a Competitive Program: We have heard from students and alumni/ae alike that they would like to compete at the EARC/EARWC level rather than move to a lower league in order to make it easier to win, not only because it is the highest level of competition, but because these are our academic peers. MIT students and alumni/ae want to continue to compete against their peers in the EARC/EARWC - Harvard, Princeton, Yale, Dartmouth, Penn and Columbia. What we hear is a belief that, with proper support, MIT can compete at that level; there is a concern that lowering expectations simply begins a downward spiral; and, perhaps most importantly, MIT students and alumni/ae want to excel at crew in the

same way they seek to excel in other areas of their classes, jobs and lives. Crew is more than mere recreation to us.

The Crew Program has Grown Beyond Its Support: MIT Crew has continued to involve large numbers of undergraduates. The women's program has continued to grow and must consider formation of a women's lightweight team, with resulting increases in the demand on coaching, equipment and the boathouse. A detailed listing of current figures (number of rowers, equipment, etc.) entitled *MIT Rowing: Current Status* is attached as **Appendix C**. This information and the Athletic Department budget issue must be looked at in light of the substantial increases in support for rowing at the schools with which we compete.

Cooperation Between the Administration and Friends Is Critical: Friends' Operating Agreement provides for use of funds raised through Friends only with the joint approval of both the MIT Administration and the Managing Committee of Friends. A cooperative, interactive relationship is critical to our success. Friends has raised a significant amount to support Crew and we are looking forward to raising substantially larger funds. We must build on the successful, cooperative relationship that Friends began with the Administration.

MIT Admissions Practices Will Not Change: The MIT admissions process recognizes all information a student wishes to provide on talent and achievements, and input on applicants is sought from alumni/ae and coaches. However, to be admitted, students must meet the academic criteria; there are no reserved spots for athletes. Recruiting must strictly follow the practices of the Admissions Department and any other applicable rules.

II. Input From Specific Sources

Coaches – Discussions With Head Coach Schmill:

As to Friends

- Write a mission statement and further develop the structure and process by which Friends will interact with coaches, the Institute and alumni/ae;
- Identify and prioritize goals.

As to Crew

- Bring freshman coaches' salaries up to par with the league. They have become full time at many other schools, and we are now behind.
- Become a vehicle for communication with the Administration regarding Crew and its role at the Institute, and what support should come from the Administration/what from alumni/ae.
- Develop the existing support for equipment so that it is slightly greater and more dependable (the fleet is improved but should be renewed on a slightly more regular basis).

- Support boathouse improvements, especially if a lightweight women's team forms. Until then, it is filled to capacity but adequate.

Students:

- Assist with costs of mid-winter training trip to Florida (and, for example, Henley trips when earned).
- Attend races and show support/that each crew is part of a history.
- Improve/increase interaction and communication between alumni/ae and undergraduates. For example, tell them what rowing meant to us, provide encouragement generally (Can I meet my life/work goals if I keep rowing?), develop a network for summer jobs and career opportunities, include more freshmen at the fall dinner, hold a spring alumni/ae/senior dinner.
- Provide equal support for equipment for women as for men (there is a perception that more shells are endowed for men than for women and that the disparity affects the age of equipment in use).
- Work with the Administration to support rowing (the Crews use the Independent Activities Period in the winter to train in Florida but are finding increasing pressure to use that time for regular course work).

Administration Concerns and Priorities:

- The integrity of the admissions process must not be affected (*e.g.*, no recruiting candidates who are not academically qualified). (The Committee agrees.)
- Athletic Department funding must be fair to all programs (The Committee believes that this leaves unanswered the questions of prioritizing sports with a history of competitive success instead of supporting equally every interest group and of measuring the student hours spent on crew compared to other sports).
- Alumni activities, such as helping with recruiting, must comply with applicable guidelines. (The Committee agrees.)
- Control over endowed funds cannot be given over to an alumni/ae group. (The Committee agrees, and this is what the current arrangement provides.)

Alumni/ae:

The Committee has been heartened by the responses by alumni/ae. In letters, email messages, meetings and other contacts, we have heard the following:

- Crew was an important -- often described as the single most important) -- experience at MIT, which helped to keep us at MIT, enhanced our educational experience, and has contributed immensely to our subsequent career and life successes.
- MIT can and should compete at the EARC/EARWC level with our academic peers.
- Crew should continue to be a program that welcomes and builds on both experienced and inexperienced rowers and coxswains.

- Alumni/ae want to help MIT Crew succeed.
- MIT students want to be competitive at play as well as in class/at work.
- “Success” should be defined in terms of enabling our undergraduates to row to the best of their ability, not necessarily by winning a particular race or regatta.

Other Programs:

MIT competes in the highest level of intercollegiate crew. Several of the most successful crew programs, in terms of winning races, are also MIT’s academic peer institutions. To help find out what has contributed to other successful programs’ successes, the Committee surveyed several schools to benchmark such basic information. Based upon discussions with other programs that are enjoying success, we identified a number of characteristics that were surprisingly consistent hallmarks of a successful crew. A detailed report is set forth as **Appendix D**.

Key findings from these other programs can be summarized as follows:

- Successful programs are well-funded.
- Funding comes from a varying combination of: athletic department, crew endowment income, and annual giving.
- Coaches in most cases are hired and paid by the athletic department.
- Paying competitive coaches salaries is important to attract and retain the best coaches, maintain continuity, and allow the coaches time to recruit.
- Recruiting has become a major issue in crew today.
- Dramatic changes have occurred in women’s crew in recent years, in part as a result of Title IX.
- MIT’s unique character and reputation can help it with recruiting qualified candidates with an interest in rowing.
- Consideration of rowing in the admissions process varies among schools.

PRIORITIES FOR FRIENDS

I. Application of What We Have Learned:

Consistency of Input

The Committee has seen a high degree consistency in the information we have gathered. Within the community of MIT Crew, the desire to compete has been articulated in terms of competing at the top levels, as MIT has proven it is capable. Not a single student or alumnus favored dropping to a less competitive league. At other universities, there was great consistency in what works. While every program is different, the priorities we recommend below were recognized almost universally as critical.

Importance of Administration Coordination and Support

It is our understanding that the MIT Athletic Department is working hard to meet the needs of all teams and is engaged in an ongoing discussion with Coach Schmill about the needs of Crew. We would like to see more support for rowing from the Administration; one strategic goal for Friends must be to work with the Institute to underscore how important crew is to undergraduate life (and to us), and to assist in finding ways to increase the Administration's support. Obviously, we can provide support ourselves, as many have done so generously over the years. At the same time, our personal support should not substitute for adequate support from the Administration. We understand the Administration plans to announce a new approach to supporting athletics. We hope it will include a substantial increase in the budget of the Athletic Department and support for crew that is proportional to the amount of student effort that goes into our sport over three full seasons each year.

Discussion of Input

The Committee has not yet received financial information we requested to allow us to evaluate the past and current costs of crew and other athletic programs. We are continuing to meet with the Athletic Department and hope to re-establish the philosophy and practice of coordinated efforts to support MIT Crew.

The Committee believes that the priorities set forth below identify the best ways Friends can help support MIT Crew. Two issues remain: how best to implement them within Friends; and whether we can obtain sufficient cooperation from the Administration to proceed.

II. Specific Priorities

Competitively Paid Full-time Coaching Positions:

Our assistant/freshman coaches (and the varsity heavyweight men's coach) are now part time. At that salary and status, especially in comparison to the schools with which we compete, we cannot consistently get and keep top people who have the time and expertise to devote to the large numbers of students interested in our full-year sport. (All three frosh coaches this year are new!) Nor can we expect them to participate in critical activities like recruiting as much as is plainly needed. With no athletic scholarships and no hedged admission standards, more time and effort put into expressing interest in applicants and responding to their interest in MIT will, in our opinion, pay back important benefits. The coaches are best suited to do this, but do not have the time now on part-time salaries. While we can hope to raise funds to help address this number one priority, support from the Administration will be needed bring us current with the competition in this critical area.

Friends Staff Person:

Fund-raising, a newsletter and other Friends' activities require coordination and record keeping. While the Institute is set up to do this and we should work through the established

channels, it would be wise to keep track ourselves and coordinate our volunteer efforts. This is especially true if we decide to target endowment amounts for particular items, such as, for example, an endowment for certain coaching position salaries, a separate one for equipment, a third for boathouse improvements. Coordinating volunteers takes a great deal of time and energy. We believe that attempting to organize multiple alumni/ae activities can lead to breakdown from year to year. We recommend that Friends consider hiring a staff person, perhaps paying for part of the time of someone in a position at an Institute office. This person could enable all of us to provide more effective volunteer help by taking on the communication/coordination tasks that are so difficult to perform consistently with a volunteer organization. The job description might include assisting with:

- fund-raising efforts and record keeping;
- regular preparation and distribution of “Squaring the Blade,” the Friends publication that the coaches have recently begun to manage through an outside publication service;
- communication among alumni/ae interested in attending races;
- coordination and preparation for Friends events such as the Fall Dinner;
- convenient contact point for questions by alumni/ae;
- help alumni/ae willing to support coaches’ recruiting efforts and help communicate the limitations of recruiting;
- coordinate any other Friends volunteer activities where help is needed, whether preparation for events, sales of items like sweatshirts, follow-up on donations, etc.
- maintain a web site for Friends of MIT Crew.

The staff person would serve the Managing Committee of Friends in order to enable all of us to communicate more easily and volunteer more efficiently.

Gender Equity:

The Committee believes MIT must establish the principle of gender equity within the rowing program to avoid a very disturbing trend at large state schools to use disproportionate funding of women’s rowing to balance men’s football or other sports for purposes of Title IX.

Funding for Trips:

Cover or offset the cost to students to participate in the winter training trips to Florida each year during IAP. Support other earned trips in exceptional years, such as San Diego Crew Classic, national championships and Henley.

Increase Funding for Equipment:

Friends has succeeded in improving the quality of the boats, oars and other equipment during recent years despite the stagnant Athletic Department budget. This is only a partial success: while efforts to create endowments to support boats in individuals’ names and other

donations of equipment have helped, they have not succeeded in placing sufficient funds into the endowment to ensure those needs are met year-to-year.

Boathouse:

We consider the boathouse to be adequate now but filled to its limit. Plans have been considered for boathouse expansion in the past. Addition of a lightweight women's crew is essentially impossible without more space. (Presently, both light and heavy women row, but there is not separate, properly sized equipment for two full squads, and they row together under one team of coaches.) Growth of all of the crews is hampered. We consider this priority to be lower than coaching and equipment because of the general adequacy of the boathouse at this time and because of the much larger cost of building/expanding the boathouse.

Alumni/ae Involvement:

The two ways almost everyone says alumni/ae can help are with money and by becoming involved personally. Activities may include fund-raising, attending races, helping with recruiting (guidelines will have to be set up with the Athletic Director's help), support and interaction with undergraduates, Friends dinners and meetings, and more. We do not want to dilute alumni/ae interest by asking for more than can comfortably be given, however.

IMPLEMENTATION: TASKS AND CHALLENGES

I. Evaluating the Cost of Achieving These Priorities.

As we finalize our thoughts on what priorities should guide Friends for the next 10-15 years, we have also continued to consider how to achieve those priorities. One idea that appeals to us is to establish “endowed funds” for specific purposes such as coaching positions, equipment, travel and the boathouse in order to be able to set specific financial goals for fund-raising and, once the targets are reached, to be able to ensure goals are met without the present year-to-year uncertainty.

Friends quickly raised sufficient amounts early in its existence to enable the money it raised to be put into the MIT endowment. Funds for these priorities could be handled the same way. (Alternatively, an independent 501 (1)(3) organization could be established to receive and manage the funds, as some other programs have done [see Appendix D]). Friends could then decide annually in coordination with the MIT Administration how much was available and how to spend it.

We have evaluated the cost of salaries, equipment and other needs using estimates for we have requested specific data on salaries and costs and intend to continue to meet with the Administration to refine our estimates. Our overall, ballpark estimate of what we need to raise \$10-15 million. To arrive at that figure, we considered what we estimate the cost will be of each priority. (That effort is necessarily a matter of guess work, in part.) We took what we know or can best figure the amount required will be, and then compared that to funding presently provided by the Administration (again, as we can best estimate it). We then assume that the Institute funding should remain at least constant and calculate the shortfall to achieve the goal(s). We then calculate the amount of endowment that would be required to yield an annual payout at a conservative rate of return to provide the needed funds. Our efforts in this regard have repeatedly yielded ball park estimates on the order of \$10-15 million. Obviously, these efforts at financial planning must be refined if and as Friends proceeds toward a major fund raising campaign to achieve and support the priorities.

II. The Future of Friends.

Friends began as a rainy day fund and has grown to become much more than that. It has kept our Crew in decent equipment through extraordinarily lean years at the Athletic Department. Going forward, we recommend:

- Consider/adopt priorities
- Establish an administrative assistant position answerable to the Managing Committee.
- Look at structure of Friends and how it operates to achieve three goals (see comments and outline of ideas attached as Appendix E for consideration):
 1. Continuity year to year;
 2. Participation by alumni/ae from all eras;

3. Efficient progress toward established goals.
- Continue to work with MIT Administration to achieve priorities and, if this fails, evaluate alternatives outside MIT.
 - Develop financial support from alumni for priorities.
 - Involve alumni/ae in non-financial activities/priorities.

III. Coordinating with the Administration

MIT is a world class institution with capable leadership. We firmly believe that MIT Crew can and should be supported by the Institute at an appropriate level, and that alumni/ae support can and should be able to supplement the Administration in a cooperative way. At the same time, as we propose to embark on a major fund raising campaign, some preparation is in order. We must confirm at the outset that the Administration agrees with the intended uses of the funds and the mechanism for oversight of their use. We are still engaged at this time in additional information gathering. As that progresses, we will report to you in a future report or “Squaring the Blade.”

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this evaluation of the future of Friends. We are pleased to say we believe that the strong alumni/ae support for MIT Crew bodes well for the future.

Respectfully submitted,

John Everett, Ph.D., P.E.
Ingrid Klass Gorman, M.D.
Joan Whitten Miller, M.D.
Dustin P. Ordway
Chester Riley
Mike Scott

To contact the members of the Strategic Planning Committee by e-mail, send your message to mitcrew@external.cisco.com.

Appendices

APPENDIX A

Rules and Regulations of the Friends of MIT Crew

(As agreed in April 1985 between the Friends of MIT Crew and MIT)

1. The name of the association shall be The Friends of MIT Crew.
2. Membership as a Friend of MIT Crew shall be open to everyone who supports rowing at MIT.
3. The association shall be managed by a managing Committee (“Committee”) composed of alumni of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology who have either rowed, coxswained, or managed MIT men’s heavyweight, lightweight, or women’s college crews. The Managing Committee shall be self-perpetuating and may elect new members as it deems wise and helpful, except that no current coach of any MIT crew or other personnel of the MIT Athletic Department may remain on or be elected to the Committee. However, the men’s and women’s varsity coaches and the Director of Athletics, or their designated representatives, may be invited to attend each meeting of the Committee.
4. The Committee shall select a Chair, one or more Vice Chairs, a Treasurer, and a Secretary, and may, in addition, select one or more honorary officers.
5. The dues shall not be any set figure, but shall be according to the interest and financial capacity of the individual.
6. The Treasurer shall send out at least one letter of solicitation each year.
7. The Secretary shall send out at least two newsletters each year.
8. In order to make gifts deductible for income tax purposes, checks must be made payable to The Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
9. All monies received from any source whatever shall be held by the Treasurer of MIT to be spent at the discretion of the Committee whether for current use or investment, subject only to such limitations and restrictions not otherwise inconsistent herewith as may be stipulated by the Treasurer of MIT. All monies to be spent for rowing related equipment or personnel at MIT Athletic Department facilities shall be spent with the consent of the Director of Athletics or his delegee. For the period from January 1, 1985, through December 31, 1987, accounts of the monies of the Friends of MIT Crew shall be maintained with the MIT Athletic Department, subject to transfer to such other Accounts at the Institute at the pleasure of the Committee. During the calendar year 1987, the

Committee shall consult with the Director of Athletics and the Treasurer of MIT and shall thereafter determine how the accounts of the Friends of MIT Crew shall thereafter be maintained.

10. The Committee's functions shall be solely financial. It shall under no circumstances interfere with the coaching or management of any of the crews of the selection or dismissal of any coach, though this prohibition is not intended to prevent any member of the Committee from the expression of thoughts or opinions as an individual. The Committee reserves the right to refuse a request for its financial help, either in whole or in part.
11. These Rules and Regulations shall be provided to all present and future members of the Committee of the Friends of MIT Crew and shall be read by the Secretary at each annual meeting of the Committee.

[END]

APPENDIX B

Charge To The Committee

Room 1-172
MIT
77 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139-4307
617/253-4192
Fax 617/258-7598

October 12, 1998

Dustin P. Ordway
Dickinson Wright
200 Ottawa Avenue
Suite 900
Grand Rapids, MI 49503

Re: Strategy Review of the Mission of the Friends of MIT Crew

Dear Dustin:

This is a follow-up to our discussions over the past several months, during which time we have discussed the form and structure of a new initiative on behalf of the Friends. This is a formal request on behalf of the Friends that you and a Committee of five other undergraduate alumnae of MIT conduct a strategy review of the mission and focus of the Friends of MIT Crew. This is to also confirm that Chet Riley, '62, Mike Scott, '73, Ingrid Klass Gorman, '76, John Everett, '77, and Joan Whitten Miller, '80, have agreed to serve with you on this Committee. Your group brings great experience as oarsmen and women, coaches, and national team members to this effort. The six of you also offer a broad perspective on crew at MIT and a long-standing commitment to intercollegiate rowing.

We have had thirteen years of notable success in raising funds and bringing news of the rowing program to alumnae. It is time, however, to pause, assess what has been accomplished, and make recommendations as to how, if at all, the activities of the Friends should be redirected over the next ten to fifteen years.

The specific charge of the Committee is this. What should the Friends be doing to support the intercollegiate rowing program over the next ten to fifteen years, both conceptually and specifically? How should the Friends position itself to keep the intercollegiate rowing program healthy and prosperous? What, if anything, should we be doing differently or more effectively to assist the intercollegiate rowing program at MIT.

As we have discussed, this effort will likely involve some comparative fact gathering about the rowing programs at MIT and other EARC/NCAA schools, along with data collection, interviews, and meetings with oarsmen/women, coaches, staff, and members of the MIT administration. This will be an open process in which other interested alumni are able to provide their input to your group.

The core concept of the Friends, embodied in its original charter, has been a partnership with the Athletic Director. Last year, I discussed the subject of a strategy review of the Friends effort by a small group of rowing alumni with Dick Hill, MIT's Athletic Director, who has been very supportive of FOMIT Crew and of the rowing program. I have also discussed the concept with Stu Schmill, Director of Crew. Both are supportive of this strategy review.

We are looking for the Committee's report in the Spring of 1999, and hope to be in a position to review and act on its recommendations during Alumni week in June, 1999.

Thank you for being willing to undertake this task. We will attempt to help in any way we can, including making the records of the Friends available ASAP.

Very truly yours,

John B. Miller
Managing Committee
Friends of MIT Crew

Cc: Richard A. Hill, Director of Athletics
Stuart Schmill, Director of Crew
Chet Riley
Michael Scott
Ingrid Gorman
John Everett
Joan Miller

APPENDIX C

MIT Rowing: Current Status

A. Rowers

Currently, MIT has a men's heavyweight, men's lightweight, and women's rowing program, each with freshman components. The women's program sometimes enters lightweight boats, but has not formal women's lightweight program. MIT typically competes in athletics as a Division 3 school, but competes in rowing in Division 1. This year there were 100 novice men and 80 novice women, with upper-class rowers bringing the total to approximately 300.

B. Coaches

MIT has one part-time men's heavyweight and a part-time freshman heavy men's coach. The men's lightweight coach is full-time, also functioning as Director of Crew, and the freshman men's coach is part-time. The women's crew coach is a full-time position with a part-time freshman coach. Coaches are no longer tenured, although a special coach's tenure track exists at MIT.

C. Equipment

The current average fleet age of the boats is 6.6 years; heavyweight shells (5.9 yrs); lightweight shells (7.6 yrs); women's shells (6.4 yrs). Ideally, the average age would be 4.5 years, which requires that three new boats are bought per year, one per program. If one wishes to provide gender equity in crew, 4 boats per year should be bought, 2 for the men and 2 for the women, and consideration should be given to starting a women's lightweight program. A new Vespoli 8 costs \$21,000, a new Empacher 8 costs \$28,000, and oars cost \$2300/10 oars.

D. Boathouse

The boathouse holds a maximum of 24 eights. There is a women's locker room, men's locker room, and guest crew locker room. Available floor space is covered with rowing ergometers and weight equipment.

E. Funding

Funding is divided between MIT Physical Plant, Athletic Department operating budget, various endowed funds at the disposal of the Athletic Department, rowers, and FOMIT.

1. MIT Physical Plant

MIT Physical Plant pays for heat, electricity, some general maintenance and exterior painting. However, it appears that the Pierce boathouse is not a high priority.

2. Athletic Department Operating Budget

The Athletic Department pays for salaries for coaches, shop personnel, shop work, nuts, bolts, parts, launch gas, housekeeping. Approximately \$50-60,000 is provided during racing season for uniforms, conference dues, slickers, and travel expenses. This year the Athletic department paid for revarnishing the boathouse lobby at a cost of \$4000. The proceeds of used equipment sales, i.e. rowing shells, are returned to the Athletic Department funds.

3. Crew Endowment Funds

These endowed funds include the McCurdy funds, the Jackson fund, and the Rowe fund. One of the McCurdy funds endowed the Director of Crew position, but the funds are currently used to fund equipment.

The endowed funds are used to finance the Florida trip, paying for coaches travel and boat transport, and purchase of equipment including ergometers, oars, weight equipment, launches, trailer, truck. The funds are also used to pay USRA dues, Head of the Charles entries, and other fall racing schedule expenses.

4. Rowers

Rowers are responsible for paying for the Florida trip, typically \$300 per person.

5. FOMIT

The FOMIT fund produces an income of \$20-25,000, and annual gifts are on the order of \$50-70,000. The fund pays for the newsletter production and mailing which costs \$4-5000 per issue for 3000 pieces. The fund pays for the annual dinner in the Fall and the invitations and mailing. FOMIT pays for the Head of the Ohio regatta, but donations from Pittsburgh area alumni/ae are returned to the fund. FOMIT funds have been used to bridge special donations, when shells are donated by a specific group but cash flow is insufficient, i.e. Peterson and Muri shells. FOMIT pays for donor recognition items such as oar plaques. Recent purchases include a training barge and two lightweight fours.

APPENDIX D

Report on Other Programs

MIT competes in the highest level of intercollegiate crew. Several of the most successful crew programs, in terms of winning races, are also MIT's academic peer institutions. To help find out what has contributed to other successful programs' successes, the Committee surveyed several schools to benchmark such basic information as:

Funding

- crew endowments
- annual contribution to crew from endowment income
- annual contribution to crew from alumni/ae/friends annual giving
- what endowment income and annual giving pays for Coaching
- number of coaches and full- or part-time status
- who pays coaches' salaries

Recruiting and athletic scholarships

Admissions

The schools surveyed were:

University of Washington
Harvard University
University of California at Berkeley
Yale University
Brown University
University of Wisconsin
University of Michigan
University of Virginia

Funding

Not surprisingly, the successful programs are well-funded. Funding comes from three main sources: athletic department, crew endowment income, and alumni/ae/ friends annual giving. However, the relative contribution of each of these components varies widely among schools.

In one scenario (e.g., Harvard), the athletic department pays for everything except special trips (Henley, national championships) which are covered on a case-by-case basis by Friends' approval of expenditures from endowment income. The only expenditure from annual giving are when someone wants to donate a boat, but this is usually handled through the Friends.

In another scenario (e.g., Berkeley), the crew is dependent for its very survival on endowment income to support day-to-day operating expenses, and receives relatively little from the athletic department. Yale, while not worried about survival, also receives a large fraction of its funding from endowment income. In another scenario (e.g., Wisconsin), there is significant annual giving but no endowment income.

The other programs fall somewhere in between. Each of the programs seems to have reached an equilibrium among the funding sources. In some cases, the Friends are very sensitive about being called upon to support an increasing burden of what has historically been the Athletic Department's responsibility. In other cases, the Friends have accepted the fact that they must support the crew or it will be eliminated or allowed to wither. In several cases, the coaching staff knows it can make a few phone calls to get support for special needs (new shell, special trips).

Table 1 summarizes some of the facts and figures regarding endowment income and annual giving. It is difficult to compare all of these programs with each other and with MIT, partially because we do not have complete information (even for MIT), but also because the programs vary considerably in such factors as:

- total budget
- contribution of athletic department
- number of athletes and separate teams: heavyweight men, lightweight men, heavyweight women, lightweight women
- number of coaches and their salaries (full- or part-time)
- how much is spent on recruiting
- how much is spent on athletic scholarship

Table 1 - Endowment Income and Annual Giving

School	Endowment	Endowment Contribution	Friends/Alumni Annual Giving Contribution	Pays For
Washington	2,000,000	100,000		Shells, oars, launches, spring trip
Harvard	seven figures	50,000		Special trips, spring break
Berkeley	7,000,000	220,000		Day-to-day operations
Yale	5,000,000???	250,000		Shells, oars, launches, spring trip
Brown	700,000		85,000 + 1 shell (includes endowment contribution)	Spring trip, IRA camp, equipment
Wisconsin	100,000	-0-	125,000	Special trips, spring break
Virginia	-0-	-0-	27,000 + 32K	Day-to-day operations
MIT	? 700,000			

Coaching

In all cases (except possibly Virginia??), the coaches are paid by the athletic department. This buffers the job security of the coaches from the whims and meddling of the alumni and friends organizations. Several of the charters or the friends' organizations even contained specific wording stating that the friends shall have no input into the hiring and firing of individual coaches.

All of the coaches surveyed agreed that paying competitive coaches salaries is important in: attracting and retaining the best coaches, maintaining continuity, allowing the coaching staff time to recruit, and attracting prospective students. Table 2 shows the number and status (full- and part-time) of coaches in the programs surveyed.

Table 2 - Number and Status of Coaches

School	Full Time	Part Time	Notes
Washington	2 men, 3 women		
Harvard	4 men, 3 women		no lightweights
Berkeley	2 men, 2 women		
Yale	4 men, 2 women		
Brown	2 men, 2 women		no lightweights
Wisconsin	3 men, 5 women (3 heavy, 2 light)		+ paid graduate assistants
Virginia	1 men, 3 women	1 men	
MIT	1 men, 1 women	5	

Recruiting and Athletic Scholarships

Every program surveyed agreed that recruiting has become a major issue in crew today. The days when a fast crew could be assembled from walk-ons ended in the mid-1980s. All of the successful crews recruit heavily, although the form varies. The programs with full-time coaches, particularly at the freshman and freshmen level, are the ones that can promote the strongest recruiting efforts.

The most notable difference has come about in women's programs. In the past few years, many women's crews have become varsity sports with very high levels of funding, including as many as 20 full athletic scholarships. This has been primarily due to efforts to comply with Title IX regulations. Some of the women's programs have been able to hire successful men's coaches by offering much better salaries and benefits.

As a result, the power structure in women's crew is now undergoing a dramatic change. Most coaches expect that traditional powers such as Princeton, Yale, and Radcliffe/Harvard will be left behind by large state schools that allow athletic scholarships. The Universities of Washington and Wisconsin, who have been successful for many years are being challenged by relative newcomers such as Massachusetts, Virginia, Michigan, Texas, California-Berkeley and others.

For men's programs, the change has not been so much based on athletic scholarships. There are several schools (not part of this survey) that offer athletic scholarships to men, but only Washington and Berkeley seem to have translated that into consistently fast boats. It appears unlikely that the large state schools with up and coming women's programs will have parallel success with their men's programs because most of the funding is aimed at women's crews.

We see this as an alarming trend for crew as an NCAA sport since it appears that powerful men's programs use women's crew to "comply" with Title IX at some schools. This kind of numbers game will not work for colleges with long term commitments to both men's and women's crew, particularly in the EARC/EARWC. We foresee a time when women's rowing at EARC/EARWC schools must be structured differently than the NCAA in order to comply with the letter and spirit of Title IX, and to maintain competitive levels among EARC/EARWC schools.

There is a great deal of recruiting taking place in the form of flying prospective students in to visit campus, coaches traveling to high schools and high school regattas, mail and telephone contact, and in some cases, help with admissions.

The level of enthusiasm for recruiting varies. Some coaches do it reluctantly, and only to remain competitive. Others thrive on the challenge and think that if you are not willing and eager to devote yourself to recruiting, you cannot build or sustain a competitive program. One coach said he does not like it, but he, with whatever support is necessary from the friends, will do whatever it takes to keep up with other programs that are raising the stakes.

Perhaps surprisingly, most of the coaches surveyed believe that MIT should be able to compete for student athletes as well as any program in the country. Most of the best crew programs are also at the top in academics. Because MIT's academic peers do not give athletic scholarships, MIT is not at a disadvantage in recruiting against Brown, Dartmouth, Cornell, Harvard, Yale, or Princeton. MIT's orientation toward engineering and science makes it stand out compared to many of the liberal arts oriented schools. MIT's reputation internationally is far stronger than the Ivy League schools'.

Admissions

The amount of help the coaching staff can expect in getting a prospective student athlete admitted varies. One very successful (former) Ivy League coach said that the coach of every school MIT competes against can take a prioritized list of 20 names to admissions and expect to get 7-8 of the top 10 and another 2-3 of the bottom 10 admitted. Another, equally successful, Ivy

League coach said he cannot get much help getting a marginally qualified student in, but he can help getting a qualified applicant prioritized. There are more qualified applicants than places in the freshman class, so some consideration of athletic ability could help someone stand out in the qualified pool. The coaches and possibly the Friends/alumni/ae may have some influence in this regard at other schools.

Another coach said he could get some help if he really wanted to, but he does not even bother. The types of students who will be successful at crew already can get admitted by themselves.

Summary of Input from Other Schools

There is no dominant model of the Friends-Crew relationship. Very successful programs get the job done in very different ways. Some crews rely heavily on their Friends for financial support and for their very existence. Some schools have multi-million dollar endowments; others have little endowment by comparison. In all cases, however, the Friends seem to make up whatever shortfall there is in the athletic department's support. None of the coaches seemed to be moaning about lack of resources.

It was also clear that all of these programs have far greater support for coaching salaries compared to MIT. All have full time varsity and freshmen coaches. Some have a third full time coach and/or part time assistants.

The impact of Title IX on major public universities appears to be heading toward massive support for women's crew (only) in order to "balance" existing support for football. We believe that MIT should take the lead, along with other EARC/EARWC schools, in making gender equity within crew a reality.

Recruiting is relatively new theme, but it is pervasive, aggressive, and extremely competitive. Every coach said you need the athletes or you will get nowhere. Recruiting varies from on-campus to worldwide, but none of the programs sits around and waits to see who happens to show up in September, and none relies on mass mailings alone. The challenge for us is to translate this information into a program that works at MIT.

APPENDIX E

FOMIT Crew Structure: Strawman proposals

As noted in the text of the report, the Committee has discussed how to implement the priorities we now recommend, including how the structure of Friends and the ways Friends serves all alumni/ae in our efforts to support Crew are relevant. Friends is governed by a Managing Committee and is presently available to support any alumni/ae initiative. Our discussions have focused on how the structure can best serve the purposes of Friends. From our perspective, it is important for Friends to be inclusive and self-perpetuating. At the same time, we do not want a bureaucracy that takes up volunteer time with "busy work" rather than focusing

our energy on productive work with alumni and the MIT Administration. Many tasks (such as ours) may be short-term and simply require formation of an ad hoc committee to perform the work or oversee the project.

Two Concepts:

We offer two approaches or concepts for your consideration and comment.

A. **Minimal Structure:** One concept is to maintain a somewhat minimal structure and identify one or more key committees on an as-needed basis that should address immediate concerns. The hiring of a staff person to help coordinate the work of Friends may minimize how much is built into the organizational structure, and facilitate the volunteer participation of more alumni/ae without formalizing the creation of additional committees or procedures.

B. **Expanded Organizational Structure:** Another approach that outlines additional structural elements is set forth below:

I. Executive Committee

A. Membership

1. 5 total (could be 3, preferably a relatively small and odd number to make sure there are no ties).

2. At least 2 of these folks need to reside close enough to MIT to regularly meet with the Crew Director(s)/coaches, the MIT Athletic Department, and other MIT folks as necessary.

3. Officers should include a President, Vice-President, Treasurer, Secretary, and ?. The President runs the meetings. The Vice President fills in for the President as needed. The Treasurer watches over and reports on all the financial transactions. The Secretary records all the minutes/decisions.

B. Term

1. 2 years, elected annually at the FOMITC meeting or by mail/e-mail prior to that.

2. Start this initially with appointed members for the first 2 years. The folks initially appointed could have different length terms (1, 2, or possibly 3 years) so that you never have a bunch of newbies running the show.

C. Meeting frequency

1. Officially once/month via scheduled conference calls.

2. Physically at MIT once/quarter.

- time.
3. Everyone active on e-mail so regular dialogue can occur all the time.
 4. Ad-hoc conference calls/meetings can be scheduled as required.

D. Responsibilities

1. Maintain a close and working relationship with the Athletic Department, the Crew Directors/coaches, and other MIT folks as necessary.
2. Manage how the endowments are spent in conjunction with the coaches and the Athletic Department. Endowment target sizes would be determined by this group.
3. Of critical importance is to do everything feasible to insure the endowment money is spent to attain the most competitive and rewarding experience possible for the MIT oarsmen/women. This will involve making sure that the coach salaries are truly competitive among their rowing peers.
4. Has overall responsibility for the management of FOMITC, which includes oversight and high-level direction setting for all other Committees.
5. If a full-time or part-time person is actually hired using FOMITC funding/endowments, then that hire would have some type of reporting relationship to the Executive Committee although their day-to-day management would more likely be by either a Crew Director or someone in the Alumni office. This staff person would assist all of the FOMITC Committees.

II. Fund Raising Committee

A. Membership

1. 14: 2 each from the graduating classes of 193x & earlier, 194x, 195x, 196x, 197x, 198x, and 199x. It can be expanded when we have 200x grads. For each decade starting with 197x, there should be one male and one female. The Executive Committee has flexibility with the numbers and composition of this Committee, so, for example, if there are three very well qualified candidates from one decade, then that could be accommodated.

2. Officers should include a President, Vice-President, Treasurer, Secretary, and ?. The President runs the meetings. The Vice President fills in for the President as needed. The Treasurer watches over and reports on all the financial transactions. The Secretary records all the minutes/decisions.

B. Term

1. Until the targeted endowments have been reached, presumably several years? The point is that this Committee will exist only for so long as major fund-raising needs to be going on.

2. The alumni/ae would be polled for those that would have the interest, time, and background necessary to be successful with this. From those that volunteer or express interest, the Executive Committee would select those that are best qualified.

C. Meeting frequency

1. Officially once/month via scheduled conference calls.
- 2.. Physically at MIT once/quarter.
3. Everyone active on email so regular dialogue can occur all the time.
- 4, Ad-hoc conference calls/meetings can be scheduled as required.

D. Responsibilities

1. Work closely with the Alumni/ae office to target alumni and raise the funds.
2. Call, write, visit alumni/ae to raise the funds.
3. Keep the Executive Committee updated on plans, progress, problems on at least a monthly basis.

III. Communications Committee

A. Membership

1. 9 alumni/ae. At least 2 women. At least two that graduated no earlier than 1985. At least 5 of these folks need to reside close enough to MIT to be able to regularly attend crew races and meet with oarsmen/women.

2. Officers should include a President, Vice-President, and a Secretary. The President runs the meetings. The Vice President fills in for the President as needed. The Secretary records all the minutes/decisions.

B. Term

1. 2 years, elected annually at the FOMITC meeting or by mail/e-mail prior to that.

2. The alumni/ae would be polled for those that would have the interest, time, and background necessary to be successful with this. From those that volunteer or express interest, the Executive Committee would select those that are best qualified.

C. Meeting Frequency

1. Officially once/month via scheduled conference calls.
2. Physically at MIT once/quarter.
3. Everyone active on email so regular dialogue can occur all the time.
4. Ad-hoc conference calls/meetings can be scheduled as required.

D. Responsibilities

1. Write/publish the Squaring of the Blade newsletter, obviously with input/help from the Crew Directors/coaches and with inputs from the Executive Committee and Fund Raising Committee.

2. Organize and publicize alumni/ae involvement at all the races and other major events like the annual fall FOMITC dinner, the spring reunion/alumni/ae race, the IAP Florida trip, etc..

3. Keep the Executive Committee updated on plans, progress, problems on at least monthly.

4. Assist the Crew coaches, in any way that is consistent with NCAA and MIT Athletic Department rules/regulations, to recruit the best oarsmen/women that meet MIT's rigorous admission requirements.