

Annual Report to Faculty Council
From the Faculty Athletics Committee

Submitted by Daryhl L Johnson II
Chair, Faculty Athletics Committee
Assistant Professor, Dept. of Surgery
October 6, 2017

I. Committee Overview

The Faculty Athletics Committee (FAC) “informs and represents the faculty and advises the chancellor on any aspect of athletics, including, but not limited to, the academic and broader University experience for varsity student athletes and the general conduct and operation of the University’s athletic program” (Faculty Code § 4-7[b], Amended 2/19/16).

Beginning with the 2016-2017 academic year, FAC’s membership was expanded to include 12 faculty members.

- **Term expiring 2017:** John B. Stephens, School of Government; Beverly Foster, School of Nursing; David Guilkey, Economics; Josefa Lindquist, Romance Studies.
- **Term expiring 2018:** Daryhl Johnson, School of Medicine; Layna Mosley, Political Science; Darin Padua, Exercise and Sports Science; Andrew Perrin, Sociology
- **Term expiring 2019:** Melissa Geil, English and Comparative Literature, Steven Knotek, Psychology; Andrew Perrin, Sociology; Deborah Stroman, Kenan-Flagler; Kim Strom-Gottfried, School of Social Work.

Lissa Broome served as Faculty Athletics Representative to the ACC and the NCAA, and thus served as an ex officio member of the FAC. Chancellor Carol Folt attends regularly, as her schedule permits; when she is unable to attend, she typically sends a representative. Several non-voting consultants also attend regularly, provide information and seek the Committee’s advice. They include Director of Athletics Lawrence Cunningham; Senior Associate Athletic Director and Senior Woman Administrator Nikki Moore; Associate Athletic Director Robbi Pickerall Evans; Director for the Academic Support Program for Student Athletes, Michelle Brown; and a representative from the Provost’s Process Review Group (Debbi Clarke). Two student-athletes, chosen by the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, also take part in FAC meetings. In 2016-2017, the students were Ezra Baeli-Wang (Fencing) and Blake Dodge (Track and Field).

FAC’s internal structure has evolved in recent years, with a general effort to more clearly define the tasks and responsibilities of each member, allowing members to develop expertise in certain areas, while also being mindful of faculty members’ other commitments and responsibilities. The position of vice-chair was added for 2016-17.

Layna Mosley served as FAC Chair in Fall 2016, and John B. Stephens was Chair for Spring 2017. Two vice-chairs were established in April 2016, one for internal assistance and the other for external and special projects, including the ad hoc **Committee on the Future of Sport**. Andrew Perrin was the internal vice-chair. The other vice-Chairs were John Stephens in fall semester and Daryhl Johnson in spring semester. Mosley and Stephens thus had formal or ex-officio roles with the ASPSA Advisory Committee, the Title IX Committee, Athletics Department Drug Policy Review Committee, Athletics Council, Student Athlete Advisory Council, the Process Review Group (formerly the Student-Athlete Academic Initiative Working Group), and multiple individual meetings with groups and individuals involved with our students participating in sports.

An initiative begun in spring 2016, per faculty council resolution, was the ad hoc **Committee on the Future of Sport**. The committee is described below, and From February 2016-present, was chaired by Kim Strom-Gottfried, John Stephens, and Daryhl Johnson

As in previous years, each member of FAC was assigned a “topic area,” for which the member was responsible for developing expertise, liaising with relevant parties on campus (for instance, in the case of the Academics topic area experts, participating in the campus review of Course Clustering), and presenting information to FAC. Topic area experts also participate in the Academic Initiative Working Group’s meetings when that body is reviewing processes relevant to their area. The topic areas include Academics; Admissions; Advising; and Student-Athlete Experience. FAC members who have experience on the Committee usually move to a new “topic area” role at some point, so that they have the opportunity to provide input on, and gather information about, an additional element of the committee’s work.

Each member of FAC also was assigned as a liaison to (typically) two varsity athletics teams. The rationale behind the team liaison assignment was that it would allow members to develop direct relationships with student-athletes, academic counselors and coaches, and that this would improve the flow of information between FAC, on the one hand, and those involved in athletics, on the other. In their team liaison role, FAC members might attend a team meeting or practice; meet with the coaching staff; meet with the academic counselors assigned to their team; or meet with individual members of the team. FAC members have approached this liaison role in various ways, reflecting differences across sports, as well as varying capacities to commit time to this role. In any case, the team liaison activity has allowed FAC members to gather information and bring perspectives that are specific to individual sports – recognizing, for instance, that the concerns of student-athletes in volleyball or basketball may not be the same as those in football or golf.

II. Activities in 2016-2017

NCAA legislation – main item: rules to protect student time related to competition travel and down time from their respective sports.

ACC network

The ACC Network was announced in July 2016 and August 19, 2016 was the first ACC Network-Extra production (i.e. a live Internet stream of a women's soccer match). The biggest front-end effect of the network is for each college to create or expand media production capabilities to meet ESPN standards and to create productions for the network. For UNC, the plan is to seek Board of Governors approval in January 2017 to build new production facilities to be ready by Fall 2019, per the terms of the ACC Network agreement.

Ken Cleary noted that fall 2019 is the launch of the cable channel part of the network. For 2019-20, the ACC Network will carry a minimum of 1200 broadcasts of sports in either digital or linear (cable channel) formats.

- December presentation and January discussion. Concerns about potential changes in travel and competition schedules which could put more pressure on student-athletes related to course and major selection and class attendance and performance.

ACC

September –

Lissa Broome's update document includes the priorities for the ACC for the coming year set by Lissa Broome, Bubba Cunningham, and Nicki Moore (UNC's senior woman administrator) as they lead their respective groups. Baeli-Wang, who heads the ACC SAAC this year, listed his priorities as well.

They are:

- Awareness (sexual assault, domestic violence, mental health/wellness, HB2, SAAC, career development)
- Legislation (time demands, early recruitment, transparency)
- Community outreach (ACC Sportsmanship Week, Project Life)

October –

Athletic Director Bubba Cunningham discussed the decision to play football on Saturday, October 8, notwithstanding the rain and wind accompanying Hurricane Matthew

Chancellor - The “Seats for Service” for football games has been well received and all local first responders have been able to attend a Carolina football game thanks funds donated to the Athletics Department by fans for this purpose.

Academics

- Course clustering and majors
- Support and opportunities
- Relative performance of UNC student-athletes
 - a) Against goals of excellence set by Athletics Department
 - b) Three metrics to compare team performance against peers
 - c) More sophisticated comparisons via NCAA PII data

Academics Subgroup

The four members of the Academics Subgroup have divided their work between an internal focus (David Guilkey, Deb Stroman), which will include a review of course clustering and majors of student-athletes, and an external focus (Steven Knotek, Darin Padua), which will compare UNC’s performance on GSR, FGR, APR with other schools in the ACC and the NCAA. The Academics Subgroup will continue to serve as a resource for Debbi Clarke and the Process Review Group when needed.

David Guilkey presented the report comparing student-athlete majors to those of the student body. The report is attached. The committee considered whether there were majors that were not available to student-athletes. There are application processes to be admitted into some majors such as those offered by the School of Media and Journalism and the Kenan-Flagler Business School. In addition, some majors within the College of Arts & Sciences have minimum GPA requirements, which might make some of these majors not available options for some student-athletes. The most popular student-athlete major is Exercise and Sport Science, but that is also a popular major among the student body and a popular major at other colleges. Ezra Baeli-Wang said that some student-athletes change their mind about their intended major after they matriculate. Sometimes the change may be based on the difficulty of the major, particularly given the student’s time commitment to athletics. The subgroup may try to build upon data collected by Dean Abigail Panter to prepare a report for student-athletes that shows the desired major for student-athletes at matriculation and the actual major. FAC members may also wish to discuss major choice and barriers to majors in the upcoming SAAC Focus Groups. The NCAA now allows courses for minors to count in the Progress Towards Degree calculations so it was suggested that it might be interesting for future reports on majors of non-athlete students compared to student-athletes to also include a comparison of the minors.

GSR and FGR data for UNC student-athletes who matriculated in from 2006 to 2009 was also reviewed (attached). The GSR is adversely impacted by student-athletes who left the University during the NCAA investigation that began in 2010.

The subgroup asked FAC about its preference for further discussion on one of the three following topics: Effectiveness of team liaison program (0), effectiveness of priority registration (2), and issues related to student-athletes with remaining athletic eligibility but who are near earning their degrees (9). The latter topic was discussed briefly. It was noted that for students who have redshirted or who come in with AP credits this can be an issue. The student may get slowed down on their progress towards degree so that they are still working on their degree while they have athletics eligibility, the student-athlete may graduate and apply for graduate school here, the student-athlete may graduate and apply for graduate school at another institution, or the student-athlete may graduate and pursue a certificate program through the graduate school. The latter course is employed by N.C. State, but has not been used by UNC. UNC is exploring with the Graduate School and the academic departments how UNC's existing graduate certificate programs might be used for these student-athletes, allowing them to graduate and then finish their athletic eligibility while pursuing a graduate certificate.

At the March FAC meeting, the Academics Subgroup focusing on external issues will present data from the NCAA's Institutional Performance Program comparing the performance of our student-athletes receiving athletics aid with student-athletes from other institutions. Bubba will provide the subgroup access to the IPP portal and contact information for the NCAA research group if there is other data that the group would like to analyze.

Admissions

- Trends in more student-athletes beginning their UNC career in spring semester, rather than summer school or fall semester. Monitoring about orientation, concerns about short turnaround from high school final grades to course planning and scheduling for their first semester. Have been a trend toward more such admissions; FAC will continue to monitor the pros and cons of this point of entry for academic goals.

There was discussion about more student-athletes entering UNC in the spring semester. There is a trend for December high school graduation, and starting UNC classes in January. Discussion noted NCAA rules constraints on what can be done to onboard these student-athletes. Mosley noted this touches on several areas: admissions, advising, and appropriate course choices. She would like to know if there is data on how these students are doing.

Michelle Brown described the increased academic programming ASPSA is offering for January enrollees. One goal is to support these students in forming a cohort among themselves, regardless of team affiliation. It was noted there could be further attention to this area, but discussion was concluded in order to move to the joint meeting of the

Faculty Athletics Committee and the Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Admissions.

- Joint meeting with **Undergraduate Admissions Advisory Committee (December)**
The criteria for review by the Committee on Special Talent is projected GPA (PGPA). A formula developed with the Odum Institute, PGPA draws on test scores and high school course grades, to predict about 1/3rd of the variation in first-year performance. Three groups are identified: Group 1, PGPA of less than 2.3; Group 2, PGPA of between 2.3 and 2.6; and Group 3, PGPA equal or greater than 2.6.

The aim over time is to move students out of the lower end of the PGPA and into the upper end. The Athletics Department has been very supportive in helping make decisions about whom to recruit and that has made a huge difference, according to Farmer.

Perrin asked Farmer if he has evaluated the boundaries between groups 1 and 2, and groups 2 and 3. Farmer replied that examination of the boundaries has not been conducted.

Farmer showed historical data, applying the PGPA analysis retroactively to the 2006 enrolled class. His conclusion is that UNC is recruiting stronger students, even at the lower end of PGPA.

Farmer showed UNC comparisons, for athletics scholarship students only (i.e. not all student-athletes) with peer universities. The comparison groups are: ACC, “system peers” (Cal, UCLA, duke, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Northwestern, Pittsburgh, USC, Texas, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin), and “aspirational peers” (Cal, UCLA, Duke, Michigan, Northwestern, Notre Dame, USC, Stanford, Vanderbilt, Virginia, Wake Forest). He presented data from 2010-2015 on Critical Reading and Math Scores, Core GPA, and PGPA, for athletics scholarship students as a whole, and then for football. Each of the graphs showed marked improvement in the performance of both our overall student-athlete population and the football team.

Academic Advising

- FAC pleased to see continued progress on coordination of ASPSA and student-body-wide advising systems. Seeing more seamless communication as the “Steele Building” advisors have regular office hours in Loudermilk.

Beverly Foster and Melissa Geil led the discussion of Academic Advising.

- a) Lee May, Andrea Caldwell, and Spencer Wellborn from the Academic Advising Program in the College of Arts and Sciences (AAP)
- b) ASPSA Director Michelle Brown and ASPSA Academic Counselor Greg Beatty t
- c) Fourth year of the partnership between the two groups.
- d) AAP and ASPSA representatives noted the culture change that has taken place
- e) A chart describing the partnership and the respective roles and functions was discussed
- f) There is cross-training between the two groups – curriculum developments are shared by AAP with ASPSA and new AAP counselors receive training from ASPSA about special issues related to working with student-athletes.

Required meeting - at least one time per year with an AAP advisor.

- a) For 2015-16 - 98-99% of Arts and Sciences student-athletes fulfill this requirement.
- b) Five AAP advisors focus on student-athletes and have office hours in Loudermilk, where ASPSA is housed.
- c) Loudermilk also provides space for advisors from the Business School to meet with student-athletes and for representatives of University Career Services.

The AAP and ASPSA representatives also discussed a handout summarizing their points of emphasis with student-athletes related to majors and career initiatives, Both groups work together in supporting students with special challenges such as a concussion or a mental health issue. There are often support teams that include a coach, AAP, ASPSA, Compliance, a doctor, and sometimes the student to plan on how to deal with the student's special challenges.

ASPSA continues to refine the programming that it offers for student-athletes when they matriculate whether it is in the summer or in January.

Student-Athlete Experience

Fifth year (approximately) of focus groups where FAC meets with SAAC members in small groups. Themes from March 2017 sessions were:

Positive Aspects of UNC Experience: school spirit, team camaraderie, strong networking opportunities, student-athlete career fairs, resources available at Loudermilk, support from coaches. Overall, strong satisfaction with UNC experience.

Many of the themes are familiar to FAC from previous focus groups.

Time Constraints: While involvement in athletics provides structure and promotes development of time management skills, demanding practice/game schedules prevent many athletes from participating in academic and social interests. Some student-athletes may select majors based on schedule and what upperclassmen on their teams major in.

Faculty Inflexibility and Stereotypes/Stigma: Focus group participants voiced having generally positive relationships with faculty (work with student-athletes to schedule make-up assignments), but multiple students noted limited availability of faculty office hours as a significant hindrance to academic success and the “quiz dropping practice” creates significant pressures. Several participants voiced experiencing stereotypes of athletes as not well-prepared academically, and assume that athletes don’t take their educations seriously.

More Resources/Resource Awareness: Expressed appreciation that the importance of mental health is being acknowledged. Greatly value the psychologist’s services and thought they should be advertised more, perhaps through CREED (the first-year required portion for the Leadership Academy). Want more psychologists on staff. Suggested having a stress management psychologist instead of just a sports psychologist. Noted a need for more nutrition services. Requested more trainers too.

Team Climate/Approach to Issues: Overall good team climate expressed. Approach to handling problems that arise on the team depends on the context/nature of the issue. Many SAs stated they would attempt to first handle things within the team before going to the coach. For small to medium issues: desire solve it within the team (Choice 1: among the people themselves; Choice 2: involve student team leadership; Choice 3: involve the coaches).

Academic Support: Request for student-athletes input on performance review of advisors and tutors (tutors already are evaluated with S-A input). Overwhelming positive comments regarding resources at Loudermilk Center for Excellence. SAs appreciate being able to see advisors at Loudermilk; voiced strong preference over Steele Building. Professors dislike completing progress reports. Several complaints/suggestions regarding tutoring:

Plus – exit surveys of athletes graduating or completing their eligibility (or leaving early for professional sports)

Student-Athlete Exit Survey (November 2016)

Nicki Moore, Senior Associate Athletic Director, discussed the latest version of the student-athlete exit survey that will be given to student-athletes who have completed their athletic eligibility. There were only minor changes in substance from last year’s survey instrument.

- a) Fall sports, the survey will be distributed on December 1 with reminders on January 1 and January 15. The survey will close on February 1.

- b) Winter sports, survey - March 1, with reminders on April 1 and April 15. The winter sport student-athlete survey will close on May 1.
- c) Spring sport student-athletes, May 1, with reminders sent on June 1 and June 15. This survey will close on July 1.

Committee on the Future of Sport.

- Purpose
- Members
- The Committee on College Sports and UNC: Implications and Insights, also continues its work. Its current members are
 - Rhonda Gibson, Associate Professor, School of Media & Journalism
 - Daryhl Johnson, Clinical Assistant Professor, Surgery, School of Medicine (Committee Chair, January 1- June30, 2017)
 - Robert Malekoff, Lecturer and Academic Advisor, Department of Exercise and Sports Science
 - Jonathan Weiler, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Department of Global Studies
 - Shielda Glover Rodgers, Clinical Associate Professor, School of Nursing
 - Madeline Harrison, Student Representative
 - John Stephens, Associate Professor, School of Government (Chair of Committee July 1- December 31, 2016 – present, FAC Vice-Chair)
- On September 14, 2016, the Committee sponsored a forum, focused on student-athletes' time commitments to their sports and to academics. This forum was held with an eye toward relevant NCAA resolutions due for action in January 2017. A panel presented perspectives from student-athletes, an athlete alumnus, a coach, an ASPSA counselor, and a faculty member. Topics addressed included course scheduling, faculty office hours, athletic travel putting pressure on academic commitments, and strategies for balancing academic work and sports-related activities. The forum included presentations, with background on current and draft NCAA legislation, as well as questions from the audience.
- Activities

A forum hosted by the Committee on the Future of Sport on September 14, 2016. The topic was "How Can We Help Student-Athletes Who Seek More Time for Academics and Student Life?"

Committee explore time commitment data from the NCAA and reports from UNC student-athletes, and well-being/mental health matters.

III. Anticipated Activities 2017-2018

Daryhl L. Johnson II will serve as FAC Chairman. Kim Strom-Gottfried will serve as Vice Chairman. Committee Member Layna Mosley returns Spring 2018 from educational sabbatical. FAC will continue to explore the intersection of intercollegiate athletics and academics here at UNC by investigating identified national priorities (time constraints, mental health issues as examples) and their affects locally on our campus. We hope to improve the academic experience of our student athletes by supporting best practices and their implementation related to these initiatives. This work coincides with work that the Committee on the Future of College Sport started. Our goal would be to help extrapolate the benefits across campus. We will seek new and innovative ways to engage our faculty to help solve faculty conflicts with athletics. We wish to respond in a timely manner to issues raised by Faculty Constituents and other parties. Action items within each subgroup within FAC will be investigated with a goal of creating a recommendation/solution. Our committee will continue to look at our peer institutions for best practices including athletic fundraising concepts that support the academic infrastructure. At the time of submission of this report the NCAA Committee on Infractions report is not available and has not been released.