

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Faculty Athletics Committee
Minutes of Meeting: October 13, 2015

Present: **Committee Members:** Lissa Broome, Marc Cohen, Carol Folt, Beverly Foster, Layna Mosley, Andy Perrin, Joy Renner, John Stephens, Deborah Stroman

Liaisons from the Student-Athlete Advisory Council: Ezra Baeli-Wang, Lexi Cappalli

Advisors: Michelle Brown (Director, ASPSA), Vince Ille (Athletics)

Guests: Chris Faison (CCSAC – Minority Male Mentoring and Engagement), Jim Gregory (Media Relations), Ray Gronberg (Durham Herald-Sun), Maria Prokopowicz (DTH), Quinton Smith (Graduate Assistant), Anne Whisnant (Faculty Governance). Some members of the Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Admissions joined the meeting at 4:00: Martha Alexander, John Engel, Steve Farmer, Lee May, Bev Taylor, Dan Thornton, Barbara Polk, Bettina Shufort, Todd Taylor, Lynn Williford, Brent Wissick.

I. Introductions and Preliminary Matters

Committee members and guests introduced themselves. The minutes of the September meeting were approved. Professor Joy Renner reminded FAC members to try to contact the coaches, team leadership, and academic counselors for their teams by November. The discussion of the Ninth Circuit’s ruling in the O’Bannon case will be deferred until November when Bubba Cunningham is present.

II. Report from FAR and Preliminary Discussion of NCAA Legislative Items

Professor Lissa Broome referred to her written report (attached). She distributed the Timeline for NCAA Legislation and discussed the timeline and voting procedures for “Autonomy Legislation” and the timeline and voting procedures for other Division I legislative proposals. She is in the process of gathering feedback from coaches and student-athletes, and looks forward to a more focused discussion of particular legislative proposals with FAC at the November meeting.

The ACC funds an Academic Consortium of ACC schools (ACCAC). A FAC member suggested that we consider a proposal to get funding to bring together ACC faculty athletic committees to discuss issues of interest. Provost Jim Dean is our main liaison to this group and will attend a FAC meeting to discuss the ACCAC.

III. Joint Meeting with the Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Admissions

Professor Renner welcomed Steve Farmer and members of the Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Admissions to a joint meeting to discuss the annual admissions report related to student-athletes to be publicly released in the coming days and to review some performance data. Mr. Farmer explained that the Office of Undergraduate Admissions makes all admissions decisions pursuant to policies set forth by the Board of Governors and the Board of Trustees. The Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Admissions has authorized 160 athletics admissions and 40 music and drama admission per year under a special talent category referenced in the Trustees' admissions policy. The report on the class entering in 2015 will be released later in the week. [It is now available through a link from the Carolina Commitment site.]

Mr. Farmer discussed the Special Talent Committee's policies and procedures. He noted that four of the seven faculty members on the committee are tenured faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences. The total number of student-athletes matriculating in 2015 was 188, 152 of whom were in the special talent category and 9 of whom required review by the Committee on Special Talent. A total of 527 prospective student-athletes, however, were presented to the Admissions Office for evaluation. Some of these students were not admissible, some were not brought forward by Athletics for admission, and some decided to attend another school. Athletics officials estimate that they likely reviewed closer to 700 prospective student-athletes at the request of coaches but only brought forward 527 for an evaluation by the Admissions Office. Fifty-two of the students evaluated by Admissions would have required review by the Committee on Special Talent, but only 14 of those applied to the school, and only 9 were admitted and enrolled.

The predicted grade point average (PGPA) was first used by Admissions for the class entering in 2013. Students whose PGPA is less than 2.3 must be reviewed by the Committee on Special Talent. If the PGPA had been in effect in 2001, 39 enrolling student-athletes would have required review by the Special Talent Committee. The Admissions Office hopes to move the prospective student-athletes it considers into higher PGPA categories over time. In 2006, 25 of 29 students who would have required review by the Committee on Special Talent under current standards were on the football, men's basketball, or women's basketball teams. For the class entering in 2015, 6 of the 9 students reviewed by the Committee on Special Talent were on those teams.

A motion was made, seconded, and passed to go into closed session to prevent the disclosure of privileged or confidential information. Professor Renner asked Michelle Brown, Vince Ille, Debbi Clarke, and Barbara Polk to stay for the closed session. During the closed session, the academic performance of particular student-athletes was reviewed. Upon motion, second, and unanimous vote the joint committees returned to open session.

Steve Farmer presented an analysis of the courses taken by the 9 student-athletes who entered in 2014 and who required review by the Committee on Special Talent. These students took 58 different courses in 19 different departments, and all had participated in at least one First-Year Seminar. He compared these results with several groups of 9 students selected randomly and with random samples of drama and music special talent students.

The Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Admissions is considering its response to a resolution regarding admissions of student-athletes and appreciated the opportunity to discuss this issue with FAC.

IV. Working Group Update

Debbi Clarke, the consultant to the Working Group, noted that the website developed by the Working Group cataloging the academic processes related to student-athletes will become available on October 14. Its web address is apsa.unc.edu. She welcomes FAC to advise on where there are opportunities to improve processes or gaps where there should be processes. The Provost is in the process of appointing the Working Group's successor, the Process Review Group. The Process Review Group will have faculty representation and will maintain a close relationship with FAC. FAC topic experts should explore the academic processes related to their topics and provide feedback to Ms. Clarke on improvements or gaps. In addition, the Process Review Group will have as members a student, a female student-athlete, and a male student-athlete.

V. FAC Open Forum and FAC Group to Convene Campus Conversations

The fall FAC Open Forum date and time were set for November 18 from 11-1:30 with a drop-in format for faculty and others to talk about issues of interest. The Working Group's website could be one topic for discussion.

Pursuant to the recent Faculty Council resolution, FAC will be working with a subgroup comprised of two FAC members, four Faculty Chair appointees, and one student to arrange campus conversations on broad issues related to intercollegiate athletics. Topics might include time commitments for athletics and academics and the cost of athletics programs and the use of student fees to help support them. Although a student-athlete is not contemplated to be a member of this group, the student-athlete liaisons to FAC will be able help shape the conversations since the subgroup conducting the conversation reports to FAC.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Lissa Broome

Attachments

FAR NCAA and ACC Update

**Update to FAC from the Faculty Athletics Representative
October 12, 2015**

1. NCAA
 - a. Timeline for NCAA Legislation (see chart posted on Sakai)
 - b. Autonomy Proposals will be voted on at the NCAA Annual Convention on January 15, 2016.
 - i. One school, one vote (Power 5 Conferences, including the ACC)
 - ii. ACC will discuss at December 5, 2015, legislative meeting
 - iii. Proposals posted on Sakai
 1. Items to discuss: 2015-18, -25, -26, -27
 2. Others?
 - c. Council (Shared) Governance Legislation
 - i. Our ACC representative on the Council, Miami Athletic Director Blake James, casts the ACC's (weighted) vote
 - ii. ACC will discuss at December 5, 2015, legislative meeting
 - iii. To be considered by the Council at the Annual Convention in January
 1. 2015-32 – MBB deadline to remove name from draft
 2. 2015-81 – Football Conference Championship game
 - iv. Remaining proposals to be considered by the Council at its April meeting
 1. 2015-66 – Academic Misconduct
 2. Others?
 - d. NCAA Institutional Performance Program (IPP)
 - i. Will work with Academic Topic group members on sharing aspects of this report on academic performance with FAC and consider other metrics which we may wish to use on a comprehensive annual academic report
2. ACC
 - a. Council of Presidents met on September 8-9
 - i. Approved addition of SWA to ACC Executive Committee as ex officio, nonvoting member
 - ii. Alcohol sales permitted at ACC Championship neutral sites (FB, MBB, WBB, and BB)
 - b. ADs, SWAs, and FARs met on October 6-7
 - i. First time that two student-athletes participated in most of the meeting (previously the SAAC president gave a report to joint meeting)
 1. Katherine Plessy, Florida State beach volleyball player
 2. Patrick Andrews, Clemson baseball player
 - ii. Approved Nominating Committee – to decide among conference school nominees for NCAA committee nominations from the ACC
 - iii. Update on ACC GOALS Survey (comparison with NCAA 2015 GOALS Survey will be available in November)
 - iv. Various proposals relating to sport administration from the SWAs
 1. Softball proposal to that conference series be spread over 3 days (Friday through Sunday) starting in 2017

3. Ninth Circuit's decision in O'Bannon v. NCAA (September 30, 2015)
 - a. NCAA's rules are not exempt from antitrust scrutiny and must be analyzed under the "rule of reason"
 - i. NCAA rules restricting an athletic grant in aid (the "price" paid to recruits to attend college) to tuition, fees, room, board, and books has significant anticompetitive effects
 1. The panel found that the NCAA established that this rule might be justified by two "procompetitive" purposes
 - a. Integrating academics with athletics
 - b. Preserving the popularity of the NCAA's product by promoting its current understanding of amateurism
 2. However, there is a less restrictive alternative to the current NCAA rule which is allowing NCAA members to provide scholarships to student-athletes up to the full cost of attendance
 - ii. The other remedy proposed by the District Court – to allow student-athletes to be paid cash compensation of up to \$5,000 per year in deferred compensation -- was found erroneous
 - b. Neither side has indicated yet whether it will apply for certiorari to the Supreme Court
4. Faculty Council
 - a. I delivered my annual report to Faculty Council prior to the September 25, 2015, meeting. The written report is posted on Sakai.
 - b. I presented slides at the September 25 meeting (posted on Sakai in text form so you can click through to links) that also reviewed some of the significant changes in athletics and academics during the law few years in the areas of
 - Admissions
 - Academic Support (ASPSA)
 - Academic Advising Program (AAP)
 - Academics
 - Governance
 - Interaction with Faculty