

UNC-Chapel Hill Office of Faculty Governance

Meeting of the Faculty Council and the General Faculty

Friday, October 5, 2007

3:00 p.m.

Hitchcock Multipurpose Room

Sonja Haynes Stone Center for Black Culture and History

Faculty Chair Joseph Templeton presiding

AGENDA

3:00 Welcome, Opening Remarks, and General Questions

- Provost Bernadette Gray-Little

3:20 Faculty Assembly Delegation report and discussion

- Judith Wegner, Faculty Assembly delegate
- Background materials on proposed changes to University Code:
 - Faculty Assembly's adopted resolution on the University Code changes (9/28/07) [pdf]
 - Faculty Assembly Executive Committee's memo to the Faculty Assembly and to faculty senate presidents about the changes (9/13/07) [pdf]
 - Faculty Assembly's Proposed Text Revisions to Nielsen "603/604" Committee University Code Revisions [pdf]
 - Board of Governors guidelines on post-tenure review, June 2007 [pdf]
 - Faculty Assembly website with full information on the 9/28/07 Faculty Assembly meeting

3:35 Carolina Performing Arts: Update and Discussion

- Emil Kang, Executive Director for the Arts

4:00 Faculty Athletics Committee and Faculty Athletics Representative annual reports and discussion

- Professor Lissa Broome, Chair, Faculty Athletics Committee
 - Read the Faculty Athletics Committee report here [pdf]
- Professor John P. Evans, Faculty Athletics Representative
 - Read the Faculty Athletics Representative's report here [pdf]

4:25 Faculty Council Priorities for 2007-08: Discussion

- Professor Joseph Templeton, Chair of the Faculty

5:00 Adjourn

FACULTY ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION: On Proposed Changes in University Code

WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly has reviewed proposed changes in the University Code proposed by the "Code 603/604 Committee" as of July 17, 2007; and

WHEREAS, Faculty Assembly delegates have sought additional review from Faculty Senates and colleagues on their campuses; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly believes that there are significant problems with key aspects of the proposed revisions particularly including those relating to relating to institutional guarantees of tenure and grounds for discharge and rights of "special faculty"; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly also believes that there are areas in which language needs to be clarified in order to avoid possible future confusion; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly believes that the Code Review committee's work exceeded its charge insofar as it included recommendations regarding post-tenure review processes that are inconsistent with policies reviewed and supported by the Assembly in late spring 2007, as reported to the Board of Governors Committee on Personnel and Tenure in June 2007; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly understands that the Code Review committee spent considerable time and effort on its proposals and wishes them to move ahead promptly, but believes that important changes will lack legitimacy if more widespread consultation with faculty is not allowed; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Assembly's Executive Committee has developed alternative language to address its concerns with the original Code 603/604 proposals in an effort to move matters forward but wishes to allow faculty members to review and understand these recommendations;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED

1. The Faculty Assembly affirms its belief that the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee's proposed alternative language is strongly preferable to language proposed by the Code 603/604 Committee in its July 2007 draft;
2. The Faculty Assembly asks that Faculty Senates and colleagues on the various campuses be given an adequate opportunity to review this alternative language, relevant background, and up-to-date proposals from the Code 603/604 Committee before General Administration and the Board of Governors acts on the Committee's recommendations;
3. The Faculty Assembly asks its officers to refer relevant materials (this resolution, the alternative language, background information, and any up-to-date proposals from the Code 603/604 Committee) to the campus Faculty Senates with a request that the Senates and faculty leaders offer comments be submitted by the end of October for further consideration at the November Faculty Assembly meeting;
4. The Faculty Assembly requests that General Administration defer submitting the Code 603/604 Committee's recommendations to the Board of Governors until at least December 2007 so that comments can be received and meaningful review completed;
5. The Faculty Assembly requests that, in the future, changes to the Code or other University policies directly affecting faculty should be undertaken only with extensive faculty representation on relevant committees or task forces, open involvement in deliberations from the outset, and adequate opportunities to comment during the academic year except under pressing and unusual circumstances.

Adopted September 28, 2007 by the Faculty Assembly

Faculty Assembly's Proposed Text Revisions to
Nielsen "603/604" Committee University Code Revisions

Code Section 602: Academic Tenure

(6) Institutional tenure policies and regulations shall distinguish among the following:

- (a) the nonreappointment (or nonrenewal) of a faculty member at the expiration of a specified term of service;
- (b) the discharge from employment of a faculty member with permanent tenure or of a faculty member appointed to a specified term of service before that term expires only for reasons of (a) incompetence, (b) neglect of duty, (c) ~~unsatisfactory performance~~, ~~including but not limited to multiple unsatisfactory post-tenure reviews~~; or (d) (c) misconduct of such a nature as to indicate that the individual is unfit to continue as a member of the faculty, *as specified in Code Section 603.*

...

Code Section 603: Due Process Before Discharge or Imposition of Other Serious Sanction

(1) *A faculty member who is the beneficiary of institutional guarantees of tenure shall enjoy protection against unjust and arbitrary application of disciplinary penalties. During the period of such guarantees the faculty member may be discharged from employment, suspended, or demoted in rank only for reasons of*

(a) *incompetence, including significant, sustained unsatisfactory performance after the faculty member has been given an opportunity to remedy such performance and fails to do so within a reasonable time;*

(b) *neglect of duty including sustained failure to meet assigned classes or to perform other core faculty professional obligations, or*

(c) *(c) misconduct of such a nature as to indicate that the individual is unfit to continue as a member of the faculty, including significant demonstrated violations of professional ethics, substantial mistreatment of students, significant research misconduct, willful financial fraud related to university duties, or demonstrated criminal conduct sufficiently related to a faculty member's academic responsibilities as to disqualify the individual from effective performance of university duties.*

An action to discharge a faculty member will ordinarily be used only in instances in which the faculty member's conduct is so serious as to render the individual permanently unfit to continue as a member of the faculty. Lesser sanctions including suspension and demotion in rank might be used in other instances.

...

(5) *If the faculty member makes a timely written request for a hearing, the chancellor shall ensure a process is in place so that the hearing is timely accorded before an elected standing committee of the institution's faculty. The hearing shall be on the written specification of reasons for the intended discharge or imposition of a serious sanction. The hearing committee shall accord the faculty member 20 days from the time it receives the faculty member's written request for a hearing to prepare a defense. The hearing committee may, upon the faculty member's written request and for good cause, extend this time by written notice to the faculty member. The hearing committee will ordinarily endeavor to complete the hearing within 90 calendar days except under unusual circumstances such as when a hearing request is received during winter or summer break and despite reasonable efforts the hearing committee cannot be assembled, or when additional fact-finding is required apart from the university discharge process.*

(8) *In reaching decisions on which its written recommendations to the chancellor shall be based, the committee shall consider only the evidence presented at the hearing and such written or oral arguments as the committee, in its discretion, may allow. The university has the burden of proof. In evaluating the evidence, the committee shall use the standard of "clear and convincing" evidence in determining whether the institution has met its burden of showing that permissible grounds for serious sanction exist and are the basis for the recommended action. The committee shall make its written recommendations to the chancellor within ten days after its hearing concludes or after the full transcript is received, whichever is later.*

1
2 Code Section 604. Non-Reappointment of Tenure-Track Faculty Members
3

4 604B Impermissible Reasons for Nonreappointment.
5

6 In no event shall a decision not to reappoint a faculty member be based upon (a) the exercise by the
7 faculty member of rights guaranteed by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, or by
8 Article I of the North Carolina Constitution, or (b) the faculty member's race, color, sex, religion, creed,
9 national origin, age, disability, ~~or~~ veteran's status or other forms of discrimination prohibited under
10 regulations adopted by campus Boards of Trustees, or (c) personal malice. For purposes of this section,
11 the term "personal malice" means dislike, animosity, ill-will or hatred based on personal
12 characteristics, traits or circumstances of an individual.
13

14 604D. Review of Non-Reappointment Decisions ~~Appeals and Grievances~~
15

16 (2) Campus Based Review Appeal. Subject to limitations contained in this Code and the Policies of the
17 Board of Governors, each constituent institution shall have a procedure whereby a tenure track faculty
18 member may seek review of the decision of the constituent institution not to reappoint the faculty
19 member. Such procedures shall at a minimum provide for the following:
20

21 (a) A reasonable time of no less than 14 calendar days within which after receiving the notice of
22 non-reappointment, the faculty member may request review of the decision by the appropriate
23 faculty committee and administrative officers.. If the faculty member does not request review the
24 notice of non-reappointment in a timely fashion as specified by campus tenure policies, the non-
25 reappointment is final without recourse to any further review by faculty committees, the
26 institution, or the Board of Governors.

27 (b) If the faculty member files a request for review in a timely fashion, ~~timely~~ ~~files an appeal or~~
28 ~~grievance~~, the chancellor shall ensure a process is in place so that a hearing is timely accorded
29 before an elected standing committee of the institution's faculty.
30
31

1 **Code Section 607. Faculty Grievance Committee for Constituent Institutions**

2
3 (3) "Grievances" within the province of the committee's power shall include matters directly
4 related to a faculty member's employment status and institutional relationships within the
5 constituent institution, *including matters related to post-tenure review*. However, no grievance
6 that grows out of or involves matters related to a formal proceeding for the suspension, discharge
7 or termination of a faculty member, or that is within the jurisdiction of another standing faculty
8 committee, may be considered by the committee.
9

New Code Section 610. Rights of Special Faculty Members.

(1) Faculty members who are appointed as visiting faculty members, adjunct faculty, lecturers, artists-in-residence, writers-in-residence or other special categories are regarded as "special faculty members" for purposes of the University Code.

(2) Special faculty members shall be appointed for a specified term of service, as set out in writing in the letter of appointment. The term of appointment of any special faculty member concludes at the end of the specified period set forth in the letter of appointment, and the letter of appointment constitutes full and timely notice that a new term will not be granted when that term expires. Special faculty members are not covered by Section 604 of the University Code and may not seek additional review of a decision by a constituent institution not to grant a new appointment at the end of a specified fixed term.

(3) During the term of their employment, special faculty members are entitled to seek recourse under Section 607 of the University Code (relating to faculty grievances). They are also entitled to protection under any other applicable policy or law.

Faculty Athletics Committee
Annual Report to the Faculty Council
October 5, 2007

Overview of Committee's Structure and Purpose

Members 2006-07: Lissa Broome (2008) (Chair), Jack Evans (ACC faculty athletics representative - *ex officio*), Kathleen Harris (2008), Garland Hershey (2009), Lloyd Kramer (2007), George Lensing (2008), Mary Lynn (2007), Steven Reznick (2009), Desmond Runyan (2008), Barbara Wildemuth (2008), and Rachel Willis (2009).

Members 2007-08: Lissa Broome (2008) (Chair), Glynnis Cowell (2010), Jack Evans (ACC faculty athletics representative - *ex officio*), Noelle Granger (2010), Kathleen Harris (2008), Garland Hershey (2009), George Lensing (2008), Steven Reznick (2009), Desmond Runyan (2008), Helen Tauchen (2010), Barbara Wildemuth (2008), and Rachel Willis (2009).

The committee was formerly made up of ten elected members of the faculty, serving staggered five-year terms. The Faculty Code was amended in the spring of 2004, to reduce the number of elected positions to nine, with members serving staggered three-year terms. This change made the term length for members of the Faculty Athletics Committee consistent with those of other elected faculty committees. Because this transition in term-length is ongoing, the committee is currently at eleven elected members, transitioning to nine elected members, and the terms of five committee members expire at the end of this academic year.

The faculty athletics representative to the ACC and the NCAA, Jack Evans, if not already an elective member, is an *ex officio* member of the committee. Chancellor Moeser attends meetings as his schedule permits. Director of Athletics Dick Baddour, Senior Associate Athletic Director Larry Gallo, and Senior Associate Athletic Director for Student-Athlete Services John Blanchard also regularly attend the committee's meetings and report each month to the committee for advice or information.

Annual Report: The annual report was prepared by Lissa Broome and reviewed and approved by the committee. It reports on the committee's activities during the 2006-07 academic year.

Meetings: The committee held monthly meetings during the 2006-07 academic year (excluding April, but including May).

Committee Charge: "The Faculty Athletics Committee is concerned with informing the faculty and advising the chancellor on any aspect of athletics, including, but not limited to, the academic experience for varsity athletes, athletic opportunities for members of the University committee, and the general conduct and operation of the University's athletic program" (Faculty Code § 4-7[b]).

Response to Matters Referred to the Committee

Faculty Council referred no matters to the Committee. As explained in more detail below, the Committee acted on behalf of the Faculty Council in making various recommendations and casting various votes at the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COLA).

The committee corresponded with other committees on matters of mutual interest as specified further below.

Report of Activities

NCAA Legislation Affecting Academics: Jack Evans served on the NCAA Committee on Academic Performance, which implements the NCAA's Academic Progress Rate (APR) and developed the Graduation Success Rate (GSR). The committee, through Jack Evans, monitored these and other developments and provided advice with respect to the institution's position. Jack Evans also served on the NCAA's Management Council, which is the group just below the NCAA's Board of Directors.

Athletic Reform Issues: Chancellor Moeser informed the committee about developments from other groups, including the Group of Six, which is composed of designated presidents from the athletic conferences represented in the football Bowl Championship Series (BCS), and the NCAA Presidential Task Force on the Future of Division I Athletics, on which he served. The charge of the Task Force was to explore the alignment of intercollegiate athletics with the mission, values and goals of higher education. That Task Force was divided into four subcommittees which represented the scope of its work: Implications of Academic Values and Standards, Fiscal Responsibility, Presidential Leadership of Internal and External Constituencies, and Student-Athlete Well-Being. Chancellor Moeser was a member of the Fiscal Responsibility Subcommittee, and helped to prepare a portion of the Task Force Report which was released in October 2006. Chancellor Moeser sought input on this report from members of the committee. The committee discussed the report in detail at its January meeting. On the few occasions where UNC-CH practices were at odds with the report's recommended practices, the committee discussed the reasons for the differences and did not recommend a change. In general, most recommendations made in the report are already in place on this campus. Chancellor Moeser reported that he has been appointed to a committee charged with monitoring implementation of the Presidential Task Force Report.

The Faculty Council became a member of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) in the spring of 2004. This organization is composed of fifty-five faculty senates from Division I-A schools around the country. Wake Forest, Duke, and Florida State are the other ACC schools that have joined COIA. Pursuant to agreement, the Faculty Committee on Athletics represented the Faculty Council in providing COIA with comments and questions on various COIA documents, including the COIA statement issued in support of the NCAA Presidential Task Force Report and the 2007 White Paper, Framing the Future: Reforming Intercollegiate Athletics. Lissa Broome serves on COIA's Steering Committee. COIA materials are available at <http://www.neuro.uoregon.edu/~tublitz/COIA/index.html>.

The Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics is hosting the Faculty Summit on Intercollegiate Athletics on Monday, October 15, 2007 in Washington, D.C. The Summit is accessible via webcast. Further information is available at <http://www.knightcommission.org/welcome/>. The COIA co-chairs are participating as panelists in the summit.

Title IX: Every year the committee invites Dr. Beth Miller, Senior Associate Athletic Director for Olympic Sports, to report on Title IX matters. Her report for 2006-07 was postponed until November 2007, so that she may present the most recent five-year review conducted by the Title IX

Committee which was finalized in the spring of 2007. Three members of the Faculty Athletics Committee -- Mary Lynn, Kathleen Harris, and Jack Evans -- served on the Title IX committee.

Academic Performance of Student-Athletes: The committee reviews the academic progress of student-athletes each year. This review includes the Academic Performance Rate (APR), as well as the GSR, and the federal graduation rate.

The federal graduation rate is the rate that is reported as the IPEDs or Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System rate. This rate is a six-year rate that includes students who received athletic scholarship aid in their first semester of enrollment. The federal rate includes in the number of total student-athletes those who left the University in good standing prior to graduation.

The Graduation Success Rate (GSR) differs from the federal rate in that a school will not be penalized when a student-athlete leaves in good academic standing to transfer to another institution, pursue a professional career, or for any other reason. The GSR adds to the group of first-time freshman who received athletic aid any students who transferred into the institution, and excludes from the group those students who leave in good academic standing before exhausting athletic eligibility. Under the current federally calculated graduation rate, such departures are counted as failures to graduate from the institution of original enrollment, even if the student later graduates from another institution.

1996-99 Cohorts: Graduation Rates

Men's Sports	UNC-CH GSR*	UNC-CH Fed Rate*	Women's Sports	UNC-CH GSR*	UNC-CH Fed Rate*
<i>Sport</i>	<i>GSR*</i>	<i>Fed Rate*</i>	<i>Sport</i>	<i>GSR*</i>	<i>Fed Rate*</i>
Baseball	61	30	-		
Basketball	70	64	Basketball	56	50
CC/Track	79	67	CC/Track	76	59
Fencing**	50	-	Fencing**	-	-
Football	70	61	-		
Golf	100	91	Golf	100	75
Lacrosse	81	71	Lacrosse	96	92
Soccer	70	67	Soccer	88	80
Swimming	94	83	Swimming	95	90
Tennis	75	50	Tennis	100	100
Wrestling	59	45	-		
-			Crew	100	-
-			Field Hockey	100	92
-			Gymnastics	100	100
-			Softball	94	89
-			Volleyball	100	91

* Both GSR and Fed Rate are reported as percentages.

** For sports for which grants-in-aid are not awarded, the school is requested to report graduation information for recruited student-athletes. At UNC-CH, no grants-in-aid are awarded for fencing and few students are recruited for this sport.

The Academic Performance Rate (APR) is computed based on points awarded each semester per student-athlete for eligibility/graduation and retention. Each team member may earn two points per

semester -- one point for maintaining eligibility or for graduation, and a second point for being retained. On a team with ten members, for instance, there would be a maximum of 40 possible points in an academic year. If two student-athletes on the team were not eligible in the spring semester and were not retained, then the hypothetical team would only earn 36 points (losing 2 points for each student during that spring semester). The APR in this hypothetical example is calculated by first dividing 36 by 40 (equals .9), and then multiplying by 1000 to get an APR of 900.

An APR of 925 is equivalent to an expected 50% graduation rate. If a team falls below a 925 APR, it could be subject to a penalty. Penalties such as scholarship reductions, postseason competition bans, and membership restrictions will be imposed on squads that are below a 925 beginning in the fall of 2007, when a four-year cycle of data collection (2003-2007) has been completed. For small teams, such as the 10-person team used in the example in the preceding paragraph, the NCAA will apply a squad size adjustment and may not subject such a team to a penalty based on that adjustment even though the APR is below 925.

The APR data for UNC-CH were computed for 2003-04, 2004-05, and 2005-06 academic years and the final report was made in April 2007. These data represent all student-athletes receiving some athletics scholarship aid (over 500 students). No team was below the 925 level (men's golf was at 917 after two academic years of data, but improved with the addition of the third year of data).

APR for 2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-06

Men's Sports	UNC-CH	Women's Sports	UNC-CH
Baseball	988	-	
Basketball	993	Basketball	989
Cross Country	947	Cross Country	990
Football	948	-	
Fencing	1000	Fencing	1000
Golf	950	Golf	1000
Lacrosse	988	Lacrosse	997
Soccer	977	Soccer	965
Swimming	988	Swimming	997
Tennis	992	Tennis	979
Track-Indoor	944	Track-Indoor	974
Track-Outdoor	944	Track-Outdoor	975
Wrestling	935	-	
-		Field Hockey	988
-		Gymnastics	992
-		Rowing	989
-		Softball	977
-		Volleyball	993

Jack Evans has prepared a comparison of the APR, GSR, and federal graduation rates for the institutions in the ACC for three sports: Baseball, Men's Basketball, and Football. See Appendix 1 to this report. For the APR data, yellow cells (between 900 and 925) qualify for the contemporaneous penalty of inability to award the grant-in-aid of a student-athlete who leaves while ineligible to continue

(subject to some mitigating circumstances). Red cells (below 900) are subject to a historical penalty (absent some mitigating circumstances) that are progressive beginning with a warning letter and culminating in the loss of access to post-season competition. For the GSR data, values below 50% are painted yellow; and below 40% are painted red. UNC-Chapel Hill has no red or yellow cells. The ACC as a conference has fewer yellow or red cells than the other major conferences.

It is also important to note the strong academic performance of many student-athletes. Of our approximately 770 student-athletes, 275 students -- the third highest in the ACC -- were on the ACC Honor Roll (requires a 3.0 GPA or better during the academic year) (compared with 294 in 2004-05 and 244 for 2003-04). For Spring 2006, 309 student-athletes earned a 3.0 or higher, and 153 were on the Dean's List for Spring 2006. The 2005-06 academic year marked the third consecutive year that the American Football Coaches Association recognized the football team for graduating its student-athletes at a level of 70% or above. Several student-athletes received ACC post-graduate awards, NCAA academic awards, or were awarded prestigious internships. Heather O'Reilly and Laura Gerraghty were honored in the NCAA Top VIII recognition, possibly the first time two honorees have come from the same institution. Moreover, student-athletes contributed over 25,000 hours of community service during the 2005-06 academic year.

Academic Support Program for Student-Athletes: The Academic Support Program reports to Fred Clark, an Associate Dean in the College of Arts and Sciences, who oversees other student academic support services. Several members of the Faculty Athletics Committee serve also on an advisory committee to the Academic Support Program. Robert Mercer, the director of the program, is invited to address the committee on occasion and attended in January 2007 to participate in the discussion of majors of student-athletes. Mr. Mercer will provide a full review of the program's operations to the committee in October 2007. He attended a committee meeting in the 2005-06 academic year to provide a similar comprehensive review of the academic support program.

The Educational Policy Committee and the Faculty Council reaffirmed several years ago a policy that provides that: "Students who are members of regularly organized and authorized University activities and who may be out of town taking part in some scheduled event are to be excused during the approved period of absence. Notification of such an absence must be sent by the responsible University official to the instructor before the date(s) of the scheduled absence." Notification of the absence will be by a "travel letter" that will now be signed by Fred Clark, Associate Dean of Academic Services in the College of Arts and Sciences, in addition to Mr. Mercer for the Academic Support Center. The committee urges faculty to interpret this policy so that a student-athlete who is absent from class for an approved absence is not counted as absent for the purpose of any class absence policy.

Carolina Leadership Academy: The Carolina Leadership Academy for leadership development for student-athletes, athletic administrators, and members of the coaching staff began during the Spring of 2004 for some student-athletes, and all student-athletes began participation in the program during the Fall 2004 semester. Donors have funded the program for a five-year period. Jeff Janssen is the primary service provider for the Carolina Leadership Academy, working with Cricket Lane from the Department of Athletics. The first level of the Academy, called the CREED¹ program, is required of all freshmen

¹ C-1 will know and embrace the tradition and CULTURE of this great University and its athletics department;
R-1 will RESPECT myself and others;

student-athletes, meets monthly, and is coordinated by Dr. Lane; the second level for "Rising Stars" is voluntary (with some input from coaches) and is taught by Mr. Janssen; and the third level for "Veteran Leaders" is for juniors and seniors, is also taught by Mr. Janssen, and contains students primarily selected by coaches, often including team captains. The Veteran Leaders program incorporates 360 degree feedback and contains customized leadership development plans. The leadership program also includes programs for coaches and athletics administrators. The program's comprehensive nature sets it apart from leadership development efforts for athletics at other institutions. The Leadership Academy has been well-received by all participants. The committee receives reports about this program on occasion from John Blanchard, Senior Associate Athletics Director for Student-Athlete Services.

Exit interviews and surveys of senior student-athletes: Each year the committee and the Athletics Department ask all graduating student-athletes to fill out a detailed questionnaire prepared by the committee covering many aspects of the student-athletes' experience at UNC-CH. In addition, committee members participate, along with personnel from the Athletics Department, in exit interviews with groups of graduating student-athletes. By examining this information, the committee is learning how student-athletes perceive their experience at UNC-CH.

One hundred sixty-eight students answered the survey in 2005-06. We have surveyed students for thirteen years, and this was the fifth year with the updated survey instrument. Kathleen Harris coordinated the compilation and reporting of the survey results. Members of the committee examined and discussed the survey results. Student-athletes reported good academic experiences, which are reinforced and supported by the coaching staff and the department's advising and counseling services. Student-athletes reported few problems meeting the demands of their course work or getting access to instructors. They believe that Carolina has prepared them well for their future life and careers. We will consider whether to move the questions relating to the Academic Support Center and advising, and survey students on those questions at the end of their freshman and/or sophomore years, when those services are more heavily used by students. That way, suggestions for improvement could be made in a more timely fashion and feedback received would be about recent experience, not practices that may have been changed or improved in the last several years.

Forty-four students participated in the exit interviews, which were held February 27, February 28, and March 1, 2006. Most members of the committee participated in the interviews and each year the committee compiles its impressions based on the anecdotal evidence gained from the interviews. Based on a consolidated report compiled by Barbara Wildemuth of the committee's impressions from the exit interviews, the committee highlights the following:

- UNC has a strong academic reputation that is emphasized throughout the recruiting process and during the student's college life.
- Student-athletes feel well-prepared to pursue their career plans, while acknowledging that their demanding athletic schedules limited their opportunities somewhat.

E – I will pursue **EXCELLENCE** in my academic work by striving to reach my academic potential while preparing for a career of significance;

E – I will **EXCEL** athletically by committing myself to performance excellence, team success and continual improvement, and

D – I will **DEVELOP** the capacity to effectively lead myself and others.

- Student-athletes are generally treated fairly in academic settings. Class attendance policies and assignment deadlines are sometimes problematic in relation to team travel.
- Assisted registration would improve student-athletes' access to needed courses, particularly in their majors.
- Communication among student-athletes and between student-athletes and coaches across differences in race, gender, or sexual orientation is respectful and positive.
- The Carolina Leadership Academy is viewed as a strong positive, with some suggestions to fine-tune the freshman year segment of the program and to clarify the selection process for participation in the second and third levels of the program.

The exit interview process provides the committee an opportunity to hear comments from student-athletes and to receive reports on follow-up activities undertaken by the Department of Athletics. In the few instances where criticism is offered or opportunities to improve are identified, the Department's personnel investigate and report back to the committee on the follow-up that has taken place. The committee will continue to discuss the areas and ways in which it may be of assistance in improving the academic experience and general welfare of student-athletes.

Exit surveys were administered in the Fall of 2006 and the Spring of 2007 to senior student-athletes. A smaller group of seniors participated in the exit interviews held on February 26, 27, and 28, 2007. The committee will discuss the reports reporting the exit survey and exit interview results at its November 2007 meeting.

Majors: The committee reviewed data on the majors of student-athletes who have junior status or higher and thus have declared majors and compared the data to our review of majors in 2004-05. The four most popular majors for junior/senior student-athletes in Fall 2006 were Exercise and Sports Science (22%), Communications (16.6%), Management (8.8%), and Business (6.6%). The percentage of junior/senior students in these majors in Fall 2004 were Exercise and Sports Science (4.77%), Communications (5.14%), Management (1.78%), and Business (7.7%). The committee considered these differences and thought the differences could be explained by the interests of our student-athletes. In Fall 2003, the most popular majors for student-athletes were Communications (18.35%), Journalism and Mass Communications (9.74%), Psychology (7.87%), and Biology and Exercise and Sports Science (tied at 7.49%).

The committee was told that many of the Exercise and Sports Science majors were female student-athletes. The addition of a concentration in Sports Administration might help to explain the increase in the number of student-athletes majoring in this area.

The committee determined that it should review the majors of junior and senior student-athletes every year.

Courses: The committee discussed online courses, independent study courses, and possible concentration of student-athletes in certain courses. With respect to on-line courses, the committee reviewed the Athletic Department's policy regarding online courses. Ten students were registered for such courses in December 2006. The committee also learned that a University committee was reviewing the institution's policies regarding online education. Robert Mercer in the academic support center tracks registration in independent studies by student-athletes. At present, the committee found no

questionable uses or patterns in this registration. The committee also agreed that it would be a good idea to ask student-athletes in the exit interviews whether student-athletes tended to congregate in any particular courses.

Priority Registration: Lissa Broome appointed Steve Reznick from the committee to chair a Task Force on Priority Registration. Other members of the committee on the Task Force are Jack Evans, Lissa Broome, and George Lensing. The committee also includes John Blanchard from the Department of Athletics, Robert Mercer from the Academic Support Center for Student-Athletes, Jane Smith and Anne Bryan from Education, Bev Foster from Nursing and the Educational Policy Committee, and Harold Woodard Woodard Associate Dean of Student Academic Counseling. The Task Force met throughout the year and prepared a policy for priority registration for student-athletes and other potential student populations, including students who need to schedule time off campus for practicum experiences and student teaching. The Faculty Athletics Committee unanimously voted to recommend the policy to the University Registrar. Chancellor Moeser voiced his support for the concept and the specific proposal. The Registrar has referred the policy to the Educational Policy Committee for discussion and review this fall. The policy was also discussed with the Faculty Executive Committee. If the policy emerges from the Educational Policy Committee with a favorable recommendation, it is anticipated that it would then be considered by Faculty Council.

Admissions: Jack Evans and Steve Reznick sit on the subcommittee of the Admissions Committee that reviews special admissions decisions. In 2008, the committee will discuss the admissions process as it relates to student-athletes with the relevant parties.

Substance Abuse Policy: Dick Baddour reported that the revised Substance Abuse Policy, effective November 1, 2005, would be reviewed by a committee that contained two members of the Faculty Athletics Committee (Lissa Broome and Jack Evans) to consider clarification of the appeal process following a second positive test. The committee learned about the number of tests administered and the small number of positive tests received. The revised policy provides for extensive counseling following a positive test.

Tickets: Faculty-staff ticket distribution is now held for tickets to provide free, reserved seating for faculty for the most popular women's basketball games. The committee invited Clint Gwaltney, Associate Director of Athletics and head of the ticket office for the Department of Athletics, to describe and review the faculty/staff ticket priority formula, adopted in 1994, used for seating in the Smith Center for men's basketball. Under the formula a faculty or staff member receives 1 point per year for their tenure at UNC-CH, plus 6 points per year for each year they ordered men's basketball tickets. For 2005-06, a total of 210 points was required to qualify for lower-level seating (e.g., 30 years at UNC with tickets ordered each of those 30 years). Point totals do not continue to accrue following retirement.

Dick Baddour also described to the committee the new online system for distributing basketball tickets and some football game tickets to students. Although there has been some opposition to the new system from students who feel that loyalty to the team demonstrated by waiting in line for tickets should be rewarded, the committee was in favor of a system that minimized the demands on student time and provided equal access to tickets even to students not able to appear at the designated time to wait in line for tickets.

Football Coaching Transition: The committee discussed the transition in the football coaching staff with Mr. Baddour in closed session. Mr. Baddour also commented on the financial implications of the coaching change at later meetings. The Department retained contractual responsibility for the continued salary of some of the football staff until they retained new employment. The new staff in many cases commanded higher salaries, and the Department also had to absorb moving expenses and temporary housing costs.

Coach Davis attended the February committee meeting for brief remarks and a question-and-answer period. He began his remarks by noting that the academic reputation of UNC was one of the strong attractions for him when he was considering this position.

Facilities: Mr. Baddour reported on a \$5 million project to convert the former Women's Gym into a training room for the University. The facility will provide opportunities for practical experience for graduate students in Exercise and Sports Science. Contributions to the cost of the facility will come from the Athletics Department, Student Health Service, the College of Arts and Sciences, and private fundraising.

Renovation of Boshamer baseball stadium will begin in October 2007. The proposed Kenan Stadium project to enclose the open-end and improve the academic support facilities located in Kenan Field House has been added to the University's master plan for construction.

Finances: In May, Martina Ballen, the Athletic Department's chief financial officer, and Dick Baddour reviewed the department's finances with the committee. Ms. Ballen provided background on principles, the budget process, budget categories, and the department's participation in the Chancellor's intra-university budget review process. The committee reviewed the departmental budget for 2006-07. This discussion included consideration of the level of debt service (felt to be at an acceptable and sustainable level). The committee learned about the principles that guide distribution of funds by the ACC to its member schools. This discussion covered TV contracts, basketball post-season play, and conference tie-ins to football bowls. Mr. Baddour reported on efforts to secure a second sponsorship for Smith Center signage (Wachovia is the only sponsor that has hard signage in the Smith Center now) and capital improvement projects that are beginning now or are in line for future consideration.

Mr. Baddour noted that as a result of the extra expenses associated with the coaching transition in football, the department would run a deficit for 2006-07 for the first time in eight years. Fortunately, the department had accumulated sufficient reserve funds during that eight-year period to fully fund that deficit.

Faculty/Staff Wellness: An often overlooked portion of the charge to the Faculty Athletics Committee is that it advises the Chancellor on "athletic opportunities for members of the University committee." Desmond Runyan and Garland Hershey from the committee were appointed to a University Steering Committee for Worker Health, Safety and Wellness. The Steering Committee will help identify existing resources on campus and recommend how best to develop a coordinated, comprehensive approach to worksite wellness. A staff position was created in 2006-07 to support faculty/staff wellness. The Steering Committee has also established a website and conducted focus groups with faculty and staff representatives.

Competitive Success: Dick Baddour reported that UNC-CH finished third in the Director's Cup (former Sears Cup) for national rankings in athletic programs in 2006-07 (fourth in 2005-06), highlighted by the baseball team's finish as national runner-up in the College World Series for the second consecutive year, and the women's basketball team's Final Four appearance also for the second consecutive year. Moreover, *Sports Illustrated* released its own ranking of collegiate sports programs in the spring of 2007, listing UNC as the top program nationally.

Conclusion

The committee enjoys a good working relationship with the Chancellor and the Department of Athletics. The committee believes that the Athletics Department joins with it to thoughtfully examine issues related to the quality of life for student-athletes at Carolina. The committee is dedicated to addressing the many issues related to the intersection of intercollegiate athletics and the academic enterprise on our campus and on the national scene, and endeavors to provide thoughtful leadership on these issues locally and nationally.

Academic Progress and Graduation Data
Baseball, Men's Basketball, and Football

Conference: ACC

Institution	Three-Year APR Data (2003-2006)			1996-99 GSR			1996-99 Fed Grad Rate		
	Baseball	Basketball	Football	Baseball	Basketball	Football	Baseball	Basketball	Football
Boston College	958	940	976	100	73	96	91	50	91
Clemson	959	894+	945	86	25	77	35	15	59
Duke	967	972	978	95	67	93	86	50	86
Florida State	941	980	952	80	75	52	39	40	42
Georgia Tech	974	944	959	65	42	55	28	23	48
Maryland	963	908+	944	66	18	64	57	13	62
Miami	947	938	966	56	69	68	31	67	65
UNC	988	993	948	61	70	70	30	64	61
NCSU	943	947	942	35	64	57	25	47	41
UVA	954	917+	948	77	85	63	63	62	60
Va Tech	922+	934	928	58	71	74	54	17	62
Wake Forest	975	986	966	80	100	93	55	75	86

Source: www.ncaa.org

Report of the Faculty Athletics Representative
To the Faculty Council of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
October 5, 2007

I. Introduction

For many years the faculty athletics representative (FAR) has met with the Faculty Executive Committee and appeared before the Faculty Council periodically, often on behalf of the Faculty Athletics Committee. This is the fourth annual report pursuant to a Faculty Council resolution (April 23, 2004) calling for an annual report by the FAR to the Faculty Council. The first of these reports was submitted in December 2004 as a supplement to the annual report of the Faculty Athletics Committee. Since that practice seemed to work well, each subsequent report has been presented in that same context. The activities of the FAR within the university relate closely to the work of the Committee on behalf of the faculty, so this seems to be an appropriate practice.

II. Activities of the Faculty Athletics Representative within UNC-Chapel Hill

The Committee report mentions many activities in which the faculty athletics representative participates within the University. An Appendix to this report provides a list of annually recurring activities of the FAR. In addition to those activities, the list below summarizes specific, additional activities within the university since the report for 2005-06.

- o On a repeating five-year cycle the Director of Athletics forms a committee to review our status with regard to Title IX compliance and the FAR serves on this committee. The most recent review was completed during 2006-07.
- o Chancellor Moeser led a group that drafted a report on fiscal responsibility as part of the work of the NCAA Presidential Task Force. At his request, I participated with a number of others in the drafting of that report and later in the review of the disclosure draft of the report of the task force. The final report became public in October 2006 and Chancellor Moeser has been appointed to the group that will monitor progress regarding the recommendations of the Task Force. I have been asked by a senior NCAA official to confer with a consultant that has been engaged to assist with implementation of some of those recommendations.
- o The officer positions within the ACC are held by faculty athletics representatives from the member institutions on a set rotation. During 2006-07 I served as President of the ACC, chaired the Executive Committee, and served on the Postgraduate Scholarship Committees. During 2007-08 I serve as Past-President and also serve on the Executive Committee and the Postgraduate Scholarship Committees.

III. National Activities

Since restructuring in 1997, National Collegiate Athletic Association governance has been led by the Board of Directors (chancellors and presidents), the Management Council (athletic administrators, conference officials, and faculty athletics representatives), and two Cabinets, plus a number of committees that review proposed legislation and discharge operating responsibilities of the membership. Institutional participation is through conference membership instead of the former one-school-one-vote structure. The Atlantic Coast Conference has one position on the Division I Board of Directors and three positions on the Division I Management Council. At the request of the Atlantic Coast Conference, I served as one of its three representatives on the Management Council through April 2007. I also serve on the Governance Subcommittee of the Management Council. This group was charged by the Division I Board of Directors to conduct a thorough review of the structure, governance, and legislative processes of Division I. We have proposed recommendations for a new structure that the Board will consider during 2007-08.

The NCAA Division I Board of Directors has adopted a comprehensive academic reform package that is intended to improve the graduation rates of student-athletes, particularly in selected high profile sports that have produced poor graduation results and consequent adverse publicity. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has been represented at all levels of this work by the Chancellor, the Director of Athletics, and the FAR. I serve on the NCAA Committee on Academic Performance, which is responsible for implementation (now under way) and also for design of additional elements of the program that will be needed in 2007-08 and beyond. The NCAA Board of Directors formed a work group on which I serve that was tasked to make recommendations that would reverse a national pattern of low academic performance in baseball. That group has prepared recommendations on which the Board has acted, but some follow-up work is under way this year. The NCAA Board has formed a similar group on which I also serve that has been asked to undertake comparable work focused on men's basketball. This group had its first meeting in August 2007 and will likely work through most of calendar 2008.

One of the objectives of NCAA President Myles Brand is to bring attention to academic research that is being done on various aspects of intercollegiate athletics as a basis for identifying research conclusions that might be relevant to NCAA policies. For that purpose he has formed an Advisory and Editorial Board on which I serve. The group is organizing an academic forum that will occur in conjunction with the annual NCAA Convention and the resulting presentations will be published.

Respectfully submitted,

John P. Evans
Faculty Athletics Representative

Appendix
Summary of Recurring Activities of the Faculty Athletics Representative
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

The list of activities that follows contains the recurring, annual activities of the faculty athletics representative.

- Serve on the Faculty Athletics Committee (ex officio if not an elected member)
- Serve as the de facto secretary for the Faculty Committee on Athletics
- Participate in exit interviews of student-athletes (with members of the Faculty Committee on Athletics and staff of the Department of Athletics)
- Review admission cases for student-athletes (with faculty who are members of the Admissions Subcommittee of the Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Admissions)
- Serve on the Licensing Labor Code Advisory Committee
- Meet with the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
- Consult with the staff of the Academic Support Center
- Monitor the academic progress of student-athletes and participate in the meetings with head coaches that review these results
- Participate in the University's compliance program regarding NCAA regulations
- Represent the University in meetings of the Atlantic Coast Conference
- Other duties as requested (e.g., Title IX Committee, Diversity Committee, discussions of the likely impact of the legislative provision regarding tuition, presentations to prospective student-athletes regarding academic programs, etc.)

Within the Atlantic Coast Conference four individuals from each member institution have the primary governance responsibility. They are the chancellor/president, the director of athletics, the senior women's administrator, and the faculty athletics representative. On specified issues the conference bylaws direct that the chancellor/president shall cast the institutional vote. However, it has become common practice within the conference for the chancellor/president to delegate the voting responsibility to the faculty athletics representative, with appropriate consultation within each member institution.

UNC-Chapel Hill Office of Faculty Governance

JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

October 5, 2007

The Faculty Council of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill convened at 3:00 p.m. in the Hitchcock Multipurpose Room of the Sonja Haynes Stone Center for Black Culture and History. The following 59 members of the Council attended: Aaron, Andrews, Bachenheimer, Bagnell, Balthrop, Barreau, Bickford, Binotti, Blackburn, Bloom, Boukheifia, Broome, Chin, Coleman, Conway, Copenhaver, Couper, DeSaix, Dupuis, Earp, Gerber, Gullede, Halloran, Heenan, Hendrick, Hightow, Hobbs, Kamarei, Katznelson, Kelly, Kendall, Kramer, Lauen, McGrath, Meade, Melamut, Moss, Murray, Orth, Papanikolas, Paquette, Parsons, Pruvost, Renner, Rhodes, Rodgers, Saunders, Stein, Sweeney, Threadgill, Toews, Wegner, Weinberg, Wilder, Williams, Wilson, Wissick and Yankaskas.

The following 28 members were granted excused absences: Ammerman, Ashby, Bangdiwala, Blocher, Brice, Campbell, Ernst, Ewend, Gilligan, Glazner, Hodges, Kirsch, Koroluk, LeFebvre, Lesneski, Maffly-Kipp, Mauro, McCombs, Oatley, Peirce, Perrin, Sheldon, Silversmith, Thorp, Visser, Votta, Weil, Whisnant.

The following 4 members were absent without excuse: Marshall, Rosamond, Temple, Vernon-Feagans.

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Prof. Joseph Templeton, Chair of the Faculty, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m., in the absence of Chancellor James Moeser, who was in Charlottesville, Virginia, meeting with President John T. Casteen and the University of Virginia Board of Visitors.

Prof. Templeton acknowledged Chancellor Moeser's State of the University Address and his outstanding contributions to Carolina during his tenure as chancellor. The Council responded with a round of hearty applause.

Provost's Remarks and Question Period

Provost Bernadette Gray-Little introduced Assoc. Vice Chancellor Brenda Malone, who has recently accepted appointment as associate vice chancellor for human resources. Ms. Malone came to Carolina from the City University of New York, where she served as vice chancellor for faculty and staff relationships. A native New Yorker, Ms. Malone is a graduate of Swarthmore College and earned her law degree at Hofstra University.

Provost Gray-Little said that the Tuition Task Force has begun its annual discussion of tuition policies. At its first meeting, which was preceded by a discussion with the Board of Trustees, the task force talked about general issues and priorities but did not take up specific proposals. Two more meetings are scheduled. The task force anticipates making its recommendations to the chancellor in late October or early November.

The provost reported that Carolina faculty members involved in research in pharmacology and toxicology have been cited by the journal *Nature Biotechnology* as among the most productive in the nation. During that four-year period 1996-2000, our faculty garnered 18,120 citations, thereby ranking

third behind the University of Texas and Merck Laboratories. The provost said this achievement is yet one more example of Carolina's growing strength in research.

The provost said that one of her primary goals has been to enhance faculty teaching and research. Toward that end, she appointed a task force chaired by Prof. Pat Conway (Economics) and charged it to develop recommendations. The task force has proposed creation of a Center for Faculty Excellence. The Center will incorporate and expand upon the mission of the Center for Teaching and Learning, include new programs in research and leadership, and become an umbrella for faculty development programs and opportunities. The Center's services will be available to all faculty. Specialized faculty support programs in particular departments and schools will continue unchanged. The Center will incorporate programs now provided by the Center for Teaching and Learning. It will be staffed by a new half-time faculty director and a full-time EPA non-faculty executive director. The Center will be guided by a faculty advisory board. The provost said that she hopes to have the new Center in place by July 2008. Part of its program will be a faculty leadership "boot camp." In that connection, the Center will work closely with the Institute for the Arts and Humanities to complement its leadership training activities.

Prof. Suzanne Gullege (Education) spoke of a recent apartment fire in which one of her students had been injured. She said the student's parents had asked if it were true that not all Carolina dormitories have sprinklers. The provost replied that this is true, but that there is an active plan that will eventually equip all dormitories with sprinklers.

Faculty Assembly Delegation Report

Prof. Judith Wegner (Law) reported on recent work of the University of North Carolina Faculty Assembly pertaining to proposed amendments to the Code of the Board of Governors affecting academic tenure and post-tenure review. She said that the Assembly's Executive Committee had undertaken a thorough review of the proposed changes and had recommended a number of revisions. (Links to full documentation of the original proposal and the changes recommended by the Faculty Assembly will be found on the agenda for this meeting posted on the Faculty Governance website.)

Prof. Stephen Bachenheimer (Microbiology & Immunology), a member of the delegation, moved to suspend the rules to allow consideration of a resolution presented by the Faculty Assembly Delegation. The motion to suspend the rules was adopted unanimously.

The Faculty Assembly Delegation introduced the following resolution:

On Proposed Changes in the Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina

Whereas, the Faculty Executive Committee has reviewed proposed changes in the Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina proposed by the "Code 603/604 Committee"; and

Whereas, the Faculty Council adopted Resolution 2007-10 on September 14, 2007, requesting additional time for review of the proposed changes; and

Whereas, the Faculty Council has received a report from the Faculty Assembly Delegation and background materials relating to efforts of the Faculty Assembly of The University of North Carolina to address significant problems in the proposals by the "Code 603/604 Committee," and

Whereas, the Faculty Council wishes to go on record regarding its concerns with the original Code 603/604 Committee proposal, insofar as it would have introduced vague language regarding possible sanctions affecting faculty, conflated the developmental purpose of post-tenure review with the process of discipline or sanction, imposed relatively lax evidentiary standards for serious sanctions of tenured faculty members, and adversely affected the rights of special faculty, among other problems; and

Whereas, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Assembly has developed alternative language to address faculty concerns with the original Code 603/604 proposals in an effort to move matters forward and has requested faculty leaders throughout the UNC System to evaluate and comment on its alternative language; now, therefore,

The Faculty Council of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill resolves:

The Faculty Council supports the alternative language proposed by the Executive Committee of the UNC Faculty Assembly and endorsed by the Faculty Assembly at its September 28, 2007 meeting;

The Faculty Council requests that, in the future, changes to the Code of the Board of Governors or other University policies directly affecting faculty be undertaken only with extensive faculty representation on relevant committees or task forces, open involvement in deliberations from the outset, and adequate opportunities to comment during the academic year except under pressing and unusual circumstances.

The Faculty Council asks the Secretary of the Faculty to submit this resolution to the Chancellor and Provost of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and the President of The University of North Carolina as an indication of its substantial concerns with the original Code 603/604 Committee recommendations, its support for the alternative text prepared by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Assembly, and its request that in the future more extensive faculty representation and opportunities for review be accorded when developing policies affecting faculty.

Prof. Gregory Copenhaver (Biology) expressed concern that making unsatisfactory "performance" a grounds for dismissal opens the door for attacks on faculty members who espouse unpopular ideas. Prof. Wegner acknowledged the concern, but felt that the language proposed by the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee is satisfactory. She said that linking the concept of performance with the concepts of incompetence and sustained and persistent failure or refusal to remedy identified deficiencies after having been given an opportunity to improve afforded sufficient safeguards against the kind of abuse the Prof. Copenhaver feared.

Prof. Richard Andrews (Public Policy), a member of the delegation, noted that Prof. Jim Martin, chair of the faculty at North Carolina State University, had spoken eloquently of the need to keep the grounds and procedures for dismissal for cause separate and distinct from post-tenure review, which should not be used to generate backing for moves to dismiss tenured faculty on grounds of unsatisfactory performance.

Prof. Baehenheimer said that consideration of this proposal had given the Faculty Assembly an unusually good opportunity to make it clear to General Administration and the Board of Governors that the faculty are vigilant and vitally concerned about actions that directly

affect faculty life.

Prof. Wegner said that the Assembly especially appreciated the position of the delegates from North Carolina State since their provost had been instrumental in developing the original proposals.

Prof. Lloyd Kramer (History) asked when the proposals are to go to the Board of Governors. Prof. Wegner replied that Vice President Harold Martin has said that they will not be on the agenda for the October meeting of the Board, and that the Faculty Assembly has asked that they not be on the November agenda.

Discussion having concluded, Prof. Templeton put the resolution.

The resolution was adopted unanimously as is ordered enrolled as Resolution 2007-12.

Prof. Bachenheimer reported briefly on the work of the Faculty Assembly's Committee on Faculty Welfare.

Carolina Performing Arts

Executive Director for the Arts Emil Kang gave a presentation on activities of Carolina Performing Arts. He especially noted interactions with students.

Annual Reports of the Faculty Athletics Committee and the Faculty Athletics Representative

Prof. Lissa Broome (Law), chair of the Faculty Athletics Committee, presented the committee's annual report. She introduced Director of Athletics Richard Baddour, Senior Assoc. Director Larry Gallo, and Senior Assoc. Director for Students John Blanchard.

Prof. Garland Hershey (Dentistry), a member of the committee, remarked that one often hears talk about what is wrong with college athletics, but that the committee's report this year emphasizes what's *right* about athletics at Carolina.

Prof. Bachenheimer, referring to tables in the report comparing Carolina with other athletic conferences, asked how we compare with our academic peers. Prof. Broome said that she thought we do well. Prof. John Evans, Faculty Athletics Representative, agreed with that impression and added that perhaps including specific comparative data of the kind referenced by Prof. Bachenheimer would be a good addition to next year's report.

Prof. Bachenheimer asked how student athletes' academic performance compares with non-athletes in the same classes. Prof. Evans said that data that would enable such a comparison is not collected.

Prof. John Papanikolas (Chemistry) said that the data reported by the committee tend to indicate that student athletes as a whole achieve lower grade point averages than other students.

Prof. Kramer asked about a recent report in the Chronicle of Higher Education indicating that Carolina leads the nation in fund-raising for athletics with a total of \$51 million last year. He wondered whether that figure is accurate. Mr. Baddour said that the figure includes pledges as well as actual cash receipts. He pointed out that last year was atypical in that funds were being raised for five separate projects: the Williamson Building (athletics administration), a new baseball stadium, a sports medicine facility, an

endowment program for scholarships, and special fund-raising for recruitment of a new football coach and renegotiation of Coach Roy Williams' salary. Mr. Baddour said that 80% of the total raised was restricted, and that only 20% went into the regular operating budget. He said that the focus of the article in the Chronicle of Higher Education was whether athletic fund-raising was a drain on other university needs. He pointed out that fund-raising for athletics accounted for about 14% of funds raised last year for all purposes while the national average is about 26%. He said that over the past seven years athletics has averaged about 11% of funds raised each year. Mr. Baddour said that these facts indicate to him that athletics has not drained money away from other university needs.

Prof. Ed Halloran (Nursing) asked that next year's report provide some information on money spent on particular sports.

Prof. Evans briefly summarized his written report as Faculty Athletics Representative.

Prof. John Sweeney (Journalism & Mass Communication) noted that the Academic Progress Rate (APR) to which Prof. Evans referred was a new measure. He said that the APR had attracted negative comments when it was first introduced and asked whether it has proved to be a positive step. Prof. Evans replied that he was biased because he was had participated in devising this measure. He said he is cautiously hopeful that it has had a positive influence. He said that the APR measures students against performance standards at the institution they choose to attend. It is not intended to measure progress against national standards. One of the objections, he said, was that the measure would encourage development of academic majors tailored for student athletes. He did not think that had been the case, but, he emphasized, it is not the business of the NCAA to regulate the academic rigor of particular institutions. Mr. Blanchard said he has found the APR to be a very useful move that has had a positive impact.

Adjournment

Its business having been completed, the Council adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Joseph S. Ferrell

Secretary of the Faculty

