



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

MEETING of the FACULTY COUNCIL

Friday, October 14th, 2005 at 3:00 p.m.

***** The Pleasants Family Assembly Room in Wilson Library *****

Chancellor James Moeser and Professor Judith Wegner, Chair of the Faculty, will preside.

AGENDA

- 3:00 **Faculty Council Convenes**
- Welcome by Professor Wegner
 - Remarks by the Chancellor
 - Introduction of University Registrar Alice Poehls
- 3:20 **Questions and Comments from Members of the Council**
- 3:30 **Comments from the Provost**
- 3:40 **Athletics Reports and Discussion**
- Professor Lissa Broome (Chair, Faculty Athletics Committee)
 - Professor Jack Evans (Faculty Athletics Representative)
- 4:20 **Diversity Assessment and Planning: Discussion with Representatives of the Diversity Task Force**
- a. Overview of Diversity Task Force findings, recommendations, process for developing "diversity plan" – Dr. Archie Ervin, Associate Provost for Multicultural and Diversity Affairs; Dr. Melva Newsom, Director, Diversity Education and Research.
 - b. Discussion of selected recommendations: From faculty viewpoint, how can we
 - "Ensure accountability for achieving diversity objectives"? (Recommendation 2)
 - "Achieve the critical masses of minority populations necessary to ensure the educational benefits of diversity"? (Recommendation 3)
 - "Make high quality diversity education, orientation, and training available to all members of the University community"? (Recommendation 5)
 - "Create and sustain a campus climate in which respectful discussions of diversity are encouraged" (Recommendation 6)

5:00 **Adjourn**

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty

Additional agenda background materials and documents pertaining to meetings of the Council may be found at
www.unc.edu/faculty/faccoun

Faculty Athletics Committee
Annual Report to the Faculty Council
October 14, 2005

Overview of Committee's Structure and Purpose

Members 2004-05: Lissa Broome (2005) (Chair), Jack Evans (ACC rep-ex officio), Kathleen Harris (2008), Garland Hershey (2006), Lloyd Kramer (2007), George Lensing (2008), Steve Leonard (2006), Mary Lynn (2007), James Murphy (2005), and William Smith (2007).

Members 2005-06: Lissa Broome (2008) (Chair), Jack Evans (ACC rep-ex officio), Kathleen Harris (2008), Garland Hershey (2006), Lloyd Kramer (2007), George Lensing (2008), Steve Leonard (2006), Mary Lynn (2007), James Murphy (alternate for Fall 2005 for William Smith), Desmond Runyan (2008), William Smith (2007), and Barbara Wildemuth (2008).

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; however, 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. Accordingly, two members rotated off the committee at the end of 2005, and three new members were elected (one of whom was reelected) for a three-year term so the committee still has ten elected members. In 2006, two members will rotate off the committee.

The faculty athletics representative to the ACC, 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.

Meetings: The committee held monthly meetings during the 2004-2005 academic year. The April meeting was cancelled because of the Final Four and two meetings were held in May. The committee has met monthly during the current academic year, with its first monthly meeting in September.

Lissa Broome and Jack Evans also met with the General Alumni Association Athletic Advisory Committee on January 14, 2005, to discuss the NCAA certification process, the activities of the Faculty Athletics Representative, and faculty oversight of intercollegiate athletics through the Faculty Committee on Athletics. That evening, Jack

Evans received the GAA's Faculty Service Award, in recognition of his service to the University, including as the Faculty Athletics Representative.

Committee Change: "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.

The committee corresponded with the chair of the Educational Policy Committee about proposed changes to the student attendance policy. The changes adopted did not impact student-athletes who are excused by the policy from attendance when representing the University in an athletics competition.

Report of Activities

NCAA Legislation Affecting Academics: Jack Evans serves on the Committee on Academic Performance, which is implementing the NCAA's new Academic Progress Rate (APR). The Committee on Academic Performance is also developing a Graduation Success Rate (GSR), which will differ from the current federally calculated graduation 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. 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.

The committee, through Jack Evans, monitors these and other developments and provides advice with respect to the institution's position. Jack Evans currently also serves on the NCAA's Management Council, which is the group just below the NCAA's Board of Directors.

Academic Performance of Student-Athletes: The committee reviews the academic progress of student-athletes each year. This review now includes the Academic Performance Rate (APR), as well as graduation rates calculated for the NCAA and the University of North Carolina Board of Governors Report.

The NCAA graduation rate (the same rate that is reported as the IPEDs or Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System rate) is a six-year rate that includes students who received athletic scholarship aid in their first semester of enrollment. The BOG and NCAA rates include in the number of total student-athletes those who left the University in good standing prior to graduation. The BOG *adjusted* rate removes these

students from the denominator of the fraction used to calculate the graduation rate. Data reported to the BOG cover recruited student-athletes, a larger population than those receiving some level of athletically related financial aid and included in calculation of the NCAA rate.

NCAA/IPEDs 6-Yr. Graduation Rates (student body rate)

| | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 |
|--------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| All athletes | 71 (79) | 69 (79) | 64 (80) | 70 (83) |
| Males | 66 (77) | 61 (78) | 50 (78) | 64 (81) |
| Females | 81 (80) | 80 (80) | 83 (82) | 81(84) |

BOG Graduation Rate Report for 1998 Cohort (as of 8/31/04)

| | |
|---|------|
| Recruited student-athletes | 77.9 |
| Adjusted* - recruited student-athletes | 88.5 |
| Full grant student-athletes | 66.6 |
| Adjusted* - full grant student-athletes | 77.8 |
| Football recruited | 66.6 |
| Football adjusted* | 88.9 |

* See explanation in paragraph above

The APR is computed based on points awarded each semester per student-athlete for eligibility/graduation and retention. Each team member could 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 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. The first set of penalties will be imposed by the NCAA beginning in the fall of 2005 based on APR data collected for 2003-05. Penalties such as scholarship reductions, postseason competition bans, and membership restrictions will not be imposed until 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 UNNC-CH were computed for 2003-04. The preliminary numbers were reported in last year's annual report. The NCAA released the final numbers for 2003-04 for UNNC-CH and for all other schools in February 2005. These data represent all student-athletes receiving some athletics scholarship aid (534 students in 2003-04). Of these students, 97 graduated during 2003-04, 21 were not eligible to compete (under either NCAA, ACC or UNNC-CH standards), and 40 were not retained (these students may have turned professional, transferred to another school, or are no longer competing). The overall APR for our student-athletes in 2003-04 was 970. Several teams scored 1000 (men's basketball, men's swimming, women's cross-country, field hockey, gymnastics, rowing, women's swimming, and volleyball). Only two teams were below the 925 level (men's golf (900) and wrestling (900)), but in both cases the NCAA report indicated that these teams have an estimated APR upper confidence boundary of 925 or above because of the squad size adjustment. Our 2003-04 APR of 970 compares favorably with that of other ACC schools in the state: N.C. State University, 929; Wake Forest, 979; Duke, 984.

The committee intends to monitor the ability of student-athletes to meet the new progress towards degree requirements and to try to learn whether there are challenges for students in scheduling particular required courses or the courses required in particular majors. The committee also intends to monitor the effect of advanced placement (AP) credits for high school on the NCAA requirements on student-athletes who, ironically, may be deemed not to be making sufficient progress towards degree because of "excessive" AP credits. The committee will also monitor any problems that early declaration of a major might create for student-athletes.

It is also important to note the strong academic performance of many student-athletes. Of our approximately 770 student-athletes, 294 students were on the ACC Honor Roll (requires a 3.0 GPA or better during the academic year). This number is an all-time high for UNNC (244 student-athletes were named to the ACC Honor Roll for 2003-04) and includes members of all 28 varsity teams. For Fall 2004, 175 student-athletes were on the Dean's List (143 in Fall 2003). For Spring 2005, 163 were on the Dean's List (141 in Spring 2004). Several student-athletes received ACC post-graduate awards, NCAA academic awards, or were awarded prestigious internships.

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 UNNC-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 hopes to learn how student-athletes perceive their experience at UNNC-CH.

One hundred students answered the survey in 2004-05. We have surveyed students for twelve years, and this was the fourth year with an 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.

Twenty-four students participated in the exit interviews, which were held February 28, March 1, and March 2, 2005. 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 the committee of impressions from the exit interviews, the committee highlights the following:

- Participation in athletics helps student-athletes develop self-discipline, organizational skills, and time management skills.
- Students report that coaches emphasize the importance of academics.
- The Academic Support Program for Student-Athletes was given high marks as an important and helpful resource in supporting students in meeting their academic goals and responsibilities.
- Student-athletes lamented the lack of parking on campus and noted difficulties this presented in getting to and from practice as well as to appointments with athletic trainers.

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.

Academic Support Program for Student-Athletes: Robert Mercer, the Director of the Academic Support Program for Student-Athletes reported to the committee at its September 2005 meeting. 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. The Faculty Athletics Committee also reviewed the Academic Integrity portion of the NCAA self-study, which addressed academic support matters.

Mr. Mercer described the self-study of the Academic Support Center, which is currently being undertaken by the faculty advisory committee to the program. Garland Hershey is a member of that advisory committee. One or two additional members of the Faculty Committee on Athletics will be considered for appointment to the open positions on the Support Center's advisory committee. Mr. Mercer provided a summary of

activities and results for student-athletes for 2004-05. He reported that staff members of the Center have increased their interaction with the advising staff. He also described the Supplemental Instruction (SI) programs occurring this fall in ten courses, which provides additional structured study group and tutoring to participating students. The SI program originated at the University of Missouri at Kansas City in 1973. Reports from over 270 institutions that have used the program since then support its effectiveness in helping students achieve academic success.

Athletic Reform Issues: Chancellor Moeser keeps the committee informed about developments among 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, which he was invited to serve on this past spring. The charge of the full Task Force is to explore the alignment of intercollegiate athletics with the mission, values and goals of higher education. That Task Force is divided into four subcommittees which represent 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 is a member of the Fiscal Responsibility Subcommittee.

The Faculty Council became a member of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) in the spring of 2004. This organization is composed of approximately fifty faculty senates from around the country. Wake Forest and Duke are the other ACC schools that have joined COIA. Pursuant to agreement, the Faculty Committee on Athletics represents the Faculty Council in providing COIA with comments and questions on various COIA documents, including a document relating to academic integrity in intercollegiate athletics. COIA members met in Vanderbilt in January of 2005 to discuss the document referred to above. UNC did not send a representative to the meeting. The committee abstained when this document was subsequently put to a COIA vote by email ballot because even though it contained many commendable provisions, the committee felt that some of the NCAA legislation that it proposed was undesirable and unworkable. Notwithstanding our remaining concerns, the document was adopted by COIA.

Currently, COIA is beginning a discussion of the NCAA Presidential Task Force reports with the goal of developing recommended responses for a meeting planned for December 2-3 at Washington State. The committee's chair has been invited to participate in an email discussion group of COIA to help frame the issues that will be discussed at the December meeting and to attend the meeting, although funding for such a trip is uncertain at this time.

NCAA Certification: The NCAA began a certification program that is similar to an academic accreditation review, a little over ten years ago. Each NCAA institution must complete a certification review and self-study every ten years. The institution's second self-study and NCAA certification began in the spring of 2004. A Certification Committee, chaired by Provost Robert Shelton, was named and began work on the self-

study which focused on three areas: academic integrity, governance and compliance, and equity and welfare. Committee members Garland Hershey and Lissa Broome chaired two of the three subcommittees preparing the certification report. The steering committee and subcommittees contained representatives of the faculty, staff, students, alumni, donors and trustees. The draft self-study was reviewed by the Faculty Committee on Athletics and reported on to the Faculty Council at the December 2004 meeting. The final self-study was submitted to the NCAA in January 2005, and it found the Athletic Department to be in full compliance with the NCAA's operating principles under review in the certification. The report contained several plans for improvement, including the creation of a Diversity Committee, and continued attention to recruiting, developing and retaining highly qualified minority student-athletes, staff and coaches.

A peer review team from the NCAA visited our campus May 18-20, 2005. The institution subsequently responded to the report written by the peer review team, and implemented several suggestions made by the team. For instance, the peer review team suggested that the Academic Support Program be subject to a formal review every three years by academic authorities. This review will be conducted by the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Academic Support Program and is expected to be complete in December 2005. The report will be reviewed by the Faculty Committee on Athletics, the Associate Dean of Academic Services in the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Senior Associate Athletics Director for Student-Athlete Services. In August 2005, the institution was notified that the NCAA Division I Committee on Athletics Certification had certified the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill during the committee's July 12-14, 2005, meeting.

Student Athletic Fee: At its January 2005 meeting the committee discussed an innovative proposal made by Faculty Council Chair, Judith Wegner, to reallocate the portion of the University's logo licensing revenue then directed to the Department of Athletics to merit-based scholarships for the student body, and to replace this source of revenue for the Department by an increase of the student athletics fee of \$150 per year. The Board of Trustees subsequently approved a total increase of the student athletics fee of \$100 for the coming academic year to be followed by an additional \$50 increase in the following academic year. The Board of Governors also approved the increase. The increase has been implemented and the additional funds have been directed to increase the operating budgets of the Olympic sports program and address salary issues for the Olympic sports coaches. The remaining \$50 fee increase is being considered this year through the relevant campus committees. The Athletics Director has proposed to direct the funds raised by this increase to help support renovations of Carmichael Auditorium.

Signage: The committee has continued to discuss with the Athletics Department its plans to place signage at Kenan Stadium and the Smith Center as an additional source of revenue to support the athletics program. Three representatives from the Faculty Athletics Committee served on a Task Force appointed by the Chancellor to discuss signage. This task force met during the spring of 2004. Its work resulted in a resolution proposed to and adopted by the Board of Trustees in the summer of 2004 requiring that signage "should only be introduced in a limited and tasteful way, with a small number of

companies that have strong integrity and national impact; that signage makes a significant financial impact; and the signage protects insofar as possible the environment and tradition of the institution.”

In-State Tuition for Out-of-State Students on Full Scholarship: The Director of Athletics also reported that there would be a positive impact for the Department and the Educational Foundation from a tuition bill approved by the General Assembly in the summer of 2005. The bill permits out-of-state students on full scholarship to be treated as in-state students for tuition purposes. This provision will also benefit programs such as the Morehead Scholars and the Robertson Scholars. In recent years, as the result of continued tuition increases, especially in out-of-state tuition, the Educational Foundation has not been able to fund all student-athlete grants-in-aid, and the shortfall has been made up by the Department of Athletics. This provision should enable the Educational Foundation to fund the cost of all student-athlete grants-in-aid.

Title IX: Every year the committee invites Dr. Beth Miller, Senior Associate Athletic Director for Olympic Sports, to report on Title IX matters. She reported at the January 2004 committee meeting. The committee did not meet separately with Dr. Miller in 2004-05, since equity issues were thoroughly reviewed by the access and equity subcommittee of the NCAA certification process and included in the NCAA self-study reviewed by the committee. Every five years, the Department of Athletics appoints a Title IX Committee to undertake a thorough review of Title IX issues. The committee has recently been appointed and is undertaking that review. Three members of the Faculty Athletics Committee -- Mary Lynn, Kathleen Harris, and Jack Evans -- serve on that committee. The Faculty Athletics Committee will invite Dr. Miller to a meeting during 2005-06 to report on Title IX and the work of the Title IX Committee.

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, the primary service provider for the Carolina Leadership Academy, reported to the committee at its February meeting. He distributed results of a recent feedback survey that indicated strong favorable support for the experience. There are three levels of the program for student-athletes: a segment for all freshmen, a rising stars program (any student-athlete other than a freshman may participate), and a veteran leader group (limited to team captains and other recognized team leaders).

UNCN President Emeritus William Friday received an award during the 2005 NCAA Convention that recognized his leadership of the Knight Commission. Mr. Friday requested that the financial portion of that award (which is to go to an institution) be directed to the Department of Athletics to be used for the Carolina Leadership Academy.

NCAA President Myles Brand gave a well-attended address on April 19 at UNC in honor of the first year of the Carolina Leadership Academy. In addition to his speech,

President Brand met with coaches, student-athletes, and faculty members (including the Faculty Committee on Athletics).

Substance Abuse Policy for Student-Athletes: In December 2004, the Athletics Director wrote to the Chancellor suggesting that a comprehensive review of the Substance Abuse Policy for Student-Athletes take place, and recommending that the Faculty Committee on Athletics participate significantly in that process. The committee discussed the existing policy at its January 2005 meeting, outlined several significant areas for review, and discussed the appropriate process for conducting the review. Mr. Baddour reported at a subsequent meeting that a working group containing administrators from the Department of Athletics, faculty members (Jack Evans and Lissa Broome), University legal counsel, representatives from Sports Medicine and Student Affairs, and substance abuse professionals (represented by Dr. Jacob Lohr, Professor of Pediatrics at UNC and Executive Director of the Governor's Institute on Substance and Alcohol Abuse) had worked to revise the policy. The group also sought input from student-athletes on the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and through questions posed to the student-athletes at the Exit Interviews conducted by the Faculty Athletics Committee.

The Faculty Athletics Committee discussed various aspects of the proposed revisions to the policy, including changes in the testing procedure to ensure that all drug tests were observed. These discussions took most of the committee's meeting time during two meetings in May. The policy was refined and revised over the summer by the working group and discussed again by the Faculty Committee on Athletics at its September 2005 meeting, where it received the committee's unanimous endorsement.

The revised policy is expected to be effective as of November 1, 2005. An important component of the revised policy is the appointment of a Substance Abuse Policy Review Committee to interpret the policy and the drug testing program as necessary, review its administration annually, and recommend any policy or program changes to the Director of Athletics for approval by the Director and the Chancellor. The Policy provides that this review committee includes faculty members.

Majors: The committee reviewed data on majors of student-athletes who have junior status or higher and thus have declared majors. The data show that student-athletes have declared some majors with greater frequency than the student body as a whole, but that these differences did not suggest cause for worry. The committee will continue to collect and monitor data on majors for student-athletes to ensure that no troublesome patterns develop.

Compliance: The Subcommittee on Governance and Commitment to Rules Compliance of the NCAA Certification Committee reviewed the Department's compliance efforts as part of its report to the NCAA.

Admissions: The admissions process was also thoroughly reviewed by the Academic Integrity Subcommittee of the NCAA Certification Committee.

Competitive Success: The Director Athletics reported that UNCC-CH finished in ninth place in the Director's Cup (former Sears Cup) for national rankings in athletic programs in 2004-05, highlighted by a football bowl (the Continental Tire Bowl in Charlotte) and the Men's Basketball NCAA Championship.

Conclusion

The committee enjoys a good working relationship with the Chancellor and the Department of Athletics. The committee believes that the Athletic 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.

Report of the Faculty Athletics Representative
To the Faculty Council of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
October 14, 2005

I. Introduction

In recent years the faculty athletics representative has met with the Faculty Executive Committee and appeared before the Faculty Council periodically, often on behalf of the Faculty Athletics Committee. A Faculty Council resolution (April 23, 2004) calls for an annual report by the faculty athletics representative (FAR) to the Faculty Council. The first report pursuant to that resolution was submitted in December 2004 as a supplement to the annual report of the Faculty Athletics Committee. Since that practice seemed to work well, this report is submitted in the same context. This seems appropriate because the activities of the faculty athletics representative closely parallel those of the Committee as it pursues its work on behalf of the faculty.

II. Activities of the Faculty Athletics Representative

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 activities that occur on an annual basis. In addition to those activities, the list below summarizes specific, additional activities since the report for 2003-04.

- 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 is typically included on this committee. A committee for this purpose is now at work.
- The Director of Athletics formed a working group that includes the FAR, to review and propose revisions to the current policy on substance abuse. That review has been under way since approximately January of 2004 and is bringing its work to closure.
- In connection with the new progress-toward-degree requirements of the NCAA, the FAR and Senior Associate Athletic Director John Blanchard co-chaired an ad hoc committee to review and revise the University's process for certifying the eligibility of student-athletes. A new process is now in place.
- In response to a request from ACC football coaches, an ad hoc committee of faculty athletics representatives was asked to review and summarize the pros and cons of a proposal called "five-for-five" (five years of financial support for five years of competitive eligibility in intercollegiate football). I served on that committee. The report has been prepared and considered by the ACC Council of Presidents. The conference position is not to support this proposal.
- While our NCAA certification review was under way, I served on the Steering Committee and on the Governance Subcommittee for preparation of our report.
- During 2004-05 I presented our appeal to the NCAA regarding the eligibility of a UNC basketball player who had played in a non-sanctioned summer league game.
- I serve as the de facto secretary for the Faculty Committee on Athletics.

The officer positions within the ACC are held by faculty athletics representatives on a rotating schedule. This year the positions of President, Vice President, and Secretary-Treasurer are held by the faculty athletics representatives of Clemson University, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and the University of Maryland, respectively. By the standard rotation, I will serve as President during 2006-07. During 2004-05 I served on and chaired the Finance Committee of the ACC.

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 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 serve in one of the ACC's three positions on the Management Council.

III. Significant National Activities

The NCAA Division I Board of Directors has adopted an extensive package of legislation that is intended to improve academic performance of student-athletes, particularly in high profile sports that have been the subject of 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 faculty athletics representative. The NCAA Committee on Academic Performance, on which I serve, is responsible for the first stage of implementation (now under way) and also for designing the additional elements of the program that will be needed beginning in 2006-07. During the spring of 2005, senior NCAA representatives asked me to write a position paper on this work that was published in the Chronicle of Higher Education (May 2005). In part because of this work, we were able to persuade NCAA President Myles Brand to deliver a major speech on intercollegiate athletics at UNC in April 2005 in connection with the first anniversary of the Carolina Leadership Academy.

Respectfully submitted,

John P. Evans
Faculty Athletics Representative

Appendix
Summary of Standard Activities of the Faculty Athletics Representative

The list of activities that follows contains the recurring, annual activities of the faculty athletics representative. This list provides a sense of the scope and range of activities.

- Member of the Faculty Athletics Committee (ex officio if not an elected member)
- Exit interviews of student-athletes (with members of the Faculty Athletics Committee and staff of the Department of Athletics)
- Reviews of admission (with faculty who are members of the Admissions Subcommittee that reviews student-athlete admissions)
- Meetings with the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
- Consultation 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
- Other duties as requested (e.g., NCAA certification, Title IX Committee, planning committee for the Carolina Leadership Academy, Signage Task Force, 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.

Diversity Assessment and Planning

with members of the

CHANCELLOR'S TASK FORCE ON
DIVERSITY

October 14, 2005

Background

CHANCELLOR'S TASK FORCE ON
DIVERSITY

Charge:

- What are we doing well?
- What do we need to improve?

Assessment Areas:

Perceptions and attitudes about

- University's vision and commitment to diversity
- Recruitment/retention efforts
- Educational benefits of diversity
- Support for critical thinking
- Climate
- School/unit level activities

Methods: randomized surveys, focus groups, ethnographic interviews, school/unit reports

Selected Findings from Faculty Survey



Faculty perceive that recruitment efforts reflect a commitment to achieving a diverse faculty (61.9% strongly agree or agree), yet:

- African American and Hispanic respondents were significantly more likely than other respondents to disagree that their departments' recruitment and retention efforts reflected a commitment to diversity, and that tenure, promotion, and professional development opportunities were unbiased.
- Male respondents were considerably more positive than female respondents about the extent to which departmental recruitment and retention efforts reflected a commitment to diversity.

Carolina is perceived by faculty as invested in diversity and concerned with diversity issues (82.8% strongly agree or agree) and over 70% reported that they never heard disparaging remarks from students or from faculty, yet:

- 26.9% of Hispanic faculty disagreed or strongly disagreed that the University is committed to creating an environment that welcomes many different perspectives and ideas. This level of disagreement was significantly higher than any other group (African American: 8.1%, Asian: 15.4%, Native American and Other: 15.8%).
- 42.3% of Hispanic faculty and 40% of African American faculty disagreed or strongly disagreed that "Carolina is a comfortable place" for racial/ethnic minorities.
- 15% of respondents noted that they have felt unfairly treated at the University due to their gender.

Faculty thought the curriculum in their school/department adequately represented the contributions of a variety of groups of people (60% strongly agree or agree), and thought they were encouraged to include diversity issues in course content (59%), yet:

- While faculty were much more positive (60.7%) in agreeing or strongly agreeing that the University encouraged faculty to include diversity content in courses, than were African American (50%), Asian (48.7%), or Hispanic faculty (44.4%).
- African American respondents were significantly more likely to disagree that faculty in their departments readily engage in diversity-related discussions.

Background: Task Force Recommendations



1. Clearly define and publicize the University's commitment to diversity.
2. Ensure accountability for achieving diversity objectives.
3. Achieve the critical masses of minority populations necessary to ensure the educational benefits of diversity.
4. Achieve greater representation of ethnic minorities among the executive, administrative, and managerial positions and among the professional/non-faculty positions.
5. Make high quality diversity education, orientation, and training available to all members of the University community.
6. Create and sustain a campus climate in which respectful discussions of diversity are encouraged.
7. Take leadership in creating opportunities for interaction and cross-group learning.
8. Support further research to advance the University's commitment to diversity.

Background:
Chancellor's Response



- We will clearly define and communicate our commitment to diversity, and we will adopt the core values for diversity proposed by the Task Force.
- We will ensure accountability for achieving diversity objectives by developing a diversity plan that will allow us to monitor our progress annually.
- We will support innovative approaches to enhancing diversity at all levels of the University, and we will continue the support of programs that are instrumental to bringing diverse students to Carolina.
- We will make diversity education, orientation and training available to members of the University community, with particular attention to developing innovative strategies to offer relevant learning and cross-cultural opportunities for members of our community.
- We will create and sustain a respectful climate and take greater leadership to promote diversity competency.
- We will support further research to advance the University's commitment to diversity, including the development of research agendas that will inform our policy decisions and program development on the state of diversity at our University.

Focus for Today's Discussion

- Task Force Recommendation 2.
Ensure accountability for achieving diversity objectives by developing a plan for diversity.
- Task Force Recommendation 3.
Achieve the critical masses of minority populations necessary to ensure the educational benefits of diversity.
- Task Force Recommendations 4. & 5.
Make high quality diversity education, orientation, and training available to all members of the University community.
Create and sustain a campus climate in which respectful discussions of diversity are encouraged.

Discussion

2. Ensure accountability for achieving diversity objectives via plan for diversity.
 - What processes would encourage faculty input and engagement with the diversity plan?
 - How are faculty best informed about the University's progress towards achieving diversity goals?

Discussion

3. Achieve the critical masses of minority populations necessary to ensure the educational benefits of diversity.
 - What proven core hiring strategies best support strong and diverse candidate pools?
 - How can search committees share and develop effective hiring strategies?
 - What are important measures of success in hiring and retention?

Discussion

5. & 6. Make diversity education available to all members of the University community, and create and sustain a respectful climate.
- What aspects of diversity education are important in your academic context?
 - What would support faculty in conducting successful discussions of diversity in classrooms and/or departments?
 - What are important measures of success for these areas?

Executive Summary

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill aims for excellence: in the education it imparts to students; in the research and outreach it undertakes for the greater good; and in the environment it creates for the thousands of people who work, learn, and visit here. It should do no less.

A critical element of excellence for a 21st century educational institution is a diverse and inclusive community. Over the past several months, the Chancellor's Task Force on Diversity has conducted an assessment of diversity on the University campus, examining it from a broad range of perspectives. The Task Force took into account the experiences of students, staff, and faculty as they relate to race, gender, class, sexuality, culture, religion, and region. It also collected information on policies and procedures from nearly all schools and selected administrative units on the campus.

The Task Force reached five general conclusions:

- Diversity clearly resonates as an important issue for faculty, staff, and students. They support diversity themselves and see the University's public commitment as supportive. Opinions are more divided on whether the University's deeds live up to its ideals. Perhaps compounding the questions, members of the community lack a common understanding of the meaning of diversity.
- The undergraduate student body is generally seen as diverse, and the University is credited with doing a good job of recruiting a diverse undergraduate population. Concerns are widely expressed about other segments of the Carolina community, however.
- Members of the University community showed widespread agreement that they have learned and benefited from experiences in a diverse community, but that the mere presence of diversity is insufficient to achieve the maximum educational benefits diversity can offer. Interaction across diverse groups also must occur.
- Although most members of the University community say they feel comfortable in discussions, dialogue about diversity issues appears to be limited. Particular problems with promoting respectful discussion exist in the classroom.
- The majority of faculty, staff, and students feel the University offers a warm, welcoming, and supportive environment. Hate speech is not tolerated. Nonetheless, the welcome extended to some groups appears uncertain.

While these findings say many good things about the state of diversity on campus, they also indicate room for improvement. The Task Force has outlined eight recommendations that it believes will move the University closer toward the excellence a diverse and inclusive community can offer. The University must:

- 1. Clearly define and publicize its commitment to diversity.**
Just as the University must be clear and direct in its commitment to educational excellence, so must it be clear and direct in its commitment to diversity as a contributor to that excellence.
- 2. Ensure accountability for achieving diversity objectives.**
The Office for Minority Affairs should be directed, in consultation with the campus community, to develop a plan for diversity that includes benchmarks and timelines for implementation and to issue annual reports to the University community on progress toward meeting diversity goals and objectives.

3. **Achieve the critical masses of minority populations necessary to ensure the educational benefits of diversity.**
Lack of diversity among faculty and among the graduate and professional student population impedes the educational process. Even among undergraduates, where the University achieves far greater diversity, the lack of a critical mass can place undue pressures on minority students.
4. **Achieve greater representation of ethnic minorities among the executive, administrative, and managerial positions and among the professional/non-faculty positions.**
Ethnic minorities are overrepresented in the lowest paying positions on campus and underrepresented in the higher ranks. These facts send an unacceptable message about the University's commitment to diversity and to the ideals of a just society.
5. **Make high quality diversity education, orientation, and training available to all members of the University community.**
Faculty, staff, and students see the potential to improve interpersonal skills through meaningful education and training about diversity. The Task Force heard consistent calls for increasing and broadening the reach of existing programs.
6. **Create and sustain a campus climate in which respectful discussions of diversity are encouraged.**
Additional measures are needed to create a climate in which the values of diversity will take root and flourish. Currently, some members of the community are hesitant to discuss differences or feel unrecognized or unappreciated. Of particular concern are negative feelings by maintenance and service workers.
7. **Take leadership in creating opportunities for interaction and cross-group learning.**
Despite the diversity that exists on campus, only limited interaction takes place across the boundaries of identified groups. The University must take ownership of this issue and demonstrate its commitment through actions and resources.
8. **Support further research to advance the University's commitment to diversity.**
The Task Force's assessment has brought to light numerous issues that call for additional information or deeper analysis. The Task Force recommends that the Office for Minority Affairs be charged with and provided adequate resources to advance systemic and continuous research and assessment on these issues.

Recommendations to Advance Carolina's Vision for and Commitment to Diversity

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill aims for excellence: in the education it imparts to students, in the research and outreach it undertakes for the greater good, and in the environment it creates for the thousands of people who work, learn, and visit here. It should do no less.

A critical element of excellence for a 21st century educational institution is a diverse and inclusive community. Over the past several months, the Chancellor's Task Force on Diversity has examined diversity on the University campus from a broad range of perspectives and has identified much that should please all of us affiliated with the University. Faculty, students, and staff for the most part see this campus as a warm and welcoming place where a diverse group of people can live and work alongside one another amicably and where ideas can be exchanged and debated in a civil manner. This is a major accomplishment.

The Task Force also has identified opportunities to move the University closer toward excellence as a diverse and inclusive community. Central to achieving this goal are: a clear vision and commitment to diversity; a critical mass of racial, cultural, social, and economic diversity among students, faculty, and staff; a commitment to informed, civil, and critical inquiry and exchange; and a campus community that offers a good quality of life and values the unique differences among its members. The Task Force, therefore, recommends that the University:

1. Clearly define and publicize its commitment to diversity.

Faculty, staff, and students value diversity in principle and believe the University does so. In surveys and discussions, however, it was clear that they lack a common understanding of the concept and are uncertain of what the University encompasses within its definition. They also are uncertain of the day-to-day implications of the University's commitment to diversity, including enforcement of non-discrimination policies. Just as the University must be clear and direct in its commitment to educational excellence, so must it be clear and direct in its commitment to diversity as a contributor to that excellence. Steps to advance this goal include:

In defining diversity, the University will promote a respect for all individual differences regardless of race, gender, sexual orientation and identity, socioeconomic status, and philosophical perspectives

- The University will adopt the five core values set forth by this Task Force as the University's core values for diversity.
 - The Chancellor will issue a statement on the University's vision for diversity, presenting the University's commitment clearly for all members of the University community.
 - Expectations concerning the University community's responsibilities toward diversity will be clearly set forth. Among these responsibilities are the acceptance of and respect for differences, along with a commitment to discuss differences in a civil manner, leading to better mutual understanding.
 - Actions for redressing discrimination will be outlined and publicized.
 - All new students, faculty, and staff will be made aware of the University's diversity values and policies.
 - University units will adopt practices and policies to support the diversity goals and objectives.
- 2. Ensure accountability for achieving diversity objectives.**

The Task Force recognizes that the best-intentioned efforts go nowhere without concrete plans for actions. It therefore recommends that the University direct the Office for Minority Affairs, in consultation with the campus community, to:

- Develop a plan for diversity that includes benchmarks and timelines for implementation.
- Issue annual reports to the University community on progress toward meeting diversity goals and objectives.
- Include in its report analysis of diversity outcomes in recruiting, admission, and retention of students and the hiring, promotion, and retention of faculty and staff.
- Identify and publicize best practices that support the University's diversity mission.

3. Achieve the critical masses of minority populations necessary to ensure the educational benefits of diversity.

Members of the University community spoke loudly: Lack of diversity among faculty and among the graduate and professional student population impedes the educational process. Even among undergraduates, where the University achieves far greater diversity, the lack of a critical mass can place undue pressures on minority students. Effective measures for the recruitment, support, and retention of minorities are required.

To promote faculty diversity, the University must:

- Expand the Diversity Initiative of the Provost's Office and the Carolina Post-Doctoral Programs for Faculty Diversity, and provide incentives for schools and departments to hire junior faculty from these pools.
- Provide appropriate assistance to faculty search committees and department chairs on strategies to eliminate bias in advertising and filling faculty positions.
- Fund faculty exchanges with historically minority universities and other institutions to increase the diversity of schools and departments.
- Direct additional attention to units most lacking in diversity.

To promote diversity and improve its benefits among the student body, the University must:

- Provide additional policy focus and resources for the recruitment and enrollment of students who enhance the diversity of graduate and professional programs.
- Provide financial support to schools and departments to create support programs for undergraduate, graduate, and professional students from diverse backgrounds.

4. Achieve greater representation of ethnic minorities among the executive, administrative and managerial positions, and among the professional/non-faculty positions.

The remnants of historical patterns of discrimination continue to be evident in the staff and administrative hierarchy across campus. Ethnic minorities are overrepresented in the lowest paying positions on campus and underrepresented in the higher ranks. These facts send an unacceptable message about the University's commitment to diversity and to the ideals of a just society. The University must therefore:

- Expand existing professional development opportunities to provide a larger, more diverse pool of employees to qualify for and attain management level positions.
- Clearly identify diversity as an important criterion in hiring, retention, and promotion of EPA non-faculty and all SPA staff.
- Develop strategies to assure equitable outcomes for women and minorities at all levels of EPA non-faculty and SPA employment.
- Continue to analyze and monitor hiring and promotion outcomes and communicate results more widely.

5. Make high quality diversity education, orientation, and training available to all members of the University community.

We like to think we know instinctively how to interact with others, regardless of our differences. Too often, it's not that easy. Subtle actions and words can lead to misunderstandings. A simple lack of awareness can create awkward, even demoralizing situations. Faculty, staff, and students recognize the dangers. They also see the potential to improve interpersonal skills through meaningful education and training about diversity. The Task Force heard consistent calls for increasing and broadening the reach of existing programs. In particular, the University should:

For faculty:

- Expand current initiatives and encourage new measures to assist faculty with managing diversity in the classroom. This includes strategies for conducting robust and respectful discussions.

For staff:

- Require all supervisory staff to attain competency in dealing with diversity in the workplace through diversity education and training.
- Incorporate diversity education and training into existing new employee orientation.
- Increase the cultural competency of the workforce by expanding opportunities to deal with diversity issues in the workplace.

For students:

- Increase emphasis on the diversity component of orientation programs for all students — undergraduate, graduate, and professional.
- Provide students with information on dealing with experiences or observations of discrimination or disrespect.
- Encourage opportunities beyond orientation for undergraduates to acquire competencies in dealing with racial, cultural, and language differences. This may include the use of interactive learning experiences and involve diverse speakers and alumni.
- Provide more opportunity for student leaders to develop skills in diversity issues.

6. Create and sustain a campus climate in which respectful discussions of diversity are encouraged.

The University can be pleased that hate speech and other disrespectful language are uncommon utterances on the Carolina campus. Diversity programming and education, encouraged in recommendations already outlined, will further improve communication and cooperation among the University's disparate groups. Task Force research indicates that additional measures are needed to create a climate in which the values of diversity will take root and flourish. Currently, some members of the community are hesitant to discuss differences or feel unrecognized or unappreciated. Of particular concern are negative feelings by maintenance and service workers. Specific attention is required for:

Faculty:

- Encourage faculty to discuss the value of diversity in the curriculum and diversity goals in the hiring of faculty.
- Provide incentives for faculty to incorporate diversity into existing coursework and to develop new courses as needed.

- Provide support to faculty to develop strategies that enhance school- and department-level climates for minority staff, students, and faculty.

Staff:

- Encourage supervisory and management staff to address diversity and to create climates in the workplace that are conducive to open and civil exchanges.
- Give more attention to providing a safe environment for all employees to express their ideas about diversity, especially for maintenance and service workers, who currently are less comfortable doing so.

Students:

- Encourage increased residential hall diversity programming.
- Implement a new award in the Chancellor's Awards to recognize student leadership in diversity initiatives.

7. Take leadership in creating opportunities for interaction and cross-group learning.

Despite the diversity that exists on campus, only limited interaction takes place across the boundaries of identified groups. To borrow from the lyrics of *West Side Story*, we stick to our own kind. This is not the way to increase our understanding and appreciation of one another. Education about diversity cannot be left to chance. The University must take ownership of this issue and demonstrate its commitment through actions and resources. Specifically, the University must:

- Sponsor campus-wide programs on diversity issues and encourage participation by faculty, staff, and students. Programs may include lectures, discussion, symposia, and panels, but also should incorporate creative alternatives for addressing diversity topics.
- Establish a diversity enhancement fund. The fund will provide grants for diversity programs, activities, and research sponsored by individuals and organizations.

8. Support further research to advance the University's commitment to diversity.

The Task Force's assessment has brought to light numerous issues that call for additional information or deeper analysis. The Task Force recommends that the Office for Minority Affairs be charged with and provided adequate resources to advance systemic and continuous research and assessment on these issues. These issues include, but are not limited to:

- Research on the educational benefits of diversity.
- Research on the concept of critical mass as it affects minority and low-income students, faculty, and staff, and development of strategies to counter the negative effects from the lack of a critical mass.
- Assessment of how diversity grievances are handled on campus.
- Refinements of the research instruments used in this assessment to allow deeper analysis of survey results. Of particular interest are questions on which responses varied significantly across groups and where high proportions of answers were "don't know" and "neutral."
- Research to understand the issues of women, people of color, and long-term employees who feel less valued by the University than do white employees as a whole.

Appendix A: Chancellor's Task Force on Diversity Membership

Chair

Archie Ervin, Assistant to the Chancellor and Director, Office for Minority Affairs

Members

Note: Steering Committee members are indicated by an asterisk.

Erika Barrera (Student)
Katie Bartholomew, Housing and Residential Education (Staff)
Prerak Bathia (Student)
Chimi Boyd, Carolina Women's Center (Staff)
John Brodeur, Student Affairs (Staff)
Brenda Coleman, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute (Staff)
Leon Coleman (Student)
Marcus Collins, Office for Student Academic Counseling (Staff) *
Jackie Copeland, Scholarships and Student Aid (Staff)
Erin Davis (Student)*
Charles Daye, Law (Faculty) *
Christina Delane (Student)
Archie Ervin, Office for Minority Affairs (Staff) *
Arturo Escobar, Anthropology (Faculty)
Sue Estroff, Medicine (Faculty)
Melissa Exum, Student Affairs (Staff)
Sandra Hoeflich, Graduate School (Staff) *
Dorothy Holland, Anthropology (Faculty)
David Jones, Student Affairs (Staff)
Joseph Jordan, Sonya Haynes Stone Black Cultural Center and African American Studies (Faculty)
Larry Keith, School of Medicine (Staff)
Michael Lambert, African American Studies (Faculty)
Jerry Lucido, Enrollment Management and Admissions (Staff)
Vonnie McLOYD, Psychology (Faculty)
Jose Martinez (Student)
Tom Mroz, Economics (Faculty)
M. Cookie Newson, Office for Minority Affairs (Staff) *
Sheena Oxendine (Student)
Lou Ann Phillips, Human Resources (Staff)
Celia Pratt, Academic Affairs Libraries (Staff)
Ennio Rao, Romance Languages (Faculty)
Victor Schoenbach, Epidemiology (Faculty)
Mary Sechriest, Office of University Counsel (Staff)
Fernando Soto (Student)
Robert Toma, Facilities Services (Staff)
Carroll-Anne Trotman, Orthodontics (Faculty) *
Adam Versenyi, Dramatic Art (Faculty)
Lynn Williford, Institutional Research (Staff)
Cecil Wooten, Classics (Faculty)

* Signifies member of steering committee

September 1, 2005

Dear Carolina Community:

Over the past academic year, the faculty, staff and students who served on the Chancellor's Task Force on Diversity worked diligently to assess the state of diversity at Carolina. We undertook this process because diversity is identified in our 2003 Academic Plan as one of six priorities of our vision for academic excellence. Our purpose was to understand better what we are doing well at Carolina with regard to diversity and to identify areas where we can improve as a leading public institution.

The scope of the assessment was substantial: The task force examined faculty, staff and student engagement with diversity across schools, departments and units, and considered a wide variety of qualitative and quantitative data.

The complete report of the task force is now available at www.unc.edu/diversity/assessment. This report includes eight specific recommendations for achieving the University's ideals for a diverse and inclusive community. These recommendations have great merit and will be useful as a guide in the future. In support of these recommendations, we will undertake the following initial actions:

We will clearly define and communicate our commitment to diversity, and we will adopt the core values for diversity proposed by the Task Force. We also will expand the University's focus on diversity by creating a new Associate Provost for Diversity and Multicultural Affairs position. I have appointed Dr. Archie Ervin to serve in this role, and I have charged him to provide leadership as the chief diversity officer for our campus.

We will ensure accountability for achieving diversity objectives by developing a diversity plan that will allow us to monitor our progress annually.

We will support innovative approaches to enhancing diversity at all levels of the University, and we will continue the support of programs that are instrumental to bringing diverse students to Carolina. We will make diversity education, orientation and training available to members of the University community, with particular attention to developing innovative strategies to offer relevant learning and cross cultural opportunities for members of our community.

We will create and sustain a respectful climate and take greater leadership to promote diversity competency. As part of this effort, we will seek to support new, creative University sponsored initiatives that enhance our community's engagement with diversity. These initiatives will be coordinated through the Office of the Associate Provost for Diversity and Multicultural Affairs.

We will support further research to advance the University's commitment to diversity, including the development of research agendas that will inform our policy decisions and program development on the state of diversity at our University.

Presentation of this report concludes the work of the full Task Force. I am encouraged by what we have learned from this assessment, and I feel very positive about our ability to build upon what we already do well to make Carolina an even more diverse and inclusive community.

Sincerely,

James Moeser
Chancellor

Selected Resources on Diversity at Carolina(10/05)

Diversity Task Force Background Information:

History: <http://www.unc.edu/diversity/assessment/history.html>

Survey and Focus Group Information: <http://www.unc.edu/diversity/assessment/documents.html>

Membership: <http://www.unc.edu/diversity/assessment/members.html>

Report: <http://www.unc.edu/minorityaffairs/assessment/index.html>

Office of Diversity and Multicultural Affairs

<http://www.unc.edu/minorityaffairs>

.....
Academic Plan:

http://www.unc.edu/provost/news/aca_planOct03.pdf
(Section on Diversity is at 26-28)

.....
Institutional Research: Data Sources

Student by Level and by Race, Ethnicity, Gender (Fall 2005 and historical):

<http://www.ais.unc.edu/ir/factbook/fb2005-2006/student/fb05fb12.html>

Students by Age & Level (2004):

<http://www.ais.unc.edu/ir/factbook/fb2004-2005/student/fb04fb19.html>

Faculty, Staff, Students by Unit and by Race, Ethnicity, Gender (12/31/03):

http://www.unc.edu/inst_res/diversity/y2003/welcome_combined_diversity.html

Full Time Permanent Employees by Race, Ethnicity, Gender (2004):

http://www.ais.unc.edu/ir/factbook/fb2004-2005/faculty_staff/fb04fb125.html

1
Full-Time EPA Employees By Division, Race, Ethnicity, Gender (January 2005)

http://www.ais.unc.edu/ir/factbook/fb2004-2005/faculty_staff/fb04fb126.html

.....
Equal Employment Opportunity/Americans with Disability Office

<http://www.unc.edu/depts/eoosada/index.html>

Equal Employment Opportunity Plan (April 2005):

http://www.unc.edu/depts/eoosada/EPA_Plan_2005.pdf

Faculty/EPA-Non Faculty Review (2004):

<http://www.unc.edu/depts/eoosada/univreports.html>

.....
Carolina Post-Doc Program for Faculty Diversity

<http://research.unc.edu/red/postdoc.php>



THE UNIVERSITY
of NORTH CAROLINA
at CHAPEL HILL

Making Critical Connections

Quality Enhancement Plan Proposal

“Making Critical Connections” Faculty Forum Schedule

| | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Tuesday, October 18, 2005 | Thursday, October 27, 2005 |
| 3:30pm – 5:00pm | 4:00pm – 5:30pm |
| Fox Auditorium | Hitchcock Multipurpose Room |
| Carrington Hall | Sonja Haynes Stone Center |

More information on the proposal can be previewed at:

http://www.unc.edu/inst_res/SACS/sacs.html

MAKING CRITICAL CONNECTIONS

2006 Quality Enhancement Plan

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
October 10, 2005

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is a major research university with a strong and dynamic roster of activities for learning and advancement not only on campus, but also throughout the state and indeed around the world. While students at UNC-Chapel Hill have traditionally been educated in the various academic disciplines within departmental settings, Carolina has long recognized the value of experiential learning as well as crossing traditional disciplinary boundaries. Some of today's foremost educational challenges -- such as helping students learn approaches to solving complex problems and develop talents for life-long learning -- have interdisciplinary and experiential dimensions that must be supported by the resources of the entire University and the community in which it is situated. Some of these needs are met by offering interdisciplinary majors, programs, and courses, of which the University already provides many vibrant options. Others are provided by scholarly activities facilitated by units such as the Office of Undergraduate Research and the Study Abroad Office.

The new General Education Curriculum, to be implemented in fall 2006, includes a series of curricular requirements to ensure that students develop *foundations* (the skills needed to communicate effectively both in English and another language, to apply quantitative reasoning skills in context, and to develop habits that will lead to a healthy life), *approaches* (a broad experience with the methods and results of the most widely employed approaches to knowledge), and *make connections* to these foundations and approaches in their programs of study. These connections are also designed to help students learn how to integrate these foundations and approaches in ways that transcend traditional boundaries, as well as to create pathways from the campus to local, national, and worldwide communities.

At first glance there are dozens (if not hundreds) of academic elements and entities on campus that would readily benefit from these kinds of connections. Thus, identifying the most significant connections -- those critical to academic, personal, and professional success both inside and outside the academy -- is not only appropriate but also necessary.

The curriculum stands at the center of the academic life of the University. So, how can the learning expected inside the classroom (where the curriculum is typically based) connect to what happens outside it? The launch of a new General Education curriculum offers the University an unusually good opportunity to make such connections, as does the requirement to craft a Quality Enhancement Plan. **Making Critical Connections** will help the University implement the new curriculum in such a way that research and internationalization become critical connections for the entire campus community.

One way of making such a critical connection is to link the curriculum to one of the major activities in which the faculty and professional staff participate: *research*. Our intellectual community is defined by the fact that faculty are involved in a wide range of undergraduate programs, are committed to training Master's and PhD students, and also are engaged in their own research and scholarly activity. If any of these three elements were to be abandoned, UNC-Chapel Hill would no longer be a major research university. Nor would the University contain "communities of learners" where "the shared goals of investigation and discovery bind together the disparate elements to create a sense of wholeness" (*The Boyer Commission Report on Educating Undergraduates*, p. 9).

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is working to make research, mentored scholarship, and creative performance even more distinctive features of a Carolina undergraduate education. The provision of "high quality undergraduate instruction to *students within a community engaged in original inquiry and creative expression*" (emphasis added) has been an explicit part of the University's mission statement since 1994.

In reality, the emphasis on research at the University has tended to separate faculty from undergraduate students and graduate from undergraduate education, to the detriment of all.

Making Critical Connections offers us the opportunity to enable our undergraduate students to be full participants in the intellectual life of our university and to engage in the research culture that surrounds them on our campus. Students who have experienced inquiry and discovery are well prepared to address future unsolved problems and to assume important roles as enlightened citizens and leaders in our increasingly interconnected world.

Another way to help students make critical connections is by further internationalizing the undergraduate experience at Carolina. Global citizenship requires an understanding of the cultural interaction between nations and the mutual impact felt around the world by such exchanges. By defining internationalization "as the process of integrating an intercultural and global dimension into the purpose and function of education at UNC-Chapel Hill in a manner consistent with both our core values as a public institution and the furtherance of a sense of global citizenship among our intramural and extramural constituents," the University extends yet another critical connection from the curriculum to internationalization.

Making Critical Connections' initiatives in the areas of Curricular Innovation, Undergraduate Research, and Internationalization will require dedicated resources.

In order to allow more students to exploit these connections, the following recommendations will be among those pursued:

- **In the Curriculum:**
 - Establishing an innovative scheduling alternative, such as a "Maymester." This intersession option, which would likely be administered by the University's well-established Summer School Office, would mean that faculty members could spend a concentrated period (three weeks under the current scenario) with a group of undergraduate students, either on- or off-campus.

- Creating a “Connections Center” on campus whose mission would be to foster the ability of faculty and students to make connections within and between the many opportunities for learning that occur daily throughout the campus, region, state, nation, and world. The Connections Center would promote a new learning vision that seeks to break down traditional barriers -- between curricular and “co-curricular” education, between research and teaching, between local and global perspectives -- by viewing the totality of student experience as a venue for student learning.
- **In the Research Area:**
 - Establishing a series of linked courses across the disciplines to introduce students to unsolved problems, help them understand multiple modes of inquiry, and enable them to conduct original work in newly established “*Research Tracks*.” We will increase the number of course offerings in which students carry out original research projects through the creation of four new term-based “*Research Professorships*,” one in each of the divisions of the College of Arts and Sciences.
 - Increasing the number of qualified mentors for undergraduate students who wish to engage in research.
- **In the International Arena:**
 - Improving the infrastructure for international activities, that will in turn increase support for international research.
 - Embedding internationalization as deeply as possible into the curriculum as a means of extending globally-based opportunities to members of the Carolina community. In order to broaden the international presence on campus, the University will increase the number of international faculty, postdoctoral fellows, graduate students, and undergraduate students.

What can be done to break down the barriers that too often currently exist between our undergraduates in the General College and the College of Arts and Sciences and the other vital places of learning at UNC-Chapel Hill, such as the graduate and professional schools and the campus’ health affairs division? How can faculty, with their considerable research expertise, better help undergraduates experience the delights of discovery and new knowledge through a deeper engagement in research, scholarship, and creative activity in their coursework? How can we eliminate the walls that so often separate local activities from international programs, thus hindering students from a fuller understanding of “foreign” ideas and cultures?

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill believes that **Making Critical Connections** will go a long way toward answering these questions.

Comments? Suggestions? Here are two ways to provide feedback:

1. Email Bobbi Owen, Head of the Quality Enhancement Plan team, at: owenbob@unc.edu
2. Enter your comments using the on-line form at:
http://www.unc.edu/inst_res/SACS/Comments.html

If you would like your comments to be anonymous, please don’t enter your name or other identifying information.

JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

October 14, 2005

The Faculty Council of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill convened at 3:00 p.m. in the Pleasants Family Assembly Room of the Wilson Library. The following 47 members of the Council attended: Alperin, Ammerman, Bachenhelmer, Barreau, Becker, Bennett, Cairns, Copenhaver, Couper, Dalton, Degener, Dupuis, Eble, Foley, Gerber, Gilligan, Heenan, Holmgren, Huber, Jonas, Klebanow, Kramer, Lastra, Leonard, Matson, McGrath, McIntosh, Mesibov, Muller, Murray, Papanikolas, Perrin, Renner, Rogers, Rustioni, Salmon, Sandelowski, Smith, Sulik, Sweeney, Tauchen, Tiwana, Tobin, Trotman, Wallace, Wissick, and Wolford. The following 38 members were granted excused absences: Arnold, Belger, Blocher, Booth, Chapman, Clemens, Connolly, Conover, de Silva, DeSaix, Ewend, Gasaway, Givre, Granger, Gullede, Howell, Kagarise, Kamarei, Maclean, Marshall, Martin, Matthysse, Miguuel, Morton, Murphy, Peirce, Rock, Selassie, Simpson, Strom-Gottfried, Sutherland, Taylor, Templeton, Vick, Weil, Weinberg, Wilson, and Yankaskas. The following three members were absent without excuse: Anton, Keagy, Lin.

Chancellor's Remarks

Chancellor James Moeser reported that Carolina has just become the only institution in the country to receive eight grants as part of the National Institutes of Health "Roadmap for Medical Research" initiatives. This program encourages researchers to attack complex problems using interdisciplinary collaboration and sophisticated computation techniques to create quick translations to patient care. Carolina's funding for these awards totaled \$15.5 million and includes support for the new Carolina Center of Nanotechnology Excellence. The Chancellor said that a major factor in our success in this competition has been the creation of an office, led by Prof. Rudy Juliano (Pharmacology), to guide our efforts to compete for prestigious awards at the highest level. Prof. Juliano will lead the nanotechnology center. Other faculty receiving grants are Professors Bruce Cuevas (Pharmacology), Michael Jarstfer (Pharmacy), K.H. Lee (Pharmacy), Eugene Orringer (Medicine), Barry Popkin (Nutrition), David Siderovski (Pharmacology), and Alexander Tropsha (Pharmacy).

The Chancellor said that the Tuition Task Force, led by Provost Robert Shelton and Student Body President Seth Dearnin, is nearing completion of work on proposals for campus-based tuition increases for next year. He said that the Task Force aims to generate between \$5 million and \$6 million (net after setting aside 40% of the increase for need-based aid and graduate student awards) to help raise the minimum per semester salary for teaching assistants to \$7,000 and to continue to advance faculty salaries closed to the mean individual salary of our peer institutions. Increases in under consideration for undergraduates are in the range of \$250 to \$300 for residents and \$600 to \$900 for non-residents. For graduate and professional students, increases under consideration are in the range of \$300 to \$500 for residents and \$300 to \$600 for non-residents.

Chancellor Moeser praised the work of the Chancellor's Task Force on Diversity under the leadership of Associate Provost for Diversity and Multi-Cultural Affairs Archie Ervin. The Chancellor said that the essence of the diversity we seek goes beyond statistical reports and benchmarks; it seems to embrace diversity in every dimension of human interaction: race, religion, politics, and sexuality. We seek an atmosphere that encourages civil discourse about sensitive topics, he said, but without adopting speech codes or infringing on anyone's First Amendment rights.

Introduction of the University Registrar

Provost Shelton introduced Alice Poehls, the newly-appointed University Registrar, who came to Carolina from a position as registrar at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. Ms. Poehls thanked all those who have been supportive and welcoming since her arrival at Carolina. She said that she has been involved in faculty governance over the years and is eager to serve the faculty as well as the administration.

Questions and Comments from Council Members

Prof. Diane Leonard (Comparative Literature) lamented the fact that the Ph.D. program in Portuguese is being eliminated. Noting that one of the Distinguished Alumni honored on University Day was Prof. Ana Lucia Gazzola, Rector of the Federal University of Minas Gerais in Brazil, Prof. Leonard said that we have had a strong faculty and student exchange program with Brazil which will be compromised by de-emphasizing studies in Portuguese. She hoped the decision would be reversed. Prof. Frank Dominguez (Romance Languages) said that this decision runs counter to trends elsewhere in the country where programs in Portuguese are being expanded. He added that Portuguese is also important for Hispanic studies. Dean Bernadette Gray-Little said that discussions with affected faculty members are ongoing. She did not think today's Council meeting to be an appropriate forum for discussion of the larger issues involved.

Prof. Lloyd Kramer (History) said that he was pleased to hear Chancellor Moeser include mention of sexual orientation in his remarks about diversity. Prof. Kramer said that some faculty members had come to him expressing concern about two recent events that called into question gay/lesbian identity.

Prof. Andrew Perrin (Sociology) said that while news of our success in NIH "Roadmap" grants is pleasing, there is a flip side. He wondered what plans are being made to enable the University to continue its intellectual mission in the face of declining NIH grant support overall. Will there be a diversion of funds from Academic Affairs to medical/scientific research in order to continue to support the superstructure that has built up over the years as grant funding continued a steady increase, he asked? Chancellor Moeser responded that the University needs to begin to think about strategies for shifting research funding more toward private and corporate support. He said that development of Carolina North would play a major role in that regard. Every research university is facing similar circumstances, he said, especially as Congress faces the challenge of identifying funds for the massive reconstruction work that is needed in areas devastated by Hurricane Katrina.

Comments from the Provost

Provost Shelton reported briefly on the status of the ongoing work in preparation for SACS reaccreditation.

As for the status of senior administrator searches, the Provost said that four finalists for Director of the Morehead Planetarium are being interviewed; we have received many applications for the post of EO/ADA Director; and searches for deans of Law and Journalism continue.

The Provost reported on experience after one year with the new Parental Leave Policy. He said that about 2% of eligible faculty took advantage of the policy in the 12 months. The total number was 51, of whom 46 were women and 5 were men. Prof. Perrin said that he has heard reports that there have varying degrees of receptivity to the policy among department chairs. He hoped for a future report on kinds in the policy that need working out. Prof. Leonard said that in the College parental leave is counted against the department's total allocation of research and study leave time. She said that in a small department that is a serious problem.

Annual Report of the Faculty Athletics Committee

Prof. Lissa Broome, Chair of the Faculty Athletics Committee, reviewed highlights from the committee's annual report.

Prof. Jack Evans, Faculty Athletics Representative, commented on aspects of his written annual report.

In response to a question, Director of Athletics Richard Baddour said that Carolina has informed the ACC that we will *not* host a Thursday night game on this campus.

Prof. Steve Bachenheimer (Microbiology & Immunology) said that one issue that arose in the 1995 reaccreditation study was that student-athletes did not find themselves integrated into campus life as

much as they would like. Prof. Evans acknowledged that this continues to be a concern, but he pointed out that Coach Dean Smith had encouraged a culture in his program that strongly encouraged students to complete their degrees. He said that Coach Roy Williams holds the same views.

Diversity Assessment and Planning

Prof. Charles Daye (Law) presented an overview of the work and recommendations of the Chancellor's Task Force on Diversity assisted by Dr. Archie Ervin, Associate Provost for Diversity and Multicultural Affairs, Dr. Melva (Cookie) Newsom, Director of Diversity Education and Research, and Prof. Carol Ann Trotman (Dentistry). See the PowerPoint presentation posted on the Faculty Governance website at <http://www.junc.edu/faculty/facoun/reports/R05DIV5.ppt>.

Prof. Jay Smith (History) would have preferred a more specific definition of "diversity." Will the University's response to the report focus specifically on traditionally under-represented groups, he asked, or on broader considerations? Chancellor Moeser commented that perhaps the "affirmative action" aspect of diversity should continue to focus on traditionally under-represented groups while the "non-discrimination" aspect casts a wider net.

Several members asked about how the Task Force collected and analyzed its data. Dr. Lynn Willford, Director of Institutional Research, explained the limitations of the research design which was intentionally structured to encourage comments from respondents without being intrusive.

Prof. Mary Anne Salmon (Social Work) commented that the trends observed in the responses from minority and women faculty parallel those found in other workplace surveys. She asked whether there are comparisons that can be drawn to the perspectives of Carolina faculty and minorities and women in other work settings. Dr. Newsom replied that more could be done in that direction.

Prof. Eric Muller (Law) asked how "intellectual diversity" fits into the work of the Task Force. Prof. Evelynne Huber (Political Science) observed that intellectual diversity is not readily measurable and should not be the subject of affirmative action, a point with which Chancellor Moeser expressed agreement.

Prof. Terence McIntosh (History) asked about the concept of a "critical mass" of minority faculty. He wondered whether there are departments in the University where a "critical mass" has been achieved. Prof. Daye replied that under the decision in *Grutter v. Bollinger* (concerning a constitutional challenge to the University of Michigan Law School's affirmative action admissions policies) it is impossible to define "critical mass" in general terms because the concept is context-dependent.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the consensus appeared to be that the Council would welcome the opportunity to continue discussion of the Task Force's recommendations at a later date.

Adjournment

Its business having concluded, the Faculty Council adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty