



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

MEETING OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

Friday, November 1st 2002 at 3:00 p.m.

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

Chancellor James Moeser and Professor Sue Estroff, Chair of the Faculty, will preside.

AGENDA

Type	Time	Item
	3:00	<i>Call to Order. The Secretary of the Faculty.</i>
DISC	3:00	<i>Chancellor's Remarks and Question Time.</i> Chancellor James Moeser invites questions or comments.
DISC	3:15	<i>Remarks by the Provost.</i> Provost Robert Shelton invites questions or comments.
DISC	3:25	<i>Remarks by the Chair of the Faculty.</i> Professor Sue Estroff invites questions or comments.
INFO	3:40	<i>Report on the Gender Salary Equity Study.</i> Executive Associate Provost Bernadette Gray-Little.
INFO	3:55	<i>Annual Report of the Faculty Athletics Committee.</i> Professor Celia Hooper.
DISC	4:00	<i>Open Discussion of Topics Raised by Faculty Members.</i>
INFO	4:20	<i>Report of the Task Force on the Academic Plan.</i> Provost Robert Shelton.
INFO	4:30	<i>Report on the Revision of the General Education Curriculum.</i> Professor Laurie McNeil.
ACT	4:50	<i>Closed Session. Distinguished Alumnus and Alumna Awards for 2003.</i>
ACT	5:00	<i>Adjourn.</i>

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty

KEY: **ACT** = Action, **DISC** = Discussion, **INFO** = Information.
Documents pertaining to meetings of the Council may be found at www.unc.edu/faculty/facoun on the Web.

October 24, 2002

Faculty Athletics Committee

(Elected Committee)

Annual Report

Members: Celia Hooper (chair), Harry Aman, Carol Arnosti, Lissa Broome, Nicholas Didow, Jack Evans (ACC rep-ex officio), Garland Hershey, James Murphy, Terry Rhodes, William Smith, and Judy White.

Meetings: December 2001-October 2002. The committee held monthly meetings during the 2001-2002 academic year. This report constitutes the activities for the months of December 2001 through October 2002 for a total of seven meetings.

Reports Prepared by: Celia Hooper (Chair, 2002-2003), based on minutes and data which have been approved by the committee.

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[a]).

Committee Charge and Functions:

In a brief discussion the history and role of the committee were reviewed. The membership includes ten elected members of the faculty serving staggered five-year terms. In addition, the faculty athletics representative to the ACC, if not already an elective member, is an ex-officio member of the committee. The committee discussed issues that they felt would be important to its work which include progress of athletes and academic integrity (including the recent Knight Commission Report), sportsmanship, title nine compliance, and the proposed NCAA Academic Reform package. The committee felt it should not have a role in the operational decisions within the Athletic Department, but should serve in an advisory capacity to the Director of Athletics with any issues that may arise at each meeting. The major charge for the committee is to work in a way so as to protect the excellent reputation that our athletic program enjoys.

In the 2001-2002 academic year, subcommittees took primary responsibility for issues as decided in the fall 2001 first meeting, including Student-Athlete Exit Interviews, Sportsmanship, Academic Support Center assistance and Title IX review. This academic year the committee has met in September and October and has reorganized to cover, as a committee of the whole, the following topics for the upcoming academic year:

- Student-Athlete Exit Interviews with Jim Murphy and a subcommittee in charge of the process and data,

- Academic Support Center liaison, with Garland Hershey as a representative to that council,
- Sportsmanship, including UNCC-CH, ACC and national issues,
- The NCAA Academic reform package,
- The Timmons student-athlete document (for discussion of Title IX, the NCAA regulation system, and student qualification)
- Other issues that may emerge during the academic year.

Committee members provided advice that was sought and used by the Chancellor and the Athletics Department. Chancellor Moeser attended meetings as his schedule permitted. Athletics Director Baddour and other members of the Athletics Department were also in attendance and reported announcements each month to the committee for advice or information. In November Celia Hooper (chair) and several other committee members will be meeting with the Executive Committee of Faculty Council to review our work in the upcoming year.

Report of Discussions:

Academic Performance of Student-Athletes

Included, as an Appendix of this report, are seven pages covering the 1984 through 1997 cohorts. These data summarize the academic status of students as of fall, 2002. The data are for men and women, athletes and non-athletes and include data are for all participating student-athletes, not just those receiving athletic scholarships. The tables contain data on the number originally enrolled on a particular year, those currently enrolled, those graduated, and those were departures. On departures, i.e., students who left before graduating, fall into two categories: "Left Ineligible" includes those students who left but were not eligible to continue (whether for academic or other reasons); "Left eligible" includes those students who left Carolina but who were eligible to continue. Some important observations regarding the data:

- For the last five cohorts in our report, the graduation percentage for male student-athletes ranges from a low of 64.4% (1996) to a high of 79.8% (1993). The corresponding rates for women student-athletes range from a low of 83.75% (1997) to a high of 91.04% (1993).
- Some of these numbers can be expected to improve slightly because of student-athletes who are still enrolled and because of re-enrollments by student-athletes who left but were eligible to continue. For example, for the 1996 and 1997 cohorts the numbers of male student-athletes currently enrolled are one and three, respectively.
- For these past five cohorts the overall graduation percentage achieved by male student-athletes to date is 71.6%. The attrition (those who left, whether eligible to continue or not) amounted to 27.1%, and those still enrolled amount to 1.2%.

With some exceptions the cohorts in individual sports tend to be small. However, annual

meetings are held with each coach by Athletic Department personnel to review the academic progress of the student-athletes in each program. Patterns that may appear over a period of years are discussed for underlying explanation.

At the October 2002, meeting, Jack Evans, our ACC representative, reported on the proposed academic reforms, which will be discussed at the upcoming (November) NCAA meeting. The committee will discuss any changes as they occur in the future and possible ramifications for our own campus.

Survey answers by, and exit interviews with, graduating senior student-athletics.

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 their experience at UNC-CH. In addition, Committee members participate, along with personnel from the Athletics Department and the Academic Support Center, in exit interviews with groups of graduating student-athletes. By examining this information, the committee hopes to obtain an accurate portrayal of how student-athletes perceive their experience at UNC-CH. This year, Jim Murphy, with very helpful assistance from Rodney Hodson and David Sheaves in the Odum Institute for Research in the Social Sciences, a new database was established for a new survey, an updated revision of the previous survey. The committee is undergoing a transition from the older version of the exit survey to the one that has been developed for use going forward. The newer version had first been administered in the spring of 2002. The Committee noted that some students responded that their participation in athletics had influenced their choice of major, as well as access to courses needed for their majors. In addition, responses were noted that indicated some perceived adverse impact on grades and ability to prepare for classes and complete homework during the season and during travel. The Committee identified for tracking and future attention the following issues: perceived impact on grades, perceived impact on choice of major by student-athletes, and perceptions of out-of-season training hours.

Sportsmanship and the Knight Commission Report

Last year's report reflected the committee discussions on the Knight Commission Report after a visit from President Emeritus Friday and Mr. Doug Dibbert, Executive Director of the UNC Alumni Association. The committee continued its discussion of the Commission issues and continued discussions that more could be accomplished at the conference level. Correspondence from John Swofford, Commissioner of the ACC, discussing ACC sportsmanship issues were discussed by the committee and the Athletic Department. At our December 2001 meeting, Steve Kirschner, Director of Sports Information, met with the committee to discuss sportsmanship issues on our campus. This topic will be one of the topics that will be addressed by the committee in forthcoming months. At the September 2002 meeting, The FAC Chair discussed communicating with other ACC schools' faculty committees in support of these issues.

Title IX discussions

In the 2001-02 academic year Beth Miller, Associate Athletic Director, reported to the committee on our Title IX compliance. Rather than have a subcommittee each year, the committee will ask Dr. Miller to report to the committee on Title IX issues on an annual basis for committee information and discussion as needed.

In conclusion:

The committee felt that the Athletic Department joins with the faculty members of the committee to do a thoughtful job of examining the issues related to the quality of life for the scholar-athlete at UNC-Chapel Hill. The large issues presented by the Knight Commission, the NCAA reform package, and sportsmanship in general sometimes reflects issues of society at large. The committee is dedicated to translating those issues for our campus and continuing to discuss them on a more practical basis for our campus.

Data on Academic Progress:

Fall 2002

Cohort

1984

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	100		1218		50		2017	
Enrolled (Currently)	0	0.0	1	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.1
Graduated	83	83.0	983	80.7	43	86.0	1612	79.9
Left, Ineligible	10	10.0	115	9.4	3	6.0	176	8.7
Left, Eligible	7	7.0	119	9.8	4	8.0	227	11.3
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)			*				1.58	

* GPA for single student omitted to preserve anonymity

Cohort

1985

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	105		1202		55		1968	
Enrolled (Currently)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.1
Graduated	83	79.0	1023	85.1	53	96.4	1624	82.5
Left, Ineligible	8	7.6	104	8.7	0	0.0	128	6.5
Left, Eligible	14	13.3	75	6.2	2	3.6	215	10.9
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)							*	

* GPA for single student omitted to preserve anonymity

Data on Academic Progress:

Fall 2002

Cohort

1986

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	115		1214		60		1914	
Enrolled (Currently)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.2
Graduated	90	78.3	1037	85.4	50	83.3	1622	84.7
Left, Ineligible	14	12.2	98	8.1	6	10.0	109	5.7
Left, Eligible	11	9.6	79	6.5	4	6.7	180	9.4
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)							3.34	

Cohort

1987

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	109		1182		71		1797	
Enrolled (Currently)	0	0.00	1	1.09	0	0.00	1	0.61
Graduated	88	676.92	1026	1115.22	63	1050.00	1568	961.96
Left, Ineligible	8	61.54	63	68.48	2	33.33	65	39.88
Left, Eligible	13	100.00	92	100.00	6	100.00	163	100.00
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)			*				*	

* GPA for single student omitted to preserve anonymity

Data on Academic Progress:

Fall 2002

Cohort 1988

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	117		1237		69		1872	
Enrolled (Currently)	0	0.0	2	0.2	0	0.0	3	0.160256
Graduated	100	85.5	1094	88.4	61	88.4	1642	87.7
Left, Ineligible	4	3.4	63	5.1	2	2.9	90	4.8
Left, Eligible	13	11.1	78	6.3	6	8.7	137	7.3
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)			3.70				1.82	

* GPA for single student omitted to preserve anonymity

Cohort 1989

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	115		1193		56		1829	
Enrolled (Currently)	0	0.0	1	0.1	0	0.0	3	0.2
Graduated	93	80.9	1031	86.4	48	85.7	1601	87.5
Left, Ineligible	12	10.4	55	4.6	3	5.4	71	3.9
Left, Eligible	10	8.7	106	8.9	5	8.9	154	8.4
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)			*				2.10	

* GPA for single student omitted to preserve anonymity

Data on Academic Progress:

Fall 2002

Cohort

1990

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	114		1184		79		1880	
Enrolled (Currently)	2	1.8	2	0.2	0	0.0	3	0.2
Graduated	81	71.1	1016	85.8	67	84.8	1610	85.6
Left, Ineligible	12	10.5	71	6.0	3	3.8	77	4.1
Left, Eligible	19	16.7	95	8.0	9	11.4	190	10.1
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)	2.53		2.33				2.54	

Cohort

1991

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	105		1095		82		1867	
Enrolled (Currently)	0	0.0	4	0.4	0	0.0	3	0.2
Graduated	78	74.3	954	87.1	74	90.2	1634	87.5
Left, Ineligible	15	14.3	48	4.4	2	2.4	72	3.9
Left, Eligible	12	11.4	89	8.1	6	7.3	158	8.5
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)			2.48				2.35	

Data on Academic Progress:

Fall 2002

Cohort

1992

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	103		1145		72		1894	
Enrolled (Currently)	0	0.0	7	0.6	0	0.0	8	0.4
Graduated	70	68.0	969	84.6	65	90.3	1605	84.7
Left, Ineligible	14	13.6	53	4.6	1	1.4	54	2.9
Left, Eligible	19	18.4	116	10.1	6	8.3	227	12.0
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)			2.58				2.11	

Cohort

1993

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	114		1178		67		2009	
Enrolled (Currently)	1	0.9	5	0.4	0	0.0	6	0.3
Graduated	91	79.8	998	84.7	61	91.0	1680	83.6
Left, Ineligible	9	7.9	65	5.5	0	0.0	71	3.5
Left, Eligible	13	11.4	110	9.3	6	9.0	252	12.5
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)	*		2.32				2.54	

* GPA for single student omitted to preserve anonymity

Data on Academic Progress:

Fall 2002

Cohort

1994

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	116		1292		83		2012	
Enrolled (Currently)	0	0.0	19	1.5	0	0.0	7	0.3
Graduated	85	73.3	1034	80.0	75	90.4	1686	83.8
Left, Ineligible	16	13.8	92	7.1	3	3.6	88	4.4
Left, Eligible	15	12.9	147	11.4	5	6.0	231	11.5
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)			2.29				2.26	

Cohort

1995

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	104		1150		83		1906	
Enrolled (Currently)	2	1.9	7	0.6	0	0.0	17	0.9
Graduated	71	68.3	962	83.7	74	89.2	1608	84.4
Left, Ineligible	15	14.4	55	4.8	1	1.2	64	3.4
Left, Eligible	16	15.4	126	11.0	8	9.6	217	11.4
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)	1.96		2.18				2.28	

Data on Academic Progress:

Fall 2002

Cohort

1996

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	104		1108		107		1965	
Enrolled (Currently)	1	1.0	22	2.0	1	0.9	26	1.3
Graduated	67	64.4	917	82.8	94	87.9	1669	84.9
Left, Ineligible	16	15.4	76	6.9	2	1.9	77	3.9
Left, Eligible	20	19.2	93	8.4	10	9.3	193	9.8
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)	*		2.45		*		2.52	

Cohort

1997

	Men				Women			
	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%	Athletes	%	Non-Athletes	%
Number (Original)	126		1173		80		2035	
Enrolled (Currently)	3	2.4	48	4.1	2	2.5	73	3.6
Graduated	90	71.4	955	81.4	67	83.8	1710	84.0
Left, Ineligible	12	9.5	84	7.2	2	2.5	80	3.9
Left, Eligible	21	16.7	86	7.3	9	11.3	172	8.5
Cum GPA (Enrolled only)	2.56		2.39		2.76		2.77	

* GPA for single student omitted to preserve anonymity



The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL FACULTY AND FACULTY COUNCIL November 1, 2002, 3:00 p.m.

Attendance

Present (59): Adimora, Ammerman, Bane, Bouldin, Bowen, Cairns, Chenault, Crawford-Brown, Daye, D'Cruz, Eller, Files, Fishell, Foley, Gerber, Gollop, Granger, Janda, Kagarise, Kelley, Kessler, Langbauer, LeFebvre, Leigh, Lohr, Malizia, McGraw, Meyer, Miller, Morris-Natschke, Nelson, Nonini, Orthner, Owen, Panter, Pfaff, Pisano, Pittman, Poole, Porto, Reinert, Rippe, Rock, Rong, Rowan, Salmon, Shea, J. Smith, W. Smith, Tauchen, Toews, Tresolini, Tulloch, Vick, Watson, Weiss, Willis, Wilson, Yopp.

Excused absences (27): Allison, Bachenheimer, Barbour, Bollen, Carelli, Carter, Colindres, Elvers, Fowler, Ghosh, Gilland, Henry, Kjervik, Meece, Metzguer, Moran, Nicholas, Parikh, Reisner, Retsch-Bogart, Schauer, Sigurdsson, Straughan, Strauss, Sueta, Vandermeer, Wallace.

Unexcused absences (4): Cotton, Holdich-Davis, McQueen, Sams.

Chancellor's Remarks

Chancellor James Moeser began his remarks with a tribute to Paul David Wellstone, A.B. 1965, Ph.D. 1969, United States Senator from Minnesota, who was killed in a plane crash on October 25, 2002.

"This past week Carolina lost one of its sons, United States Senator Paul Wellstone -- a true man of the people. Paul Wellstone represented the state of Minnesota but he has often been described also as North Carolina's third senator because of his strong ties to Chapel Hill, where he earned a Bachelor's degree Phi Beta Kappa in three years and a Ph.D. in political science. He also won the 1964 ACC Championship in wrestling. He is remembered even by his political opponents as a man of uncommon kindness and human warmth. Joel Schwartz, his mentor and lifelong friend at Carolina, relates how he constantly reached out to others, including the very nemesis of his Carolina student activist days. Senator Jesse Helms. Paul Wellstone sharpened and honed his commitment to human rights at this university. Joel Schwartz tells this story: when he was an undergraduate there was a struggle here to desegregate the last holdouts among area businesses. One café still would not admit blacks and there was a protest with pickets, and people on the other side were taunting the pickets. Wellstone and his wife were trying to finish school, they were in a hurry, and they walked about a hundred feet past the protest when he said to her 'you know there comes a time when if you see injustice, you just can't ignore it.' He joined the protest. In 1969 he helped organize support for the volatile Lenoir Hall cafeteria workers strike. As a United States Senator, he reflected those values in all that he did. I met Paul Wellstone only once, on one of his visits to this campus last year when he talked to our students about service. He told them that public service is a lifetime commitment, that college is not a dress rehearsal for life but that they should begin now in becoming engaged and helping others. To all who knew him, he was not Senator Wellstone, but Paul. As Senator Tom Harkin of Iowa said, 'no one ever wore the title of Senator better and used it less.'" The Council rose for a moment of silent remembrance.

Faculty salary equity report. The chancellor thanked Dr. Lynn Williford, director of the Office of Institutional Research, for the painstaking work that went into the report of the faculty salary equity study (to be discussed later on today's agenda). He said, "we need to study and understand these data and then develop an orderly process of dealing with them. Recognizing that we are dealing with individual members of the faculty, we shall have to treat each case on its own merits with appropriate administrative and peer review."

Black Alumni Reunion. Chancellor Moeser noted that the 22nd annual Black Alumni Reunion is taking place this weekend. "African-Americans first enrolled at Chapel Hill in 1951 and Harvey Beech, the first African-American alumnus, graduated in 1952," he said, "but African-Americans helped build this university from day one -- October 12th 1793, the day the cornerstone was laid at Old East. It is a wonderful fact that we have more African-American tenure-track faculty and more endowed chairs held by African-American faculty than any other university in this country. But we are not content with where we are, and we are not content with very high ratings from our own students. Our vision is to be the leading public university and that includes this critical area of diversity."

Provost's Remarks

Budget. Provost Robert Shelton recapitulated the budget reductions that he reported at the October Council meeting. They totaled \$11.8 million, or about 3%. A little over 50% of the reductions recommended by the deans to meet their quotas came from vacant faculty positions. These reductions were offset to some extent by \$9.8 million in additional revenue received for enrollment increases and from campus-based tuition increases. We have now received our allocation of additional budget reductions mandated by the enacted State budget. The first comes from a mandated "efficiency reduction" of \$25 million for all of State government. Our share of that is \$765,000. This is a permanent reduction. The second results from a \$41.5 million "negative reserve" in the budget; in other words, the amount by which total authorized appropriations exceeds estimated revenues. The governor is estimating a revenue shortfall of considerably more than that and has directed that State agencies reduce current-year spending by 2% in addition to the permanent budget reductions already implemented. For Carolina, this short-term reduction comes to \$8.2 million. After consulting the chancellor and the Budget Committee, the provost said he is allocating this reduction to all units on a pro rata basis.

Academic Plan. Work continues on the academic plan but it is not yet ready to present to the Council and others in the University community. In addition to the topics mentioned at the October Council meeting, the plan will identify metrics to measure success in implementing it. These measures will be consistent with the measures of excellence presented to the Board of Trustees earlier this year and that will be presented to the Board for approval at their November 20 meeting. The goal is to bring work on the academic plan to closure in time to present it to the Trustees for approval at their January 23 meeting.

Tuition Advisory Task Force. The Tuition Advisory Task Force continues its work with a goal of completing its task in December. At its most recent meeting, the Provost's Office placed before the members quantitative options and examined how they would address (1) new faculty positions to improve the student/faculty ratio, (2) faculty salaries, and (3) teaching assistant salaries. The estimated amount needed to meet these needs is \$27 million. The task force also asked to discuss the possibility of using campus-based tuition for support of SPA staff salaries. The estimated amount needed for that purpose is \$7.2 million. The group discussed in detail how the needs might be addressed if tuition were increased by \$400 per year for each of three years, and how things would change if the increase were only \$200 per year, or as much as \$600 per year. Throughout the discussions, it has been tacitly assumed that 40% of the increase would be reserved for need-based aid. The provost said he has been encouraged by the fact that members of the task force have resisted the natural urge to dig in to rigid positions. The group has remained cohesive and seems committed to reaching a consensus.

Chair of the Faculty's Remarks

Parking permits. Professor Sue Estroff reported that the Advisory Committee on Transportation has endorsed a scheme for tiered parking permit fees based on the employee's salary. Those earning less than \$50,000 per year will see a 5% per year increase over a five-year period. Those earning between \$50,000 and \$100,000 will see 10% annual increases for five years, and those earning \$100,000 and up will see annual increases of 20% over the same period. No one will get a reduction. After the five-year ramp-up, fees will stabilize. This recommendation is in the early stages. It has not yet been accepted by the administration or approved by the Trustees.

Lowest-paid employees. The Executive Committee has received from Associate Vice Chancellor Laurie Charest a non-identified list of SPA employees who earn under \$20,000 per year. There are more than 230 of them, many of whom are people of color in housekeeping jobs. Many have worked here for less than two years, but some have as much as 30 years of service. This information underscores the fact that the University as a workplace falls far short of providing a living wage to everyone who works here, which is unacceptable. Several units are moving ahead with plans for fund-raising on behalf of their staff. Faculty members in other units can contribute by contacting Human Resources. In view of differing sensibilities among staff about receiving contributions, the Executive Committee decided not to call for a campus-wide campaign. Instead, ECFC proposed a joint working group of faculty and staff to address the topic of living wage. Prof. Charles Daye (Law) will be co-chairing the group with a counterpart from the Employee Forum.

Report on Faculty Salary Equity Study

Executive Associate Provost Bernadette Gray-Little spoke to the report of a study of faculty salary equity by gender and ethnicity that has recently been completed by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) under the leadership of Dr. Lynn Williford. The OIR has monitored faculty salaries on an ongoing basis for many years, but a number of factors this year heightened interest in gender/ethnicity issues both on this campus and across the nation. Several major universities and several professional and disciplinary organizations have conducted reviews of gender equity among faculty and in disciplines. Two general conclusions have emerged from these studies: (1) in some disciplines the number of women faculty is increasing without necessarily leading to equity in salary or status, and (2) in other disciplines the number of women faculty remains low. On this campus, several groups including the Status of Women Committee, the Association of Professional Women in the Medical School, and the Association of Women Faculty and Professionals, have been especially interested in this issue and have asked for a study of the status of women faculty on this campus. In response, Provost Shelton and Chancellor Moeser asked Assoc. Provost Gray-Little to work with Dr. Williford in designing and conducting such a study.

The goal of the study is to determine if systematic salary differences by gender and ethnicity can be detected after controlling for a number of other variables that might reasonably be expected to be related to salary. The study differs from many previous studies on this campus and most of the studies on other campuses in two ways: (1) it covers all academic units, including those in which clinical income is an important factor, and (2) it includes fixed-term faculty. The data for the analysis were taken from University personnel files, updated and corrected by the relevant departments and units. A special effort was made to understand policies and practices with regard to salaries in the School of Medicine and the School of Dentistry because of the importance of clinical income in those units.

The procedure used in the study yielded a number of multiple regression analysis models. This statistical method is used in most studies of this type and is the method of choice because it provides a means of estimating the impact of gender and ethnicity on salary while holding constant a number of other variables such as rank, time in rank, discipline, highest earned degree, and tenure status. The models were able to account for 80% of the variance in salaries. Productivity and quality variables were not included in the models. The analyses were conducted by Dr. Williford in consultation with Professors Kenneth Bollen (Sociology), Daniel Caplan (Dental Ecology), Keith Muller (Biostatistics), and Abigail Panter (Psychology).

Assoc. Provost Gray-Little presented the principal findings of the study (which can be found, along with an executive summary, at <http://www.unc.edu/faculty/faccoun/selecteds.htm> on the Web). In Academic Affairs, after controlling for all other factors used in the model, female faculty are paid on average \$1,332 per year less than white males, while minority faculty are paid \$1,680 more than white males. In Health Affairs schools other than Medicine, women are paid \$3,440 less and minorities \$2,552 more. In the School of Medicine, women receive \$6,976 less overall and \$9,293 less in the clinical departments. The study supports two major conclusions: (1) females have lower salaries than males in all models attempted, the average dollar disparity depending on the unit of analysis, and (2) minority faculty have higher salaries than white faculty in all areas except Medicine, where a negative disparity was noted in two of the analyses.

In concluding her remarks, Assoc. Provost Gray-Little said that the most important factors accounting for salary are rank, market value of the discipline, number of years in rank, and rank, and whether or not the person holds a distinguished professorship. Gender and ethnicity were relatively minor predictors in the model. The models used are very reliable. The question before us now is to gain a better understanding of what steps to take in response to the findings.

Annual Report of the Faculty Athletics Committee

Prof. Celia Hooper (Allied Health Sciences) presented the annual report of the Faculty Athletics Committee and briefly summarized how the committee organizes to do its work. A Council member asked why the graduation rate for women athletes is better than it is for men. Prof. Hooper replied that in her experience female athletes are highly motivated and have good time management skills. Another member noted that graduation rates appear to vary considerably from year to year and that the number of observations is small. He asked whether the data represent all student athletes or only a portion. Prof. John Evans (Business School), a member of the committee and our ACC faculty representative, explained that data in the committee's report represents all participants in all athletic programs. Graduation rates are reported to different entities in different ways. We report to NCAA with respect to scholarship athletes. This is the smallest group. We report to the Board of Governors with respect to all recruited athletes, a slightly larger group. The committee's report to the faculty covers all participants. It is true that the data vary from year to year. For that reason, Prof. Evans said he surveys the data over a rolling five-year period. This discloses slightly more stability. For male student athletes, the graduation rate hovers in the low 70% range. For females, it is in the mid-80% range. Looking at the data over a five-year period is especially important for individual programs in which the number of participants is small. Prof. Hooper added that the committee also reviews exit interviews in order to get a feel for the culture of a particular sport.

A member of the Council asked whether there are differences in graduation rates among the races. Prof. Evans reported that NCAA data for Carolina for the most recent four cohorts combined show the following graduation rates: black male student-athletes, 49%; all black male students, 57%; black female student-athletes, 83%; all black female students, 68%. The rates for all students were 79% for males and 80% for females.

A member of the Council asked about recent NCAA legislation that seems to eliminate a minimum SAT score requirement for scholarship athletes. Prof. Evans replied that NCAA legislation previously set a minimum SAT score of 820 which could be offset by a high grade point average (GPA). Thus, the legislation has embraced a sliding scale concept. The new legislation simply extends the concept to embrace the lowest possible SAT score of 400. The effect is that there is no SAT score that cannot be offset by an appropriately high GPA in order for a student to qualify for admission under NCAA standards. Meeting NCAA standards does not mean that a student meets the qualifications of any particular institution. The number of students who have low SAT scores but high GPA's is quite small. The former truncated sliding scale was thought to be vulnerable to legal challenge on the basis of arbitrariness. He added that neither Carolina nor the ACC favored extending the scale because it leaves the impression that standards are being lowered and creates a temptation to recruit and admit students who will not be able to succeed academically. Our position did not prevail on a vote of 50 in favor, 15 opposed. Prof. Hooper said that the committee had discussed this matter and is concerned at the potential pressure that it may bring to bear on high school teachers.

Topics of Concern

Prof. Laura Janda (Slavic Languages and Literatures) expressed frustration at not being able to gain approval for meaningful salary increases for EPA personnel whose positions are fully funded from grant funds, even though the underlying grant provides for such increases. She said this policy has been in place for three years. Council members from the School of Medicine and the School of Social Work said that they have been able to pass on grant-funded salary increases. Prof. Janda said that she has received different advice from officials in the Office of the Dean of Arts and Sciences. Provost Shelton said he would look into the matter.

Council member Elizabeth Chenault (Academic Affairs Libraries) pointed out that Wilson Library is one of the few academic buildings open for business on Saturday mornings, yet the pre-game pep rally takes place on the front steps and is distracting. She hoped another more suitable site might be found.

General Education Curriculum Revision

Prof. Laurie McNeil (Physics & Astronomy) briefed the Council on the status of the undergraduate general education curriculum revision that she is heading. Work on revision of the curriculum began with the formation of a Steering Committee in the fall of 2000. In the fall of 2001, the Steering Committee formed a set of subcommittees made up of faculty, staff, and students involved in undergraduate education. About 160 people are involved in those subcommittees. Each of the subcommittees is charged with reviewing a particular area of the curriculum. The Steering Committee received the initial reports of the subcommittees and integrated them into one coherent curriculum after imposing certain constraints, such as a decision that there would be no increase in the number of credit hours required for graduation. The first draft of the proposal was presented to a faculty forum on April 22, 2002 and a revision prepared in light of the discussion. The revision was then presented and debated at another faculty forum on October 7, 2002, and at a student forum on Oct. 15. The proposal has now been revised in light of those discussions and has been officially submitted for comment to the Administrative Board of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Educational Policy Committee. Council members who wish to comment on the proposal should contact one of those bodies. When this part of the process has been completed, the Steering Committee will prepare a final report that will be brought forward for debate and formal approval by the Faculty Council. Prof. McNeil hopes that this will take place at the February Council meeting, an admittedly ambitious goal, but in any event before the end of this academic year. Once approved, the revised curriculum will take effect in due course, possibly as early as the Fall semester 2004 but probably more realistically in the Fall semester 2005. The revised curriculum would affect students enrolling for the first time on or after its effective date. Thus, for a number of years, we would be administering two sets of requirements as students first enrolling under the current requirements would continue to be governed by them.

Prof. McNeil then led the Council through a detailed survey of the specific requirements of the proposed curriculum.

Distinguished Alumna and Alumnus Awards

The Council went into closed session to hear the report of the Committee on Honorary Degrees and Special Awards with respect to Distinguished Alumna and Alumnus Awards to be presented at University Day 2003. The Council approved the committee's nominees.

Adjournment

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

Joseph S. Ferrell
Secretary of the Faculty