

MEETING OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

Friday, 19 January 1990, 3:00 p.m.

* * * * * Auditorium (Room 100), Hamilton Hall * * * * *

Chancellor Paul Hardin will preside. Attendance of elected Council members is required.

AGENDA

- I. Chancellor Hardin's remarks: questions or comments on any subject will be invited.
- II. Chairman of the Faculty Harry Gooder.
- III. Annual Reports of Standing Committees:
 - * a. Building and Grounds: John L. Sanders, Chair.
 - * b. Faculty Hearings: Anne M. Dellinger, Chair.
- IV. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics and the University: Doris W. Betts, Chair. [Discussion of report and discussion and vote on its recommendations. The report was circulated prior to the December 15 meeting.]
- V. New Business.

Laurence G. Avery
Secretary of the Faculty

* Copies of these documents are being circulated to all members of the Faculty Council and to Chairs and Deans, so that all faculty members may have the opportunity to read them. Council members: please bring your copies to the meeting.

THE NEXT MEETING OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE WILL BE ON FEBRUARY 5.

Minutes of the
MEETING OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL
Friday, 19 January 1990
100 Hamilton Hall

Faculty Council Attendance: present 54; excused absences 10; unexcused absences 13.

Chancellor Hardin presided through item I. Chairman of the Faculty Gooder presided for the remainder of the meeting.

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

I. Chancellor Hardin's remarks.

The Chancellor welcomed William Friday, former President of the University and founding member of the Knight Commission on Athletics, and Thomas McKeon, newly appointed Director of Continuing Education. He also announced a called meeting of the Council for 3:00, 9 February, in Hamilton Auditorium if needed to complete the agenda for today.

Not wanting to chill faculty discussion, the Chancellor has refrained from public comment on the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics and the University. He considers the subject important, however, and shares the committee's pleasure that our athletic programs comply with NCAA rules. For this he commends not only the Department of Athletics and the Faculty Committee on Athletics but also our Trustees and members of the Educational Foundation. Major violations of rules usually involve booster misbehavior with the connivance of key trustees, and our record of strict compliance reflects responsible behavior on the part of everyone, including off-campus members of the university family. About athletics, however, he is never complacent. Should a violation occur, he will take appropriate disciplinary action so promptly that the Council will not even have time to fret over it. He concluded by noting the emphasis in the report on the importance of UNC being a leader in the national reform of athletics. He agrees completely. We are perceived that way today, and he along with others who represent us in the NCAA and ACC intend to keep UNC in the vanguard of reform.

At the call for questions Paul Debreczeny (Slavic Languages) noted the disastrous fate of the library in the present budget crisis. While we might scrimp for a time on the purchase of supplies without jeopardizing the educational mission of the university, the same is not true of books and journals. A cut-back there enfeebles both the teaching and the research of the faculty. Suspending book and journal purchases, as is now being done, is like suspending classes for a semester. In one of its major functions, the university has come to a halt. The Chancellor shares Prof. Debreczeny's values and concerns, but in the short run knows nothing else to do. The financial crisis is genuine and has to be dealt with. The library is central to the university's mission, however, and has been given high priority in the bicentennial fund raising campaign. Perhaps in the long run we can make it somewhat less dependent on state funds.

There being no more questions or comments, the Chancellor moved to the floor.

II. Chairman of the Faculty Harry Gooder's remarks.

Despite requests to do so, Professor Gooder has not commented on the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics and the University. He does note, however, that the committee found no violations of NCAA regulations in our athletic programs and declared itself "impressed with the care taken by our Athletic Department and by the coaches and their staffs to avoid" violations. He is disappointed that this finding of the committee has drawn so little attention. He hoped in vain to see some such newspaper headline as: "Carolina Clean." If the reverse had been true, he is sure the news would have

Summary of Proceedings, 19 January 1990

2

been loudly disseminated. He wants to assure everyone involved with athletics at Chapel Hill that our present discussion is about the proper role of athletics at an institution of higher learning, not about participants in the program and their supporters. Of them we have every right to be proud. Professor Gooder knew the Chancellor would make similar comments but thought it important for the faculty view also to be on the record.

III. Annual Reports of Standing Committees:

A. Building and Grounds: John L. Sanders, Chair. (report attached)

Mr. Sanders noted that his report had been circulated and asked for questions. To Professor Gooder's question about when we might know the location of the new School of Business, Mr. Sanders replied that it will be late winter or spring.

The report was accepted.

B. Faculty Hearings: Anne M. Dellinger, Chair. (report attached)

Professor Dellinger's circulated report noted that the committee has conducted no business this year, which, Professor Gooder added, is good news.

The report was accepted.

IV. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics and the University: Doris W. Betts, Chair,

Professor Gooder noted that the first nine recommendations in the report involve reforms of intercollegiate athletics on a national scale and proposed that the Council consider those nine as a group. He called on committee member George Taylor (History), who drafted that part of the report, to introduce the nine.

Professor Taylor said the recommendations can be reduced to three propositions: (1) that student-athletes should be students and (2) should have their study time protected, and (3) that coaches should recognize study as prior in importance to sports. A coach's responsibility is broad, and not reducible to a won-loss record. Student athletes should not only graduate, they should graduate with an education -- their intellectual capacity stretched, broadened, deepened. Is there now a conflict between study and athletics? Yes. Practice, travel, other team activities take far too much time. He and other committee members had this brought home to them in the spring of 1989 as they interviewed numerous student athletes. Virtually without exception the students said in college their sport is no longer a game, but a job. He cited a host of remarks from these interviews to the effect that team activities left little time or energy for study, that coaches assume sports come first, and that many athletes resent the monopoly of their time by their sport. If we expect student athletes to be students, clearly we must reduce -- sometimes drastically -- the length of seasons, practice time (in weeks and hours), and other team activities such as meetings and travel. He concluded by reminding the Council that in athletic matters it cannot legislate, only advise the Chancellor, but that the custom here is for chancellors to take seriously the advice of the faculty. During the long hours of committee work he felt many emotions, but one was pride in this faculty for its effort to reaffirm the academic process at this University.

Stephen Bayne (Dentistry) wondered whether, with respect to the first nine recommendations, there was a difference between revenue and non-revenue sports, and Professor Taylor said no, they all take too much time for a student athlete really to be a student.

A sheet of amendments drawn up by Stirling Haig II (Romance Languages), Douglas G. Kelly (Mathematics), Jack M. Sasson (Religious Studies), William W. Smith

Summary of Proceedings, 19 January 1990

3

(Mathematics), Richard A. Soloway (History), and Jon W. Tolle (Mathematics) was made available to the Council at the outset of the meeting, and Professor Gooder asked the Council to consider the first one, which amended recommendation three. The amendment reduced the number of hours required of an athlete for team-related activity per season from 360 to 270. Jack Donnelly (Political Science) wanted to know the bases of these numbers, and committee member Henry Landsberger (Sociology) replied that 270 derived from the University's maximum of eighteen hours per week for non-academic work for students multiplied by the fifteen-week season recommended in the report. Three-hundred-sixty hours is far too much time away from studies; that is more than half an average work week over a season. Christopher Martens (Marine Sciences) noted that 270 breaks down to about four hours per day during a season and would have a great impact on travel time for teams. Professor Taylor replied, exactly. If adopted nationally, the reduced hours would mean that teams played closer to home. Bruce Winterhalder (Anthropology) asked whether the committee talked with coaches about the impact of reduced hours, and Professor Taylor said no, the principle is that study comes first. Team activity can adjust. Professor Landsberger said that in graduation rates and related statistics UNC does all right, but the job of the committee was to state what is academically justifiable. A major change of direction for college athletics is in the air, and we must support it. Donald Higginbotham (History) said graduation rates are the lowest common denominator. The important thing is the quality of the education -- a student's ability to interact with others in his or her major, to attend plays and concerts, to pursue study projects. All of that takes time. Lawrence Slifkin (Physics), noting the praise heaped on our athletic establishment for violating no NCAA regulations, hoped that when he dies his friends can say more of him than that he never was arrested. As an undergraduate at NYU he ran track, which took about eighteen hours per week, but quit (despite a sympathetic coach) because that was too much time away from his studies if he hoped to prepare in a way adequate for becoming a professor at UNC. Now the demands on athletes are much greater. Professor Winterhalder said by Professor Slifkin's own example students could drop a sport if so minded. They aren't forced to play. Professor Taylor admitted they aren't dragged in, but thinks they are "bought" in. He suggested reading the autobiographical book by one of our former football players, Lawrence Taylor, to see how that works. On a call for the question, the amendment failed by a two to three margin, leaving the limit on team-related activity during a season at 360 hours.

Professor Gooder asked the Council to consider the second amendment on the distributed sheet, an amendment to recommendation nine. The amendment eliminates the final words beginning with "fall below those of the least . . ." and substitutes: do not meet the admission standards that are generally applicable within the institution to which they apply. Professor Donnelly objected to the amendment on the grounds that it would handicap affirmative action efforts. Professor Kelly said the intent was rather to close a loophole in the recommendation that would permit a school, on the basis of one student with low admission scores, to admit a host of marginal students as athletes. But he shared the concern for affirmative action and suggested an amendment to the amendment, to read: "generally applicable, including affirmative action, within . . ." Other signatories to the amendment accepted the new language as a friendly amendment. At a call for the question, the amendment as amended passed by a wide majority.

Professor Gooder then asked the Council to consider the resolution on the distributed sheet, a resolution to substitute a new paragraph for the one introducing the first nine recommendations. The present introductory paragraph reads: "The first nine recommendations are for national reforms in intercollegiate athletics. For five years the University should support them aggressively and do its best to obtain their adoption by the NCAA, the ACC, and other conferences and governing bodies. The University should then consider adopting them unilaterally." The substitute paragraph reads: These recommendations are for national reforms in intercollegiate athletics. The University should support them aggressively and do its best to obtain their adoption by the NCAA, the ACC, and other conferences and governing bodies. In any case, the University should now prepare to implement them, unilaterally if necessary, by the Fall of 1995.

Summary of Proceedings, 19 January 1990

Professor Betts said the question here was whether to tell our successors to consider doing something, or to tell them to do it. She prefers the injunction to consider. That isn't a wishy-washy course for us to take, but a prudent one. It's unwise to bind the future. We don't know what circumstances people might face five years down the road. The Committee debated this very point, and the majority favored the flexibility inherent in consider. Our successors will have no trouble seeing our intent.

Committee member Daniel Pollitt (Law) said he was among the minority who wanted the recommendations adopted by UNC not only unilaterally but also now. Professor Betts is right, we don't know the future. Today there is a spirit to reform college athletics. Tomorrow, or five years from now, the spirit may well have evaporated. So reform is now or never. If reform is desirable five years from now, it is desirable now. Professor Soloway, a sponsor of the resolution, said it reflects the doubts people have about the willingness or ability of the NCAA to reform itself. We need to begin planning now for the eventuality that the reforms don't succeed on the national level. Committee member Tom Scott (Research Services) pointed out that there is reason to be more hopeful. At its recent meeting the NCAA began to reform itself by cutting back on the length of football and basketball seasons, and our own Athletics Department supports the reform movement. Professor Slifkin said he isn't all that happy with our athletic programs. Every semester faculty members get a note from the Provost saying we mustn't give quizzes the week before finals because they produce too much stress for the students. In the week before finals last fall, however, the basketball team set a record for the number of miles travelled and games played. Talk about stress! Professor Landsberger urged adoption of the resolution. We can't lock in the future. They can do what they think best no matter what we say now. Let's go on record as wanting these reforms even if it means unilateral adoption.

Timothy Taft (Medicine) said that to a degree we would bind the future if we began implementing the recommendations now because team schedules are made up three to five years in advance. And if we were to implement them unilaterally, the net effect would be elimination of some sports. Professor Donnelly hopes the Chancellor sees that some of the recommendations (two and seven in particular) can be implemented quickly and without reference to national acceptance. Chancellor Hardin, responding to the general discussion, said he thinks flexibility with resolve is the better argument here. People are working, reform is underway. He expects the ACC and some other conference to sponsor our reforms in the NCAA. And who knows? Maybe it won't take five years to get them through. Fleming Bell (Institute of Government) proposed a revision to the present introductory paragraph, deleting the words "consider adopting them unilaterally" and replacing them with the words resolve to adopt them unilaterally. The Committee accepted the revision, and at a call for the question the resolution to substitute failed by a two to one margin.

Alec Marantz (Linguistics) wondered whether recommendation four, limiting hours of required physical activity during the off-season, would require some kind of monitoring. Professor Taylor said yes, that someone on a coach's staff could be required to keep a log book of such activity. Professor Kelly said the recommendation seemed so broad as to include informal pick-up games and the like, and he proposed amending it as follows: after the words "and unsupervised play should be allowed, but" insert the words such activity required of a student athlete. The Committee accepted the amendment.

Ruel Tyson (Religious Studies) called the question on the first nine recommendations as amended, and they were adopted unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 5:35.

Laurence G. Avery
Secretary of the Faculty