

28.a.1

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

Friday, 9 February 1990, 3:00 p.m.

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

Chairman of the Faculty Harry Gooder will preside. Attendance of elected Council members is required.

AGENDA

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics and the University: Doris W. Betts, Chair. [Discussion of report and discussion and vote on recommendations 9-32. Recommendations 1-9 were voted on at the January 19 Faculty Council meeting. The report was circulated prior to the December 15 meeting.]

Laurence G. Avery
Secretary of the Faculty

FACULTY AFFAIRS

PROCESSED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL
SERIES 1: MINUTES OF GENERAL FACULTY AND FACULTY COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

Friday, 9 February 1990, 3:00 p.m.
Auditorium (Room 100), Hamilton Hall

Faculty Council Attendance: present 47; excused absences 15; unexcused absences 15.

Chairman of the Faculty Harry Gooder presided.

Special Session for consideration of recommendations ten through thirty-two of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics (recommendations one through nine having been dealt with at the January meeting of the Council).

Chancellor Hardin wished to inform the Council of two recent developments relating to our business for the day. (1) This morning the Board of Governors passed a resolution the gist of which is that the audited financial statements of all fund-raising organizations associated with schools in the university system will be made public. (2) The Long-range Planning Committee of the ACC, chaired by John Swofford (Athletic Director), has developed recommendations that in several instances resemble recommendations in the Ad Hoc Committee report: for instance, elimination of athletic dorms, a limitation on athletic seasons to twenty weeks per academic year and team-related activity to twenty hours per week, elimination of grants-in-aid for students who fail to score at least 700 on the SAT and meet the core curriculum in high school courses, no absences from class for athletic practice and a reduced number of absences for game-related activity such as travel. The ACC is already respected by people with educational values (within the last few weeks the Chancellor has received calls from presidents of two highly regarded universities who wondered about the possibility of their schools joining the ACC), and the recommendations of the Long-range Planning Committee only show that the respect is well placed. The Chancellor concluded by congratulating the Committee, whose report brings into focus the primacy of education, and the Council, whose discussion has been conducted in a manner that does not polarize the community. He moved to the floor.

Chairman of the Faculty Gooder, noting that our deliberations have received a good deal of national attention, quoted the Chronicle of Higher Education to the effect that the deliberations were exceptional as much for their tone as for the conclusions they reached. He hopes the high level of discussion will continue today as we consider local reforms. He also hopes we can move with dispatch and reminded the Council that we are considering recommendations, not regulations, so the spirit or intent of an item is more important than its details. Before calling up recommendation ten, he noted that the Ad Hoc Committee had revised the wording of recommendations ten, fifteen, seventeen, twenty-six, and twenty-nine and that he proposed to accept the revised language in each case as the language under discussion. These revisions are available to Council near the sign-in sheet, as are substitute recommendations for ten, fourteen, and twenty-five submitted by Professors Stirling Haig (Romance Languages), Howard Harper (English), Don Higginbotham (History), Douglas Kelly (Mathematics), Jack Sasson (Religious Studies), Lawrence Slifkin (Physics), William Smith (Mathematics), Richard Soloway (History), Jon Tolle (Mathematics), and Ruel Tyson (Religious Studies).

recommendation #10

To place it before the Council, Professor Gooder read the new version of recommendation ten: "The average admission credentials of out-of-state student-athletes admitted to the University should, at the end of five years, be equivalent to the average admissions credentials of other groups of out-of-state admittees defined for admission purposes as contributing to the diversity of the student body or having special talents; and in the out-of-state quota the University will reduce to 75 per year the admissions of athletes who are non-competitive in that admission category."

Committee chair Doris Betts (English) explained that after consultation with Gillian Cell (Dean of Arts and Sciences) and Richard Cashwell (Director of Undergraduate Admissions), the sub-committee felt the earlier version of the recommendation laid too much stress on SAT scores. The present version more nearly reflects actual admission criteria. William Smith (Mathematics) preferred the new version to the old, but warned the Council against getting bogged down in technicalities. Our principle here is that we want to admit good students. It is easy to get worked up about out-of-state students because the quota there is so small, but in fact we ought to ask the same question about all students, in-state as well as out-of-state: to what extent should athletic ability be used as a criterion for admission? Richard Soloway (History) was still distressed over the large number of academically non-competitive students permitted within the out-of-state quota (75 in a quota of about 600), and proposed amending the recommendation at several points with language from the recommendation proposed by Haig et al. Professor Gooder noted that it would be less confusing to move to substitute recommendation ten in Haig et al. for the recommendation presently on the floor, and several voices made and seconded such a motion. After some discussion (during which Committee member Henry Landsberger [Sociology] urged the importance of retaining the idea of equivalency contained in the opening sentence of the Committee recommendation) and another proposal by Professor Soloway that he soon withdrew, the substitute recommendation read:

"Except as noted below the athletic skills of applicants should not be considered in the admissions decisions of the University.

1. For each of the sports of men's football and basketball and women's basketball and soccer, a number of applicants may be admitted on a 'noncompetitive' academic basis. The number admitted should not exceed 50% of the total number of athletes on scholarships in that sport. The percentage of out-of-state students among those admitted on a 'noncompetitive' basis should not exceed the percentage of out-of-state students allowed for the University as a whole. Exceptions for athletes to the minimal admissions standards of this University should be gradually phased out and ended completely by the 1995-96 academic year.

2. ("equivalency" sentence from Committee recommendation) The average admission credentials of out-of-state student-athletes admitted to the University should, at the end of five years, be equivalent to the average admissions credentials of other groups of out-of-state admittees defined for admission purposes as contributing to the diversity of the student body or having special talents.

3. For all other sports all 'noncompetitive' and 'exceptional' admissions should be phased out and ended by the 1995-96 academic year."

Professor Betts noted that the Council was now going through the same process as the Committee in trying to pin things down. The substitute recommendation is too elaborate, too detailed, too specific, too punitive. The majority on the Committee came to adopt a middling position, and that position is best reflected in the new Committee version of recommendation ten. Theodore Oldenburg (Dentistry) called for the question, and the substitute recommendation was defeated by a three to four margin.

With the Committee recommendation back on the floor, Professor Smith said there might be a rationale for allowing some number of "exceptions" (academically noncompetitive students) in the out-of-state allotment for the revenue sports -- and he would include women's soccer with the revenue sports. We've all heard those sports referred to as the front porch of the University or the glue binding the alumni to the school. So the rationale is the importance of the revenue sports in the public relations of the University. But that rationale doesn't apply to non-revenue sports. Associate Dean for Honors Robert Allen (RTVMP) wanted the Council to appreciate how precious all of those out-of-state slots are. He talks with many out-of-state applicants in the fall and winter, and, if their record warrants it, encourages them to think of enrolling in the Carolina honors program. Too often, however, in the spring he gets calls from the parents of those applicants who are angry that their child, though eligible for the honors program, wasn't even admitted to the University. Among out-of-state applicants, Dean Allen thinks, we could admit the top 400 of those we presently reject and all of them would be eligible for the honors program.

Fleming Bell (Institute of Government) moved to amend the recommendation by substituting 25 for "75" in the final clause, so it would read: "in the out-of-state quota the University will reduce to 25 per year the admissions of athletes who are non-competitive in that admission category." Cynthia Adams (Davis Library) wondered how many such students are admitted at present, and Associate Athletic Director Richard Baddour replied, about a hundred. At a call for the question the amendment was defeated by one vote.

Arnold Loewy (Law) asked what was the rationale for the number 75, and Professor Betts replied that the Committee desired some reduction but a realistic one. Barbara Entwisle (Sociology) thought the number of exemptions important. By lowering the number, we encourage coaches to recruit good students for their teams. Donald Warren (Dentistry) held that SAT scores are poor measures of potential. Being good at a sport is itself an accomplishment requiring discipline, competitiveness, a sense of responsibility -- all of which are important to success in life. Our message to the administration should be left simple: we want good students. Professor Bell moved to amend by substituting 50 for "75" in the final clause, and at a call for the question the amendment carried by a five to four margin. Lest anyone think a full fifty exceptions have to be admitted every year, Richard King (Psychology) moved to amend the final clause by adding the words a maximum of before the number "50" so the phrase would read: "reduce to a maximum of 50 per year." The amendment passed by a large majority. Professor Loewy wondered if there were special admission categories for minority applicants, categories unrelated to athletics, and Mr. Cashwell answered, yes. At a call for the question, recommendation ten as amended passed by a margin of ten to one.

Amendments effected only the last clause of the Committee recommendation, which in final form reads: "and in the out-of-state quota the University will reduce to a maximum of 50 per year the admissions of athletes who are non-competitive in that admission category."

recommendation #11

Committee member Daniel Pollitt (Law) identified himself as among the minority on the Committee who wished to permit grants-in-aid only in men's football and basketball and women's soccer and basketball. The minority position means that participants in other sports would be students, in sports parlance, "walk-ons," and therefore perhaps not as good at the sport as people we could recruit. That might mean we had to re-schedule Davidson for Clemson, but our athletic teams (except for the four mentioned) would be made up of students. Douglas Kelly (Mathematics), referring to the opening phrase of the recommendation, wondered if the recommended policy was indeed already in force, and Mr. Baddour said, no, not as a policy, but the Athletic Director does discuss the academic progress of his or her team members with each coach. Professor Jack Donnelly (Political Science) proposed deleting the opening phrase ("In accordance with a policy we understand to be already in force,"), and after some discussion that amendment and also the insertion of new before "grants-in-aid" were accepted by the Committee as friendly amendments. Professor Oldenburg wondered what the phrase "average graduation rate" meant. Did it mean, over a four year period, over five years, six, what? Committee member Maynard Adams said the phrase assumed a five year period. At a call for the question, recommendation eleven as amended passed by a large majority.

As amended, recommendation eleven begins: "The number of new grants-in-aid in each sport. . . ."

recommendation #12

For the word "professional" toward the end of the first sentence, Stirling Haig (Romance Languages) proposed substituting academic so the phrase would read: "clear academic goals." Professor Betts accepted the change, and recommendation twelve as amended passed by a large majority.

recommendation #13

Professor Gooder noted that, if the recommendation contemplated an actual interview with each student-athlete departing the university, it contemplated about 150 interviews each year -- a labor-intensive job for the Faculty Athletics Committee. He wondered if a questionnaire might serve. Professor Betts said Committee members found their conversations with student-athletes most helpful. Chancellor Hardin added that the Faculty Athletics Committee also was concerned about the large number of interviews being called for. Sometimes a questionnaire might be preferable, since it would provide confidentiality; at other times an interview would be better. Couldn't we devise language allowing either one? Professor Betts accepted the intent of the suggestion, and Professor Gooder proposed the following language, which was accepted: "The Faculty Committee on Athletics should arrange for exit questionnaires or personal interviews at the election of the student to include. . . ." Donald Higginbotham (History), former member of the Faculty Athletics Committee, said there was a long tradition of exit interviews with student-athletes and gave some examples. He added that, when appropriate, coaches should have an opportunity to reply to information generated in interviews. At a call for the question, recommendation thirteen as amended passed unanimously.

As amended, recommendation thirteen begins: "The Faculty Committee on Athletics should arrange for exit questionnaires or personal interviews at the election of the student to include. . . ."

recommendation #14

Professor Betts accepted recommendation fourteen in Haig et al. as a friendly addition to Committee fourteen. Professor Warren asked the meaning of "long-range" in the phrase "a coach shall have a long-range contract." Professor Pollitt said the concept of tenure doesn't apply to coaches since tenure is designed to protect academic freedom, but "long-range" is something like tenure. Chancellor Hardin said that kind of open-ended contract might tie his own hands in dealing with coaches. Coaching is essentially an administrative job, and he needs some discretion in dealing with administrators. A fixed-term contract, he thinks, better suits the situation. Professor Pollitt said the Committee didn't want coaches serving at the will of a chancellor. Their contracts can be terminated at any time for just cause, and the limitation on a chancellor is that he discuss it with the faculty elected Advisory Committee. The Committee was not trying to tie anybody's hands. It just wanted to assert the principle that coaches can be terminated only for just cause after consultation with the Advisory Committee. Professor Donnelly proposed substituting fixed-term for "long-range" at the point in question, and the motion was seconded.

Concerning the proposed amendment, Professor Kelly said the intention behind the recommendation is to prevent won-loss records from being major factors in decisions about the future of coaches, and a long-range contract is an important protection in this area. Professor Warren liked the idea of fixed-term contracts. "Fixed term" implies timely review, and that is the direction we are taking with administrators. Professor Loewy noted that the rest of the recommendation covers all of our concerns by spelling out that coaches shall be evaluated by a host of criteria in addition to won-loss records. Chancellor Hardin pointed out that senior administrators don't have even fixed-term contracts. He serves at the pleasure of the Board of Trustees, and the vice-chancellors serve at his pleasure. In the case of coaches, long-range contracts might actually invite buy-outs, which are among the things the faculty wants to prevent. Fixed-term contracts would allow him, in consultation with his Advisory Committee, to work more compassionately with coaches but to insure that we retain only those who share the values under discussion today. At a call for the question, the amendment passed by a large majority.

Then recommendation fourteen as amended passed unanimously.

As amended, recommendation fourteen begins: "After a probationary period, a head coach shall have a fixed-term contract. . . ." It concludes with the recommendation from Haig et al.: "No contract for coaches or athletic officers, now or renewed, should include clauses for automatic financial rewards based on win-loss records or qualifications for post-season play."

recommendations #15-19, #21-22

Professor Gooder accepted Professor Donnelly's proposal that recommendations fifteen through twenty-two be considered as a group. Chancellor Hardin said there isn't anything in the group that his administration is uncomfortable with. Concerning eighteen he added the gloss that it is already the Chancellor who decides how our votes are cast in the NCAA and ACC. Also concerning eighteen Professor Gooder pointed out that at the last meeting of the NCAA there were about 130 votes, and he wanted some clarification from the Committee. He supposed the Committee was not asking for an oral report to Council on every one of those votes, but instead contemplated a written report with an opportunity for the Council to raise questions about votes of interest. Professor Betts said his supposition was correct.

Concerning twenty-one Professor Loewy wondered whether, with all of the important functions of the University contending for space, we really want to accord high priority to space for intramural sports. Professor Landsberger is sure we do, since by all international measurements American youth are far behind not only in academics but in physical fitness as well. Chancellor Hardin thinks that in our enthusiasm for intercollegiate competition we oughtn't to lose sight of the physical needs of all students. Professor Oldenburg, noting the use of "revitalized" in connection with intramural sports, asked what was the evidence that they are not vital now? In order to recognize the good work being done now, Professor Betts accepted the suggestion from several quarters to substitute emphasized for "revitalized" at the end of sentence three.

Concerning twenty, which calls on the University to provide for all students the same level of academic support now provided for athletes, Christopher Martens (Marine Sciences) wondered if we could afford it. Professor Betts said twenty was complex and was related to the next group of recommendations, twenty-three through twenty-seven. She would be more comfortable if twenty could be considered with that group. Professor Gooder and the Council accepted Professor Martens's proposal to shift twenty to the later group for consideration.

Concerning fifteen, Professor Donnelly suggested that the concluding phrase "to non-varsity athletes" really meant to all students. Professor Betts and other Committee members agreed that it did.

At a call for the question, recommendations fifteen through nineteen and twenty-one through twenty-two as amended passed unanimously.

As amended, the last sentence of fifteen reads: "Training tables should be opened, for a fee, to all students." As amended, the third sentence of twenty-one reads: "The intramural sports program should be emphasized."

Professor Betts announced that she recently received two communications about the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee. One came from the Council of Ivy League Presidents, which called the Report the most careful and definite prescription for athletic reform the Presidents had seen and urged her to publish the Report in some widely accessible place such as The New York Times or Sports Illustrated. The other came from Dean Smith (Men's Basketball Coach), who recalled his own efforts at athletic reform and wished to lend his support to the Ad Hoc Committee and the Council in their efforts. Professor Betts thought the Council would like to know about these reactions to our business.

Permanent Minutes, 9 February 1990

28

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Laurence G. Avery
Secretary of the Faculty

FACULTY AFFAIRS

SERIES 1: MINUTES OF GENERAL FACULTY
AND FACULTY COUNCIL