

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL
HELD ON FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1967, at 4 P.M.
IN 111 MURPHEY HALL

Chancellor Sitterson Presiding

Roll call: Sixty-two elected members were present. There were twenty-six excused absences; thirteen were unexcused.

BBF708

I. Professor A. C. Howell, Adviser to Foreign Students, discussed the participation of universities throughout the country, and of this university, in international education, which helps to fulfill our responsibilities to developing countries and to improve international relations. There are now in the United States more than 100,000 foreign students. On this campus there are 326, and in addition 117 post-doctoral fellows, technologists, research associates, and visiting professors. As brought out in discussion, one difficulty is that such large numbers of foreign students, once their studies are completed, remain in this country. Professor Howell, in reply to Professor Hollis's question, stated that there is no policy of differentiation in grading foreign students, here or throughout the country. In response to Professor Fischer's question the speaker replied that the length of stay of foreign students in this country varies from one year to six. An International Student Center has been established in Carr Dormitory, with offices, seminar rooms, library, lounge, and living accommodations for 62 men, half of them foreign and half American. (Attached is the full text of Professor Howell's remarks to the Council.)

II. Report by Wesley Wallace, Chairman for the Committee on Faculty Social and Recreational Facilities. The Council approved the Committee's recommendation:

That the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Social and Recreational Facilities be authorized to continue its efforts to organize a voluntary, non-profit corporation to be known as the University of North Carolina Faculty-Staff Recreation Association, Inc., as directed in a resolution of the Faculty Council dated April 7, 1967; and subject to the first four conditions and exceptions contained in that resolution; and further:

That the Committee be directed to report the results of its efforts at the February 2, 1968, meeting of the Faculty Council.

(Attached is a copy of the full report circulated to all members of the Council.)

III. The Faculty Council at its regular meeting on May 5, 1967, approved the annual report of the Faculty Athletic Committee, and simultaneously adopted an amendment directing four separate questions for consideration and report by the Committee in the Fall. Professor Edward Hedgpeth, Chairman of the Faculty Athletic Committee, presented the requested report, which, he asserted, is based upon a careful investigation and consideration of the subject matter of each question. Attached is a copy of the complete text of the report (which states the four questions asked). Before Professor Hedgpeth read the report, duplicated copies were placed in the hands of Council members present.

Immediately following the reading of the report the Chancellor pointed out that he is personally accountable for the athletic policies and practices of the University. The faculty, of course, can and does make recommendations about athletic policies. He pointed out that the University is a member of the National Collegiate Athletic Association and of the Atlantic Coast Conference,

and that we abide by all the regulations of these bodies. Football schedules are now made up for ten years in advance, and thus we have inescapable commitments. This year we play all members of the Atlantic Coast Conference, seven games, and three non-Conference games--Vanderbilt, Tulane and the Air Force.

Athletes in the University must be admitted under general university policies and must remain eligible on the same basis as other students. With respect to admissions, it is undeniable that athletes do get some special consideration; that is, in many cases they are admitted with college board scores and/or predicted grade averages somewhat less than those of most students--although they cannot be less than agreed upon minima. To get a grant-in-aid an athlete must, under ACC regulations, have a minimum college board composite score of no less than 800; under NCAA regulations he must have a PGA of 1.6, although ways of figuring this PGA under NCAA standards are much less stringent than for our own PGA, which is based on average records of our own students in preceding years in our own exacting curriculum. The Chancellor explained the background of the adoption of the PGA 1.6 by the University and pointed out that it was partly as a result of his insistence (and at that time approved by the Faculty Council) that the Admissions Committee should be permitted to examine meritorious applications which meet either SAT minima and not PGA minima or PGA minima and not SAT minima--in order to assure that the University not be bound to such inflexibility as to exclude applicants with special talents. Otherwise the University, almost uniquely among institutions, would be bound by a completely inflexible standard. Informed admissions officers everywhere advise strongly against such an inflexible policy. He also pointed out that over the years a number of such applicants in the arts, pharmacy, etc., had been considered and recommended for admission, although in 1967 only athletes were so considered.

Professor Henry Brandis, who had received a copy of the Committee's report a day prior to the meeting, presented a written statement, discussing and, for the most part attacking, the committee's investigative procedures and the validity of the conclusions. Since Professor Brandis has not made available to the Secretary a copy of his remarks, I cannot attach the full text. Following are some brief notes on his comments.

Professor Brandis stated that what prompted Question (1) (see Committee Report) was Coach Dooley's remark, reported in the press, that "he would recommend" that certain grants-in-aid be withdrawn. The Committee, Brandis felt, should have taken account in the report of this and other quoted statements by Mr. Dooley. He stated that the Committee's answer to Question (2) was highly unacceptable, believing that inadequate investigation of the facts had been made. He thinks, in short, that the description of the course as a regular part of the physical education curriculum is a subterfuge. With respect to Question (3), he accepted the Committee's answer as complete and accurate, except with respect to the word "voluntary," which he feels should be more carefully defined. He criticized the Committee for not making more fully known the results of Commissioner Weaver's investigation of the special course in physical conditioning. As to Question (4), he vigorously questioned the truth of the statement in the report that with respect to football players the higher standards of our own institution always take precedence over minimal Conference regulations, pointing out that eleven football players and one basketball player were admitted to the University with predicted grade averages of less than 1.6 (our institutional PGA), and that no student other than athletes were so admitted this year. Mr. Brandis concluded his remarks by addressing the Chancellor in these words: "The Trustees have allocated to you the responsibility for all matters of athletic policy. I respectfully affirm my conviction that you have work to do."

At the completion of Professor Brandis's remarks, Professor Caldwell, Chairman of the Committee on Scholarships, Awards and Student Aid, asserted that some of Mr. Brandis's statements were a direct reflection on him and his Committee. He had told Mr. Brandis in the spring that it is perfectly clear that the coach has no authority in discontinuing grants-in-aid. This is a power vested solely in the Committee and the Committee has never violated the full right of any student with respect to discontinuation of a grant-in-aid. The Committee does not even take advantage of a possible latitude which the NCAA allows in discontinuation of grants-in-aid for students who voluntarily give up the sport for which the grant-in-aid was originally made.

Professor Wiley stated that Professor Brandis was, in effect, questioning the integrity of the Committee.

Professor Hedgpeth asserted that the Committee was not witch-hunting, and that its disposition, properly, was to accept as honest and honorable the assertions made by those directly charged with athletic responsibilities. He granted that Mr. Dooley had made unfortunate comments, which stemmed from misunderstandings on his part, misunderstandings which have been corrected.

To Professor Nash's objection that the statements in Paragraphs 1 and 2 under (1), about discontinuation of a grant-in-aid of a student who voluntarily withdraws from a sport, are contradictory, Mr. Caldwell replied that the NCAA regulations are themselves somewhat inconsistent and ambiguous and require further interpretation.

With respect to continuing eligibility, the Chancellor pointed out that in figuring quality point averages many institutions disregard the grade of F if the course is later repeated and passed. In this institution, in such circumstances, the grade F is counted, for all students.

By a close vote of 27 to 23 the Council voted "to accept" the report.

(During the discussion the automatic adjournment time of 5:45 p.m. was reached and the Council voted to extend the time of meeting for fifteen minutes.)

- IV. Professor Carroll Hollis gave notice of his intention to present a proposal at the December meeting: the appointment of a Council committee to study and clarify the status of part-time instructors, who are both teachers and graduate students. Following are the explanatory comments he made:

It would be most helpful to the faculty to have the status of the Part-Time Instructor clarified in more specific terms than can now be found in the principles of government of the university. Since the role of instructor does include faculty privileges and protection, the implication is that the part-time instructor only teaches part of a full load but that he is entitled to the same privileges and protection as a full time instructor. This implication may not be true, for the part-time instructor is also a graduate student; but the ambiguity remains to the confusion of many on the faculty. May I suggest, therefore, that a committee be appointed to examine this matter and to bring its report to the Faculty Council for discussion and action.

Many universities use the title "teaching assistant" or "teaching fellow" to cover the activities of our part-time instructors. Other schools use the designation "assistant instructor" to be followed by "associate instructor" as the graduate student reaches candidacy for the doctorate.

BBF708

There is also in use "junior instructor" as a term to indicate the holder is not yet of instructor status. Any of these terms might be valuable in avoiding the semantic difficulty of our term.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Clifford Lyons

Clifford Lyons
Secretary of the Faculty