

**The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill**  
**Faculty Athletics Committee**  
**Minutes of Meeting: November 5, 2013**

**Present:**       **Committee Members:** Lissa Broome, Beverly Foster, Paul Friga, Layna Mosley, Barbara Osborne, Andy Perrin, Joy Renner, John Stephens, Deborah Stroman, Kimberly Strom-Gottfried

**Athletic Department Personnel:** Bubba Cunningham

**Other Advisers:** Michelle Brown

**Guests:** Jan Boxill (Faculty Chair), Willis Brooks (History, retired)

I. Introductions and Preliminary Matters

Professor Renner introduced Professor Paul Friga, Kenan-Flagler Business School, who is serving as an alternate on the committee in place of Professor Eugene Orringer, whose health challenges prevent him from participating in the committee's meetings.

The minutes from May, September, and October were approved with minor changes noted for September and October.

On November 15, Spencer Wellborn (from Advising) and Jenn Townsend (from ASPSA) are coordinating a brown bag lunch for faculty about a day in the life of a student-athlete. Some student-athletes will make presentations. The meeting will be held in Hanes 239.

At the next Faculty Council Meeting, Dean Karen Gill, will present the results from a survey of UNC alums. The results will also be posted on the Faculty Governance website. FAC members might find this information of interest.

II. Update from the Faculty Athletics Representative

Professor Lissa Broome distributed an update to the chart which accompanied her annual report to Faculty Council and that was reviewed at the October meeting. The updated numbers include the most recent Graduation Success Rate (GSR) which was released following the October F AC meeting. The discussion noted that APR data is more current since it measures the eligibility and retention of the student-athletes currently on campus, rather than those who entered UNC seven to eleven years ago. Professor Broome will post on the Sakai site, data compiled from the NCAA that show the percentile ranking (90th, 80th, 70th, etc.) of our teams within their sport and within all sports. This data helps to show the relative APR performance of our teams against other teams in their sport and at other Division I schools.

We discussed some teams with lower than desirable GSRs and APRs. Professor Broome noted that she and Dr. Michelle Brown participate on a team that has begun to construct APR

improvement plans for some teams. It was suggested that we may also want to learn more about the teams that have achieved excellent academic performance, how they identify and recruit talented students, and share any techniques or tactics used by these teams that may help to contribute to excellent academic performance for others.

### III. Alignment Work Plan Report

Professor Kimberly Strom-Gottfried and John Stephens discussed "Alignment" first in the context of the academic priorities set forth in the Athletic Department's strategic plan to "achieve a top 3 academic finish in the conference and a top 10 finish nationally in each sport." They asked how these benchmarks will be determined and monitored and what role FAC will have in helping Athletic Director Bubba Cunningham and ASPSA Director Dr. Michelle Brown address these priorities. For instance, if a team is struggling in this academic priority, will there be a shift in the time devoted to athletics if necessary to address academic deficiencies?

Bubba Cunningham noted that as used in the Athletic Department's strategic plan, the "alignment" priority is phrased as aligning the department's operations to fulfill the mission of the University, and that there is a separate priority for top 3/top 10 academic achievements. Professor Stephen responded that he and Professor Strom-Gottfried were viewing their "alignment" subcommittee as charged with evaluating alignment with academics. There is also the possibility that "alignment" defined by academic performance may overlap as well with the Academic Subcommittee (Professors Mosley and Stroman) Professor Renner noted that overlap is inevitable and good to ensure that we do not miss anything.

### IV. Steve Farmer –Admissions

Steve Farmer, Vice Provost for Enrollment and Undergraduate Admissions, spoke to the committee about admission policies affecting student-athletes. Mr. Farmer began his remarks with two important points. First, he is responsible for the admission of every undergraduate student, including student-athletes. Second, the only students admitted are those we think can succeed academically at the University. He noted that admissions are an art, not a science.

Although student-athlete admissions procedures have changed over the past two years, Mr. Farmer wants to be sure that FAC understands that the University should still be proud of the students who were admitted under prior practices.

The new system for admissions uses a formula based on quantitative data to compute a predicted first-year GPA for applicants (PGPA). The Subcommittee on Special Talent (composed of faculty members) reviews those applicants whose PGPA is below 2.3 (Level I students). In addition, the Subcommittee considers applicants who have failed to meet the University of North Carolina System's minimum admission standards (MARs) or minimum course requirements (MCRs). The Subcommittee also tracks students whose PGPA's fall between 2.3 and 2.6 (Level 2) and those with PGPA's above 2.6 (Level 3). Over time, the Subcommittee hopes the number of students in Levels I and 2 will decrease. Previously, the Subcommittee considered applicants who met a certain multi-factor test and did not consider the characteristics of those student-athletes not reviewed by the Subcommittee.

Twenty-three student-athletes matriculated at UNC-CH in fall 2012 who would have been Level 1 students had that criteria been used when they were admitted. Of those students, two-thirds have a GPA of 2.3 or greater (and are outperforming their PGPA) and three or four have a GPA greater than 3.0.

Mr. Farmer noted that there has been some discussion of literacy. He noted that assessing literacy is much trickier than one would expect and requires an examination of a student's entire record. There is no one test that determines literacy. Mr. Farmer did note that in 2012 there were 62 students admitted (not all student-athletes) with a critical reading score on the SAT of less than 500, an SAT writing score of less than 500, or the equivalent on the ACT. Approximately, 95% of those students were retained and are enrolled this year. For the class matriculating in 2013, there were 39 students (not all student-athletes) admitted with scores below these levels. Mr. Farmer noted that he and the Subcommittee continue to monitor and refine the admissions process to continually improve it.

Mr. Farmer reported that there are typically 12-15 transfer student-athletes who enroll each year. These students are not reviewed by the Subcommittee on Special Talent. Mr. Farmer also recounted that private universities do not report their athletic admissions so it is hard to evaluate our program against those at private universities. In Mr. Farmer's conversations with other admissions directors, some are surprised by the low number of students we have accepted in the Level 1 category and report that other Level I students would be admissible at their universities. Our level of faculty involvement in advising on admissions is much higher than at most other schools. Mr. Farmer believes that faculty involvement in the Subcommittee on Special Talent helps to underscore to the coaches the seriousness and importance of the process.

Mr. Cunningham noted that the coaches understand the role of the Subcommittee, value its work, and are also searching for student-athletes who will be successful in the classroom.

Mr. Farmer noted that we do take some risks in our admissions process and that the risk is on a continuum. Professor Andy Perrin expressed that he would like to reduce or eliminate the risks we take in admissions, but believes that the evidence is strong that we are moving in the right direction. Professor Perrin noted that his work on contextual grading has shown that the median grade for a UNC undergraduate is 3.0 and that in some departments the median grade is as high as 3.4 or 3.5. He is troubled with the gap between the median performance and those of some students admitted by the Subcommittee who achieve a 2.2 or 2.3 GPA.

The Provost's Working Group on Student-Athlete Academic Processes is also reviewing Admissions. The Working Group is concentrating on documenting processes and reviewing the prior reports (Faculty Executive Committee Report, etc.) regarding suggestions related to admissions.

#### V. Upcoming Faculty Council Report

Joy Renner said she would try to say one or two things about each topic that FAC is monitoring when she makes FAC's annual report to Faculty Council at its November 15 meeting.

As she and the committee discussed each topic, the following points were offered.

#### Admissions

- Moving in the right direction
- High level of faculty involvement although Steve Farmer and his office still make the final decision
- Only students who the Subcommittee on Special Talent and the Admissions Office believe are capable of being academically successful at UNC are admitted
- Coaches understand we are trying to reduce the number of Level 1 and Level 2 students and are adjusting their recruiting accordingly

#### Academics

- There have been University-wide reforms on independent studies
- We monitor majors of student-athletes and course training
- Academic success is viewed by multiple metrics, including OSR, FOR, APR

#### Advising

- There has been a big change here with advisors (from Steele Building) with a plan moving toward student-athletes meeting with an advisor each semester

#### Student-Athlete Experience

- FAC had focus groups with SAAC members this year
- Exit survey has been redesigned
- Implementation of the exit survey has been revamped to get a higher return

#### Administration and Operations

- FAC reviews the budget each year
- Working to get year-to-year information that captures the resources devoted to ASPSA

#### VI. Planning

Professor Renner noted that a video is in process introducing the AD, ASPSA Director, FAR, and F AC Chair. Barbara Osborne is preparing a voice over PowerPoint about issues related to having student-athletes in class such as travel letters, excused absences, and progress reports. Other PowerPoint will be prepared by Michelle Brown about ASPSA, and Spencer Wellborn and Andrea Caldwell about advising for student-athletes. Professor Renner is also hoping to present a video with several student-athletes explaining why they chose to attend UNC and the role of academics in their decisions.

The meeting adjourned at 5:33 p.m.

The next meeting is December 10, 2013.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Lissa Broome

**Academic Performance Measures – Student-Athletes  
UNC-Chapel Hill: Multi-year GSR, FGR, and APR**

	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13
<b>GSR</b>	80	81	87	85	87	87	88	88	86
<b>-MBB</b>	82	70	86	86	75	88	89	91	90
<b>-Fball</b>	64	70	79	78	80	75	75	75	65
<b>-WBB</b>	64	56	64	90	100	100	85	79	79
<b>-WSoc</b>	78	88	100	94	88	73	73	67	67
<b>FGR</b>	70	70	71	73	73	73	74	74	72
<b>St.body</b>	81	82	83	83	84	84	85	87	88
<b>-Diff</b>	(11)	(12)	(12)	(10)	(11)	(11)	(11)	(13)	(16)
<b>APR</b>									
<b>-MBB</b>	989	993	995	989	995	985	963	959	
<b>-Fball</b>	943	948	947	947	957	955	943	934	
<b>-WBB</b>	982	989	975	970	979	960	959	963	
<b>-WSoc</b>	993	965	974	974	972	965	959	962	

11-12	UNC-CH	NC State	UVA	Duke	WFU
<b>GSR</b>	88	77	87	98	95
<b>-MBB</b>	91	73	64	100	100
<b>-Fball</b>	75	62	69	92	86
<b>FGR</b>	74	60	76	86	80
<b>-St.body</b>	87	72	93	95	89
<b>-Diff</b>	(13)	(12)	(17)	(9)	(9)
<b>APR</b>					
<b>MBB</b>	959	984	946	995	942
<b>Fball</b>	934	947	959	989	970

For 2011-12, UNC-CH had five sports in the top 10% of their sport for APR:

- Men's swimming
- Women's fencing
- Women's golf
- Gymnastics
- Volleyball

FGR, GSR, and APR are defined on the next page.

The information on these charts came from the NCAA websites listed below. I choose to present the results from only 4 of our 28 intercollegiate athletic teams, focusing on some of the teams that might be in the public eye. Information on all other teams is publicly available. I would be happy to compile any additional information or comparisons that Faculty Council believes would be helpful.

**FGR** – Federal Graduation Rate. This graduation rate is reported by the Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics as part of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). This metric is a six-year rate that includes students who received athletic scholarship aid in their first semester of enrollment. The federal graduation rate counts student-athletes who left the University in good standing prior to graduation as non-graduates. This data is available for student-athletes at an institution and for the student body so it is a way of comparing the performance of student-athletes with the student body.

<http://fs.ncaa.org/Docs/newmedia/public/rates/index.html>

**GSR** – Graduation Success Rate. The GSR is an NCAA metric and is calculated for student athletes who received athletics aid. The GSR adds students who transferred into the institution to the group of first-year students who received athletics aid and also differs from the FGR in that schools are not 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 FGR, such departures are counted as failures to graduate from the institution of original enrollment, even if the student later graduates from another institution.

<http://fs.ncaa.org/Docs/newmedia/public/rates/index.html>

**APR** – Academic Performance Rate. This is an NCAA metric based on the academic eligibility, retention, and graduation of student-athletes. Points are awarded each semester per student-athletes on the basis of eligibility/graduation and retention. Each team member may 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 in this hypothetical example is calculated by first dividing 36 by 40 (equals .9), and then multiplying by 1000 to get an APR of 900. For 2012-13 and 2013-14, a team must have a 4-year average APR of 900 to be eligible for postseason play or a 930 APR for the most recent two years. In 2014-15, the threshold is a 4-year APR of 930 or 930 for the most recent two years, and for 2015-16 going forward the standard for postseason play is a four-year APR of at least 930.

<http://fs.ncaa.org/Docs/newmedia/public/rates/index.html>