

**The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Faculty Athletics Committee
Minutes of Meeting: October 9, 2012**

Present: **Committee Members:** Lissa Broome, Glynis Cowell, Beverly Foster, Layna Mosley, Eugene Orringer, Barbara Osborne, Eileen Parsons, Joy Renner, John Stephens, Holden Thorp

Athletic Department Personnel: Bubba Cunningham, Vince Ille

Other Advisors: Mario Ciocca, Harold Woodard

Guests: Rudi Colloredo-Mansfield (Anthropology), Victor De La Cruz (DTH), Kaitlyn Kelly (DTH), Wayne Lee (History)

I. Preliminary Matters

Committee members and guests introduced themselves. Barbara Osborne moved approval of the minutes from the September meeting. Gene Orringer seconded. There were no additions or corrections and the minutes were approved.

II. Information from the Chancellor

Chancellor Thorp noted that the BOG review panel is scheduled to meet on Thursday, October 11. Governor Martin may provide an update to the panel. Governor Martin's report will be delivered to Chancellor Thorp and the Board of Trustees when it is completed. In the spring, Hunter Rawlings will begin his committee's work and discuss broader issues regarding athletics and academics. Chancellor Thorp reported on a meeting that occurred last week with the Faculty Executive Committee subcommittee which submitted its report this summer. The subcommittee understands how its review and recommendations are being implemented, which include increased communications to three faculty representatives regarding the Academic Support Program: Joy Renner, Chair of FAC; Lissa Broome, Faculty Athletics Representative; and Abigail Panter, Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Academic Support Program for Student-Athletes.

III. Information from the Athletics Director

Athletic Director Bubba Cunningham discussed some recent developments in the ACC. Notre Dame will join the conference at a date to be determined. Notre Dame will schedule five football games a year against ACC opponents. As a result, the ACC decided to reduce its conference football schedule from 9 games per season to 8 per season. The ACC has also formed a committee (on which UNC is represented by Larry Gallo) to discuss scheduling, costs, and missed class time for Olympic sports in a fifteen-school ACC. The committee will be particularly mindful of ensuring that missed class time is kept to a minimum even while the ACC's geographic footprint has expanded.

IV. Closed Session

Pursuant to a motion by Lissa Broome in accordance with N.C. Gen. Stat. § 143-318.11, the committee went into closed session to prevent the disclosure of privileged or confidential information. That motion was seconded and approved. Visitors to the committee left the room and the committee proceeded in its closed session.

At the conclusion of the committee's discussion (at which no action was taken), Lissa Broome moved that the committee conclude its closed session and move into open session. That motion was seconded and approved. Visitors rejoined the committee as the committee resumed its open session.

V. Report from the Faculty Athletics Representative

Lissa Broome reported that at the recent ACC meetings, the ACC FARs discussed ways to monitor course enrollments by student-athletes. She also reported on a recent ranking showing the U.S. News rankings of each school in the six most prominent football conferences. The ACC (including Pitt and Syracuse but not Notre Dame) had the best overall ranking of any of the six conferences. She also commented that there was a Majors Exploration Night for student-athletes to be held at Loudermilk Hall that evening. Joy Renner noted that she would be there representing Health Affairs.

VI. Report from the FAC Chair

Joy Renner asked committee members to send her any additional suggestions on how the orientation video should be further modified for a general faculty audience. She also asked Bubba Cunningham to discuss with the committee at its next meeting the metrics that would be used to measure teams' academic performance goals set forth in the Department's Strategic Plan. Professor Renner reminded committee members to learn from others on campus with expertise in their assigned topic areas. She previewed the topics for upcoming meetings:

- November: student-athlete experience – exit surveys and interviews and data collection; academics
- December: admissions
- January: advising

The December topic area has not yet been determined.

VII. Discussion of Team Assignments

Professor Renner circulated a document collecting information from some committee members about what they had done so far regarding their team assignments. Joy Renner and Glynis Cowell met with Coach Larry Fedora and reported that he has practice on Sunday with Monday as a day off. In part, this is to facilitate students taking labs and other courses on Monday

afternoons. Coach Fedora also told Joy and Glynis that if there is a conflict between a class event and practice that the student is excused from practice to attend the class event.

Eileen Parsons wanted clarification on the FAC role to be clear that FAC members were not being asked to be mentors or academic advisors to individual student-athletes.

Track and field coaches (many of whom are new to our campus) asked Layna Mosely whether she could assist in helping them identify faculty in particular areas to talk to recruits when they are on campus. Joy Renner suggested that FAC assist in the development of a resource list and also that Athletics consider developing a resource manual for new coaches, which might include such a resource list. Lissa Broome noted that often ASPSA personnel contact faculty about meeting with recruits who have an interest in their area of expertise.

Lissa Broome encouraged team liaisons to also meet with the team's academic advisors. A list of each team's sports administrators will be posted on the Sakai site as well.

As Joy Renner envisions this program, each faculty representative will know enough about their teams to consider the committee's actions with their teams in mind. Coaches have been informed about their team liaisons by email. As the committee further defines the role of the team representatives, that information will also be conveyed to the coaches.

VIII. Student-Athlete Experience

John Stephens, Glynis Cowell, and Barbara Osborne are the content resources on student-athlete experience. John Stephens provided an overview of the process followed in prior years by the committee and the Athletics Department. He noted that the NCAA requires that the athletics department conduct exit interviews in each sport with a sample of student-athletes whose eligibility has expired, with coaching staff members not to be included in the interview process. We have used group interviews with FAC members alongside members of the Athletics Department and individual survey instruments. The Athletics Department is reviewing this process and would like the committee's input on how to improve the process.

Barbara Osborne reported on last year's Exit Surveys. Only 46 of 126 graduating student-athletes completed the interviews for a response rate of 37%, the lowest in several years. She referred to her draft report summarizing the results, which concluded that senior student-athletes "rated both the athletic and academic experiences at UNC quite favorably." She noted that there was some difference this year with student-athletes participating in revenue sports being less pleased with their experiences than student-athletes participating in non-revenue sports. The report states that this may be due to the "lingering effects of the NCAA investigation and sanctions, and the heightened national and local press associated with the football and athletics program."

Glynis Cowell reported on last year's Exit Interview, which took place in the fall and in the spring with department and FAC members, with a total of thirty-seven student-athletes. At one of the interview sessions she noted that there was only one table, affording each student-athlete less of an opportunity to talk than when there are multiple tables with smaller numbers of

students. She referred the committee to several recommendations based on the interviews included in the conclusion of her draft report, including some that have already been acted upon, such as clarifying the respective roles of academic counselors and academic advisors. Another recommendation was to clarify the roles of coaches, team physicians, and trainers with regard to injuries and when a student-athlete may return to play.

Vince Ille noted that the Department was reviewing the exit survey and interview process and that the department needs the information provided by this feedback to evaluate its services to student-athletes. He said a goal of the Department would be to increase the participation to 100%. The role of the FAC in the revised process has yet to be determined. Bubba Cunningham noted that at Tulsa the Athletic Department did not participate in the process at all. He said he likes having both the empirical data provided by the survey and the anecdotal data provided by the interviews. Eileen Parsons cautioned about the “interviewer effect” -- that a student-athlete being interviewed only by an athletics administrator might be less critical of the department than if non-department personnel were also involved. Vince Ille’s experience was that since the student-athlete’s eligibility has expired at the time of the interview, they don’t hold back.

The committee discussed whether UNC could devise a model form for intercollegiate athletics programs around the country. John Stephens encouraged members to focus on areas the FAC cares most about – academics and the student-athlete experience. Layna Mosely suggested a possible role for Institutional Research or the Odum Institute.

Joy Renner urged committee members to review the survey instruments posted on Sakai from other schools and to email Vince Ille (with a copy to Joy Renner) within the next two weeks the questions that the FAC member thinks should be included in a survey/interview. Vince Ille will present to the committee at its next meeting the process and the content of the surveys/interviews that he proposes for 2012-13, since fall student-athletes need to be surveyed and/or interviewed before the end of the semester.

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

The next meeting is November 6

Minutes respectfully submitted by Lissa Broome

Student Athlete Experience 2012-13

For FAC discussion – October 9, 2013

From Glynis Cowell, Barbara Osborne and John Stephens

I. Historical Background

NCAA Bylaw 6.3.2 Exit Interviews. The institution's director of athletics, senior woman administrator or designated representatives (excluding coaching staff members) shall conduct exit interviews in each sport with a sample of student-athletes (as determined by the institution) whose eligibility has expired. Interviews shall include questions regarding the value of the students' athletics experiences, the extent of the athletics time demands encountered by the student-athletes, proposed changes in intercollegiate athletics and concerns related to the administration of the student-athletes' specific sports.

Two different assessments of exiting senior student-athletes have been conducted on an annual basis: a group interview and a quantitative survey. In the past, John Blanchard has been in charge of overseeing the coordination of both the exit interview and the survey, with Cricket Lane responsible for engaging the student-athletes. The FAC has assisted the Athletic Department in these two efforts by: 1) FAC members participate with Athletic Department representatives (last year Mr. Baddour, Larry Gallo, John Blanchard, and Beth Miller) in the exit interviews and a FAC member is responsible for compiling and summarizing the exit interview notes; 2) a FAC member compiles and analyzes the survey data. The survey results and the interview information are shared with the FAC and suggested recommendations are offered.

A. The Group Interview

The interviews take place over lunch, provided by the Athletic Department, in or around the Academic Support Center for Student-Athletes, over a two-day period (usually Tuesday and Wednesday). They last a little over an hour, with student-athletes free to join and leave as their schedules permit. Both the FAC members and the Athletic Department representatives ask questions and the FAC members generally take notes. One FAC member per table agrees to compile that table's notes, generally sends the draft to the Athletic Dept. representatives and the other FAC members who participated at that table for approval, before sending them on to the FAC member who will compile notes from all tables. Until last fall, exit interviews were conducted once per academic year, usually at the end of February and/or the beginning of March. Last fall we conducted interviews in late November and again in late March in an attempt to include those fall sport seniors, some of whom graduated in December.

Categories of Questions Asked in the Group Interviews

Academic Experience at UNC – broad questions such as “Describe your academic experience at UNC. Do you feel you have received a good education?” and more specific: As an athlete, have you experienced any disadvantages with regard to academics? (include major, courses, career plans, etc., in discussion); coaches support your academic pursuits; experiences with the Academic Support Program and Academic Advising; witnessed or experienced academic dishonesty

Student Development at UNC – availability and quality of particular services (drug education seminars, community service opportunities, career development services, Carolina Leadership Academy)

Athletic Experience at UNC – coaches ability to teach/develop athletes; particular components of support (e.g., nutrition, psychologists), team climate and potential problems (e.g., hazing, alcohol/drug use; abusive relationships), equipment and facilities, ability to “go beyond the coach” with concerns to Athletics Administration

General - most positive aspects of your overall experience at UNC? What can be improved? If you could do it over again, would you choose Carolina? Would you choose to participate in your sport again?

B. Individual Surveys

Quantitative surveys have also been administered to all senior student-athletes at the end of their final season of eligibility. The surveys have been distributed through Cricket Lane’s office in Student-Athlete Development. The surveys are anonymous, although the participant may choose to provide his/her name. The Athletics Department has transposed the data and a FAC committee member has completed the statistical analysis.

Questions Asked on the Quantitative Survey

Demographic data is collected. There are spaces for additional comments indicating strength(s)/positive and weakness(es)/negative. At the end, the student-athlete has the ability to request an in-person meeting with a member of the athletics administrative staff.

Likert-type data is collected on:

- Strength and conditioning
- Sports medicine
- Academic Support
- Student Athlete Development
- Coaching
- Administration

C. Strengths/Weaknesses/Comments on the Current System

Group Interviews

- Group interviews allow for more qualitative data; good conversation and exchange with FAC members and student-athletes
- Athletic department personnel participation/observation of the group interviews may suppress free sharing of opinions
- Group interviews as a research tool have inherent weaknesses (efficiency may require doing these in group settings, but this also might lead some students to be less forthcoming, and/or it might lead the conversation down a path that’s the result of what one student starts with, rather than representing all participants more equally.
- Few FAC members have been able to participate in the interviews

- Comments/suggestions from Barbara, Glynis and John:
 - a. In terms of the content, it might be useful to ask a bit more specifically about the academic opportunities available to student-athletes, e.g. were they able to take the courses or choose the major that they wanted; did they experience pressure to take some courses rather than others (not only an issue about courses at certain times or with labs, but getting to the more general concern that athletes are directed toward “easy” classes/profs).
 - b. In terms of the team climate questions, it might make sense to break “diversity” down, as this could include issues related to race/ethnicity, sexuality and/or gender.

Student-Athlete Surveys

- Easier and more flexible to administer; allows for individual replies. Designed to be completed fairly quickly.
- Very low response rate lessens the reliability of the data
- Possibility that only the positive and negative perspectives are presented, while those who are more moderate/centrist don't bother to complete the survey
- Survey question(s) may not truly provide the information FAC needs to inform the faculty and advise the Chancellor
 - Do you know of others on your team who have cheated, plagiarized, or committed other forms academic misconduct?
 - Have you ever felt pressured to take a particular class, or not to take a particular class, in order to maintain your eligibility?
 - Have you received different treatment in a class -- either better or worse -- due to the fact that you are an athlete?
- Limited to seniors

II. Moving Forward

In examining the academic research related to student-athlete surveys, and also looking to see what peer institutions do, there is no magic formula. Some of the research indicates that surveys aren't worth the time or effort spent on them. Other institutions conduct personal interviews with each senior student-athlete – some of the interviews are conducted only by athletics department administrators, others are conducted by athletics department administrators and faculty, and at least one is conducted just by a faculty member. All indicate that this process is incredibly time consuming (1-2 or more hours per interview).

1. The Athletic Department will be revising the interview/survey for implementation in December 2012
 - a) FAC October meeting – big picture: input on what kinds of information are most important to gather
 - b) FAC November meeting – review/approve of revised process and instrument
2. What way(s) should FAC participate in assessing the student-athlete experience?

2011-12 Senior Student-Athlete Exit Survey Results

Summary Report from Barbara Osborne

First Draft 9/24/2012 – not for distribution

Background

In 2008 the exit survey instrument administered to all senior student-athletes at UNC was revised by a FAC subcommittee of Kathie Mullan Harris, Glynis Cowell, John Blanchard, and Cricket Lane based on input from the Faculty Athletes Committee and Athletic Department advisors to the FAC. The revised survey included new question items recommended by the NCAA (from their website) and retained some important items from the survey instrument used in prior years. The revised exit survey was first administered to senior student-athletes at UNC during the 2008-09 (n= 75) academic year and has been used each year since: 2009-2010 (N= 72), 2010-11 (N=59), and this year 2011-12 (N=46)..

The exit survey collects data on 34 questions related to academic and athletic experiences at UNC, along with demographic information, GPA, and a question that relates to reasons for choosing UNC (Appendix A - Survey). The survey also records student-athletes' academic major, sport, and allows for open-ended comments on the strengths and weaknesses of their experience as a student-athlete. Responses to each question item are in a 5 pt scale: 1) strongly disagree; 2) disagree; 3) neither agree or disagree; 4) agree; and 5) strongly agree. In processing the data from the surveys, numeric values of 1-5 were assigned for strongly disagree (1) through strongly agree (5), respectively.

Description of Sample

Forty-six senior student-athletes completed exit surveys during the 2011-12 academic year. The sample was almost evenly balanced between males (23) and females (22). More white/Caucasian athletes (30) than non-whites (15) completed the survey. The majority of senior student-athletes who completed the survey had participated in non-revenue sports (33) compared to only 13 revenue sport student-athletes. See **Appendix B** for the distribution of sports, followed by the distribution of academic majors (**Appendix C**).

Methods

Student-Athlete Recruitment and Response Rate

At the end of each season, Cricket Lane, Director of Student-Athlete Development, emails the survey and attends team meetings to administer the survey to all senior student-athletes on all sports teams, both revenue and non-revenue. In 2011-12, there were a total of 123 senior student-athletes; therefore the overall response rate was 37%.

Survey Scoring, Coding and Analysis

Survey items were scored 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree. Generally, statements were worded in a "positive" manner such that higher scores indicate approval or satisfaction with the particular sports/academic program topic under question (e.g., strength and conditioning program, sports medicine, academic support program, coaching, etc.). Several items were not worded in a positive manner and are in **bold** #17-22 under Academic Support Program, and #30 under Coaching. As a result, lower scores were actually more desirable in just these cases. The wording of these items has remained consistent with previous surveys for comparability across time.

Not all of the student-athletes answered every question either out of choice or because the question was not applicable. The amount of missing data was negligible on any given item. The important exception was GPA which had 7 missing values.

Mean results were calculated for the overall sample of respondents and then were stratified by gender (male/female), race/ethnicity (white/non-white), and by athletes who participated in revenue/non-revenue sports. Significance tests for the difference between means were conducted using T-tests to test mean differences and a Chi Square to test differences in categorical proportions for all subgroup contrasts (e.g., gender, race, revenue/non-revenue); the shaded cells signify that the subgroup difference is statistically significant at a probability level of .05 or less in orange and $p < .01$ in blue.

Open-ended responses were compiled and coded by two independent coders.

Results

General Summary

Overall results from the 46 senior student-athletes who completed the exit surveys for the 2011-2012 academic year indicate a **fairly positive view** of their UNC experience in both athletics and academics. The average response for all positive items is greater than 4.0 (i.e., between agree and strongly agree on the 5pt scale). **Strength and Conditioning** was very favorably perceived with mean score of **4.525** for all questions in that section; Q1 availability of weight room and staff and Q3 condition and maintenance of weight room had the highest score (mean=4.7). Student-athletes also gave the highest score (mean=4.7) to the **physician availability** (Q5). Availability of the **athletic trainers** (Q6) also scored high (mean=4.6). The overall mean for the Sports Medicine section was **4.313**. Student-Athlete Development services were also favorably received with an overall mean of **4.0**. The Administration (mean=**3.85**), Coaching (mean=**3.775**) and Academic Support Programs (mean=**3.7** for positively phrased questions) were viewed slightly less favorably, yet still in a positive manner.

Of the positively phrased questions, the lowest mean was 3.5 which is halfway between neutral and agreement. **Q29 communication between coaching staff and academic staff had the lowest mean (mean=3.5)**. All of the questions with a mean of 3.6 were also in some way related to academics: Q14 level of support from academic support staff, Q15 **accuracy of information/advising from academic support staff**, Q16 **tutors abiding by the Honor Code in providing assistance**, and Q31 **coach's support beyond athletics**. The lowest reported item mean from the 2010-2011 academic year was 3.7. *So down*

Questions 17-22 in the Academic Support Program section inquired about the tension between athletics and academics for student-athletes. These questions were phrased in a negative manner, so lower scores indicate a more favorable response (i.e. a 1 response is strongly disagree that athletics impinges on academics). Mean responses to these items range from mean=2.4 (a rating between disagree and neutral) for Q17, reflecting a **positive ability to select the academic major** the student-athlete wanted to mean=3.4 (a rating between neutral and agree) for Q18, indicating a **moderate inability to schedule the classes** that the student-athlete wanted to take. Student-athletes were neutral (mean=3.0) whether participating in their sport leaves them too tired to pay attention in class (Q19), or that participation has negatively affected their grades (Q22). All other negatively phrased questions had means between 2.5 and 2.8, indicating that student-athletes value their academic performance (Q21), the coaching staff emphasizes the importance of academic achievement (Q30) and that athletics participation does not leave student-athletes too tired to do homework or prepare for class (Q20). These results are quite positive and **suggest that responding student-athletes maintain a good balance between athletics and academics.**

Subgroup Differences and Related Trends

Significant differences between all subgroups were found for two questions (Q19 and Q20). Females slightly disagreed that participating in sport left them too tired to pay attention in class or to do their homework (mean=2.5) while males slightly agreed (mean=3.2) that they were too tired to complete homework, and

somewhat agreed (mean=3.5) that they were too tired to pay attention in class. Similarly, white student-athletes slightly disagreed that participating in sport left them too tired to pay attention in class (mean=2.6) or to do their homework (mean=2.5) while non-whites slightly agreed (mean=3.4) that they were too tired to complete homework, and somewhat agreed (mean=3.7) that they were too tired to pay attention in class. Non-revenue sport student-athletes somewhat disagreed that participating in sport left them too tired to pay attention in class or to do their homework (mean=2.5) while revenue sport student-athletes somewhat agreed (mean=3.6) that they were too tired to do homework, and agreed (mean=4.2) that they were too tired to pay attention in class.

Gender differences. Two other questions (Q21, Q30) indicated a significant difference based on gender. While females disagreed (mean=2.0) that athletic performance was more important than academic performance (Q21), males were neutral (mean=3.0). Females also somewhat disagreed that the coaching staff expected them to earn grades to remain eligible (Q30, mean=2.4) while males were neutral (mean=3.0). These gender differences may be explained by different values placed on academics between non-revenue and revenue sport student-athletes (discussed further in that section).

Differences by race/ethnicity. There were four questions that found significant differences based on race/ethnicity in addition to Q19 and Q20 discussed previously. White student-athletes looked more favorably upon the training techniques and safety in the strength and conditioning program (Q2) and in the development of individualized off-season strength and conditioning programs (Q4) than non-white student-athletes. Similarly, white student-athletes were more satisfied with the level of commitment displayed by the coaching staff to rules enforcement (Q32) and the overall conduct of the athletics administration regarding student-athletes (Q34).

Revenue/non-revenue sport differences were much more prevalent among student-athlete respondents in 2011-12. Overall student-athletes in revenue sports were less pleased with their experience than non-revenue sport student-athletes. Only the level of communication between sports medicine staff and coaches (Q12) scored significantly more positive for revenue sport student-athletes (mean=4.5) compared to those in non-revenue sports (mean=3.7). In addition to Q19 and Q20 reported previously, revenue sport student-athletes indicated that they were less likely to select the academic major they really wanted (Q17), their athletics performance is more important than their academic performance (Q21), and their grades have suffered due to their participation in sport (Q22) as compared to non-revenue sport student-athletes. Revenue sport student-athletes somewhat agreed (mean=3.5) that the coaching staff only expected them to earn grades that would keep them eligible (Q30) while non-revenue sport athletes somewhat disagreed (mean=2.4). Revenue sport athletes were also less satisfied with student-athlete development experiences (Q23, Q25, Q26) although their overall means were still favorable (mean=3.5). The level of commitment of the coaching staff to rules compliance (Q32) was rated lower by revenue sport student-athletes (mean=3.3), while non-revenue sport athletes were more satisfied (mean=4.3). Similarly, revenue sport student-athletes were more neutral toward the overall conduct of the athletics administration regarding student-athletes (Q34, mean=3.3) while non-revenue sport student-athletes were more pleased (mean=4.1).

Principal Reasons for Choosing Carolina

In the overall sample of senior student-athletes who completed the exit survey, the main reasons why student-athletes reported choosing to attend North Carolina were: academics (76.1%), followed facilities (73.9%) and social life (73.9%).

GPA

The average GPA for the senior student-athletes who responded to the exit survey in 2011-12 was 3.10, which was the same as reported for 2010-2011. Difference in GPA by gender were not statistically different. Student-athlete mean grade point average was significantly different based on race/ethnicity, with a reported mean of 3.3 for white student-athletes and a mean of 2.8 for non-white student athletes (n=39). There was also a statistically

significant difference between revenue and non-revenue sport student-athletes reported mean grade point average (revenue mean=~~2.6~~, non-revenue mean=~~3.3~~).

Student-Athlete Open-ended Comments

Space was provided for students-athletes to leave written comments on strengths/weaknesses related to their experience at UNC. The Carolina Leadership Academy was cited as a strength by 32% of the respondents. Other strengths acknowledged by student-athletes included the overall college/campus experience at UNC, team cohesion, athletic training, and support for injured student-athletes. Opinions about student-athlete services were mixed with 32% of respondents viewing it as a strength and 36% indicating it was a weakness. A perception of inequality in treatment between revenue and non-revenue sports was reported by 16% of respondents. Poor student-athlete coach relationships (12%), including coaching turnover, dissatisfaction with coach's attitude, and quality of coach were expressed by a few respondents. Poor communication between coaches and medical/athletics training staff was identified as a weakness, and one complaint was made about perceived gender bias in athletics training staff availability.

Overall Summary: In general, senior student-athletes who completed the exit surveys in 2011-2012 rated both the athletic and academic experiences at UNC quite favorably. It is likely that many of the significant differences reported between revenue and non-revenue sport student athletes are the lingering effects of the NCAA investigation and sanctions, and the heightened national and local press associated with the football and athletics program. In spite of these stressors, senior student-athletes were generally quite favorable about their time and experiences at UNC.

Scrutiny of the athletics program and subsequent investigations on campus have resulted in many changes in leadership, staffing, policies and procedures. ~~Care should be taken in assuring that these changes result in improved experiences for student-athletes.~~ Significant differences between non-revenue and revenue sport student-athletes' experiences should be minimized. Any differences related to emphasis on academic achievement should be eliminated, with all student-athletes positively valuing their education at UNC. Similarly, all student-athletes should be receiving the same messages regarding the importance of their education from the coaching staff.

Appendix A - Survey

Sport: _____ Date of Evaluation: ____/____/____ Your name (OPTIONAL): _____
 Gender: Female _____ Male _____ Estimated GPA entering Spring 2009 _____ Major _____
 Race: Asian/Pacific _____ American Indian _____ Alaskan Native _____ Hispanic _____ Black/Non Hispanic _____ White _____ Other _____
 Reason You Chose to Attend UNC: Academics _____ Specific sport program _____ Coaches _____ Teammates _____ Facilities _____ Social Life _____

Thank you for agreeing to complete this **Student-Athlete Survey** regarding your experiences as a student-athlete (s/a) at the University of North Carolina. Your responses will be CONFIDENTIAL. Using the following scale, please rate your experiences as a UNC student-athlete. Please return this survey to Dr. Cricket Lane.

RATING:

- Strongly Agree** Exemplary performance in all areas.
- Agree** Surpasses the standards and performance expectations in many important areas.
- Neutral** Good performance. Consistently meets standards and performance expectations in important areas.
- Disagree** Performance does not meet expectations in some important areas; below expected levels. Improvement needed.
- Strongly Disagree** Performance falls below expectations in many areas. Substantial improvement critical.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
STRENGTH & CONDITIONING (S & C)						
1. The weight room and its staff are available to me.						
2. The staff utilizes safe, effective and current training techniques.						
3. The weight room is in good condition and maintained well.						
4. The staff develops off-season programs with clear individual goals.						
SPORTS MEDICINE						
5. Sports medicine physicians are available to me.						
6. Sports medicine athletic trainers are available to me.						
7. I am pleased with the level of care I receive from sports medicine physicians.						
8. I am pleased with the level of care I receive from athletic trainers.						
9. I am pleased with the level of coverage by sports medicine at off-season practices and competition.						
10. I am pleased with the level of care received from sports medicine staff regarding rehab and athletically related issues.						
11. I am pleased with the level of communication between sports medicine staff and student-athletes.						
12. I am pleased with the level of communication between sports medicine staff and coaches.						
ACADEMIC SUPPORT PROGRAM						
13. The academic support staff is available to me.						
14. I am pleased with the level of support from the academic support staff.						
15. I am pleased with the accuracy of information/advisement I receive from the academic support staff.						
16. Tutors abide by Honor Code in providing academic assistance to						

Rough Draft – not for distribution

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
student-athletes.						
17. Participating in my sport has kept me from selecting the academic major I really wanted.						
18. Participating in my sport has kept me from scheduling courses that I wanted to take.						
19. Participating in my sport leaves me too tired or preoccupied to pay attention in class.						
20. Participating in my sport leaves me too tired to complete my homework or preparation for class.						
21. My athletic performance is more important to me than my academic performance.						
22. My grades have suffered due to my participation in my sport.						
STUDENT-ATHLETE DEVELOPMENT						
23. The quality of my experience with s-a development was good.						
24. The student-athlete development staff was accessible to me.						
25. I am pleased with the level of support from the student-athlete development staff.						
26. I am pleased with the quality of personal development programs. (alcohol and other drug education)						
27. I am pleased with the quality of career development services.						
COACHING						
28. My head coach fostered a strong academic atmosphere.						
29. The coaching staff and the academics staff communicate well.						
30. The coaching staff expects me to just earn the grades needed to remain eligible.						
31. I am pleased with the level of coach's support of student-athletes beyond athletics.						
32. I am pleased with the level of commitment displayed by the coaching staff to adhere to NCAA, conference, and institutional rules.						
ADMINISTRATION						
33. The athletics administration is available to me.						
34. I am pleased with the overall conduct of the athletics administration regarding student-athletes.						

Please use the space below to make any additional comments that you care to make about your team or your experience at Carolina.

Strength(s)/Positives:

Concerns/Weaknesses:

Rough Draft – not for distribution

Do you wish to request an in-person meeting with a member of the institution's administrative staff? Yes _____ No _____
If so, please contact the Athletic Department as soon as possible to schedule this meeting.

**Thank you for taking the time to complete and return this survey to Dr. Cricket Lane
The results will be used to better serve student-athletes at the University of North Carolina**

Appendix B – Distribution of Sports

Baseball	2
Fencing	3
Field Hockey	2
Football	12
Gymnastics	1
M Basketball	1
M Lacrosse	1
M Soccer	1
M Swimming	1
M Tennis	1
Rowing	5
Softball	1
Track and Field	7
W Lacrosse	2
W Soccer	1
W Swimming	4
W Tennis	1

Appendix C – Distribution of Majors

Art	1
Political Science	1
AFAM	2
Biology	2
Chemistry	1
JOMC	15
Economics	3
English	1
EXSS	10
History	2
International Studies	1
Math	2
Management and Society	1
Psychology	2
Public Policy	1
Political Science	2

Senior Student-Athlete Exit Interviews, Fall 2011 and Spring 2012

Prepared by Glynis Cowell

Summary of Results

Overall, the student-athletes interviewed felt their academic and athletic experiences at UNC-CH were very positive. The majority agreed they made the right decision in attending this university and would choose to do so again as student-athletes. Their specific comments on a variety of issues are summarized in this report: academic experience including relationships with faculty, disadvantages of being a student-athlete, coaches' support of academic pursuits, experiences with the Academic Support and Academic Advising Programs, and knowledge of academic dishonesty; student development focused on services provided; athletic experience including instruction from coaches, support from Sports Medicine, team climate, equipment and facilities, and availability of Athletics Administration; and general comments regarding positive aspects of the overall experience and suggestions for improvement. The summary is followed by some recommendations based on these results.

I. Academic Experience

Overall experience. The majority of student-athletes interviewed were pleased with their academic experiences at UNC-CH and described them as positive and challenging with regard to balancing schedules. A few mentioned learning from adversity, and for the most part, feeling supported. Two others felt they could have been pushed more academically.

Relationships with faculty. While some expressed that it is difficult to be a student and an athlete, especially with regard to office hours, absences and missed exams due to competition, others described their relationships with faculty as good, indicating that in general, professors are supportive and accommodating. [Note: Steps are already being taken to clarify for faculty the University attendance policy.]

Disadvantages of student-athletes with regard to academics. Disadvantages with regard to class attendance were also mentioned here, along with the sense that academic expectations for some first-year student-athletes could be higher, based upon the level of preparation coming out of high school. Completing a major in Education is a challenge for student-athletes, as are internships. [Note: a subcommittee including members of FAC and representatives from the School of Education met in 2011-2012 and are developing a plan to make a major in Education possible for student-athletes.]

Coaches' support of academic pursuits. In general, student-athletes felt their coaches were encouraging and supportive of academics, although there were some differences among sports.

Academic Support. Comments were mixed regarding guidance received and there were some issues reported related to the tutoring program including availability and quality of tutors for specific courses.

Academic dishonesty. While they recognized that there is academic dishonesty among students in general, the consensus was that academic dishonesty is not a serious issue for student-athletes.

II. Student Development

Available services. Student-athletes voiced a variety of opinions regarding student development. For the most part, they were complimentary of the services. With regard to drug education seminars, many felt that focus should be on specific data/information and testimonials rather than on advice. Comments on community service opportunities were positive, citing a variety of experiences including working with Habitat for Humanity, serving in soup kitchens, acting as big buddies and making hospital visits. While some student-athletes stated they did not take advantage of career development services, primarily due to lack of time and/or of awareness of the resources, others felt it is a good resource that is becoming more visible and could perhaps take advantage of social media to publicize resources and events. The use of graduate athlete mentors was also discussed to promote career development. Comments were also positive regarding the Carolina Leadership Academy, with special praise for the Veteran Leaders Program.

III. Athletic Experience

Overall experience. The majority agreed they had a good experience as an athlete at UNC-CH. There was some discussion of issues caused by coaching changes and coaches' handling of student-athletes who lack commitment and a strong work ethic on and off the field.

Coaches: instruction and development. Those who responded indicated that coaches did teach the athletes their sport and helped them develop into better athletes.

Sports Medicine. Comments regarding doctors and trainers were varied but for the most part positive. Issues expressed involved uneven coverage across teams, a large team that had only 1 head trainer and 2 graduate assistants who could not meet all the needs of those student-athletes, coaches overriding a trainer's guidance, and some disagreement with how the research on concussions impacts play. Comments were favorable with regard to the strength and conditioning staff and the nutrition program. Concerning the sports psychologists, student-athletes indicated that some teams may not be aware of this service while others could have taken advantage of the resource if it were more positively viewed and more readily available. The suggestion was made that the sports psychologists meet individually with teams.

Team climate with respect to diversity, hazing, gambling, alcohol and other drugs. A few student-athletes shared specific comments: one regarding a positive team experience with an openly gay/lesbian team member, and two negative remarks involving separate racial groups within a team and a hazing issue that was addressed by the Athletic Department and the Dean of Students. Beyond a mention of small-scale poker, there were no issues regarding gambling. Comments about alcohol and other drugs suggested that alcohol is readily available but use varies by team and the individuals on a team.

Equipment and facilities. Most student-athletes who responded reported issues with facilities. The women's tennis facility is off campus which affects attendance. The suggestion was made to hold one or two home matches at the Cobb courts. The rowing team holds "home" meets on Lake Wheeler and for practice and training they share space with the public at University Lake where bathrooms are sometimes locked, racks do not fit all kinds of boats and the lake is too small for a full race. The fencing team has reportedly had one home meet in four years. According to one student athlete, EXSS classes

have a 2-mile run while the team is practicing and people from the community also run on the track during practice. Also mentioned was the lack of coverage by the DTH of some teams.

Availability of Athletics Administration. While several student-athletes felt they could contact the Athletics Administration with issues, and some already had, to others it did not appear to be clear whom to contact. A suggestion was made that administrators could travel to competition once or twice so student-athletes could get to know them.

IV. General Comments

Most positive aspects of overall experience. There were numerous positive aspects mentioned by the student-athletes. There were multiple comments on the atmosphere of Carolina athletics, including excellence, camaraderie and pride. There were also several comments regarding the Carolina Leadership Program, team relationships, development as an athlete, time management, networking with coaches and others and the Academic Support Program and staff. Other positive comments involved training facilities, including for non-revenue sports, history professors, perspective on life and life lessons.

Suggestions for improvement. The comments included a need for more information for graduate school and an earlier start with career services; more equitable investment in facilities across sports; coaching issues involving managing internal conflicts, balancing influence and power among physicians, trainers, and coaches, and the need for a workshop for coaches on how to communicate with female student-athletes about weight; more out-of-state travel for the track team and a home meet for the fencing team; and clarifying for student-athletes the 20-hour per week rule—what is included in those 20 hours.

Perceived constraints of being an athlete. There were few responses for this category, perhaps because they had already voiced their opinions in responding to previous questions, however study abroad was not possible for one and a lack of time to focus on post-graduation plans was an issue for another.

Decision to attend UNC and as a student-athlete. The majority agreed they would choose to attend UNC again and as a student-athlete. One group was asked to share their best moments at UNC and also what they would do differently if they could. Best moments ranged from personal reflections regarding family, to spending time with teammates, to playing in championships. Comments regarding what they would do differently included taking greater advantage of academics and campus activities, thinking more on his/her own and placing less trust in advising and in one case, coaches.

Additional comments. One student-athlete shared that he/she had the great opportunity of entering as a walk-on and leaving as a scholarship athlete. Another mentioned that the student-athletes who participate in the exit interviews are generally those who have taken advantage of resources.

Recommendations to consider

1. Explore new ways to continue to foster the relationship between athletics and academics.
2. Continue to encourage academic excellence for student-athletes among coaches and teams.
3. Clearly define and communicate to student-athletes the roles of ASPSA (Academic Support Program for Student Athletes) academic counselors and academic advisers in the Academic Advising Program.
4. Consider revising drug education seminars to include more specific data and testimonials.

5. Continue to publicize career development, perhaps using social media as a means to communicate this type of information. Consider the feasibility of using student-athletes who have already graduated as mentors to promote career development as well as networking.
6. Clarify the roles of coaches, team physicians, and trainers with regard to injuries and when a student-athlete may return to play.
7. Review the coverage of trainers across teams and expand where needed, if possible.
8. Consider expanding the Sports Psychology program and invite psychologists to make team visits to explain their roles.
9. Continue to educate teams with respect to diversity. Train coaches on to how to best handle issues and internal conflicts involving this and other situations, should they arise.
10. With regard to athletic facilities, consider holding home tennis matches at the Cobb courts once or twice a season, hosting a home meet for the fencing team, limiting track use to team only during practice, and working with the DTH to publicize all athletic events and teams. Also investigate whether any improvements can be made with regard to facilities for the rowing team.
11. Promote visibility of Athletic administrators and their connections with teams at team meetings, practice and competition.

Procedural notes. The interviews that yielded the data summarized in this report were conducted with four different groups of senior student-athletes on November 29 and November 30, 2011, and again on March 26 and March 27, 2012. The 37 student-athletes (20 female) participate in 14 different sports: baseball (2), fencing (3), field hockey (2), football (6), women's golf (1), gymnastics (1), men's lacrosse (1), rowing (5), men's soccer (1), women's soccer (1), softball (1), swimming and diving (5), men's tennis (1), women's tennis (1) and track & field (6). The majors listed for these student-athletes were: African American Studies (1), Anthropology (1), Art (1), Biology (2), Business (1), Chemistry (1), Communication Studies (7), Economics (3), English (2), Exercise and Sports Sciences (9), History (2), Journalism (6), Mathematics (2), Pharmacy (1), Political Science (2) and Psychology (2). The interviews covered student-athletes' academic experiences, student development, and athletic experiences. The interviews were conducted by members of the Faculty Athletics Committee (Byers, Cowell, Foster, Reznick and Stephens) and athletic administrators (Blanchard, Cunningham, Gallo, Lane and Miller).