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UNC’s APR scores slide in basketball, football, but no penalties

By Andrew Carter - acarter@newsobserver.com

CHAPEL HILL—Amid attrition and NCAA woes, the academic progress rates for North Carolina’s men’s basketball and football teams suffered, according to data the NCAA released Wednesday.

UNC’s men’s basketball team scored a 905 in the APR during the 2010-11 academic year, while the Tar Heels football team scored an 895 for the same year. Both scores are more than 40 points lower than UNC’s four-year APR average in both sports.

The departures of Will Graves and Larry Drew II hurt UNC’s 2010-11 basketball APR. Tar Heels coach Roy Williams dismissed Graves before that season, and Drew II left midway through the season.

The UNC football team spent the 2010 season mired in the start of an NCAA investigation that cost several players their eligibility and eventually led to the firing of coach Butch Davis. Because the team scored less than 900 in the APR, UNC will receive a letter from the NCAA warning about the team’s poor academic performance.

“It’s what it is,” UNC coach Roy Williams last week said of his team’s APR score. “I dismissed one player, and three kids left. I think that’s the right time period there. And so we’re concerned about it. But everybody’s concerned about it.”

Williams was referring to the departures of David and Travis Wear, who transferred after the 2009-10 year.

Overall, 21 of UNC’s teams exceeded the national APR average in their sports. N.C. State boasted similar success, with 16 of its 23 teams maintaining or exceeding their multi-year APR averages.

The Wolfpack’s men’s basketball team scored a 947 in the APR, which placed it between the 70th and 80th percentile nationally. The N.C. State football team scored a 943, the national average.

The N.C. State wrestling team, which had lost scholarships in two of the previous four years due to low APR scores, received a perfect 1,000 in the 2010-11 APR. Carrie Leger, N.C. State’s associate athletic director for
academics and student services, said she was pleased by the wrestling team’s improvement and the overall improvement over time among Wolfpack teams.

“We are in a good place with our leadership and the commitment to improving our academic rates while also meeting the other strategic goals in the athletic department to improve competitively, as well,” Leger said.

The focus now, Leger said, will be on teams hovering around a score of 930, which will be the new APR benchmark. Teams that fall below that number in the future could face penalties, ranging from scholarship cuts to postseason bans, from the NCAA.

In its ninth year, the APR, as defined by the NCAA, “is a Division I metric developed to track the academic achievement of teams each academic term.” Every scholarship athlete earns one retention point for staying in school, and one eligibility point for being academically eligible. A team’s total points are divided by the total points possible and then multiplied by 1,000 to determine the team’s APR.

Duke led the ACC in overall APR for the period ending in the 2010-11 academic year. Nine Duke teams received a perfect score of 1,000, while the Blue Devils’ 2010-11 APR average was 993, highest among the ACC’s 12 schools.

Thirteen Duke teams led the ACC in APR, including the Blue Devils’ men’s basketball and football teams.

Nationally, the average four-year men’s basketball APR improved to 950, which is five points better than last year. Football improved by two points, to 948. Still, 15 teams will serve postseason bans in 2012-13 because of low APR schools.

Among those are 10 in men’s basketball, including Connecticut and UNC-Wilmington. North Carolina A&T will be ineligible for the postseason in football.

UNC first-year athletic director Bubba Cunningham explained the Tar Heels’ low APR numbers in football and men’s basketball in a school release. Cunningham pointed to attrition in both sports, and said the university would focus on improving both scores.

“Moving forward, it is imperative that we do a great job of identifying young people who will succeed academically and who will stay in our program throughout their eligibility,” Cunningham said. “Our current and
future student-athletes must accept the challenge that is the University of North Carolina.”

Williams, meanwhile, last week criticized the APR, which penalizes teams when players transfer. Williams cited the high number of transfers in college basketball, and said it’s difficult for schools to retain players who are in search of instant gratification.

“The APR has some great points about it,” Williams said. “But it is severely lacking and some of the understanding of what’s going on in today’s world.”

More information

Here’s a look at how state teams performed in the 2010-11 and multi-year APR scores:

**Football**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School,</th>
<th>Multi-year APR,</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>989,</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>943,</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C. State</td>
<td>931,</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest</td>
<td>973,</td>
<td>969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State</td>
<td>982,</td>
<td>992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>926,</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>995,</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carolina</td>
<td>952,</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elon</td>
<td>974,</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner-Webb</td>
<td>943,</td>
<td>886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C. A&amp;T</td>
<td>880,</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C. Central</td>
<td>934,</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Carolina</td>
<td>937,</td>
<td>939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Basketball

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School,</th>
<th>Multi-year APR,</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>995,</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>963,</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C. State</td>
<td>974,</td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest</td>
<td>939,</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State</td>
<td>947,</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>935,</td>
<td>941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>940,</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>990,</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carolina</td>
<td>965,</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elon</td>
<td>995,</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner-Webb</td>
<td>962,</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Point</td>
<td>948,</td>
<td>904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C. A&amp;T</td>
<td>934,</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C. Central</td>
<td>893,</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC-Asheville</td>
<td>954,</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC-Greensboro</td>
<td>980,</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC-Wilmington</td>
<td>890,</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Carolina</td>
<td>959,</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: NCAA*
Chris Seward - cseward@newsobserver.com

N.C. Senate Pro-Tem Phil Berger, left, and N.C. House Speaker Thom Tillis announce a joint budget during a press conference held Wednesday, June 20, 2012 at the Legislative Building in Raleigh.

**State legislators give teachers raises but little else to public schools**

By Lynn Bonner - lbonner@newsobserver.com

Legislators are expected to vote Thursday on a $20.2 billion budget that gives state employees and teachers raises and shrinks the amount that school systems would have to cut from their budgets next year.

Legislative leaders praised their work, but school administrators, school board members and Gov. Bev Perdue reserved opinions until they could look at the numbers.

A possible veto by Perdue, a Democrat, looms over the discussions. The House schedule for finishing its work for the year takes into account a potential veto.

She vetoed last year’s budget but the legislature overrode her veto.

“This budget is a good faith effort to restore funding and to provide some certainty in a number of other areas, education and health and human
services probably the most important,” said House Speaker Thom Tillis, a Mecklenburg County Republican.

**Funding cuts ‘devastating’**

But House Minority Leader Joe Hackney on Wednesday night called the cuts to education “devastating,” with the money lost equivalent to salaries for 3,400 teachers.

He questioned Republicans’ support for traditional public schools.

“I think any alternative to public schools, they are supportive of,” said Hackney, an Orange County Democrat. “They’re supportive of home schools, they’re supportive of religious schools, they’re supportive of online education charters, they’re supportive of traditional charters. They’re supportive of any program that does not involve funding adequately our traditional public schools for everyone.”

The budget cancels $143.3 million in budget cuts that local school districts would have to make. That’s less than the $330 million the House wanted districts to be able to keep next year, but more than the $74 million relief in the Senate proposal.

Local school districts must make $360 million in discretionary cuts next year and face the loss of $259 million in federal stimulus money, which runs out in a few months.

State employees and school employees will receive raises – 1.2 percent – for the first time in four years. Retirees will get a 1 percent cost-of-living increase.

The budget delivers what could be a fatal blow to the state teacher recruitment program, the N.C. Teaching Fellows. The House revived the program in its budget, but Senate Republicans don’t want it.

Republicans want to kill the program because it started under Democrats, Hackney said. “It’s really not clear to me whose little vendetta that is, but it’s somebody’s little vendetta.”

**$27 million education reform plan**

The budget also includes a literacy plan requiring more children to read at grade level before they’re promoted to fourth grade, requires A to F grades for schools, and directs local districts to develop plans for teacher performance bonuses. The budget includes $27 million for this package of changes, pushed by Senate leader Phil Berger, an Eden Republican.
The budget did not include two controversial school proposals: one to end teacher tenure and another to allow businesses to receive dollar-for-dollar state tax credits for donations to private-school scholarships. Tillis said the scholarships could still be considered this year.

Natalie Beyer, a Board of Education member from Durham County, said the so-called short session was not the time to pass such weighty changes to education.

“I am most concerned that the proposal contains major untested education policy initiatives that have not had input from teachers and principals nor have they had ample public debate in the short session,” she said.

Teachers said they were pleased to get raises after four years of stagnant pay. The House had wanted one-time bonuses for teachers and state employees.

Bethany Meyers, a Johnston County middle school teacher, said teachers were feeling “disrespected and disliked by the Republican Senate,” but appreciated the respect the raises demonstrated.

**Key provisions in the state budget**

- $5 million for a job retraining program aimed at community college students to help the long-term unemployed
- $1 million for a new library at N.C. State’s Centennial Campus
- $3.5 million for early learning literacy programs
- Eliminates an assistant secretary position in the N.C. Commerce Department, saving $130,000
- $500,000 for Johnson & Wales University in Charlotte
- $500,000 to RTI International, a RTP research firm
- An additional $4.5 million to fund need-based scholarships for students attending private colleges
- Increase of $18.6 million in need-based financial aid to the UNC system
- The budget prohibits the state Department of Health and Human Services from spending money on statewide smoking-prevention media or marketing campaigns.
• Closes the Edgecombe Youth Development Center, eliminating 57 full-time positions, for savings of $1.71 million

• Adds 44 full-time positions to the Family Court Program at a cost of $2.86 million

• Directs the Department of Transportation to start collecting new and increased tolls that had been ordered in the budget a year ago, but with some changes: The busy Hatteras-Ocracoke ferry across Hatteras Inlet and the Knotts Island ferry across Currituck Sound will remain toll-free (Senate leaders had proposed tolls on these routes.) Gives a one-year reprieve to riders of the Minnesott Beach ferry across the Neuse River, which serves Cherry Point commuters. Riders on the Pamlico River ferry in Beaufort County, which also serves commuters, will start paying tolls for the first time.

• Cuts $63 million in funding for the planned Garden Parkway near Charlotte and Mid-Currituck Bridge on the northern Outer Banks, because DOT officials have said they will not be ready to spend the money in the coming year.

• Drops a Senate proposal to charge a statewide fee of $45 for teens under age 18 who take driver education class. Local school systems are still authorized to collect a fee of up to $45, to make up for a cut in state funding last year.

• Eliminates the state’s New Starts program that supplements federal money for urban rail transit projects. The remaining $25 million in the fund will be earmarked for Charlotte’s light-rail line, which has been the only New Starts beneficiary to date. Local officials in the Triangle and other communities with plans for light rail now will have to compete with highway projects for state money.

• Cuts the gas tax, now 38.9 cents per gallon, to a maximum of 37.5 cents for the coming year.

• Cuts $26 million from a state fund for paving dirt roads and improving other secondary roads.
Guesswork goes into climate forecasting

By Kerstin Nordstrom

RALEIGH The debate in the legislature over the expected sea-level rise along the North Carolina coast over the next century has been presented as a choice between two numbers: eight and 39.

The number would guide local governments as they decide where to permit development in coming decades. If the number is too small, more coastal property could be damaged because of erosion and storm surges. If it's too large, economic development could be unnecessarily stifled, and insurance rates might soar.

But like so much having to do with climate change, the two numbers aren't simple.

Let's start with the eight. The bill passed by the Senate and headed for a joint conference committee would mandate that local governments plan for a rise in sea level of as little as 8 inches by 2100.

The 8-inch number is based on historical data from the southern North Carolina coast. Since the ocean rose 8 inches during the last century, legislators would require that governments assume a rise of 8 inches during the next century, at least in that part of the state. The future will look like the past.

But the ocean rose much more along the northern North Carolina coast over the last century, as much as 17 inches at Duck. The bill has been amended to reflect that variability, acknowledging that there shall not be one rate for the entire coast.

In other words, planners could anticipate a rise of as much as 17 inches in some areas, if the bill becomes law.

Where the number 39 comes from

That's still a far cry from what a panel of scientists appointed by the state have predicted. The Coastal Resources Commission Science Panel came up with the 39-inch figure in a report in March 2010, setting off the alarm that led to the bill in the legislature.

The panel based its forecast on the widely held idea that a warming atmosphere will accelerate the rise in sea level over the next century.

The science panel's report recommended using one number for the whole coast as a starting point, concluding that "local differences are likely to be overwhelmed by global effects." It chose the 17-inch figure from the Duck gauge. From the panel's perspective, while the gauge had the highest rate of rise of the eight gauges along the coast, it was also the best source of data, because it was the least influenced by human activity such as widening of shipping channels.

Sea-level rise has three main contributing factors:

- The land itself can sink, though this is somewhat random and hard to predict.
- Glaciers melt due to rising temperatures, increasing the amount of ocean water.
- Water expands as it is heated, just like the wedding ring that's a bit too tight.

Scientists say temperature also influences the rate of sea-level rise. A much-cited 2007 Science paper by German oceanographer Stefan Rahmstorf demonstrates this effect using historical data. So if the global temperature is increasing, as climate scientists generally believe, then sea-level rise must be accelerating. Going up at a faster rate every year.

Within the range

The science panel took this concept and used the range of 2100 temperatures predicted by climate scientists. This gave best- and worst-case scenarios of 20 and 55 inches of rise.

But panel member Stan Riggs, a geology professor from East Carolina University, said the state requested a single number, so the panel somewhat begrudgingly chose 39 inches, or 1 meter, as a compromise between the best- and worst-case scenarios.

"We only stand by the range reported," Riggs said. "It's science; there are uncertainties, and they get larger as you forecast further into the future. But the state can't deal with uncertainties and wanted a specific number."

The panel further cautioned in its report that its number was not a prediction but a plausible number for planning purposes.

After critiques of the report emerged, attacking the choice of location and the validity of the model, the panel provided an addendum to its original report in April.

In the addendum, the panel stood by its report as the best estimate based on scientific knowledge at the time but also cautioned that as models and data improve, so will the projections. Panel members say the projections should be reassessed at least every five years.

Nordstrom: 919-829-8983
John Wooten’s most memorable moment in a batter’s box has likely changed a few times over the last couple of weeks.

On June 3, he stroked a no-doubt home run out of Boshamer Stadium in Chapel Hill in his final collegiate at-bat for East Carolina. Fifteen days later and 800 miles to the north, Wooten dug in for the first time as a professional for the Vermont Lake Monsters, the short-season rookie league affiliate of the Oakland Athletics.

In between, however, one great at-bat at rookie camp in Arizona that Wooten called his trial by fire might have helped the former ECU standout get to Vermont more than any he logged with the Pirates, but that’s baseball.

“That’s what pro ball is. How you play is going to be the factor in where you go,” said Wooten, who became a fixture at first base as a sophomore for the Pirates before becoming a hard-hitting utility man last season, playing some in the infield and some in the outfield.

The rapid progression the Goldsboro native made at the plate made him enough of a commodity to be selected by the A’s in the 37th round of the
draft. Wooten led ECU with a .338 batting average, 80 hits and nine homers. He finished tied with Corey Thompson for the team lead in RBIs with 40.

Although it was admittedly a tough decision to leave ECU early, Wooten took what he figured might be his best shot, and it came as a surprise.

“After I saw where I got drafted I thought, ‘OK, I’m going back to school, no big deal,’” he said. “I got drafted in the 37th round and I wasn’t expecting much out of that. I was really excited to get drafted and I was happy about the opportunity, but in the back of my mind I was thinking I’ll go back to school and finish my senior year and get my degree, which would have been fine with me also.

“My scout called me from the Athletics and said, ‘Hey, we want to try to make this work.’”

Wooten wanted to spend some time with family after that, weighing his options. But as it turned out, the A’s were serious about agreeing to terms with Wooten and vaulting him into their feeder system.

“It was literally within two hours,” he said of the return call from Oakland, ready with an offer. “(The A’s said), ‘We got you what you want, you leave for Arizona on Monday,’ and it was Saturday.”

Wooten reported to rookie camp in Arizona for about four days. There, he stroked an 0-2 hit into center field against a former San Francisco Giants lefty Merkin Valdez and was soon shipped to his first true assignment in Vermont.

Although the Monsters lost to Tri-City in their debut, Wooten’s pro career began with a 2-for-4 night.

“Every little kid in the world is going to be in the back yard saying, ‘Bottom of the ninth, Major League Baseball game,’ they’re not saying, ‘Bottom of the ninth, high school senior state championship,’” Wooten said.

“Everybody wants to make it to the big leagues, everybody here wants to make it, and it’s something I’m really excited to have the opportunity to do.”

The Wooten family has deep ties to eastern North Carolina and the pro ranks, and ECU head coach Billy Godwin knew of that pedigree before either arrived in Greenville.

The Pirate skipper also knew there was a good chance a solid junior prospect like Wooten would take the leap.

“We knew coming in he had some tremendous tools,” Godwin said of Wooten, who was initially drafted by San Diego in the 20th round after his
senior year at Eastern Wayne High School. “He came here wanting to get better and he’s a tremendous young man. After the year he had this year it’s deserving. He deserves that opportunity to go out and play professional baseball.”

Wooten is one of six former Pirate mainstays to hear their names called during the major league draft and the third junior.

Catcher Zach Wright (L.A. Angels), left-handed pitcher Kevin Brandt (Tampa Bay) and third baseman Corey Thompson (Chicago White Sox) — all seniors — joined junior pitchers Jharel Cotton (L.A. Dodgers) and Tyler Joyner (Kansas City) on the draft list.

Cotton said via text message on Monday that he still hasn’t made a final decision on whether or not he’ll return for his senior season at ECU. In the meantime, he recently re-joined the Peninsula Pilots of the Coastal Plain League.

Joyner, meanwhile, was still waiting to hear from the Royals as of Tuesday night and has made one start for the Wilson Tobs in the CPL.

Contact Nathan Summers at nsummers@reflector.com or 252-329-9595.
Letter: Fire UNC-CH chancellor, others
Thursday, June 21, 2012

Chancellor Holden Thorp at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and other upper administrators need to go with as many accounts of fraud (academic and financial) that are coming to light. The facts are bearing out that UNC-CH has not had any institutional control over professors and academic advisors for a long while.

That educational institution has been propagating the idea out to everyone about its pristine ivory tower status — i.e. look at all of our awards and rankings — while behind the thin eggshell covering is the smell of rotten eggs.

I am looking for other educational entities to come in and evaluate their positions and even change the status of the ratings/rankings. And the NCAA needs to revisit now that new information continues to come forward. The penalties should be severe and those at the top need to be cleansed, not as sacrificial lambs, but as a result of poor leadership.

The UNC Board of Governors has insulated and protected this school for so long and the public funding from the state budgets has provided the school with sense of entitlement and being untouchable. It is time for a reality check there and university as a whole needs to feel the pinch this time.

WAYLAND SUMERLIN
Grifton
William Philip Moore Jr., loving husband, father and friend, peacefully entered into the arms of Jesus, Monday, June 18, 2012, at 12:35 a.m. surrounded by his children. Born Feb. 24, 1927, he lived a wonderfully full life. A memorial service will be conducted Friday at 11 a.m. at Jarvis United Methodist Church.

Phil lived in Greenville his whole life, and spoke fondly of many friends from his childhood. Many of these friendships lasted his lifetime. World War II took Phil from his college studies as he served in the U.S. Navy. After the war, he returned to Duke University where he graduated third in his class in Mechanical Engineering. Upon graduating, General Electric provided Phil's first employment opportunity in the northeast. It was during this period that he developed a love of snow skiing.

After a period of time, Phil realized that he missed his Greenville home and returned to accept an offer to become a partner with Coastal Refrigeration. Phil always loved the coast of North Carolina, especially Atlantic Beach where his father was one of the initial property owners of the resort town. It was shortly after his return to North Carolina when he met the love of his life at the beach, Margaret Mae Hamilton from Beaufort (known to all of her friends as "Peggy"). After their marriage, they made their home in Greenville where they started their family. While raising three children, he was very active in their lives, serving as Scoutmaster for his sons and other young men in the community. Additionally, he was actively involved with Jarvis Memorial United Methodist Church, serving on the Building Committee. An avid problem solver, he also assisted with the day-to-day operations of the Methodist Student Center at East Carolina University. While working for Allison Erwin in the heating and air conditioning business, Phil won countless trips as top salesman who allowed for much fun with Peggy and other friends. He also was part owner of Moore Mechanical Contractors for many years; however, he eventually was blessed with a position at Burroughs-Wellcome. Here, he designed and developed fluid bed dryers for their sterile products area which are still used world-wide in the pharmaceutical industry. Upon retirement, he continued to serve
as consultant to many with his expertise in engineering. His love of people made him an easy friend and co-worker.

Phil was the only son of the late William Philip Moore Sr. and Elmo Tucker Moore of Greenville. He was preceded in death by his eldest child, William Philip "Will" Moore III.

Phil is survived by Peggy, his loving wife of 59 years; daughter, Julia Moore Morris and her husband, Christopher Ridenour Morris, of Raleigh; son, Lee Hamilton Moore and fiancee, Stephanie Connor, of Greenville; and two grandsons William Christopher Morris and Michael Joseph Morris, of Raleigh.

The family would like to express their sincere love and appreciation to Silvercare, especially Lois Cannon who has been support and care for Phil and Peggy for over six years and has become a member of the family, and Laura Kaye Moore who has served as night time aid and companion for over a year.


Published in The Daily Reflector on June 21, 2012
Editorial:

Up in Charlottesville

However badly things seem to be going for UNC-Chapel Hill these days, they could be worse. That’s the lesson from Charlottesville, where the University of Virginia’s governing board has forced out the campus president without making it clear why – and in a cloak-and-dagger manner that’s prompted widespread comment in the commonwealth.

To the extent that the board has made known its reasons, the action seems hasty and single-minded. Cavalier, you might say.

Apparently, some on the Board of Visitors (the governing body) and most notably Rector Helen Dragas (the rector heads the board), felt UVa President Teresa Sullivan, just two years into the job, wasn’t active enough on the online education front, failing to keep up with the Stanfords and MITs in offering Internet courses and developing a Web presence.

Perhaps not, and Sullivan, in the few comments she’s made since her forced exit – she resigned after being told the board unanimously wanted her out, when that may not have been the case – admits she’s “incremental” in her approach. Online learning is only one of many issues for UVa, which has seen state support dwindle to 5.6 percent of the total budget; state aid has fallen 22 percent since 2008. Sullivan would be right to worry about more than the Web.

In North Carolina, we certainly have campus controversies, plus an evolving system of governance in which Republicans now control the top spots on the UNC system Board of Governors. But we should aim to do much better than Virginia. The board’s job, and that of the UNC-Chapel Hill trustees, is to help obtain sufficient financial support and to make wise, transparent personnel decisions to keep this one of the top public university systems in the country.
U-Va. President Teresa Sullivan speaks to the crowd on Monday with husband Douglas Laycock, right, looking on. (Mark Gormus/AP)

The U-Va. mess: Sign of the (bad) times
By Valerie Strauss

Correction: A previous version used the wrong name in relation to Helen Dragas’ effort to remove Teresa Sullivan. It is now correct.

The debacle at the University of Virginia over the secretive ousting of the school’s first female president is more than a tale about how one school’s governing board can blunder. It is a sign of these unfortunate times in public education at all levels.

The actions of the governing board of the elite public university in forcing out popular President Teresa Sullivan reflect the way school reform at all levels has been carried out in recent years in some important ways.

Here are some key phrases that describe the episode: Acting in secrecy. Ignoring teachers. Viewing public education as a business. Refusing to admit a mistake.
Who does that sound like? (Answer: Modern K-12 school reformers.)

Let’s review:

The head of the governing board, Helen Dragas, a fiscally conservative developer from Virginia Beach, worked for months in secret on a campaign to fire Sullivan.

She kept the faculty — who, along with the students, are the heart of any school — ignorant of her plans, and when the news became public and professors demanded an explanation, she didn’t give it to them.

Reporters ferreted out from people involved in the drama that Dragas had never quite trusted Sullivan from the start of her tenure, and that she didn’t think she was a bold, strategic leader who could make tough cuts at the university in these troubled financial times.

My colleagues Daniel de Vise and Anita Kumar also reported discrepancies in statements made by Dragas, including about the number of board members who knew about, and agreed with, the Dragas-led ouster of Sullivan.

She had suggested that the decision among the 16 members of the Board of Visitors was unanimous, when it turned out that in fact some members didn’t even know she had wanted to get rid of Sullivan. In fact, they reported that the board never met or took a vote on Sullivan’s ouster.

Then, as donors threatened to withhold money from the university, the students and faculty demanded answers and even the esteemed former president, John Casteen III, said it was time for the board to explain itself, Dragas put out a statement.

What did she do? She apologized for the ouster was handled, but not for the decision to remove Sullivan.

“Let me state clearly and unequivocally: You, our U.Va. family, deserved better from this board, and we have heard your concerns loud and clear.”

The faculty wasn’t satisfied and asked Dragas, the rector of the Board of Visitors, and Vice Rector Mark J. Kington to resign.

And now the board has appointed an interim president, who will take over on Aug. 16, the day after Sullivan officially leaves. After a number of top candidates said they didn’t want the job, the board appointed as interim president Carl P. Zeithaml, dean of U-Va.’s highly regarded McIntire School of Commerce.
Let’s look at some of the similarities between this episode and the K-12 school reform process of recent years.

Many of the efforts to get state legislatures to pass reform packages that include the reduction or elimination of teacher tenure, evaluation systems that link teachers’ jobs to student test scores, and more, have been done in secret. For example, a group called the American Legislative Exchange Council, or ALEC, an organization of nearly 2,000 conservative state legislators, worked in secret for years to promote privatization and corporate interests in education and other areas of American society.

At the center of the modern school reform movement is the philosophy that public schools should be treated not as civic institutions but rather as corporate entities. That the interim leader is Zeithaml, whose speciality is in the field of “strategic management” speaks volumes about the direction the board wants the school to go.

Another central characteristic of school reform is the role of teachers: They don’t have one, at least when it comes to making decisions. Teachers have been scapegoated for many of the problems facing public schools, and their voice has been ignored in the education policy debate.

Throughout the reform era, reform leaders, such as Michelle Rhee, rarely (if ever) admit they make a mistake and make major decisions without the benefit of research backing up their action.

As telling as anything is the fact that Dragas, my colleagues reported, hired the public relations firm Hill+Knowlton to help the school ride out the mess she helped make.

The University of Virginia, long one of the most highly ranked public schools in the country, is going to need more than good public relations to fix this mess and maintain its place in higher education.

It is going to need somebody to start making some smart decisions.
Carl Zeithaml, a longtime University of Virginia dean, listens to a question at a news conference after his appointment as interim university president. Zeithaml was picked to take over for Teresa Sullivan, whose ouster prompted a backlash on campus.

Norm Shafer / For The Washington Post

Sullivan supporters plot to reinstate her as U-Va. president

By Anita Kumar and Daniel de Vise

CHARLOTTESVILLE — Several members of the University of Virginia’s governing board spent Wednesday quietly counting votes and plotting a move to reinstate Teresa Sullivan after the popular outgoing president informed them that she wants to remain if Rector Helen E. Dragas resigns, according to current and former board members briefed on the conversations.

Sullivan holds such broad support among professors that the Faculty Senate chairman held out hope that she could be reinstated following the resignation of one of her critics on the governing board. She has also indicated to board members that she would seek other changes were she to return, including communications with them.

“It’s not over,” law professor George M. Cohen, who leads the Faculty Senate, said in an interview. “Have you counted the votes?”

Sullivan’s supporters on the board think they are close to the eight votes needed to reinstate her. They note that only eight votes are needed since
Mark J. Kington, the vice rector who teamed with Draga to orchestrate Sullivan’s ouster, resigned Tuesday, leaving just 15 members on the board.

Sullivan’s supporters have until 5 p.m. Thursday to call a meeting for June 27, at which a reinstatement vote would be taken. Only three board members are required to request such a session. But they will not do so unless they believe they have eight votes.

As efforts to reinstate Sullivan continued,-U-Va.’s incoming interim leader, commerce school dean Carl P. Zeithaml, ruled out any interest in becoming the university’s next president. He was appointed interim president by the board Tuesday in hopes that he could help calm the university and preside with the trust of the faculty until a new president is hired.

Virginia’s flagship university has been embroiled in turmoil for 11 days, since the board announced June 10 that Sullivan would leave. At a 5 p.m. gathering on the Lawn, faculty leaders told a crowd of several hundred they would meet with the interim president in the morning.

“Ask him to resign!” someone yelled from the crowd.

The dispute has come to be seen as a larger battle over the direction of the school Thomas Jefferson founded.

Sullivan calls herself an “incrementalist” who seeks change from within the university’s traditions; board critics say the school needs a bolder vision that will take into account financial pressures in academia and the evolving role of online education, among other factors.

Zeithaml, scheduled to take over as interim president Aug. 16, said at a news conference that he initially turned down the job and worried that he would be perceived as part of a “conspiracy” to remove Sullivan. “I don’t support the board’s decision to remove her,” he said.

He took note of the controversy over the removal of Sullivan in a letter to McIntire School of Commerce alumni.

“Some people disagree with my decision to serve in this role, and I understand their reasons,” Zeithaml, the McIntire dean, said in the letter. “After profound deliberation, however, I felt that I had no choice. I am sorry if you disagree with my decision, but please join me in my efforts to move the University forward.”

At one point during a closed board meeting that stretched from Monday into Tuesday, allies of Sullivan seemed to have the support of eight members on the board, according to several people briefed on the session who declined to
be named because of the sensitivity of the matter. Because Kington, the vice rector, had not yet resigned his seat on the 16-member board, nine votes would have been necessary to reinstate Sullivan.

Instead of voting on Sullivan’s reinstatement, the board voted 12 to 1 to appoint Zeithaml as interim president until a permanent successor can be found. The dissenter was W. Heywood Fralin. Board members Robert D. Hardie and A. Macdonald Caputo abstained, and Glynn D. Key left before the vote.

Whether the board would revisit its decision following Kington’s resignation was uncertain. With each passing day, the leadership transition is gaining momentum.

Dragas has not responded to repeated e-mails and telephone calls seeking comment.

Some university supporters fear the coming search for a permanent successor to Sullivan will yield few prospects.

“I think finding a qualified candidate who will even consider this job will be extraordinarily difficult, if not impossible, at this point,” said Austin Ligon, a retired automobile executive and former board member. Of Sullivan’s removal, Ligon said, “I think this will become the textbook case for bad university governance.”

*Kumar reported from Richmond.*
Should Colleges Consider Legacies in the Admissions Process?

Many colleges ask applicants if they have a parent or grandparent who went to the school. The student's answer is often the difference between acceptance or rejection.

At some of the country's most selective colleges, one study has shown, having an alum parent boosts the applicant's probability of acceptance by 45 percentage points. That is, if one candidate has a 30% chance of admission, an applicant with the exact same academic record and extracurricular activities but also a parent who attended the school as an undergraduate would have a 75% chance.

Both sides in our debate agree that legacy admissions once were used to give preference almost exclusively to white, male students. Today, however, supporters of legacy admissions point out that diversity has become so well-established on campus that the legacies themselves are multicultural. And the preference being shown to a few, they say, is more about boosting alumni giving and school spirit.

Its critics, meanwhile, argue that the custom is still discriminatory. To base college admissions on any criteria other than merit, they say, runs counter to America's democratic principles.

Taking the pro-legacy position is Stephen Joel Trachtenberg, president emeritus and university professor of public service at George Washington University in Washington, D.C. Making the opposing case is Richard D.

**Yes: It's Good for the Schools**

By Stephen Joel Trachtenberg

Many colleges look favorably on applications from children of alumni—and they should. Legacy admissions, used judiciously, are good for schools, and for all of the students.

Half a century ago, it is true, seats in the freshman class would often pass from one generation of white men to the next without much regard for merit.

But the world of college admissions has changed dramatically. The doors to college are open wider than ever. The admissions process is more democratic and largely a meritocracy.

Admission decisions, though, can't just go by the numbers. Data can be unreliable. High-school grades and standardized exams have flaws; letters of recommendation are subjective and tell us as much about the authors as the candidates.

The result is that a lot of factors get thrown into the pot as admissions officers try to create balanced classes with students who have particular talents and a variety of backgrounds. Whether an applicant is a legacy should be one of those factors, because it is so important to sustaining two qualities at the core of the college experience: school spirit and a lasting sense of community.

Like other admitted students, alumni children must have the necessary academic achievements. But they also come to campus ready to embrace the institution from the moment they arrive. They bring unique qualities of tradition, loyalty and pride of place. Many students and their families, not just legacies, are proud to be Tigers, Elis, Colonials, Lions or Longhorns. They wear the sweatshirts, they display the logos. But legacies are raised with such pride from infancy, like mother's milk.

As recently as 25 years ago, legacy admissions still arguably favored white wealthy children. But the alumni rolls of U.S. colleges grow daily more diverse. African-Americans, Latinos, Asian-Americans, Native Americans and students from around the world compose today's college classes. Alumni
children are increasingly multicultural. Thus, seeking diversity by including
the children of alumni is a positive, not a negative.

Legacies also make recruiting easier. For every college, building the class is
a full-time competitive job. Most schools scramble to find enough qualified
candidates each year. Because legacies who get accepted do tend to enroll,
they are thus a valuable building block.

Ensuring that a portion of each freshman class has a particularly close
connection to the school also helps keep alumni giving strong. Not all
"giving" is in dollars and cents. Creating community is spiritual, not
material. Speaking well of one's alma mater, referring applicants,
involvement in campaigns, mentoring interns, working with faculty on
research, sports-ticket subscriptions, etc., all add to a university's worth.

Yes, accepting a legacy student displaces someone else. But at every school
where more students apply than are accepted, each person admitted displaces
someone else. And those who are rejected almost always go on to attend and
graduate from another institution. To say that it is discrimination for a
college to accept one applicant over another because the school is looking
for specific characteristics is to challenge the very concept of affirmative
action.

We need not exaggerate the cost of legacies nor inflate their benefits: They
are only a small part of the admissions pie, and they warrant neither alarm
nor undue celebration. They help bridge an institution's past and present.
They represent tradition and underscore the history of an institution and
modestly acknowledge what the present owes to the founders.

In an already highly regulated environment, nothing about legacy
admissions calls for federal intervention. There are more than 4,000 colleges
in the U.S., and only about a hundred accept less than 50% of their
applicants. When colleges have enough applicants to make real choices in
admissions, the mosaic of candidates is selected even as many of apparently
equal quality go on to happily matriculate at alternative institutions. There is
no simple formula that results in perfect equity. No student is exactly the
same as another.

The criteria for a sound legacy admissions policy are moderation and
balance: Accept a qualified few; use judgment; find talent and readiness;
diversity is imperative.
In other words, the criteria are the same as they are for musicians, mathematicians, basketball players, thespians, equestrians, urbanites and country mice, locals and internationals. Legacies should be treated no worse.

Prof. Trachtenberg is president emeritus and university professor of public service at George Washington University. He can be reached at reports@wsj.com.

**No: It Hurts the Deserving**

By Richard D. Kahlenberg

Legacy preference in college admissions is one of the few issues on which liberals and conservatives should be able to agree. Giving special privileges to a group of relatively advantaged students based on where their parents went to college makes no sense, whether you come at the question from the political left or the right.

Liberals, concerned about fairness, should balk at providing affirmative action for students who are disproportionately white and wealthy. For conservatives, legacies violate the articulated principle that America ought to be a merit-based society rather than an entitlement society. Little wonder, then, that 75% of Americans oppose legacy preferences.

Still, preferences for alumni offspring are employed at almost three-quarters of selective public and private research universities and virtually all selective liberal-arts colleges.

Defenders suggest that legacy status is merely a "tiebreaker" among equally qualified candidates. However, it is more than that. Princeton University scholar Thomas Espenshade and colleagues found that, among applicants to elite colleges, legacy status was worth the equivalent of scoring 160 points higher on the SAT (on a scale of 400 to 1600).

But even if the legacy boost were a minor factor in the college's decision, it's a form of discrimination based on ancestry. Would we say discrimination against Latino candidates is permissible because it's "one factor" of many?

Legacy preferences began after World War I, part of an effort to curtail the enrollment of immigrant students, particularly Jews, at Ivy League colleges.

While it is true that legacies today are more racially and ethnically diverse than in the 1950s, they are still disproportionately white. One study found that underrepresented minorities make up 12.5% of the applicant pool at selective colleges and universities but only 6.7% of the legacy-applicant
Defenders of legacy preferences today say they are necessary to encourage alumni donations, but there is little good evidence to support the claim. The most comprehensive study of the issue is a 2010 analysis published by the Century Foundation that examined alumni giving at the nation's top 100 research universities from 1998 to 2007. Researchers compared giving at the 75% of these institutions that provide legacy preference against the quarter that do not. The authors, once they controlled for the wealth of an institution's alumni, found "no statistically significant evidence of a causal relationship between legacy preference policies and total alumni giving."

The study also examined giving trends at seven universities that eliminated legacy preference policies during this period. The authors found "no short term measurable reduction in alumni giving as a result of abolishing legacy preferences." The California Institute of Technology, with a straight merit-based admissions system for legacy and nonlegacy candidates alike, manages to raise almost as much money as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which grants alumni children a preference and is five times as large and has many more alumni to tap for donations.

Some argue that if a Yale applicant gets bumped aside for a legacy, he or she is still likely to attend a great college. But discrimination based on parentage and ancestry is an aristocratic and deeply un-American practice. Would anyone seriously argue that it's acceptable for Yale to discriminate against
applicants who are black or Muslim because, after all, they can attend another good university?

Part of the genius of the American experiment is that we have tried to follow Thomas Jefferson's dictate, that America should develop a "natural aristocracy" based on "virtue and talent," not an "artificial aristocracy" based on hereditary status. What kind of lesson do we teach teenage students applying to college when a university policy expressly suggests it's important where their mother and father went to college?

Public and private universities receive enormous public subsidies because institutions of higher education are supposed to serve the public interest. There is broad consensus among Americans, however, that legacy preferences contravene the public interest by undercutting merit and discriminating based on lineage. Higher education should acknowledge what the public has long recognized and end this anachronistic practice.

Mr. Kahlenberg, a senior fellow at the Century Foundation, is editor of "Affirmative Action for the Rich: Legacy Preferences in College Admissions." He can be reached at reports@wsj.com.