I. A. ANNOUNCEMENTS
Gates welcomed Senator Steve Millsaps (College of Business)

B. VISITORS/INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS
Chair Gates welcomed visitors and asked them to introduce themselves. (See voting sheet for visitor's names.)

C. VOLUNTEERS NEEDED TO ATTEND FEB. 7th BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING. Chair Gates solicited volunteers. The following senators agreed to attend the Board of Trustees meeting: Senator Woodworth, Senator Yaukey, Senator Arnold, Senator S. Simon, and Chair Gates.

D. CHAIR REVIEWS - FALL 2002
Chair Gates reported that chair reviews are underway. Senator Koch asked if all of the Departmental Chairs are being reviewed. Gates said, "As I understand, there are some in various stages of completion. The College of Business was the first to complete theirs. I don’t in fact, know about Education. I think Arts & Sciences is underway. Harvey (Durham) could tell you." Provost Durham responded that he "had no idea." Senator Anderson pointed out, "what is actually being discussed is a periodic re-opening of the chair position, not the annual spring evaluation." Chair Gates agreed with Senator Anderson. Senator S. Simon asked Chair Gates to read the official list of Chairs scheduled for evaluation. Chair Gates read the list as follows: Arts & Sciences: Tom Rhyne, Chemistry, Lorin Baumhover, Sociology & Social Work; Jesse Taylor, Philosophy & Religion (at that point, Chair Gates was not certain about Taylor but Senator S. Simon was positive that he would be reviewed). Senator Truett announced that the Curriculum & Instruction department is "about to start reviewing Michael Jacobson." Chair Gates referred back to the Arts & Sciences review of Bill Bauldry, Mathematics and Stan Aeschleman, Psychology. He mentioned, "both have asked to go up a year early and that is being completed."

E. SENATE VACANCY – A one semester appointment from College of Fine & Applied Arts. Chair Gates announced that the Senate vacancy was formerly Senator Weitz’s seat and needed to be filled.

F. SENATE ELECTIONS -Chair Gates announced the senate elections would be coming up soon and asked senators to "earnestly solicit" new Senate members. Senator Bortz asked Chair
Gates why his items did not make the agenda and what was the process for getting his items on the agenda.

II. VISITORS – Chair Gates asked Bobby Sharp, Chair of the Provost Search Committee, where the search committee currently stands. Sharp informed the senators that the application deadline had passed at noon that day and another meeting was scheduled for the following Friday. He noted that he and his colleagues (see visitor’s list) came "primarily to listen to the Faculty Senate as a group." Sharp revealed there were 70 applications for the Provost’s position. According to Sharp, the search committee had "consolidated and crystallized" some of the content involved in the screening process. Senator Bortz asked Sharp how many internal candidates were on the list and wanted the list of candidates released as soon as possible. Sharp stated that he "really didn’t know" how many internal candidates were listed. Sharp explained that he couldn’t actually release this list. Sharp also revealed that he had a conversation with Rick Howe about releasing the candidates list. According to Sharp, "for reasons of confidentiality," his search committee could not release the list of candidates. Furthermore, Sharp indicated it is not a common practice. Senator Rardin inquired, "What is it we’ll have access to?" Sharp informed senators that "there will be access (to the short list) and that it will be made public." Senator Bortz probed Sharp on issues surrounding withholding information. Senator Bortz asked, "If it doesn’t violate a state law or state policy then clarify (from Rick Howe) if it is internal policy by ASU and by whom." Sharp replied, "O.K." Sharp noted that candidates’ vitas would be made public. Senator Hall asked about the final tally of candidates coming up for interviews. Sharp replied that he doesn’t know. According to Sharp, the search committee tried to "follow the handbook as much as it applies." He also pointed out the Provost search is different from regular searches and that "the stakes are greater." Senator McKinney was curious about search criteria (i.e., administrative background versus academic background). Sharp notified senators that the search has arrived at some fairly consistent themes and welcomed input from senators. Chair Gates wrapped up the discussion and thanked Bobby Sharp (as well as other committee members) for coming and listening to the senate.

III. MINUTES

Chair Gates announced that the October and November minutes were available on-line. Senator Woodworth noted that the November minutes were not approved. Senator Rardin explained that the minutes have been far behind schedule. Senator S. Simon announced that the minutes were not approved for November or December but corrections were made (as requested at the last meeting). Senator Rardin stated that he didn’t know why the November minutes weren’t at the meeting. However, the November minutes had been posted on the Faculty Senate’s web page. Senator Millsaps announced that he had the hard copy of the minutes on hand. Senator Millsaps noted he had downloaded the minutes from the Faculty Senate web page a couple of hours before the Senate meeting commenced.

Senator S. Simon moved to approve the amended & revised November 11th minutes as they appeared on the web page. Senator Woodworth seconded the motion.

VOTE 1. Motion to approve the amended & revised November 11th minutes

18 YES 3 NO 1 ABSTAIN
Motion to approve the amended & revised November 11th minutes passed.
Chair Gates asked senators to review and discuss the December 9th minutes. Senator Moore requested Chair Gates’ letter to the Board of Trustees (see BoT Letter attached at the conclusion of the minutes) be included as "a matter of record" with this month’s meeting. Chair Gates concurred. Senator Moore also requested distribution of the BoT letter to all senators. Senator Moore noticed a couple of corrections that needed to be made in the minutes. According to Senator Moore, the words, "part-time faculty" needed to be stricken and replaced with the words, "non-tenure track faculty". Senator Muir spotted "cancelled" typed in the minutes should have only one "L". One more typographical error was noted and corrected. Chair Gates announced that the discussion was completed and moved to approve the December minutes. There were no objections.

Senator S. Simon moved and Senator Truett seconded to approve the December 9th minutes as amended & corrected.

VOTE 2. Motion to approve the December 9th Minutes as Amended & Corrected

21 YES 0 NO 1 ABSTAIN
The motion to approve the amended & corrected December 9th minutes passed.

Chair Gates moved the meeting forward by addressing committee reports.

IV. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS
A. ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE
1. Motion FS02-03/01-01- Regarding Review of Administrators-
Administrators in the Office of Academic Affairs are to be reviewed by faculty on a regular basis, beginning their third year and every three years thereafter.
Rationale:
Currently, department chairs and deans are reviewed by faculty on a regular basis.
Administrators in the Office of Academic Affairs are the chief academic officers of the university.
Feedback from faculty is necessary for adequately performing in these positions.
Senator S. Simon pointed out that the senate had a discussion on the motion before adjourning at the December 9, 2002 meeting. Senator S. Simon informed the senators that at the last meeting, they were in the midst of discussing the first motion regarding the review of the members of the Office of Academic Affairs. Chair Gates announced the discussion would continue. Senator S. Simon continued where he left off at the last meeting. Senator S. Simon said that it was the general assumption that the committee would have to set up the process to review individuals in the Office of Academic Affairs. According to Senator S. Simon, the Senate had not really discussed how the reviews would take place. Furthermore, Senator S. Simon stated that his committee is "simply making a recommendation that the process ought to be established.” He
expounded upon this issue by informing senators of the number of years after which chairs are up for review (subsequent reviews are usually scheduled every 3 years but Senator S. Simon determined it could be changed to every 5 years). Senator Koch reckoned that in principle, the motion sounds "really good" but he already has contact with his department chair and to some extent, the dean. Senator Koch also revealed that he doesn't have a lot of contact with Associate Vice-Chancellor Ward or Senior Associate Chancellor for Academic Affairs Clinton Parker. Senator Koch asked about the kind of mechanisms currently in place and utilized to evaluate the administrators at issue. Senator Koch concluded again, "in principle it sounds good" however, he "just needed to have more information." Senator S. Simon talked about the previous process in which deans were reviewed and set up by committee. According to Senator S. Simon, the committee sent out questionnaires to faculty and then the committee wrote the general review of the composition of the faculty input. This information would then be submitted to the Provost. Senator S. Simon noted, "this was the process for previously evaluating chairs but the committee hasn't taken up that question." Senator Kennedy inquired, "What was the goal of meeting in the end?" Senator S. Simon explained it was based on rationale that "we as faculty are reviewed by departments, deans are reviewed by colleges… that would be logical then that the members of the Office of Academic Affairs, likewise ought to be reviewed." Senator S. Simon added that he thought even the chancellor had set up a process that he was also reviewed. Senator S. Simon disclosed "the only office that seems not to be periodically reviewed is the Office of Academic Affairs and the Vice Chancellor." Provost Durham responded, noting that he had been reviewed by the faculty and that the Faculty Senate had a procedure and committee structure for review. Provost Durham also pointed out he was reviewed every 2-3 years and that it "was very well participated in by the faculty." In response to a question about whether or not a survey was sent out, Provost Durham informed senators that there was a general survey sent out and that was brought back to a small committee briefing. Furthermore, he mentioned that (in the past) the committee would meet with the Dean about his case. Senator S. Simon said, "that was the way it used to meet…but that was 10 years ago." Senator K. Simon recalled from last month’s minutes that there was a written vote on the issue, however there was a suggestion of parenthetical remarks to be included in the original motion (specifically, the 1st paragraph of the motion). She suggested that the motion be changed by inserting the following words; "Administrators in the Office of Academic Affairs, including the Provost, Assistant and Associate Vice-Chancellor…" to the motion. S. Simon had no objection to her modification. Senator Bortz suggested postponing the discussion on the motion until discussion on the report from the Ad-hoc Committee on Deans Evaluations was presented. Senator Bortz also mentioned that there are too many different mechanisms for review and he was appalled by "the amount of secrecy the Faculty Senate has endured." Chair Gates explained to Senator Bortz the changes made in the Dean's Evaluations. Chair Gates revealed that the changes were utilized as instruments (i.e., better questions, better wording, additional questions, deletions, ambiguous questions, etc.). Gates also acknowledged that Senator Bortz's question about, 'what had happened to the results’ was not raised. Senator Bortz suggested that it might be productive to have the discussion immediately following the discussion on the Dean's Evaluations. Chair Gates informed Senator Bortz that Senator Butts and Senator Weitz worked on this issue in committee. Chair Gates also noted that Senator Butts was setting up his first day lab and therefore he would be arriving late. Senator S. Simon announced that he had no problem with postponement. Senator S. Simon emphasized that, "all his committee was asking for was the recommendation." Senator S. Simon stated, "what is at hand is not about the process and Senator Bortz was talking about the
process." Senator S. Simon suggested another motion establishing and addressing the specific process for evaluation and review. Senator S. Simon implored senators, "All we’re asking here is that the senate agree to propose that the members of the Office of Academic Affairs should be reviewed by the faculty. That’s all we’re asking right now." Gates endorsed the motion in principle and "gave it the go-ahead" to establish an ad-hoc committee. Senator Moore, Senator K. Simon, Senator Bortz, Senator Woodworth, Senator S. Simon, and Chair Gates made suggestions for clarification on the wording and details of the motion. Senator Marking called for the question and Senator K. Simon seconded.

VOTE 3. Call for the question.

21 YES 1 NO 0 ABSTAIN
The question passed.

Chair Gates proceeded to voting on the reworded motion.

VOTE 4. Motion FS02-03/01-01- Regarding Review of Administrators as Amended-
Administrators in the Office of Academic Affairs including the Provost, Associate and Assistant Vice-Chancellors be reviewed by faculty, beginning in September of administrators third year and every three years thereafter. Rationale:
Currently, department chairs and deans are reviewed by faculty on a regular basis. Administrators in the Office of Academic Affairs are the chief academic officers of the university. Feedback from faculty is necessary for adequately performing in these positions.

20 YES 1 NO 1 ABSTAIN
The motion carried.

2. FS02-03/01-02- Motion Regarding Annual Report Form-
Departments create one form for faculty to fill out annually which would reflect merit criteria, promotional and tenure guidelines, and current annual report information.

Rationale:
Annual reports are often used by chairs and DPCs to determine merit, promotion, and tenure. Current annual reports may or may not adequately reflect merit criteria and/or promotion and tenure guidelines. Merit criteria and annual reports should reflect promotion and tenure guidelines, since these are the standards for faculty.

Faculty, especially untenured faculty, must frequently submit materials for review. Chair Gates proceeded with the agenda by addressing motion, FS02-03/01-02-Regarding the Annual Report
Form. Senator S. Simon pointed out a typographical error in the motion. It was noted by the Faculty Senate Office Assistant to be corrected. Senator S. Simon discussed the need for departments to create one annual form that sufficiently reflects faculty merit, promotion and tenure guidelines in an effort to create standards and cut down on paperwork. Senator S. Simon pointed out that there was a broad difference of opinion on the motion. In response to Senator S. Simon’s view that there was "a lack of standard," Senator Anderson understood that the Annual Report form was standard. Senator Anderson deduced that, "Everything that would or should be considered for promotion and tenure would be one of those categories in the annual report."
Senator S. Simon agreed. Senator Anderson expressed her concern that the proposed motion would not "...adequately capture, across departments, all of the things that should be (and might be or would be) important for promotion & tenure." Senator Anderson had mixed feelings about the motion because, she noted that "On some level we should probably be more standards across departments." Senator S. Simon briefly informed senators about the annual report’s history. Senator S. Simon agreed with Senator Anderson’s comments but pointed out that that is not what was at issue at the moment. Senator Woodworth expressed concern that it might restrict kinds of information like publication materials and other materials that go into a portfolio. Senator S. Simon responded that the annual report form does provide a summary for information and is located on the first page of the form. Senator S. Simon conveyed a need to resolve problems occurring in past reports, like false information. Senator Yaukey expressed her trepidation that this may only create more paperwork. Senator S. Simon retorted, "it’s just the opposite." Senator Rardin asked, "How is this (motion) going to save paperwork?" Senator S. Simon explained that the annual reports that are on file are to be submitted. Senator Rardin responded, "To my understanding, when one comes up for promotion and tenure, you are to make a case. We do not make cases in annual reports." Senator S. Simon also divulged that it was a committee motion and he doesn’t always support the committee’s motions. Senator Arnold and Senator Koch voiced opposition to the motion. Senator McKinney called the question and Senator Yaukey seconded.

VOTE 5. Called for the question.

21 YES 0 NO 1 ABSTAIN
The question passed.

VOTE 6. FS02-03/01-02- Motion Regarding Annual Report Form- (as written)

1 YES 21 NO 0 ABSTAIN
The motion failed.

3. FS02-03/01-03– Motion Regarding Advisory Boards have Written Bylaws
All departmental advisory boards have written bylaws and that these bylaws be included in departmental policies and procedures and be accessible to faculty.
All college or school advisory boards have written bylaws and that these bylaws be posted on the college/school’s web page.

Rationale:
Most departments (and colleges or schools) have advisory boards. Many of these advisory boards do not have written bylaws. It is required by SACS that such boards have written bylaws. Faculty need to know the function and membership of these boards. Since departmental advisory boards relate to departmental business, their bylaws should be included in the department’s policies and procedures.

Since college or school advisory boards relate to college/school business, their bylaws should be posted on the college/school’s web page. Senator S. Simon commented on the fact that there are currently no written bylaws for Advisory Boards. His committee suggested that all departments include accessible written bylaws to be published in each department’s "policies & procedures." Senator S. Simon continued to suggest that the proposed bylaws needed to be posted on department web pages. Senator S. Simon noted that from the committee’s perspective, "there is no real controlling factor over advisory boards." Senator Marking pointed out that not all departments have advisory boards and suggested a "friendly amendment" stating, "all department advisory boards will produce written bylaws." Senator Simon agreed. Senator Bortz asked about the specific date the Academic Policies & Procedures Committee met to approve the motion. Senator S. Simon noted that they met in October. Senator Woodworth asked for clarification on what advisory boards actually do and wanted to find out more information on the subject. Senator Arnold expressed concern that "this kind of board could influence the running of the department." Senator S. Simon responded, "We have no bylaws set forth. All we’re saying is to put it in writing. What this board does, what its composition is and what is its purpose. That’s all we’re saying. We’re not even concerned about the influence it has." Chair Gates interjected, "That is a tremendous concern because, such bylaws should delineate what a board can and cannot do." Chair Gates expressed concern over the potential for advisory boards to meddle in departmental curricula. Senator Koch described his experience dealing with controversial advisory boards when he served as Chair of AAUP. Senator Koch spoke of controversies that arose due to "meddling in the administrative level and meddling from outside people." Senator Koch stressed the importance of the motion and offered "a friendly amendment" stating, "He suggested rephrasing the first line of the motion to include "all external advisory boards have written bylaws..." (internal advisory boards were excluded from the motion). Senator Truett informed senators of her experience with advisory boards and emphasized the importance advisory boards had played at community colleges. Senator Truett also revealed how her own department utilized the influence of advisory boards in an effort to save a doctoral program as well as a school principal program. Senator Truett pointed out she would vote against the motion. Senator Yaukey noted that her department has an advisory board and the board serves as a connection for students and people who want to serve the department. Senator Yaukey also expressed a need for structure within advisory boards and gave examples of how departments could have utilized advisory boards to their advantage. Senator Waring announced that faculty should have access to information about advisory boards and he would vote "yes." Senator Moore contemplated the
details (or lack thereof) of the proposal. Senator Abbott suggested that a single set of bylaws could apply. Senator Moore pointed out, "if a department has an advisory board, it must have bylaws and if they don’t have an advisory board then they must create one." Senator Moore then suggested that every department should write their own bylaws because "there are too many idiosyncrasies as to how departments operate." Senator Rardin pointed out that "as with his department, some departments don’t have a separate document called "policies & procedures." Senator Rardin also stressed that "policies & procedures" connotes some weight and legality…” Senator Rardin pointed out that he was "at a loss as to what we’re (senators) talking about when we’re talking about ‘policies and procedures’." Senator S. Simon informed the senators of the history of "policies & procedures." Chair Gates reminded senators that Gretchen Bataille met with the Council of Chairs a couple of years ago and the CoC drafted a resolution on policies & procedures. Chair Gates revealed that he was not sure what had been done since then. Further discussion and debate ensued revolving around various topics like legal issues; clarification on what would go on the web page; clarification on the wording of the motion; and suggestions for adding a friendly amendment. After all senators had their opportunity to speak, Senator Koch called for the question and Senator Lambert seconded.

VOTE 7. Called to question.

20 YES 1 NO 1 ABSTAIN
The question passed.

Chair Gates asked Senator Rardin to read the revised motion for the vote.

VOTE 8. FS02-03/01-03 – Motion Regarding Advisory Boards have Written Bylaws (as amended)
All external departmental advisory boards have written bylaws and that these bylaws be included on the department web page.
All college or school advisory boards have written bylaws and that these bylaws be posted on the college or school web page.

Rationale:
Most departments (and colleges or schools) have external advisory boards.
Many of these advisory boards do not have written bylaws.
It is required by SACS that such boards have written bylaws.
Faculty need to know the function and membership of these boards.
Since departmental advisory boards relate to departmental business, their bylaws should be included in the department’s policies and procedures.
Since college or school advisory boards relate to college/school business, their bylaws should be posted on the college/school’s web page.
The motion carried.

4. FS02-03/01-04 – Motion Regarding Departments Post Policies & Procedures On-line
All departments have written policies and procedures, and they be posted on-line with the office of Academic Affairs for all faculty to access at any time.

Rationale:
Policies and procedures guide every department.
All such policies and procedures are supposed to be written and available to faculty.
Faculty need to know these policies and procedures.
Departmental policies and procedures are not readily accessible to all faculty at all times.

Senator S. Simon pointed out that there were no written departmental policies & procedures posted on-line. Senator Rardin suggested that the motion should be written in future tense and Senator S. Simon agreed. Senators discussed the complexities, legalities and annoyances relating to publishing policies & procedures on-line. Concerns from senators were raised, ranging from minor office procedures to the policies and guidelines for promotion and tenure. Senator S. Simon noted that codification of policies & procedures was necessary. Senator Bortz underscored his concerns about a need for policies & procedures in order to protect faculty. Senator Bortz also expressed it was "important to have certain written things to protect faculty members and to protect democratic and scholarly institutions." Senator Bortz recommended the motion be given to a committee that had experience dealing with mistreatment of faculty. Senators continued to discuss the details and complexities of the motion. Senator S. Simon suggested amending the motion. Senator Koch suggested withdrawing the motion. As the discussion carried on, Chair Gates announced that due to the number of comments and the range of comments, the motion should be withdrawn and go to the Welfare & Morale Committee. Senator S. Simon withdrew motion #4 and said, "I think Jeff (Senator Bortz) has some very valid points. There’s a lot of things I don’t agree with, but I do agree with you (Senator Bortz) on this. I want that for the record." Senator Moore agreed with Chair Gates on sending the motion to go to a larger committee. Senator Bortz stressed that entire departments have collapsed due to a lack of enforcement and rules, therefore departments needed policies & procedures to avoid future complications. Chair Gates agreed the motion was of importance and needed to be addressed in the future.

B. WELFARE & MORALE COMMITTEE –REPORT
FS02-03/01-05- Appalachian House – D.C. Campus Housing Facility Resolution-*
Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate supports earmarking a line item in the Capital Campaign for monies to be allotted specifically for the purchasing and renovation of an off campus housing facility on Capitol Hill in Washington D.C. That estimated dollar amount is $2,000,000.00. (*this motion was introduced as "New Business" by the Chair during the meeting)
Senator Yaukey presented a motion created by Mick Kreszock and herself. Senator Yaukey revealed concern because the App House would no longer be available. According to Senator Yaukey, two faculty members’ positions at the App House (slated to run the house in Fall 2003 and Spring 2004) have been canceled. Senator Yaukey directed concerns and questions about the fate of the App House to Provost Durham. Provost Durham divulged reasons for the scheduled November 30, 2003 termination of the App House’s lease. Provost Durham noted the poor condition of the App House. He also explained that Amherst College (the App House’s lessor) is renovating the Folger-Shakespeare Library. Therefore, Amherst College will need their leased space back to be used as office space during the library’s two-year renovation period. Provost Durham also mentioned that Amherst College is interested in leasing the space back to ASU after their library’s renovations have been completed. Provost Durham expressed concern that if ASU gives up Amherst’s offer to re-lease the building, then ASU may be in jeopardy of losing their much-needed boarding permit. Senator Yaukey asked about the Capital Campaign in regards to funding a new space for the App House. Senators discussed the utilization and implementation of Capital Campaign funding. Provost Durham explained that, due to current economics, many pledged funds have been “stretched out” (for example: a 3-year pledge may be stretched into 5 years) therefore diluting the estimated $43 million in assets which have been pledged to the foundation but not yet collected. Provost Durham suggested senators invite foundation representatives to present a more specific report to the Senate. Senator S. Simon verbally requested the Faculty Senate invite the foundation for a report on this matter.

Amendments to the proposed resolution were suggested by Senator Woodworth, Chair Gates and Senator Bortz. It was finally agreed that Senator Bortz’s verbal version of the amended resolution would be voted on by senators. Chair Gates called for a vote on the amended resolution. There were no objections.

VOTE 9. FS02-03/01-05- Appalachian House – D.C. Off-Campus Housing Facility Resolution as Amended-
Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate strongly urges the administration to exercise all efforts to continue to maintain an ASU facility on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C.

19 YES 0 NO 0 ABSTAIN
The resolution passed.

C. Ad-hoc Committee’s report on Appalachian Attractiveness – Senator Truett gave a brief report. She was pleased to announce that the Hubbard Center incorporated her committee’s recommendations on its web site.

D. Ad-hoc Committee’s report on Deans’ Evaluations – The report was postponed due to Senator Butts’ excused absence. Senator Bortz made a point of stressing the Dean’s Evaluations should not be “kept secret.” Senator S. Simon made a motion to adjourn and Senator Marking seconded the motion.
Dear Mr. Wilcox:

As the Board of Trustees prepares to meet next week to consider the recommendations of the Football Opportunities Committee Report, I feel it necessary to write to express an opposing view. In extensive discussions with several groups and many individuals over the last few weeks, I have concluded that there is very little support on campus for most of the plans contained in the report. Further, it appears that what support there is comes primarily from off-campus and from a small, but apparently influential, group of alumni. This group is attempting to force a change in the University which is unwanted by a majority of the campus community.

The most astonishing aspect of this plan is its shamelessly poor timing. The Appalachian State University community has just begun to absorb the affects of this year’s reduced legislative appropriation and we are bracing for even further cuts during the Spring semester. To make matters worse, all signs point to a continuing deterioration of the North Carolina economy in
2003, and this month’s legislative elections give no reason to hope for other than further cuts for the 2003-2004 academic year.

Given our pressing academic needs, all 19 members of the Faculty Senate who have expressed an opinion have strongly opposed plans to spend more than $30 million on athletic improvements. From the faculty perspective, athletics are only complementary to academics and are not a part of the University’s function of educating North Carolina’s young people. A student fee increase for such an ancillary purpose emphasizes the wrong priorities for the University and runs counter to the University’s mission.

The students themselves also oppose a 16.5% increase which would vault Appalachian’s athletic fee to the second-highest in the UNC system. The majority of this increase would directly benefit less than 4.5% of the on-campus student body, but further squeeze a much larger group of students also facing the probability of further steep tuition increases for the foreseeable future.

There is also considerable concern that, since overall fees to the students would not increase next year under this plan, other fee-supported needs will be deferred to the following year. Attempting to meet those needs this year would encourage deficit spending, eating into reserves in student development accounts. Whether foregone or drained from reserves, those funds will have to be recaptured the following year, forcing a much larger than normal fee increase for 2004-2005.

Other consequences of this overall fee plan include a reduction in working hours for students whose campus jobs are supported by non-athletic student activity fees. There will also likely be fewer recreational and other extracurricular opportunities for all students who participate in those activities which would not enjoy the benefit of the typically modest 5% annual increase in general fees instead.

The use of institutional funds, whether collected from the students or provided by the Legislature, to improve athletic facilities so dramatically in a difficult fiscal environment while other needs go unmet, send the wrong message. Please help keep Appalachian’s priorities straight and vote against an irresponsible fund-raising and spending scheme.

On behalf of the faculty, thank you for all you do for Appalachian.

Very truly yours,

Paul H. Gates, Jr., J.D., Ph.D.
Chair, Faculty Senate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Senator</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABBOTT, JOHN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN, PATRICIA (excused)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON, STELLA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNOLD, CHIP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORTZ, JEFF</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH, ROBERT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTTS, JEFF (excused)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATES, PAUL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALL, KIM</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNEDY, KEVIN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOCH, ANDREW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMBERT, MONICA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKING, MARTHA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinney, Harold</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millsaps, Steve</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, Michael</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muir, Ken</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson, George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rardin, Patrick</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon, Kathleen</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon, Steve</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VOTE 1: Motion to approve the amended & revised November 11th minutes.
VOTE 2: Motion to approve the amended & corrected December 9th minutes.
VOTE 3: Call for the question.
VOTE 4: Motion FS02-03/01-01- Regarding Review of Administrators as Amended
VOTE 5: Call for the question.
VOTE 6: FS02-03/01-02- Motion Regarding Annual Report Form
VOTE 7: Call for the question.
VOTE 8: FS02-03/01-03- Motion Regarding Advisory Boards have Written Bylaws as Amended
VOTE 9: FS02-03/01-05- Appalachian House - D.C. Campus Housing Facility Resolution as Amended
VOTE 10: Motion to Adjourn.

VISITORS: Bobby Sharp, Director of Institutional Research, Assessment & Planning, Dr. Lorin Baumhover, Chair of Sociology & Social Work, Cindy Wallace, Acting Associate Vice-Chancellor for Enrollment Services (members of the Provost Search Committee).
Jennifer Ware, Staff Council, Harry L. Williams, Associate Vice-Chancellor for Diversity