At 3:16 p.m. on January 14, 2002, Chair Weitz convened the Faculty Senate meeting in the University Conference Room (224 Greer Hall).

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   A. VISITORS. Weitz welcomed visitors and asked that they introduce themselves. (See voting sheet for visitors’ names.)
   B. NEW LIBRARY UPDATE. Mary Reichel and Larry Boyer updated the Senate on the status of the new library. A similar presentation given at the last Board of Trustees meeting by Boyer was also given to the Senate. Boyer noted that Belk Library was built in 1968 and remodeled and expanded in 1980. It currently has around 140,000 square feet of which around 100,000 are usable. It seats 900 readers and has about 45 computer workstations. There are around 650,000 volumes and is at 85-90% capacity. In 1996, the Task Force looked at several options such as expanding the current library or building a new one. The Administration decided on building a new library and the passing of the bond referendum of November 2000 made it possible. In May 2001, the architectural firm of Pease Associates of Charlotte, in partnership with Shepley, Bulfinch, Richardson & Abbott (SBRA) of Boston, was selected to design and build the new facility. SBRA has done the libraries at Elon University and UNC-Charlotte. Right now, the new library is in the schematic design phase (November 2001-February 2002). The next phases are design development (March-May 2002), development of construction documents (June-November 2002), bid period (February 2003), construction (March 2003-April 2005), and the final move (Summer/Fall 2005). The new library is proposed to go where the current Whitener parking lot is. After the final move, Belk library will be renovated and those areas in Whitener Hall will be moved to Belk and Whitener will be torn down and replaced with a 3-story parking deck.

   The new library will have approximately 213,000 square feet (149,000 assigned usable) and reading space for 1800, which is shy of one standard to provide spaces for 20% of the student population. The building is being kept as flexible as possible.

   Yaukey asked if there will be any more meetings for faculty to give input. Boyer replied that there will be one held next month for faculty, staff, and students. Reichel will let Moore know when and where so that this information can be inserted in the minutes.

   For further information, go to http://www.library.appstate.edu/lib/newlibrary/

   C. STAFF COUNCIL COOKBOOK. Weitz informed the Senate that the Staff Council is selling cookbooks as a fund raiser for scholarships, etc. The cost is $10. To obtain a cookbook, faculty can contact Peggy Ellis, President of Staff Council (Political Science/Criminal Justice-#3184), Amy Greer (English-#3098), Connie Noble (University Advancement-#2039), Melanie Edmisten (Intramural Sports-#2100), and Sharon Kincaid (Technology-#3110). When ordering a cookbook, please let the contact person know if you would like it delivered.

   D. SPRING SEMESTER MEETINGS
      1. Chancellor’s Advisory meetings. Weitz noted that the Spring Chancellor Advisory meetings will be held on January 28th at 3:30 and April 15th at 3:30. The Academic Policy Committee and the Committee on Committees will attend the January meeting and the Campus Planning and Welfare of Students Committees will attend the April meeting. Weitz asked that if
anyone has any questions for either of these meetings, to forward them to her a week prior to the meeting so that she can email the questions to the Chancellor prior to the meeting. Weitz added that impromptu questions are welcomed, too.

2. Board of Trustees meeting. Weitz noted that the next Board of Trustees meeting is Friday, March 22nd at 8:30 a.m. at the Broyhill Inn. Weitz encouraged any senator who is interested to attend but asked that at least one person from each Faculty Senate committee attend a respective sub-committee meeting.

E. FACULTY SENATE/AAUP FORUM. Weitz reported that on Friday, January 25th at 2:00 p.m. in Greer Auditorium, a forum sponsored by the Faculty Senate and AAUP will be held to continue the discussion on academic freedom and freedom of speech. An announcement will be going out shortly.

Weitz welcomed Jerry Fox back to the Senate. He will be serving as a replacement for the Spring Semester for Stella Anderson and will serve on the Committee on Committees.

II. MINUTES

Simon moved and Allen seconded to approve the December 3 minutes as written.

VOTE # 1 25 yes 0 no 0 abstain The motion passed.

Weitz noted that she asked Parliamentarian Gates to check into the dilemma the Senate may get itself into where the hand count does not match the tally count. It is the tally count that is binding and this is not known until after the meeting and the votes are tallied. Weitz asked senators not to change their hand count or the tally count will be done away with. Gates added that if the tally count is done away with, a roll call will have to take its place in order to continue the practice of recording in the minutes votes by senators. Weitz noted that that process would be time consuming.

III. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE

1. Non-tenure Track Faculty Committee Report. Weitz reported that she was charged with looking at the Non-tenure Track Faculty Committee and noted that Diane Sides, chair of the Non-tenure Track Faculty Committee, was in attendance. Weitz asked Sides what were the Committee’s concerns and how the Senate can help with them. Sides responded that non-tenure track faculty would like a yearly contract and to have benefits. Weitz noted that she has met with John Turner who is part of a system-wide committee dealing with non-tenure track faculty issues. This committee has looked at information from all 16 UNC schools and will have a report and recommendations out in February. Weitz noted she will share that report when it comes out. Turner echoed the same concerns Sides mentioned. It is hoped that the system-wide committee’s recommendations have some teeth to them.

Weitz asked Durham about offering one-year contracts as opposed to one semester contracts; would doing this invoke benefits problems. Durham responded that a year’s contract would be acceptable if department chairs know in advance they are going to need that person for the year. Weitz asked if communication could go forward to the department chairs that they can extend a full year’s contract.

Weitz suggested that Sides and Weitz go before the Council of Chairs with the Committee’s
report so that the chairs receive the information first-hand.

Weitz added that there are differing interpretations of the Faculty Handbook as to who is eligible to vote and serve on committees. Weitz suggested that it needs to be clarified to chairs and faculty who is eligible for what.

McLaughlin noted that probably one of the reasons why there is a system-wide committee is that there are concerns about the numbers of sections covered by part-time faculty. McLaughlin asked Durham if those numbers concerned him. Durham responded that they did, but that it would be very difficult to do anything about it. It would be hard to give full-time faculty release time without part-time faculty picking up the load.

Yaukey noted that a concern she has is that part-time faculty, in an interest to participate more in their department, will end up taking on greater responsibility with no pay-off. Chairs could expect such service as a part of employment.

Bush asked if it was written somewhere what the definition of and differences of full-time non-tenure track faculty and full-time tenure track faculty is. Weitz responded that there was—in the finance section of the Office of the President. Weitz noted that she is advocating that a definition section be placed in the Faculty Handbook.

**Non-tenure track faculty committee report**

Bill Barber is the faculty senator working with the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee. He is unaware of any meetings of this committee. I talked with Diane Sides, Chair of the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee and John Turner, member of the Office of the President’s task force on Non-Tenure Track Faculty.

Diane said that last year all non-tenure track faculty were surveyed, and two forums were held to discuss issues and concerns. (A similar forum for non-tenure track faculty will be held February 14th from 8:30 to 9:30 in room 154 of Whitener.) As a result, several recommendations were made to the Provost. Here is a summary of those recommendations and the Provost’s responses:

- Form a Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee in every department (Deans are giving this further thought.)
- Remind chairs that some non-tenure track faculty do qualify for merit raises (Deans are aware of this.)
- Have a Non-Tenure Track Faculty Appreciation Day (Each college/school will have such a day.)
- Have all colleges/schools have a teaching award for non-tenure track faculty (Arts and Sciences does, School of music opens teaching awards to all, and other three colleges are developing procedures for a non-tenure track teaching award.)
- Use some of the tuition increase money for non-tenure track faculty. (Actually, part-time faculty received a 4% increase from these funds.)
- Work to extend health insurance to all those teaching at least half-time. (The Provost is working on this.)

Diane added that non-tenure track faculty would like to have a one-year vs. a one-semester contract. In addition, she submitted some changes for the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee, which I presume will come forward from the Committee on Committees.
John has been part of a system-wide look at non-tenure track faculty. 
http://www.charlotte.com/observer/natwor/docs/adjunct1217.htm
His committee’s report to the Board of Governors will be out in February. He will give us a copy.

His committee cited five major concerns of non-tenure track faculty:
Contracts and benefits, Ranks and expectations, Salaries, Lack of participation in faculty governance, and Quality of life issues (offices, phones, travel money, etc.). He was hoping the report would have some teeth to it.

2. Student Grade Appeals Process. Simon reported that Bill Ward is rewriting a clearer description of the grade appeal process. If any faculty have any questions about the process, direct them towards Ward. Weitz will distribute to senators a copy of Ward’s draft to review and ask for colleague comments.

B. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
1. Faculty volunteers for Deans’ evaluations. Butts reported that a call for volunteers went out in early December, but that he has only received three faculty volunteers. Weitz said that another request will go out.

Weitz gave a report on status of the deans’ evaluations. The evaluations will be taking place the first week in February and that it is an electronic survey. It will be sent to all faculty (except non-tenure track teaching less than 6 hours, adjuncts, and emeriti). Those faculty who have graduate faculty status will also have the opportunity to evaluate the Graduate School dean.

Weitz mentioned to Butts that the ad-hoc committee may be reconvened to come up with a shorter, more concise, and less ambiguous survey for the next go around.

C. CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE
1. Free parking. Abbott reminded that at the last meeting, a motion regarding free parking for faculty on campus was tabled until this meeting. Abbott reported that in speaking with Jane Helm, the State does not provide funding for parking—all maintenance of parking is paid for by fees and fines. McKinney moved to remove the motion from the table. (Motion: That for faculty to work at Appalachian they need a place to work. Therefore, faculty should be provided with free parking.)

VOTE 2 23 yes 0 no 2 abstain The motion passed.

Discussion followed. An amendment was made to include staff. Fox noted that he would like to see parking fees waived for staff. Bush noted that he is on the Traffic Management and Safety Committee, which is working on the price of the new parking deck. If faculty and staff parking fees will not be included for funding/maintaining the deck, the Committee needs to know that. Allen called for the question.

VOTE 3 5 yes 20 no 0 abstain The question was not passed.

An amendment to base parking on a percentage of one’s salary was rejected by McKinney. After further discussion, Moore called for the question.

VOTE 4 21 yes 4 no 0 abstain The question passed.
A vote was taken on the motion as amended: Faculty and staff be provided free parking at Appalachian State University.

VOTE 5  6 yes  15 no  4 abstain  The motion failed.

2. **Ad-hoc Space Committee.** Weitz submitted a report on the Committee's composition and charge. One can keep up with their agenda and minutes via their [webpage](#).

**Ad-hoc Space Committee charge and members**

Members:
- Marianne Adams
- John Abbott
- Linda Bennett
- Sammie Garner
- Dave Haney
- Howie Neufeld
- Stuart Towns
- Gayle Weitz

The charge is:
1) To examine Appalachian's decision-making process in regards to land utilization/acquisition, building renovation/construction/acquisition, and space allocation/utilization, and
2) To make recommendations, if need be, regarding the role faculty should play in this process, given the University's primary mission of the "practice and propagation of scholarship," a mission for which the faculty are uniquely qualified and responsible.

**D. WELFARE AND MORALE**

Report. Weitz noted that Arnold will temporarily be chair of the Committee.

**E. BUDGET COMMITTEE**

Report. Petschauer reported that the Committee has not had a chance to meet and draft a report.

**F. AGENDA COMMITTEE**

1. **Senate meetings.** Weitz called attention to the meeting dates for this semester:
   - February 11, March 18, April 8, and May 6.
2. **Reports/motions due.** February 4, March 8, April 1, and April 29
3. **Electronic voting.** Weitz moved that college and university elections be done electronically. SGA already has electronic voting. Voting can be done anonymously and only once (password). Simon seconded. Notification for electronic voting will go out electronically and via paper mail.

VOTE 6  25 yes  0 no  0 abstain  The motion passed.

**G. FACULTY HANDBOOK COMMITTEE**

Update. Weitz noted that everything in the Faculty Handbook has been approved by the Board of Trustees and that Durham and Parker will be presenting Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook to the General Administration on January 18 for its approval. Once Chapter 3 is approved, the whole Handbook will become a living electronic document which we will be able to be update much more readily. Durham added that Bataille has several suggestions for the
H. WELFARE OF STUDENTS COMMITTEE
   No report.
I. AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON DPCs
   Report forthcoming by spring break.
J. AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON WORKLOAD IMPLEMENTATION
   Report forthcoming by spring break.

IV. OLD BUSINESS
   A. ATHLETIC POSITION STATEMENT. Weitz reported that NCAA will be changing
   its criteria for I-A and that if these changes take place, Appalachian would never qualify. Barber
   responded that this is not entirely accurate. He noted that NCAA will be meeting in April to
   consider several options and one of the options is to upgrade the requirements of I-A so
   Appalachian is still not in the clear yet, though it is looking like it is.
   Weitz added that the faculty sentiment still is, as it was four years ago, not to move to a I-A
   classification. Weitz asked for an official endorsement of the proposed document by the Senate
   so that the Chancellor and others can know what the faculty position is on this issue. Simon
   moved and Barber seconded to endorse the document.

   VOTE 7  25 yes  0 no  0 abstain  The motion passed.

   B. AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON IMPROVING APPALACHIAN’S
   ATTRACTION. Truett distributed a report naming committee members and the
   committee’s charge. Hall asked that students be included in #3 of the report.

   Committee Chair:  Dr. Carol Truett
   Committee Co-Chair:  Dr. Peter Petschauer

   Committee Members:
   Dr. Mary Valante, History
   Dr. Steve Bronack, Leadership and Educational Studies
   Ms. Vicki Clift, Art
   Ms. Gail Hearn, Chancellor’s Office

   Other community people will be consulted as needed including bankers, realtors, ASU
   Foundation personnel, Jane Helm’s office, loan officers, Hubbard Center, etc.

   The Committee’s Charge will be to:
   1. Explore housing alternatives and issues and recommend possible solutions given the high cost
      of housing in this area for both new and continuing faculty and staff members at Appalachian.
      This may include such programs as alternative and/or university owned housing (e.g., one
      building at University Courtland reserved for faculty), first time home owner mortgage plans,
      other low cost mortgage programs, etc.
2. Explore ways to aid and assist faculty and staff partners in seeking employment in the Boone area which lesson the effects of underemployment for highly qualified and educated dual career couples and suggest strategies to departments recruiting such couples.

3. Identify some additional new strategies for diversity and minority recruitment which will increase the attractiveness of Appalachian for minority faculty, staff, and students, including, but not necessarily limited to, the above two areas.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Evaluation of Deans. Weitz asked senators to consult with colleagues about volunteering to serve on the evaluations of deans committees. The whole process should be completed by the end of February.

B. Diversity. Weitz reported that she had invited Barbara Daye to present a video that a student did as a class project in conjunction with Student Development that deals with minority students views of faculty and what it is like to be in classrooms, but Chancellor Borkowski presented the video at the spring term General Faculty Meeting so she decided not to show it today. There seemed to be sufficient interest among senators, so Weitz noted that the 13 minute video will be shown at 3:00 p.m. prior to the February Faculty Senate meeting. Diversity is the Chancellor's number one concern. A web site dealing with diversity put out by the University of Maryland can be found at http://www.diversityweb.org/ Weitz noted that part of the problem at Appalachian, as well as other places, is the lack of a concerted effort to deal with this issue. Faculty could be the link to make a more concerted effort, but that they need to be convinced of the benefits of diversifying not only students, faculty and staff, but also the curriculum. Weitz asked senators to consult the diversity web site by the next meeting so that senators could brainstorm what faculty can do to influence diversity on campus and coordinate efforts on campus.

C. Dialog component on Senate web page. Allen noted that there seems to be a lot of miscommunication and misinformation on campus. Allen suggested that the Faculty Senate web site have a page where frequently asked questions can be posted and addressed. Weitz and Allen will get together to further discuss the idea and have a draft by the next meeting.

Ideas for Staff/Faculty Q&A Website

Purpose: Provide online means of checking out information related to ASU.

Rationale: Many of the problems that arise on campus are due to miscommunication issues. At present, there is not a forum whereby staff and faculty can deal with the number of rumors floating around campus. An online forum run by Faculty Senate can help to reduce some of this miscommunication by making public the latest information and/or locations for obtaining correct information.

Proposal: Online, web-based system separate from Campus Pipeline whereby staff and faculty can submit their questions. The answers will be posted on a separate web-page that will be routinely updated. Sections can be set aside for FAQ, or categories related to FAQ. As information is made available, this can be added to the web-site.

Benefits: 1) A reduction of the sense of helplessness often expressed by staff and faculty pertaining to not having the correct information. 2) Documentation of information provided by various sources. This should help reduce the number of situations where one campus unit says one thing and a different unit something else. 3) More publicity for information already available online.
D. Teaching evaluations. Barber noted concern from his colleagues regarding the policy with teaching evaluations. Their concerns lie with access to the evaluations, the lack of trust, and the cost for making copies. Weitz reiterated that the policy of evaluations being university property is not new, but rather poorly communicated. Gates clarified that the Senate’s previous motion stated that though the original evaluations are housed within the department for five years, faculty have free access to the evaluations. Butts was concerned with how quickly faculty see the evaluations; results need to be returned to the faculty in a timely fashion so that faculty can use the results. Weitz asked the Academic Policy Committee to look into the concerns raised, such as what happens to evaluations after five years; how soon are the results shared with faculty; what about evaluations that faculty do on their own for formative purposes; what about evaluations that were done for a faculty member who has, after three years, left the university; is there any way the evaluations can be done and stored electronically.

E. Convocation Center. Abbott noted that he has received feedback from faculty about the process by which faculty and staff have access to the track in the Convocation Center--faculty and staff are not trusted to use the facility.

McKinney noted that new faculty who have come to Appalachian are shocked that faculty have to pay to access the Quinn Center and for other perks. This issue was given to the Ad-hoc Committee on Appalachian’s Attractiveness.

Simon moved to adjourn and Allen seconded.

VOTE 8 23 yes 0 no 0 abstain The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 5:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Moore

Faculty Position Statement on Athletics at Appalachian State University

Appalachian State University is a comprehensive institution with a strong reputation for academic excellence at the undergraduate level. It has consistently received national recognition for its concern for student living and learning. The Appalachian faculty take pride in and support this mission.

The Appalachian Department of Athletics also supports this mission. Under the leadership of Athletics Director Roachel Laney, the department has placed strong emphasis on the word "student" in the phrase “student-athlete,” and seeks to ensure that all student-athletes have the opportunity to receive a solid undergraduate education. Every effort is made to "mainstream" student-athletes into the general student body so that student-athletes can benefit from a strong undergraduate education. The athletics program offers 20 intercollegiate sports, 10 for women and 10 for men. The overall graduation rate among the athletes who participate in these 20 sports consistently hovers close to the graduation rate of the undergraduate student body as a
whole. In the Department of Athletics’ Five-Year Strategic Plan, a primary goal is to improve the already strong graduation rate among athletes.

Appalachian faculty endorse a strong academic focus for all student-athletes and support a broad-based athletics program geared to providing opportunities to student-athletes in many sports, the mainstreaming of student-athletes, and the commitment to providing the means necessary to maintain the graduation rate for student-athletes the same as for all students.

Appalachian faculty overwhelmingly oppose moving to I-A football. This conclusion is based on a 1999 Faculty Senate survey in which 98% voted against the move, with 60% of the full-time faculty participating. This issue generated the highest rate of participation by the faculty in a poll of any kind in recent years. Faculty believe that moving the level of competition for our football program to the Division I-A level would seriously weaken both the well-being of our athletes, especially those in football, and of our overall athletics program. Also, the ripple effect of such a move would negatively affect the entire athletics program and the whole university. There are numerous reasons for this strong faculty concern about moving the football program to the I-A level.

The specifics of these concerns are focused in three areas: academics, finances, and program philosophy.

**Academic Reasons for Opposing a Move to I-A Football**

- Appalachian State University is a public comprehensive university offering a wide variety of degree programs at the baccalaureate, master’s and intermediate levels, as well as the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership. With a distinctively residential campus and a high-quality faculty and staff with a broad range of professional skills, Appalachian takes as its mission the practice and propagation of scholarship. This is accomplished primarily through instruction, but also through the research, creative and services activities of the university community. Appalachian is committed to excellence in its undergraduate and graduate educational programs while continuing to serve as a center of cultural and professional activity within the state and region. Athletics should be part of a complete university academic experience, however, they should neither be of primary concern nor be organized as to be detrimental to the experience.

- Appalachian’s mission of practicing and fostering scholarship is achieved through excellence in teaching and research, not through athletic programs. According to Indiana University President Myles Brand, "Athletic success cannot substitute for academic success. Universities must be seen and understood and judged by their achievements as academic institutions and not as sports franchises."

- Division I-A football creates a pressured athletic environment in which players tend to be viewed as athletes first and as students second. Their entrance requirements are lower, their use of remedial programs is greater, more of their time is spent on athletics than academics, and their classroom performance is inferior to that of the student body at large. These factors have been cited by The Drake Group, a group of professors at Division I-A institutions who want college faculties to reclaim control over the academic prospects of athletes and who outlined the group’s position in the February 23, 2001 issue of The Chronicle of Higher Education.
Appalachian has consistently maintained a high graduation rate for its student-athletes. During the past three years, the graduation rate at Appalachian for all students has ranged, by year, from 59.3% to 61.9%. The graduation rate for student-athletes receiving financial aid has ranged, by year, from 58.5% to 64.8%. Pressures to produce winning teams that are exerted on all athletics programs moving from the Division I-AA level to I-A are enormous. It would become considerably more difficult for Appalachian to maintain a graduation rate for its student-athletes that is comparable to that of its overall student body. To mainstream student-athletes and emphasize their receiving a quality education has long been the cornerstone of Appalachian’s athletics program within the university’s mission as a comprehensive state university. Moving to Division I-A would pose a major threat to that key element in Appalachian’s mission.

Academic programs should never compete with athletic programs, but Division I-A football programs do compete with academic programs. (Murray Sperber, Beer and Circus: How Big-time College Sports is Crippling Undergraduate Education, 2000.) Our current athletics program, under the direction of Roachel Laney, seeks to find balance between athletics and academics in line with the mission of the university. Due to the long history of incompatibility of academics and athletics at nationally ranked NCAA Division I-A institutions (see James L. Shulman and William G. Bowen, The Game of Life, 2001) the faculty oppose moving to a I-A football classification.

Financial Reasons for Opposing a Move to I-A Football

- As revealed in the Carr Report, a 1999 study commissioned by the Appalachian State University Board of Trustees to study the future of athletics at the university, Appalachian has neither the money to enlarge the stadium nor the funds to annually sustain a Division I-A program. The immediate costs of a move to I-A football would exceed $17 million, including $10.2 million for expansion of Kidd Brewer Stadium and $4.4 million for an addition to Owens Field House. Annual expenses for personnel and football operations would be about $2.47 million initially, and would most likely increase yearly thereafter.
- Home games will not generate enough gate revenue. We don’t even meet the current minimum paid attendance requirement of 17,000 seats sold per game for four consecutive years, and it is highly unlikely that Appalachian could attract enough spectators to meet the minimum attendance requirements given our remote location.
- Until Fall 2001, Academic Affairs subsidized our athletic program by appropriating teaching faculty salary monies to pay athletic coaches. Over the past decade, the faculty at Appalachian lost approximately $6.7 million in funds designated for faculty salaries to subsidize revenue shortfalls in athletics. At our present level of I-AA, our athletic program has only recently been
able barely to pay its own way; it is clear that any move to a more expensive program risks negatively affecting academics and academic faculty.

- Changing the current football competition classification to I-A will create an enormous increase in expenses for football, but also increase expenses for other sports. Under Title IX, a university has to show a reasonable proportionality in expenditures between men's and women's athletics programs, and a dramatic increase in funds devoted to men's sports, specifically in football, will mandate a major increase in expenditures for women's athletics. This will include additional scholarships for women, an upgrade of women's facilities, an increase in travel allocations to women's teams, increases in recruitment budgets and coaches' salaries, etc. Thus, one cannot just talk about what it would cost to move only football to Division I-A. The ripple effect of such a move would be felt throughout the athletics department and would require an increase in nearly every part of the entire athletics department budget.

- Movement to a Division I-A football conference will dramatically increase the level of competition in all sports programs, and that will necessitate a major influx of funds to both men's and women's sports other than football if they are to be competitive in the context of a new I-A conference.

- A Division I-A program in football would negatively affect many other programs on campus, such as minority scholarships, international travel, and community service. Appalachian currently has 8,000 students involved in intramural athletics (approximately 64% of the student body), and offers more than 60 team and individual sports for both men and women. Club Sports consists of 18 clubs, which offer athletic experiences such as fencing and ice hockey, activities not offered as varsity sports or by any other organization in the local area. Aquatics offers water-based programming such as free swim, swimming lessons, and team training sessions in the university pool. Last year students made more than 182,000 visits to the Quinn Recreation Center, which houses the fitness center. Focusing on Division I-A football would shift resources away from these programs and deprive students and faculty of opportunities to participate in these important, healthy activities.

- Most I-A football programs do not make money. Only NCAA "star schools" turn a profit (see the Carr Report, Appendix F, Section IV). More than half of I-A schools require higher levels of expenditure on athletics than the programs' revenue can cover (The Chronicle of Higher Education, November 21, 1997, p. A41).

- Having a I-A football program does not increase overall alumni gifts to the institution. In 1999, U.S. News and World Report ranked 200 American universities in alumni giving. Universities with the highest alumni donations tended to be those that provided a quality undergraduate education. Only four I-A football schools - Notre Dame, Stanford, Duke and Rice - were among the top 20 universities in alumni giving. These schools concentrate first on providing their undergraduates with a high-quality education, which in turn results in their alumni getting good jobs - that's what they come to a university for that's what generates their loyalty and donations. Big schools with major football programs, such as Michigan, Wisconsin, and Texas, which one would expect to overwhelm smaller schools just by their sheer numbers of alumni donors, all finished between No. 120 and No. 150 on the list (Sperber, Beer and Circus: How Big-time College Sports is Crippling Undergraduate Education, 2000).
The timing of this proposal could not be worse. The state is $850 million in the red and Appalachian might give up as much as $5.7 million from its current year’s budget. These cuts to existing academic programs and positions must be resolved before even considering Division I-A football.

The NCAA is presently studying the status and structure of Division I-A football, which makes the requirements for admission to that level uncertain. There is a high probability that reorganization will occur within the next three years and that this will also affect the current Division I-AA structure. Obviously, it would be inadvisable to even consider a move to Division I-A before the new structure, organization, and requirements of that level are defined. One example of the type of requirement that could significantly affect Appalachian’s participation at the I-A level is the requirement of a minimum actual attendance at football games rather than minimum ticket sales, which are relatively easy to manipulate. Even as a contender for I-AA supremacy, it would be difficult for Appalachian to meet the minimum attendance requirements. If Appalachian were to move to the Division I-A level, and if that move were to reduce the number of traditional rivals scheduled for home games, it would become even less likely that Appalachian could meet the minimum attendance standard.

Overall, most I-A football programs drain the institutions’ finances and offer few benefits in return. For financial reasons alone, the faculty oppose moving to Division I-A football.

Other Reasons for Opposing a Move to I-A Football

- The centuries-old concept of a sound mind is a sound body applies to the relationship between Appalachian’s academic and athletic programs. Athletic dollars are best spent to improve the physical and mental well being of all students, which is more effectively accomplished through intramural programs than through spectator sports. The entertainment pay-off resulting from Division I-A football is of highly questionable value to the students and the university.
- Appalachian is the third most popular school in the UNC system, averaging five applications for every available spot. The claimed marketing benefits of a Division I-A football program are unnecessary here. Appalachian attracts students who know it by its academic reputation. We do not want students to select us because of a higher-profile Division I-A football team.
- Appalachian does not need publicity from Division I-A football to enhance its reputation. Appalachian was selected "College of the Year" in the September 10, 2001 issue of Time Magazine for excellence as a living-learning community. Other national publications such as U.S. News & World Report consistently cite Appalachian for its excellent education and value.
- The University of North Carolina Board of Governors gives authority to make intercollegiate athletic decisions to the Boards of Trustees of the individual constituent institutions. Appalachian’s Board of Trustees approves and endorses our current athletic program, its
Appalachian’s current athletic program, under the direction of Roachel Laney, complements Appalachian’s educational mission. Appalachian faculty are satisfied with the present athletic administration, and because of the excessive costs and potential to harm academics, faculty oppose moving ASU football from Division I-AA to Division I-A.

---
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voting symbols:  Y = yes       N - no       A = abstain

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABBOTT, JOHN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN, PATRICIA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNOLD, CHIP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBER, BILL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSH, ROBERT</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTTS, JEFF</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROCKER, DEBORAH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOX, JERRY</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATES, PAUL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOCH, ANDY</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG, BETTY</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCLAUDE, MARTHA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCLAUDE, HAROLD</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCLAUDE, TOM</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLSAPS, STEVE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORE, MIKE</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUIR, KEN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VISITORS: Larry Boyer, Library; Michael Lane, Foreign Languages and Literatures; Mary Reichel, Library; Diane Sides, Foreign Languages and Literatures; Bill Ward, Academic Affairs; Nathan Winkler, student.

VOTE 1: Approve December 3 minutes as written
VOTE 2: Remove free parking motion from the table
VOTE 3: Call for the question
VOTE 4: Call for the question
VOTE 5: Vote on free parking motion
VOTE 6: Motion that college and university elections be done electronically
VOTE 7: Motion to endorse the Athletic Position Statement (I-A classification)
VOTE 8: Adjourn
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