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Call to Order

The meeting of the Academic Senate was called to order by Chairperson Cohen at 7:00 p.m. in Stevenson 401.

Roll Call

The Secretary called the roll and declared a quorum to be present.

Approval of Minutes

A motion (Upton/Carey) to approve the minutes of the November 2, 1977 Senate meeting with the following correction was made. Mr. Carey stated that he did not remember raising the question on page 2, the last paragraph, about how acceptance of the proposal would change what is going on right now in the Speech Communication Education major. The minutes were approved as corrected.

Chairperson’s Remarks

Mr. Cohen stated he had been requested by the College of Continuing Education to submit a list of priorities for the Committee on Community and Campus Programs which was established in 1973. He has created a committee that will counsel him in drawing up these priorities; the committee’s members are Tom Wilson, Bob Sutherland, Vernon Pohlmann, Charlotte Upton, Elwood Egelston, and Mr. Cohen himself.

Mr. Cohen also spoke briefly on the procedures to be followed for those elected to the Ethics and Grievance Committee. He stated the eleven people elected recently will draw lots to determine who will serve for three years and who will serve for two years. In June, the Senate will elect seven people to the Committee, six for a three year term, and one for a two year term. These procedures will be considered the will of the Academic Senate when Mr. Cohen meets with the Ethics and Grievance Committee unless there is objection. There was no objection, and it will be so considered.

Administrators’ Remarks

Provost Horner spoke briefly on the Budget Team’s procedures. The Team is currently dealing with the procedures for allocation for the next fiscal year and with writing up those procedures for wide distribution on campus.

Provost Horner then spoke extensively on the controversial registration process involving the College of Business which has resulted in a number of students being turned away from business courses. In explaining why this situation exists, he stated the University has had a long range commitment to gain American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) accreditation for the College of Business. The AACSB accreditation visit is scheduled for this coming February. The AACSB has standards that are very precise on faculty-student ratio. At the same
time enrollment projections for business courses have proved to be too low; demand for business courses has exceeded expectation. ISU has never previously reduced business class size to meet accreditation standards, but since the accreditation group will visit ISU in February, the College of Business must move toward those standards.

In explaining how AACSB standards could be met, Provost Horner explained that there were three alternatives: 1) provide additional resources to the College of Business, 2) defer accreditation, or 3) limit the numbers enrolled in business classes. Since there are no additional resources for the College and accreditation remains our goal, the latter course was chosen.

Thus, eighty sections out of 150 were limited to Business majors only. There are no courses open only to business majors where there are programmatic requirements in any other program in the University. This situation has caused two reactions: those from the students who want the classes as electives, and those students who want classes as College of Business majors.

The major portion of the problem seems to stem from how the situation was created. Poor communication has also been a major problem this registration period. Provost Horner stated, however, that better communication is not the sole long-range solution to a variety of problems. The priority was set for students who had requirements in their programs and there have been no cases where majors have been denied entrance into classes. The problem surrounds the electives. It is unfortunate not to be able to meet those needs, but it is more important to meet the required needs.

The problem of communication will be improved, the Provost stated. There are a number of departments that advise students to take electives that seem like requirements because of the emphasis placed upon them. These "required electives" cannot be planned for in the scheduling of classes. There is also a matter of human resources that cannot be filled. Another problem is that of dealing with double majors who are not listed as Business majors.

Mr. Rhodes began discussion by asking three questions that frequently had been put to the Academic Affairs Committee. How was this policy determined? How is this policy to be reviewed and changed if warranted? And what steps are being taken to prevent this situation from happening again? Provost Horner responded that in the schedule booklet, certain classes are listed as being restricted to majors and non-majors. These listings are forwarded to Department Heads, College Deans and to the Scheduling Office. Because of the time overlap, the listings did not make the schedule booklet for the semester's registration and there was a gap of notifying faculty advisors and academic advisors. Procedures concerning scheduling are discussed and debated in the Council of Deans. In order to prevent the situation from happening again, there will be efforts made to meet the needs of the students registering for College of Business courses.

Mr. Rice asked where the breakdown in communication came in not telling faculty advisors about the class changes. Provost Horner stated that it could be blamed on no one individual or office. There were a number of persons involved who can easily share the blame.

Ms. Upton asked how realistic the ratio is of faculty to students which is being
required by the accrediting body. Provost Horner replied that the standard is 400 undergraduate credit hours generated per faculty FTE and 300 graduate credit hours per faculty FTE. As to how realistic the standard is, he indicated that the College of Arts and Sciences as a whole has a very comparable ratio.

Mr. Carlile questioned the wisdom of the whole accreditation process. He felt that accreditation could be harmful to the University and that accrediting regulations will keep creeping up on ISU. He stated that the University needs to reevaluate the question of accreditation. Mr. Horner agreed that the philosophical question of accreditation is open to debate. He stated that a position has been accepted on seeking accreditation. Coming from an accredited program means a great deal to the graduate when s/he tries to get a position. This need is compounded by the fact that a great number of institutions are seeking accreditation in the state.

Mr. Goldstein stated that it appears that the process used in the present situation is such that any college can make a unilateral decision like that of the College of Business to close down courses except for majors. Mr. Horner stated that it has been done in the past. He could not argue that it was the best process. He added that the simple solution would be to increase the class size in the College of Business, but then the College would not meet accreditation standards. Mr. Goldstein next asked if the AACSB requires that all courses for majors be taken in the College of Business. Provost Horner said there is a standard on what proportion must be under the control of the College. Mr. Goldstein concluded with a statement of his feeling that courses should be taught by those in the discipline of the courses.

Mr. Hicklin observed that several universities have limited enrollment in their Colleges of Business, and Provost Horner agreed. He added that there have been efforts to limit enrollment in the College of Business at ISU.

Mr. Christiansen questioned Mr. Horner's earlier statement concerning the reactions from the students who want classes as College of Business majors. Mr. Horner stated that they were reacting to the lack of seats available in classes to meet their demands. Mr. Christiansen then asked what steps were being taken for students who are supposed to be admitted to courses as College of Business majors. Mr. Horner stated that they had been admitted, but Mr. Christiansen disagreed on the grounds of what he heard from majors that were denied admission. Mr. Horner stated that those students should contact Dean Harrison. Mr. Cooper felt the situation reflected the need for more faculty, and Provost Horner agreed that is true throughout the University.

Ms. Cook referred to the problem of double majors and asked if they were considered as those who preferred courses instead of those who required them. Mr. Horner stated that if they are not listed as Business majors they probably would be denied the courses required for their double major.

Mr. Rhodes felt it was inconsistent for AACSB to insist on faculty having no outside activities while the University to advertise that such are available to Business faculty. Ms. Patterson observed that we have little response to job listings in Business because we are not accredited.

Mr. Carlile asked a number of questions of Dean Harrison. He asked what the Dean told students when they came to his office for help in registration at this time. Dean Harrison responded that he asked them their major, how many credit hours they have accumulated, the courses they have taken, and those that they want. Then the
determination is made as to what can be done for the student. Mr. Carlile said students say they are being told nothing can be done. Dean Harrison replied that he has seen three to four hundred students and that seven out of ten have found accommodation. Mr. Carlile asked what the rationale is for not publishing the names of faculty members with their course assignments in the College of Business in the schedule booklet. He responded that these course assignments have been published when possible. The problem of not publishing the names in the schedule booklet is caused by staff assignments being made after the booklet has gone to press. The College of Business has added faculty positions so rapidly in the past few years that they have not been able to determine class assignments before the schedule booklet has gone to press.

Mr. Carey pointed out that if the College dropped accreditation, it would not change the fact that the faculty-student ratio is extremely high in the College of Business. The accreditation, he indicated, is also good for graduates in improving their position in interviews. He added that having an accredited program also may generate more research money and lead to improvement in instruction.

Mr. Ritt asked about the size of the classes that are being closed to students. Mr. Horner stated that on the average the size of the class is thirty-two to thirty-three. Mr. Ritt asked how many students would have to be admitted to each class to accommodate the statement that demands are not being met. Mr. Horner responded that no one could say what the demand would actually be if the classes were open. Mr. Ritt asked why some departments have to create credit hour production of 40 to 50 students per section, while the College of Business wants to keep their class size to thirty-two students. Mr. Horner responded that the number of thirty-two is merely an average.

Mr. Quane asked what the outlook for the fall and next year is, assuming the visit in February from the accrediting group is positive. Dean Harrison stated that the results from accreditation will not change the College's situation greatly. With the increasing demand in the Business majors and minors on campus, there will most likely be no diminution in the demands of students. The College of Business will try to accommodate needs and preferences given the finite resources it has. The 33-persons to each class is not a limit, but an average. Mr. Quane asked if registration next year will create the same amount of problems as it has this semester. Dean Harrison stated that the needs will be same as they are for the coming semester, but communication will be handled differently. He stated that the College of Business will still feel an obligation to its majors. Mr. Quane asked if departments find their students cannot obtain preference courses with the College of Business, would the College be against the notion of the departments creating their own courses? Dean Harrison stated that he would object because that is not the best answer to a resource shortage. He added that fiscally the College has been accommodated by the University, but human resources are a problem.

President Watkins stated that there is a problem in treating the shift of student interest and that same problem would exist whether or not Colleges were seeking accreditation. There has been a communication problem that will not occur again.

Mr. Christiansen asked what steps have been taken to correct problems with ad-
visement of students. Mr. Horner stated that advisors have been provided with detailed lists of sections that are closed and those that are only open to Business majors. A statement of policy is also included in advisement materials. Mr. Christiansen asked if townspeople have been notified of the situation in Business in case they want to take classes, and Mr. Horner replied negatively. Mr. Christiansen expressed his feelings that the situation reflects poorly on the University and that the problem could easily have been avoided.

Ms. Greathouse asked if a Business major withdraws from a class, will a non-major replace that student. She also asked if classes are somehow open after registration of majors, will those openings be available to non-majors. Mr. Horner responded that the problem of withdrawal is a compound question. Withdrawals are not generally known until too late in the semester.

Student Body President's Remarks

Mr. Rutherford expressed his concern about the College of Business's situation with registration, and stated that if ISU should expect this type of expansion, some suggestions as to a revised procedure may be necessary. He stated that a procedure used by other Universities is that students may register by their major, with majors receiving first choice of courses in their respective Colleges.

The Student Association has received a letter from the regional supervisors of the Danforth Foundation. Students are now allowed to nominate faculty for the Danforth Associate award. If anyone would like to nominate a faculty member for this award, they are to contact Mr. Rutherford.

A Student Association Assembly meeting will be held in Stevenson 401 on November 27, at 7:00 p.m. President Watkins will join the Assembly members at that meeting. The Academic Senate is invited to an Association meeting to be held on November 30 at 4 p.m. in Stevenson 401. A member of the Board of Regents has been requested to attend and address the students present.

Minor in Public Relations

Mr. Rhodes distributed a new information sheet concerning the proposed Minor in Public Relations. This sheet deletes the proviso that "courses taken for the major may not be counted in this minor." The Academic Affairs Committee considered the proposal and voted to recommend the proposal to the Senate. A motion (Rhodes/Carey) to approve the Minor in Public Relations as presented on the newly distributed information sheet was made.

Mr. Goldstein stated that approval of the proposal seemed to an additional stage in turning ISU into a vocational school. The University has begun to worship accreditation and FTE. There has been a decrease in support for basic skills courses. Before approving anymore of the same types of proposals he felt there was a need for a discussion about where the University is heading. He said he would abstain on the motion.

Mr. Carey responded that there is always a philosophical question involved in meeting accreditation. He stated that students need an education that prepares them to benefit themselves as well as society. Mr. Goldstein stated that a great number of businesses prefer employees who can think broadly and they are willing to spend a great deal of money to train these people in specific areas.
The motion was approved on a voice vote with one negative vote and one abstention.

Deletion of the MS in Education for Secondary Teachers Degrees

IX, 36 A motion (Moonan/Ritt) to approve the deletion of the MS in Education for Secondary Teachers Degrees (in departments specified) was approved on a voice vote. The departments are Art, Biological Sciences, Chemistry, English, Geography, History, Speech Communication, Spanish, Speech Pathology/Audiology, and Theatre.

Revision of Student Elections Code

IX, 37 A motion (Rice/Christiansen) to approve the revised Student Elections Code was made. Mr. Carlile expressed his concern about the section on negligence of the committee. He stated a desire to see the definition of negligence clarified in the document. A motion (Carlile/Rutherford) was made to substitute the following for the first sentence in II-6, p. 4: "An Elections Committee member shall be determined to be in violation of the Student Elections Code by a 2/3 majority vote of the Student Elections Committee. Removal shall be by a combined vote of the incumbent committees of the Academic Senate, the Student Association Assembly, and the Association of Residence Halls." The amendment was approved on a voice vote.

IX, 38 A motion (Gamsky/Sims) was made to add to II-5, p. 4, the following: "Three separate accounts, one for each source of funds, shall be established in order to implement these election procedures, and there shall be assigned one fiscal agent for all accounts."

Mr. Rice stated that he agreed with the intent of the motion, but the process itself could become obsolete. In leaving the budgeting open, the Rules Committee intended to allow Student Affairs to work it out as it would find it necessary. Mr. Rutherford stated that it could become restrictive if there were created more than three bodies.

Mr. Gamsky expressed his concerns for a strengthening of the committee through sound budgetary sources. There has already been some confusion in trying to obtain money for Senate matters, so there should be an identifiable amount of money for specific purposes as well as a specific location. Ms. Patterson added that the amendment will clear anyone of handling of funds. Ms. Val Harris, for the Student Association, stated that there is a possibility that the Student Association will pass a budget amendment also to that effect.

Mr. Rice expressed his concern that senators had not approached him before the action stage of the Code to suggest changes in the document. Mr. Goldstein stated that there seemed to be confusion as to the establishment of the budget and the problems involved. Mr. Rutherford explained that the article states that there will be three separate accounts. Mr. Gamsky stated that the main point is to set up an identifiable account for the committee's use. There can be only three sources of funds, bond revenue (ARH), student fees (SA), and general revenue (Academic Senate).

On a roll call vote, the motion to amend the main motion was approved 17-16-5.

IX, 40 Mr. Hicklin stated his concern about the attempts to change the document on the floor of the Senate. A motion (Hicklin/Rhodes) to recommit the document to Com-
mittee was made. Mr. Rice stated that this type of postponement would push approval of the document to the end of the semester and will cause problems with political pressures. He stated his concern about the Committee's length of time in dealing with the document and the lack of input from fellow senators. Mr. Hicklin stated that this document might be comparable to the extensive work done on the Senate floor with the ASPT document, so Mr. Hicklin withdrew his motion.

IX, 41

A motion (Christiansen/Cooper) to table action on the Student Elections Code to the December 7 meeting was made. Explanation of tabling action on the document was that the document is subject to approval by three separate bodies, the Association of Residence Halls, Student Association, and Academic Senate. The discussion of the document serves as a representative point of view of the Senate. The motion to table action on the document passed by a vote of 17-16.

Student Records Policy

IX, 42

A motion (Sims/Karnstedt) to approve the Student Records Policy was made. Mr. Ritt began discussion by expressing his compliments to the Committee on the revisions that had been done on the document.

Mr. Goldstein objected to the exclusion of protection of psychological information about a student in some areas of the document. Mr. Cohen stated that he felt the protection of such information was provided in the document.

Mr. Watkins expressed concern about the protection of the employment records of a person employed by an educational institution who is also in attendance at the institution. He stated that there are a large group of people employed at the University who are also considered full- or part-time students. The provision for these people was clarified and corrected for publication of the document.

Mr. Moonan questioned the clarity of Section III.G. concerning Research Information. He asked who had the responsibility of deciding if there is any doubt about the identity of a student. Mr. Christiansen responded that there are two people responsible, the researcher and the person who maintains the records. Mr. Moonan stated that there is the possibility that the person who views the research would get so involved with the research purposes that the primary purpose of safeguarding the records would be forgotten.

Mr. Quane asked if a student's request for not releasing personal information needs to be registered each semester. Mr. Ritt stated that the document reads that a student only has to register his request once.

The motion to approve the Student Records Policy was approved on a voice vote.

Proposed Student Evaluations Policy

The proposed policy statement is:

The academic departments shall utilize student evaluations of classroom teachers in the decision-making process regarding the award of tenure and for evaluations of the quality of teaching within the departments. The following shall be followed:

1) Students should have a systematic way to express their views about classes and the performance of professors in these classes.
2) Academic departments will decide how these student evaluations will be conducted and how the results will be used in the evaluation process.

Mr. Young explained the background on the proposed student evaluations policy. He stated it was called to the attention of the Faculty Affairs Committee that the ASPT document does not contain any information about student evaluations. He indicated that the specific concern of the BOR policy on student evaluations is with tenure. The policy drawn up by the Faculty Affairs Committee provides for yearly collection of evaluations. Students have brought their views to the Committee to state that they would like to carry a larger amount of weight in their evaluations, and that these evaluations should be collected in some systematic fashion. The statement itself allows each department to regulate how student evaluations are to be used and given. He also stated that the policy will appear as a minor change in the ASPT document. Assuming the Senate agrees with the intent of the policy statements the Faculty Affairs Committee will recommend a specific change.

Mr. Rutherford asked if there has been any type of request that the departments place their procedures in writing. Mr. Young stated that each department is expected to have its own faculty evaluation guidelines.

Mr. Carlile argued against the weakness of the statement, since a department could technically evaluate faculty each five years if they so desired. Ms. Patterson asked if there would be provided some sort of course comparison evaluation. Mr. Christiansen questioned the alternatives that were considered to the policy statement. Mr. Young stated that there were a wide range of suggestions, from no student evaluation to one form for the whole University with a percentage weighting to be given to student evaluations.

Mr. March asked if there could be a provision stating that students may express their views in writing. Mr. Quane asked if a mark on an IBM form is sufficient as a written view. Mr. Cohen suggested the use of the term "formally" before the phrase "to express their views."

Mr. Young emphasized that the evaluation policy was not only for awarding tenure, but for general evaluations of faculty. Mr. Hicklin suggested clarification of that policy in the statement.

Mr. Christiansen stated that the statement seemed to provide for both kind of evaluations—evaluations of courses and professors; they could be viewed as two separate forms. Mr. Hicklin stated that separate forms could result in evaluations of faculty members' personalities instead of their work in class. Mr. Quane suggested the word "should" in 1) should be "shall."

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs: Mr. Rhodes stated that all senators should have received the Academic Plan. The Academic Affairs Committee will hold two hearings on the Plan, one on November 29 and another on December 6. The document will be considered as an information item at the December 7 Senate meeting. Academic Affairs Committee members will also be holding office hours in the Senate Office to allow ample time to ask questions about the document.
He also stated that the policy for final examinations is nearly finished by the Academic Standards Committee.

Administrative Affairs: Mr. Goldstein stated that there will be a Committee meeting December 1 at 4 p.m. in DeGarmo 435. A meeting of November 17 will be held jointly with the Parking and Traffic Committee. Items to be considered will include proposal for parking gates, increase in fees, and a discussion by the Secretary's Office on the absence of legal office in collection of outstanding fines. Guests at the meeting will be Dr. Eastman and Mr. Goleash.

Budget Committee: Ms. Cook stated that the Committee will meet November 17 at 3:30 p.m. in Hovey 301.

Executive Committee: Mr. Christiansen stated that the Executive Committee will meet November 30 at 4 p.m. in Hovey 308.

Faculty Affairs: Mr. Quane stated that the report concerning temporary faculty is available in the Senate Office. A letter concerning departmental staffing plans has been responded to by the Committee.

The Faculty Affairs Committee was asked to render an opinion about terms used in the Constitution, concerning the definition of "faculty." Over half the department chairpeople and the College Deans were polled concerning the definition of three groups, faculty associates, faculty assistants, and lecturers. There were varying answers concerning the status of these individual groups. The reasons given for the differentiation of opinions were mainly because of tenure. The Committee brought it before the Senate in order to get an opinion.

Since the Provost had placed the request for this definition, he was asked to explain the reasons behind the request. He stated that the definition of "faculty member" was too vague in the Constitution. He needed to learn the intent of the term in order to enforce the policy of the University. Mr. Cohen stated that the intention of the word "faculty" is equivalent to an individual who is in tenureable rank. If they are not on a tenure track, they are not technically faculty.

Mr. Carlile stated that he did not really know what a faculty associate or lecturer was in relation to other positions. Mr. Horner explained that the term is used to principally designate persons who have somewhat less educational background and sometimes to designate visiting types of capacities. He stated that faculty associates are predominantly used in lab schools. All three titles are specifically temporary titles. Mr. Hicklin stated that since they are on a temporary basis, they are on a year to year reappointment basis. He stated that the definition should remain consistent with BOR policy.

Mr. Wilson stated that the problem was a complicated one, in that it included membership determination on the Senate's external committees. Only those holding instructor rank and above are allowed to serve. It seemed to him to be unfair to exclude other ranks when they could contribute a great deal to the committees.

Mr. Rhodes suggested that the Faculty Affairs Committee poll the Senate so that those who understand the concepts involved may contribute.

The next Faculty Affairs Committee meeting will be held November 31, at 7:30 p.m. in Fairchild 204.
JUAC: Mr. Hicklin stated that the Committee will meet Wednesday before the next BOR meeting.

Rules Committee: The meeting of the Committee will be held November 30, 5 p.m., in Stevenson 227a. Ms. Upton stated that student representation will be discussed, and she requested input from the senators.

Student Affairs: The next Committee meeting will be held November 29 at 5 p.m. in DeGarmo 551. The Committee will discuss policy changes in the one-year dorm contract.

Communications

Mr. Sims suggested that the senators improve their communication efforts so that time may be saved on the Senate floor discussing minor points of information. Mr. Watkins asked if there were any editing services available to the Senate for the lengthy documents that are issued. Mr. Nagy asked if the packets could be sent out earlier to the senators. There was also a request that the Committee meetings be listed and distributed to the senators so that they may be aware of each committee's meetings.

Adjournment

IX, 43 A motion (Boaz/Law) to adjourn was approved at 10:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ira Cohen, Chairperson
John K. Boaz, Secretary
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>Motion No.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowen</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butz</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carey</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlile</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christiansen</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croxville</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egelston</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>A exc.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldstein</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greathouse</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td>A exc.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicklin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnstedt</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koehler</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyler</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La...</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massie</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohr</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagy</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natale</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quane</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritt</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenbaum</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searight</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sims</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>A exc.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vybiral</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weidner</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamsky</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belshe</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horner</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watkins</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>