

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Summer 5-5-1993

Senate Meeting, May 5, 1993

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, May 5, 1993" (1993). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 606.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/606>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

May 5, 1993

XXIV, No. 14

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of April 21, 1993

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Action Items: None

Information Item: Academic Affairs Committee Recommendation
for Elimination of Programs:
D. A. in Mathematics
D. A. in Economics
M. A. and M. S. in Business Education
Cooperative M. S. in Agriculture
with the University of Illinois
B. A. and B. S. in Dance Major
Suspension of Teaching of
Arabic and Chinese

Communications

Committee Reports

Adjournment

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University Community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussions with the consent of the Senate. Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(Not Approved by the Academic Senate)

May 5, 1993

Volume XXIV, No. 14

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:03 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

SEATING OF NEW SENATOR

Chairperson Schmaltz introduced the new Student Government Association President, Diane Shaya.

ROLL CALL

Secretary Jan Cook called the roll and declared a quorum present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 21, 1993

XXIV-94

Motion to approve Academic Senate Minutes of April 21, 1993, by Barker, (Second, Ritch) carried on a voice vote.

CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS - NONE

VICE CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Vice Chairperson, Renee Mousavi: I would like to wish all the student senators good luck on the rest of their final exams, and best wishes for a nice summer.

SGA PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

Senator Diane Shaya: I am very pleased to be here with you tonight. I am looking forward to a very prosperous year. I, too, would like to wish everyone good luck on their remaining finals. The Student Government Association is having an open assembly meeting tomorrow night at 9:00 p.m. in the Student Services Building, Room 375. I would like to

welcome any student senators or anyone else who wishes to attend.

ADMINISTRATORS' REMARKS

PRESIDENT WALLACE - NONE

PROVOST STRAND - NONE

VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS GUROWITZ - NONE

VICE PRESIDENT FOR BUSINESS AND FINANCE ALEXANDER HAD AN EXCUSED ABSENCE.

ACTION ITEMS: NONE

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. **Academic Affairs Committee Recommendation for Elimination of Programs:**
 - D. A. in Mathematics**
 - D. A. in Economics**
 - M. A. and M. S. in Business Education**
 - Cooperative M. S. in Agriculture with the University of Illinois**
 - B. A. and B. S. in Dance Major**
 - Suspension of Teaching of Arabic and Chinese**

Senator Walker: Senators have before them the Academic Affairs Committee's recommendation, rationale, and observations. If there are any questions, we will entertain those. Before we begin discussion, I would like to yield the floor to Provost Strand.

Provost Strand: Thank you. There are a number of members of the Senate who were not on the Senate last year, and perhaps are not aware of the history of this process. I would like to very quickly move through some background information for you. Please bear in mind that this is an externally driven process. By that we mean that we were forced to establish a list of programs to be disestablished, and this listing was prepared in response to the Illinois Board of Higher Education PQP initiative. As we looked at programs to place on this list, we examined the program reviews, and in some cases, such as the Dance Major, we had more than one program review. We examined the program reviews as a frame of reference for making decisions about which programs were placed on the list. The file that I am holding up now constitutes the information about the dance major as a result of two program reviews, correspondence regarding that program and concerns that were expressed

about that program. As I said, this information constituted the frame of reference for it being placed on the list.

It should also be remembered that our list of programs recommended for disestablishment is one of the most modest, if not the most modest, in the state in number of programs. The list from the Illinois Board of Higher Education is much more ambitious. The chairperson of the Illinois Board of Higher Education and the staff of the IBHE expect the institutions in Illinois to follow through on the original lists that were submitted during the early part of this academic year. I have discussed this matter with Dean Chapman, as I have with other Deans, and there are no viable options to the deletion of the dance major in the College of Applied Science and Technology that she or I would substitute for the Dance Major. I recommend that the position of the Academic Affairs Committee be endorsed and would also like to point out that present this evening to speak in support of the disestablishment of the Dance Major are Dr. Elizabeth Chapman, the Dean of the College of Applied Science and Technology; Dr. Alan Dillingham, Interim Associate Vice President for Instruction and Dean of Undergraduate Studies; and Dr. Ron Fortune, Interim Associate Vice President for Academic Planning and Program Development. Any one of the four of us would be happy to respond to questions from senators regarding this program elimination.

Senator Walker: The Academic Affairs Committee has a set of recommendations for the senate and a rationale followed by some observations that the committee made. Perhaps we need a fifteen minute recess for people to read this. It has just been distributed this evening. In fairness to all the senators, we probably need a short recess.

Chairperson Schmaltz: Let's see whether there are any questions. People could be reading while others ask questions. If not, and it is the will of the Senate, a fifteen minute recess can be called.

Senator Zeidenstein: If there are a lot of people who need to study for exams tomorrow, we could make tonight short and come back tomorrow night. I believe it takes a 2/3 vote of the Senate, to move the item to action stage this evening, after the information stage. I don't want to impose this on anyone, but some of us feel that two meetings in a row during final exam week, two short ones, are not as good as one longer meeting.

Chairperson Schmaltz: Technically, this item is at the information item stage this evening. One senator discussed with me that at the end of the information item stage, he would make a motion to move the item to the action item stage.

Parliamentarian Cohen: As long as the senate is in information item stage right now, it would not be inappropriate to move the item to action item stage. Then it becomes debatable, and requires a 2/3 vote.

XXIV-95

Motion by Zeidenstein (Second, Sendlak) to move the item to action item stage.

Senator White: I think this would give the appearance of ramrodding this whole thing through the Senate. Some of our colleagues have spent a lot of time preparing these appeals and I certainly don't want it to appear that the Senate is giving them short shrift. If we are to have both Information and Action Items tonight, I think it is utterly incumbent upon us to provide for the possibility for people to read this report.

Senator Liedtke: I would like a clarification, the letter from the Academic Affairs Committee indicates that the Foreign Language teaching of Arabic and Chinese languages are suspensions. On our information item list, they are listed as eliminations.

Senator Walker: The Information Item list is wrong on several counts. There are actually a total of eight programs being considered.

Senator Liedtke: I think we should have that list clarified for us.

Parliamentarian Cohen: There is no motion on the floor at this time. When it is made, it could be worded correctly.

Senator Ritch: Are there senators not here tonight that might be planning to attend tomorrow night.

Chairperson Schmaltz: We don't have that information. A few people have asked for excused absences.

Senator Ritch: That would be a consideration in my mind, whether senators were planning to attend.

Senator Schroeer: Could we start the debate tonight and continue it tomorrow evening?

Parliamentarian Cohen: The Senate could move to adjourn or postpone action to tomorrow night.

Senator Wilner: How many students are planning to be here tomorrow night? (Showing of hands indicated all but one student senator planned to attend the May 6th meeting.)

Roll call vote on motion to move information item to action this evening (Zeidenstein/Semlak) failed 16 to 14, with 5 abstentions.

Senator Zeidenstein: I have a question of Senator Walker. This is on the cover memo dated May 5, 1993, to Len Schmaltz regarding Program Disestablishment. On page 3, third paragraph: "The Department of HPERD also charged that the communication received by the UCC from the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate was a violation of Academic Senate Disestablishment Policy. In effect, paragraph five of the communication dated April 12, 1993 is the directive which is questioned (see attachment). The paragraph in question states: "The final listing of program elimination recommendations shall be no shorter than the current listing. Therefore, if you or the Senate delete any program from the original list, you (it) must add to the list a program of comparable scope from the same college." The word shall is used in one place and the word must is added to make it plainer.

The next paragraph states: "It is the opinion of the Academic Affairs Committee that while this part of the communication may be questioned it does not violate current policy for the "Disestablishment of Academic Units" (see attachment). In addition, it was pointed out at the May 3 hearing by Dr. Cook that the Executive Committee viewed this communication as an administrative communication on behalf of the President and not a policy statement."

Having said that, I now turn to the bottom of page 4, the third observation: "Three, the inclusion of a directive such as the one regarding substitution of another program if a recommendation to disestablish is overturned should receive Academic Senate endorsement prior to submission." which appears to contradict the observation that the Academic Affairs Committee made on the end of page 3. The third observation says that the inclusion of any directive such as the one regarding substitution of another program should receive Academic Senate endorsement. Is that a contradiction?

Senator Walker: No. We looked at that issue in some detail and we read the Disestablishment policy which you have received, and if you read that, the fact that the directive was sent with the Disestablishment Policy does not preclude that the Disestablishment Policy could be followed accordingly. It is in addition to it. So it did not violate the policy as currently written, but was in addition to it. Our observation is that it sure muddies the waters and we don't think that's appropriate, but it did not violate the current policy by saying that the policy could

not be followed. Personally, I think it is a darn poor directive, but that has nothing to do with the policy.

Senator Zeidenstein: If what happened has nothing to do with existing policy or the process that other programs follow to be deleted by meeting with the Curriculum Committee, etc. and if as you say it muddies the waters which I agree with, what does observation three refer to? -- "should receive Academic Senate endorsement prior to submission." What other kind of behavior or action would require Academic Senate endorsement before it happens, whereas this apparently either does not require Academic Senate endorsement because it did not violate the policy. Can you give me an example of what observation three would be observing, if it isn't observing what is on the middle of page 3?

Senator Walker: I think it is observing what is on page 3, but it is just an observation that the committee noted clouded the issue. It should lend some insight as to where Dance is probably coming from with their appeal. Technically, no, what actually transpired did not violate the Senate policy.

Senator Razaki: I have a question for Dean Chapman. I would like to know how you came to this decision. The more I read about the ISU Dance Department, the more impressed I was in terms of the quality of their program. Secondly, the issue of centrality to the mission of the University was cited. To me it seems that for any University things like literature, philosophy, fine arts and dance are very central to the education of that University's students. Why did you decide to discontinue this program?

Dean Chapman: The Illinois Board of Higher Education defines centrality very differently than you have. I think that is important in a process that is driven by the IBHE. If you look at the way that they calculate the data, centrality is the very first thing that I would reject as a basis for elimination. Because, the IBHE has defined centrality as a percentage of non majors that take a program's courses, compared to the number of majors. If you think of it from that point, it is ridiculous, if you had no majors in your program, you would have 100% centrality. I wonder about that kind of reasoning. It is a program that has a lot of non-majors who take classes. Agriculture did not have a lot of non-majors. Why does this program have a low priority? First of all, the program only has three staff members. We need to look at the perspective of the college, which graduates just short of 1,000 students per year. Averages over the last four years show that the dance program graduates four students per year. The students have voted with their feet. That does not mean that Dance is not important. We will retain the minor in Dance, and all

current majors will be able to graduate before the BS and BA are eliminated.

Senator Zeidenstein: I have a question for Senator Strand and one for the Dean. In talking about the staff, the Dean just said that the minor in dance would be retained. There will still be a minor?

Provost Strand: That is correct. There will still be a minor.

Senator Zeidenstein: Can I assume then, that would allow Theatre majors or minors to still have the opportunity to take dance? Would there be enough left of the dance program to meet the typical demands of Theatre majors?

Dean Chapman: There are four classes that rotate each year that dance majors take. These classes will not be taught after all the majors have graduated.

Senator Razaki: Professor Mawson would you like to offer any rebuttal to any of the issues the Dean brought up.

Senator Mawson: I can tell you that the department is concerned not only about the classes being offered for students across campus, but we are concerned about the requirement of courses for division majors and also for recreation majors because we require courses in those two majors in dance. There has been some talk about the dance minor going toward the Theatre Department, and we would need some assurance that the courses that we require of them would be available to physical education majors and to recreation majors. Right now I don't believe that there are any dance courses that are required in Theatre. It is an elective.

Senator White: I was struck by the fact that I did not see a principle basis for appeal among the three listed here. It seemed that there was a basis for appeal in the HPERD document that had to do not with the constitutional process, but with the defacto elimination process. I argued strenuously at the last senate meeting that there had been a defacto process that the whole university community had adopted for this IBHE initiative. It seems to me that one of the things that your department had objected to was the fact that the defacto process hadn't really been accurately followed. I would like to get some information on that tonight if I can. One of the documents that the President's Committee of 27 received from the Provost stated in Part IV of the process document: "At appropriate points in time, the Provost, Deans, and Provost's Staff, will share the outlines of the review process with department chairs, university community, and members of the Academic Affairs, Budget, Faculty Affairs, and Administrative Affairs

Committees of the Academic Senate." So, it seems to me that there was originally in the process the idea that at some appropriate timely time the departments would be given an opportunity to address the suggestions of the Committee of 27. At that same meeting, Dean Chapman gave us a document that said in fact that Dance was identified as a possible candidate for elimination based on its small graduation rate. This was on September 17th. So, it was certainly my assumption, and I assume the assumption of the rest of the President's Committee of 27, that people were thinking about Dance at a very early point. What I am really confused about, and here comes my question, is in your page 3 you quote Dean Chapman in October saying: "...conclude that it (the (ISU Dance Program) should be removed from the University's 'to be considered for elimination' list." What you are saying is that at no point after that until it was made public did your department receive information that you were still on the list. That is a very important point that I would like to ask Dean Chapman to speak to. I think this is something that the Academic Affairs Committee in its observations on page 4, refers to, that I would like to hear Dean Chapman explain how the Dance program was returned to the list without knowing about it.

Dean Chapman: I think Dr. Mawson agreed with me that it was a matter of not having all the pieces there. On October 8, 1992, I did indeed request that the Dance program be removed from the list. That request was not granted until November 7th. Secondly, on the 20th of October, the Department was given a chance to fill out some materials about why it should not be eliminated. That was turned in on October 30th. On January 7, 1993, Provost Strand relayed in a memo to me "that the major in dance should remain on the Illinois State University list of programs recommended for elimination." I don't think there was any confusion on anyone's part between October 6th on whether it was on the list, especially when each department was asked to answer questions about their programs.

Senator White: Something about this, and all the students who attended the last Senate meeting, impressed me. It has been my experience that chairs of departments don't fly in the face of their deans. There must have been some communication problem. If not for this case, then for other cases down the road, we need to clarify this. I was of the opinion that the process we were using was a fair and adequate process. But, if this is pointing out some sort of glitch within it, I think we need to identify it.

Dr. Marlene Mawson, Chair of HPERD: We did not know in the department that a decision was made prior to the October announcement. Dean Chapman told me on September 30th that it actually was going to be listed for elimination. Prior to that, she told me that it was vulnerable. Maybe she did

not know that it was on the list until September 30th. But, that was the first date that we knew that it was to be included on the list of programs for elimination. Then, two days later the President announced that. Of course, we were not prepared to know that there was something that we could respond to, and we did respond in a reactionary way on campus. It was that very night that I appeared here at Senate for the Coaching elimination that I was assured there would be an opportunity for dialogue, which Dean Chapman referred to occurred on October 20th.

Senator White: You expected another opportunity, didn't you?

Dr. Mawson: Yes. I expected another opportunity for dialogue after the original announcement that the Dance program would be on the recommended elimination list, and what I found out in January was that dialogue was the ten questions that we answered on October 20th. I did not realize at the time that I put those answers to ten questions that that would be the extent of the dialogue.

Senator Wilner: I was curious at a time when our student fees and tuition are going up a lot and we need to cut programs to save money, how much money is being saved by eliminating this program as compared to say a trip to Russia or something?

Senator Walker: The Academic Affairs Committee was not charged with studying the costs.

Provost Strand: I will address the question, keeping in mind that there are several answers to that question in the sense that it depends upon who is asking the question and for what purpose the response is being prepared. You can make a calculation like the Board of Higher Education would make on any program, a computer printout and get a calculation. You can also look at a calculation at a given point in time, say September 1st of this year, and estimate what your savings would be. We need to recognize that we had the resignation of a faculty member in the program subsequent to the announcement that this program was to be eliminated. So, the range of savings for this program if it were disestablished is somewhere between \$50,000 and \$75,000 per year which will be reallocated into other parts of undergraduate education.

Senator Wilner: So, you are saying that the savings is \$50,000 to \$75,000?

Provost Strand: That's correct.

President Wallace: It seems that meeting after meeting we have to point out that back at the beginning of the IBHE

process we specifically said that we realized that quality programs would have to be sacrificed to satisfy the Illinois Board of Higher Education. In terms of money involved, according to the guidelines there will be a shift of funds for example money will be shifted by the IBHE to certain categories like undergraduate instruction including money for salaries. We now know how much will be needed for salary raises next year. How much a program is saving is not germane to the question. The case has been made that these are quality programs, but we are being forced to cut back on the scope of programming. We are also being asked to reduce international programs. This is very painful. Really, there are no savings. The money will be reallocated.

Senator Semlak: I have two questions. First of all, what is the University's official position on the programs to be eliminated regarding students who are currently enrolled in them -- what will happen to them in terms of graduation?

Provost Strand: Students currently enrolled in any program on the list will be allowed to complete those programs in a reasonable amount of time. Students who are not enrolled, but admitted to the programs, will be allowed to finish those programs within a reasonable amount of time.

Senator Semlak: My second question is originally when we got into this program reduction exercise, the Board of Higher Education gave us one set of programs. We put up a second set of programs which seems to be smaller. Do we have any reason to believe that when we go to the Board of Regents they will accept this set of programs which we substituted for those other programs. Will this be sufficient?

President Wallace: As recent as today at the appropriation hearing in Springfield, one of the members of the house asked IBHE Executive Director Richard Wagner if he was going to admit that the IBHE did not have the authority to eliminate programs. People are pointing out that such decisions should be made by governing boards such as the Board of Regents.

Senator Walker: I would like President Wallace to clarify why it is important to submit this list if indeed Wagner is recognizing that they don't have this authority to cut programs.

President Wallace: The Board of Higher Education does have the authority to make budget cuts. We do not know what the policy is going to be. JUAC members here tonight might know. A lot of wind has been taken out of their sails. ISU has substituted their own list for the IBHE list of recommendations. The IBHE took action in February to cut

\$2.5 million dollars out of the budget. This did not have any faculty positions. They looked at other things besides faculty positions. It is not easy to guess what the IBHE will do.

Senator Walker: Why is it important to submit this list?

President Wallace: The IBHE does have the authority over appropriations for programs.

Senator Liedtke: I have a three-part question. I would like to ask Dr. Mawson what the four courses are that will be eliminated.

Dr. Mawson: Those are just the ones that we have been offering so that dance majors could go on. Some of the courses are only offered once every two years, so there would be two semesters in a year where we would offer two different courses and the following year we would offer two different courses. That way majors could take the classes they need.

Senator Liedtke: How are the enrollments in those classes.

Dr. Mawson: The average enrollment is ten to twelve students.

Senator Ritch: I have a couple of questions for Dr. Mawson. Is this correct that you currently have 22 majors as of 1992-93 in the Dance Program?

Dr. Mawson: We had 34 in the fall, and I believe we had four graduates. We lost two to attrition. But, I think we have 28 students this Spring. We expect more in the fall. We have 31 that have been admitted. There may be some that do not show up, but we expect a good number of them to show up. One of the reasons is because each fall we have an audition in dance for scholarships that we give and those students after they have been here are more likely to come back. We expect a stronger enrollment in the fall class, unless some of this notoriety impacts that.

Senator Ritch: So in the fall, your enrollment could be as high as 59, minus whoever graduates in the spring. I am figuring 28 majors now, 31 coming in, that gives a total of 59, minus people who don't show up and whoever graduates in the spring.

Dr. Mawson: I am sure that there will be some who don't show up. Right now there is a target percentage of people who normally are admitted through a program.

Dean Chapman: I would like to point out that the show rate for the Dance Program is somewhere between .3 and .4. This

projects a show rate of ten students. The enrollment management figures show thirty four students in the program.

Senator Ritch: Has anyone calculated the money that would be lost to the University from 34-35 majors who would not be students at ISU. Is that greater than the \$50,000 to \$75,000 savings? If so, how does the University plan to make up for this lost tuition?

Provost Strand: There would be no loss of revenue to the University. We look at a total figure as far as student admission, so students who would have gone into the dance major would go into other programs. We would still have our same enrollment target. There would be no loss of revenues.

Senator Ritch: Would you calculate that the \$50,000 to \$75,000 that we are saving would cover the expense of those students transferring into music or theatre or something else at another school? By eliminating this program, are we in effect losing money and not saving money?

Provost Strand: The answer is no, we are not losing money. We are saving money because we can reallocate dollars. Previously, I indicated that one of the faculty members had resigned during the course of the year. There is a difference in the salary level between that faculty member and the person who was hired to take that person's place. There would be fewer courses offered.

Senator Manzo: I have a question for Senator Wilner, as a student who serves on the Academic Affairs Committee. Do you feel that the Dance program should be eliminated?

Senator Wilner: As much as I dislike seeing any programs being cut, I think my committee made the right decision. It was the best option. It stinks, but it was the best option.

Senator Barker: I would like to verify a quote from the Vidette. Senator Mawson was quoted as saying that only 10% of the students who apply to ISU actually attend the University.

Dr. Mawson: I don't know if that is the direct quote. The author of that article asked me how many people normally come when there is a particular number admitted. I said it might be any where from 10% on. That was the context of my answer. I don't believe I gave an exact amount. We had ten freshman this past year, and that was from a number of nineteen that had been admitted. That is more like 50%.

Senator Strand: I just wanted to indicate that as a University we have with regard to first time freshmen, approximately 40% of those who are accepted enroll in the

University. In regard to transfer students, approximately 60% of those who are accepted enroll in the University.

Senator White: I have a question about Attachments A and B in this package. Where did they come from?

Senator Walker: They come from the University Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council. The attachments came from the University Curriculum Committee and refer to the Option Suspension Request from Foreign Languages. They were part of the total elimination process.

Senator Johnson: I have two things. In regard to Attachment A, it refers to the Program Deletion Request for the BA and BS in Dance, in the HPERD department of the College of Applied Science and Technology, not the College of Arts and Sciences. The other thing is, looking at this in a statewide picture, in the case of Dance, assuming ISU does eliminate the dance program, are those Illinois residents who desire a major in dance able to obtain that option somewhere else in the state?

Dr. Mawson: Right now there are three programs recognized by the IBHE in dance in this state. One of them is at Southern Illinois University in Edwardsville, department of Theatre, and they have four majors. It has been recommended by the IBHE to eliminate that. The University of Illinois has a program that admits students only by audition, and they are limited to only 30 students. We have 34 students at ISU.

Senator Mersinger: As a student who takes dance classes at this University, I have observed that the dance classes here at ISU focus on technique. The University of Illinois focuses on performance.

Senator Schroeer: I was confused by Senator Wallace's reply to Senator Wilner's question about the savings -- \$50,000 to \$75,000 would be saved by the elimination of the dance program. He also said that we might not save any money.

Provost Strand: It was my response that we might save \$50,000 to \$75,000.

Senator Schroeer: I thought I heard that in some cases even though we eliminate programs, there are no savings at all.

President Wallace: There is no rationale or rhyme or reason for the IBHE requests for program eliminations. In the last 20 years, Illinois has gone from being ranked fifth in the nation to being ranked last. What is happening through the state is happening year after year, programs are being

dropped, services are being inadequately provided. We are looking at a shrinking state budget for education. There is not a lot of rationale about what we are being pressured to do.

Senator Schroeer: Getting back to the original statement about savings, that the elimination of the D. A. in Mathematics and the D. A. in Economics are not really saving any money. Are we just playing politics?

President Wallace: To a certain degree we are and to a certain degree we aren't. The programs we have on the list that have probably been the biggest savings. The bulk of the money we are saving is from the elimination of 60 positions in February. That gave us \$2.8 million dollars that we can redirect. Only a small percentage is coming from these programs. That is not the best way to get resources.

Senator Liedtke: Was suspension ever a question for the Dance program?

Senator Walker: The Academic Affairs Committee did address that a little. I was going to raise that issue again this evening for clarification with Provost Strand or President Wallace. We need to realize that these programs that have been recommended for elimination, all of them have been challenged in terms of priority, quality and productivity in the programmatic reviews. They were at least questioned in the programmatic reviews. They were questionable programs to start with, and I think that is why they surfaced. They may eventually have been recommended for elimination from programmatic review in established channels. Maybe not at this point. The question of suspension, though, is a realistic one. I would ask for clarification. It seems to me that if indeed the IBHE is backing off, and we can either show savings or not show savings in terms of budgets, would suspension of these programs not satisfy the same answer -- why or why not? In a University that is dynamic, you never know where the students are going to want to major from one set of years to another. They may be highly interested in Philosophy for a few years and then suddenly not. You can't simply drop programs because of low student demand at any one point in time. It is extremely hard to get a program back once it is eliminated. I would like for someone to address the issue of why suspension is not a good one, given the situation.

Provost Strand: Suspension is not a viable option in the eyes of the Illinois Board of Higher Education. The difference is if you eliminate a program, you are recommending to your governing board, and reporting to the IBHE that you are eliminating a program. Suspension is not acceptable in the eyes of the Board of Higher Education because part of what they are saying is that there is a

surplus of certain types of programs. We can look at it in terms of numbers of students pursuing the programs. What a suspension does is leave the latitude in the hands of the institution to reinstitute the program without having consulted with its governing board or the Board of Higher Education. That is not a satisfactory alternative to the IBHE.

Senator Page: Why were the foreign language department's teaching of Arabic and Chinese only suspended and not eliminated? Does it have anything to do with how many students are enrolled in these programs?

Provost Strand: This was a recommendation of the Dean. The difference here is that we are suspending those courses, and we do not have majors in them. In the other programs, there are majors. That is the difference in the terminology of whether to eliminate or suspend. There is nothing to eliminate. There is no formal program to request elimination of. We are indicating that we are going to suspend the teaching of those courses because of the same factors that some of the other programs are being eliminated.

Senator Ritch: I have a question for Senator Walker. Tomorrow night when we vote on this, will the motion come as one unit to eliminate all eight programs, or will they come program by program.

Senator Walker: I was going to recommend the document before you all at one time.

Senator Amster: If your program review was the basis for this cut, what was the basis on the first cut list? Which leads me to my second question, if you decide that the college would not cut dance, but save it, then the college would be obligated to submit another course within their college. The statement that the college has to have the responsibility to do this budget crunching. Why was a particular college charged to alleviate the problem, since the money saved goes back to the university in general?

Provost Strand: I don't understand the question. What were you talking about the first cut list and the second cut list?

Senator Amster: You had an original cut list from IBHE and the Dance program was not on it. It was a shorter list. The IBHE must have had a rationale or basis for not including the Dance Program on the list. I was wondering where that decision came from, what rationale was used?

Provost Strand: I don't know why the IBHE made its recommendations. They reviewed program reviews just as we did. We only made similiary recommendations on two programs.

There are several differences. I know why we included the dance program, but I do not know why they did not.

President Wallace: The good judgment they used to identify Agriculture and Biology.

Provost Strand: Your second question was why in the process of review and appeal, was a college that had a program on the list asked to substitute another program if it wished to take something off. The reason is that each college as a result of program review knows of programs that have areas of concern and problems that need to be addressed. There are programs within each college that qualify, and that is part of the reason that the IBHE picked some of the programs. It would have been very easy to simply say that it was someone elses responsibility to come up with programs to substitute for the one we are have identified. Recognizing that this is a multi-year process, there will probably be other programs that we need to defend before PQP is completed. It was felt by the President and me and also endorsed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate that as this process moved along, a college that wanted to take something off the list also had the responsibility to place another program on the list.

Senator Amster: Then each college down the line will have that same responsibility?

Provost Strand: Yes. As we get into the further stages of PQP if there are additional program elimination recommendations that have to come from campuses, if we get into that type of negotiation, that will be something that has to be factored into the equation.

Senator Amster: Does that mean that the current college in question will be out of the running for other options?

Provost Strand: Not necessarily. It will all depend on more recent program reviews and what is happening across the rest of campus, and what is happening in terms of enrollment in programs, and what this institution views as its mission, vis a vis, the educational needs of the state and the nation -- those are all factors to be considered. In the third area you talked about, you made reference to the faculty, could you rephrase what you are trying to get at.

Senator Amster: You said that you had \$75,000 that would go back into the pot for undergraduate instruction. I was wondering if you were still going to teach undergraduate

course required for other majors? Will we still maintain these faculty members?

Provost Strand: As was indicated, the minor in dance will still be offered and a number of courses will still be available to service a variety of students. The resignation of the one faculty member who was away on leave was very helpful in the way of attrition. At the moment there is no plan to release other faculty. This will be subject to other types of reallocation exercises that take place within colleges.

Senator Shaya: My question is for Senator Strand or Senator Wallace. It is my understanding that we negotiated to give the BOR a substitute list for the list the Illinois Board of Higher Education put out. What will happen if we do not meet with these cuts which are less than what they actually put forth, especially since this is phase one of the PQP process. Where will this put our university?

Provost Strand: I think it puts the University in a very embarrassing situation. It would confirm in the minds of the chair of the Illinois Board of Higher Education that institutions of higher education do not have the fortitude to make tough decisions and strengthen the position of those who believe that the Board of Higher Education must be placed in a position of eliminating programs itself because institutions and their governing boards won't take the action.

Senator Razaki: Provost Strand, you made a very strong statement that the IBHE cannot accept suspension in lieu of elimination. I still don't understand why. Both actions show we are cutting our budget. If the actual decision shows that we are in fact leading to higher productivity. If we suspend the programs, rather than eliminate them, we could, if we wanted to, five years from now avoid going through the process of approving new programs.

Provost Strand: I wish the world were that logical. But, it is not. There is a point of view which you expressed which may make sense to this group sitting around the table this evening, but it would not sell in Springfield. It would not be accepted by the Board of Higher Education Staff, Board of Higher Education members, or members of the General Assembly.

Senator Razaki: They are people like us. Especially at the IBHE because they have gone through exercises like this. It is like saying that one of us could go to work for the IBHE and we would become an absolute moron or imbecile.

Senator Shaya: They also recommended that our Ag Department be eliminated.

Senator White: I have a question for President Wallace. Next year we are looking at round two of this reallocation process. What do you see that might prepare us for next year? Is it your expectation at this point that if the PQP initiative is continued, will we follow the same process?

President Wallace: First of all, we will be continuing the PQP process. I don't think there will be any more money in the budget next year. The governor's budget did not have money for salaries. The PQP process in the future will be determined by the economy of the state. Once the next gubernatorial election is over, there will be some serious discussion about redoing the tax structure in the state. Illinois is the 49th state in tax rates. I think we are going to see two more years of difficulties. It is a question of how much squeeze there is on universities. I suspect that it will be related to how much we will allow tuition and fees to go up. There is a whole list of things not answerable. If they can give the universities a percent or two over the next few years. If we will continue to take part of the tuition money toward financial aid.

Senator White: What about autonomous reallocations?

Chairperson Schmaltz: I think the discussion is getting pretty far afield.

Senator Liedtke: Across campus we have several departments that have creatively hidden programs that have small enrollments by assigning them as sequences within a major. Is a sequence in dance a possibility rather than elimination?

Dr. Mawson: It would be possible if this Senate through the University Curriculum Committee were to approve a dance sequence in Physical Education. There has also been some discussion that the dance program might be a sequence in Theatre. It would be a possibility, yes, but would need to go through the University approval process.

Senator Liedtke: Is it typical at other institutions to have dance majors within the realm of B. S.

Dr. Mawson: They are a specialty in dance or theatre, but it is not considered a dance major in itself. In fact, Northern Illinois University has that structure right now.

Senator Ritch: This is just a piece of information for senators. There is a study committee that has been formed to look at putting some sort of sequence in dance in the Theatre Department. Am I correct in relating that they are

far from reaching a conclusion about that. Or, are they close?

Provost Strand: This option is being studied as part of a recommendation that came out of those 15 questions raised in the Fall Semester about programming in the academic areas. One of those questions was related to the relationship of programs to departments. Out of that came the exploration of moving dance programs to the department of Theatre. That is still under study.

Senator Walker: On the issue about a sequence. The 1992 follow-up report that Dr. Batsche wrote states: "The Department determined that it was not advisable to change the status of the Dance program from a major to a sequence within the B.A., B. S., B.S. Ed. in Physical Education...." So that issue has been addressed, even by the Dance department.

Senator Zeidenstein: I have a question for Provost Strand and one for Dr. Mawson. Dr. Mawson, your May 5th memo to the Academic Senate says about the middle of page one that: "Quality Faculty in Dance will be compelled to develop career goals at a University that has a major program in Dance. Although a Dance minor is proposed to be retained, it is doubtful whether the instruction will remain at the quality that would be desirable." If there could be a sequence in Dance, would it be sufficient to keep such quality faculty -- a sequence, not a major?

Dr. Mawson: It's a conjecture for an answer. I think that it would not be as appealing, obviously, as a major. I think that it could be of use to see if there are majors that want to stay with us. Right now we have a sequence in Athletic Training in Teacher Education of Physical Education and also in Fitness Leadership. Our athletic trainer student majors have difficulty recognizing the fact that they are in fact Physical Education majors. This could be the case with Dance, too.

Senator Zeidenstein: Also, pertaining to retention or hiring of quality faculty, is that speculation?

Dr. Mawson: Yes. I think that it would not be as attractive as if it were a major, but it would be more attractive than a minor only.

Senator Zeidenstein: I have a question for President Wallace or Provost Strand. Is there any feasibility that the sequence could be funded internally? Is there any feasibility that the Board of Higher Education would accept the sequence in lieu of elimination, and if they did, would the administration be willing to consider a sequence?

Provost Strand: A sequence has never surfaced in any of the discussions, so I would not be willing to comment on that. An earlier statement about substituting a sequence as an alternative for the elimination of the major is not an appropriate response to PQP.

Senator Zeidenstein: A follow-up question that would more appropriately be answered in closed session. Is it feasible that if and when the major in Dance is eliminated, then internally without making a lot of ripples with the IBHE, a sequence might be possible. I am not asking you to make any promises.

Provost Strand: With your introductory clause, you are asking that I answer that?

President Wallace: Are you suggesting that the English Department may want to take five of its existing positions and use them to hire people in the Dance program?

Senator Insel: I am going back to the suspension of the teaching of Arabic and Chinese. You have two languages, with the suspension of teaching two courses in each language. This seems like micro management. Will we be seeing more of that? These courses are under the department of Foreign Languages. I thought that type of suspension was under the purview of the department.

Provost Strand: That recommendation came from the Dean. I presume the Dean consulted with the department before she offered that. That did not originate higher up.

Senator Insel: Could this be translated to a part-time position?

Provost Strand: There are no tenure track faculty.

Senator Walker: Is this question for language or for dance?

Chairperson Schmaltz: We are discussing the entire package.

Senator Zeidenstein: There is only one appeal before this body.

Chairperson Schmaltz: Senator Insel, your colleagues and the chair are questioning whether your comments are germane to this discussion.

Senator Liedtke: I think it is important because you are talking about the suspension of four courses in Foreign Languages?

XXIV-96

Senator Liedtke: I would like to make a motion that we move the items that we have discussed this evening to action item stage. (Second, _____)

Chairperson Schmaltz: You want a reconsideration?

Parliamentarian Cohen: The motion is debatable, and would require a two thirds vote.

Senator Wilner: If this motion passes, will there be a limit on debate?

Chairperson Schmaltz: No.

Senator Nelsen: I am opposed to the motion. I voted no earlier this evening on moving this to action item stage. I have difficulty agreeing with a motion to reconsider. I strongly feel that once you make a decision, you should not vote to rescind it.

Senator Liedtke: The reason I suggested this motion at this time is that I voted no earlier this evening because we had not had an opportunity to listen to the item as an information item, and we were trying to make a decision as to whether to move it to action. Now that we have had that discussion, it is appropriate now to vote to reconsider that decision, and move it to action tonight.

Chairperson Schmaltz: I should have asked you when you made the motion if you were on the prevailing side.

Senator Liedtke: Yes.

Senator Semlak: I agree one hundred percent with Senator Liedtke.

Senator Schroeer: Sometimes it helps to have private conversations outside the Senate after information has been gathered, and before the item proceeds to action. We have not had that opportunity.

Senator Nelsen: Even though we had not had the information stage at the time we took the vote, I honestly believe that at the point a judgment could be made as to how much information would be brought forward. As such, this is a political move.

Senator Liedtke: The packet of information from the Academic Affairs Committee was just received tonight, and therefore we did not have time to review it beforehand.

Here on the floor of the Senate, we have been able to discuss it and answer our questions.

Senator Zeidenstein: As the mover of the motion that lost, it was not a political move. I was trying to save people's time from having to attend two meetings during finals week. That was my only motivation.

Vote on whether to reconsider the motion on moving the item to action failed. Roll call vote: 18 yes; 10 no; 5 abstentions. Vote required a two thirds majority.

COMMUNICATIONS

Chairperson Schmaltz: At your places this evening are three sheets of paper which I would like to call to your attention. One is a communication from the Rules Committee regarding two faculty appointments to replace members on Academic Standards Committee and the University Curriculum Committee; the second letter is from Provost Strand recommending faculty appointments to the Council for Teacher Education; and the third is recommendations for student appointments for the Council for Teacher Education. These items do not appear on the Agenda this evening. I will ask the Senate to put these items on the agenda tomorrow night, so these committee appointments can be confirmed before the summer.

Senator Zeidenstein: This communication refers to what President Wallace said earlier about reductions in programming and reallocation of money for faculty salaries. My communication is a request, and I do not expect an answer this evening. My question is, when would it be possible for this body either directly or through the Faculty Affairs Committee to be informed on how the money for faculty salaries through internal allocations (since this is not appropriated money) will be distributed. Will it go through the ASPT system, or will it be redistributed through some mechanism other than the ASPT system. If the latter, what mechanism will that be. If the former, why not? Consider that a verbal letter that you may wish to address under Administrator's Remarks in the future.

Senator Barker: How were these students selected for Council for Teacher Education? How were students informed about these openings?

Chairperson Schmaltz: The recommendations were made by the Council for Teacher Education. The students filled out the same forms for application to Senate committees that are filled out by students in the fall. They are education students who are interested in serving on the committee. Copies of their applications are attached to the recommendation.

Senator Wilner: When students are voting on faculty members, it would be nice to know something about them.

Chairperson Schmaltz: The Rules Committee will be discussing that issue.

Senator Schroeer: I have a question about the procedure tomorrow evening. When we debate the action item, is it possible to separate the recommendations into separate motions.

Chairperson Schmaltz: Yes.

Senator Schroeer: Could the motion be changed to substitute sequence for elimination?

Chairperson Schmaltz: Yes.

Senator Mersinger: Since these Council for Teacher Education recommendations were made by CTE, perhaps someone from that committee could speak to the Senate about their qualifications.

Chairperson Schmaltz: The Provost recommends those faculty candidates to the Senate. The Senate just approves or disapproves his recommendation.

Senator Parr: Does anyone know whether the tables are going to continue to shrink?

Chairperson Schmaltz: These are brand new tables. I will discuss this with the Director of the Bone Student Center.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Senator Paul Walker reported that included in Senators' packets was a letter to Len Schmaltz from Ron Fortune with attached third draft of "Illinois State University - A Student Centered Institution." The Academic Affairs Committee became involved in this early on as the proper Academic Senate committee to respond to the University's North Central Accreditation process. We are trying to keep the Senate informed as to what is going on. I will ask Ron Fortune, the Interim Associate Vice President for Academic Planning and Program Development and NCA self study coordinator for ISU to speak to us about what will take place so that the Senate is aware of what is happening before the fact.

Dr. Ron Fortune: Most of the information that I have prepared, I have prepared at the recommendation of the Academic Planning Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee. There may be more here than you need, but we are

operating on the principle that we want to keep you fully informed from the very beginning. This approach will work better than trying to fill you in at a later date after some activities have already gotten under way. As you know from the letter to Senator Schmaltz, we are scheduled by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools for an on-site accreditation visit February 13-15, 1995. The purpose of the self study is to document "the institution's present effectiveness and strategy to continue and improve its effectiveness." The basic self study report will require a three-day on campus visit after which the NCA will determine what kind of continued accreditation we should receive. The maximum an institution can be given is a ten-year extension before the next visit. That is what we had last time. The steps we have taken so far include forming a steering committee following the guidelines set down by the North Central Association as well as the procedures we used in 1985. We have articulated a time table between now and February of 1995 for the various kinds of things that have to happen in order for us to be ready to have a report for the visitation team. We have a draft rationale which is included in the materials you have to request permission to pursue a special emphasis option as opposed to pursuing a traditional option. I will go into that in a bit more detail in a minute. The steering committee is in the process of forming the subcommittees that will take responsibility for drafting the different sections of the NCA self study that will be submitted to the visitation team. This summer we will be developing a prospectus, or plan of action, for conducting the self-study over the next two years, and we will negotiate that with the liaison that has been assigned to us from the NCA. We also plan this summer to complete, and we are in the process of drafting right now a general outline for what the self-study report will actually entail. Some of the methods we have settled on for keeping the University community and the Senate as a whole apprised of self-study activities include: (1) I have met with the Academic Planning Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee, and again it is at their recommendation that I am presenting this to you tonight. As an ex officio member of the Academic Affairs Committee, I will continue to keep them apprised of the steering committee activities. Senator Borg who is on the steering committee and is also a member of the Academic Affairs Committee, has agreed to serve as a liaison between the steering committee and the Academic Affairs Committee and the Academic Senate on all activities related to the NCA self study. (2) The entire campus will be provided with regular updates on the self study progress through the Provost's Newsletter and periodic updates from the steering committee itself. (3) Several months before the final draft of the self study is completed and sent to the respective evaluators, we plan on placing copies of the final draft at various places around campus so everyone in the University can have a chance to look at what

is included in that document before it gets sent off. Senators Gurowitz and Strand are also on the steering committee. Involvement of the Academic Senate -- the self study report will be structured to cover a variety of different topics and subcommittees (the steering committee is in the process of identifying these subcommittees) will be assigned to each of the topics to be included in the self study. One of the chapters or sections that will have to receive significant attention in the document itself will demonstrate that the University addresses the five accreditation criteria established by the NCA. I have already talked with Senator Schmaltz and he has indicated that it would be appropriate to have on the subcommittee that would deal with those five accreditation criteria, one faculty member from each of the Senate's committees. In that way we would have a fairly comprehensive representation of the Senate in a key chapter of the final self study. Other Senate committees will also be involved in other sections of the self study. For example, we will be required to have a separate chapter or segment on what we are doing with assessment in the University. As a part of addressing this chapter, the steering committee has agreed that the Academic Affairs Committee and the Academic Planning Committee will have to have representatives on the subcommittee dealing with the question of assessment. Individual members of the Senate who serve on departmental, college, and University committees will also be involved in some combination on the subcommittees responsible for addressing the other topics to be covered in the self study report. Finally, just a few words about the special emphasis option. The special emphasis option basically gives the University the prerogative to identify a couple of key themes that are of particular significance to it at this point in its history. The steering committee formulated this as a strategy for approaching the self study primarily because it is a more efficient way to address issues that we as an institution need to address and at the same time fulfill the responsibility to get NCA accreditation. The alternative is to have a separate self study focusing on the traditional themes the NCA has identified and at the same time address separately these other themes that have surfaced in the strategic plan, the vision statement, and the academic planning priorities. So the idea in part is simply to make this whole exercise feed more directly into what is important in the University at this point in its history. We have talked with the liaisons, both the one who will no longer be our liaison and the one who has taken her place, about pursuing the special emphasis option, and they have been very encouraging for the very reason that it is simply a more efficient way to deal with the accreditation.

Senator Shaya: You said that you needed a faculty representative from each senate committee. Why didn't you include students?

Dr. Fortune: Because the general structure of the committees that we are following is a structure that is fairly common among other institutions that have done this recently and also reflects the committee structure that we used last time. That structure would have one administrator, four or five faculty and two students. Working with Randy Fox and the Student Affairs area, we have two student representatives who are on the steering committee, and they have agreed to identify students who will serve on the subcommittees for us. What that means is if we had students from the Senate on these subcommittees, then we would not have the appropriate balance among faculty, administration and students.

Chairperson Schmaltz: But, these students will be chosen by the Student Government Association.

Dr. Fortune: Yes, that is my understanding from the representatives on the steering committee.

Senator Zeidenstein: I would like to clarify the meaning of the special emphasis option. Attached to your memo is a third draft document, "Illinois State University - A Student Centered Institution." Is that the special emphasis? And, are (1) University Studies; (2) Technology in Instruction; and (3) Connecting Instruction, Research, and Public Service; specific examples of A Student Centered Institution? Or, are there three special emphases: 1, 2, and 3.

Dr. Fortune: There is an overriding special emphasis that is identified as the single overriding theme and that overriding theme is articulated into three sub-themes. That is a structure that is pretty much recommended by the NCA.

Senator Zeidenstein: And what is the overriding theme?

Dr. Fortune: "Illinois State University - A Student Centered Institution."

ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Senator White stated that there had been some question whether he would serve as chair. He had also been elected to his DFSC, and had planned not to do both, but had changed his mind, and would serve as the Administrative Affairs Committee Chairperson. No report.

BUDGET COMMITTEE - Senator Wayne Nelsen had no report.

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Senator Khalid Razaki announced that the Faculty Affairs Committee had some business to attend to and would meet after Senate.

RULES COMMITTEE - Senator Eric Johnson reported that Rules Committee would hold a short meeting after Senate.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Senator Casie Page asked the Student Affairs Committee to meet following Senate adjournment.

REMINDER -- ACADEMIC SENATE WILL MEET AGAIN TOMORROW NIGHT, MAY 6, 1993, IN THE BOWLING BILLIARDS CENTER ACTIVITY ROOM AT 7:00 P.M.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

XXIV-97

Motion to adjourn by Nelsen (Second, Barker) carried on a voice vote. Academic Senate Meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE

JANET M. COOK, SECRETARY

NAME	ATTEN- DANCE	DOCE						DOICE DOCE	
		ROEION # XXIV95	ROEION # XXIV96	ROEION #	ROEION #	ROEION #	ROEION #	ROEION #	U N
ALEXANDER	EXCUSED							XXIV-94	X
AMSTER	P	YES	NO					XXIV-95	X
BARKER	P	YES	YES					XXIV-96	X
BORG	P	ABS.	ABS.					XXIV-97	X
CHERNICKY	EXCUSED								
COOK	P	NO	---						
DEVINATZ	P	YES	YES						
GRAUMENZ	P	YES	YES						
GROENEVELD	EXCUSED								
GUROWITZ	P	ABS.	---						
HESSE	EXCUSED								
INSEL	P	NO	NO						
JERICH	P	NO	NO						
JOHNSON	P	YES	YES						
KUSH	P	YES	NO						
LAUGHLIN	P	NO	NO						
LEON	EXCUSED								
LIEDTKE	P	NO	YES						
MALEE	EXCUSED								
MANZO	P	YES	YES						
MCCARTY	EXCUSED								
MECKSTROTH	P	NO	YES						
M ^{RS} SINGER	P	NO	NO						
M. SAVI	P	YES	YES						
NELSEN	P	YES	YES						
NEWGREN	EXCUSED								
PAGE	P	YES	YES						
PARR	P	YES	YES						
RAZAKI	P	YES	YES						
RITCH	P	NO	NO						
ROSENIHAL	EXCUSED								
SCHMALTZ	P	YES	YES						
SCHROEFER	P	NO	NO						
SCHWARTZKOFF	EXC.								
SEMLAK	P	NO	YES						
SHAYA	P	ABS.	ABS.						
SIMS	EXCUSED								
STRAND, D.	P	ABS.	ABS.						
STRAND, K.	EXCUSED								
TAYLOR	P	YES	YES						
WALKER	P	NO	ABS.						
WALLACE	P	ABS.	ABS.						
WHITE	P	NO	YES						
WILNER	P	NO	NO						
WINCHIP	P	YES	YES						
ZEIDENSTEIN	P	YES	YES						
ZENK	EXCUSED								
	TOTAL	16 YES	18 YES						
		14 NO	10 NO						
		5 ABS.	5 ABS.						