

Illinois State University

## ISU ReD: Research and eData

---

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

---

Spring 3-5-1997

### Senate Meeting, March 5, 1997

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, March 5, 1997" (1997). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 789.  
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/789>

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](mailto:ISUReD@ilstu.edu).

## ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

March 5, 1997

Volume XXVIII, No. 12

### Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m. by Chairperson, Jan Cook.

### Roll Call

Secretary Paul Borg called the roll and declared a quorum.

### Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve minutes of February 19, 1997 by Senator Wilner (seconded by Myers).  
Carried unanimously on a voice vote with no abstentions.

### Chairperson's Remarks

Chairperson Jan Cook said the Executive Committee will meet tonight after the Senate meeting to set the agenda for the March 19 meeting, since there will be no Executive meeting next week. The following Executive Committee meeting will be on Monday, March 24, 1997, to set the agenda for the April 2 Senate meeting.

The March 19 Senate meeting will be short. I am inviting all the new senators, faculty and students, to meet in the Redbird Room at 6:00 p.m. for a general orientation on the Senate procedures, then invite them to the Circus Room to observe the regular Senate meeting. At the end of the meeting refreshments will be served, with student and faculty caucuses taking place simultaneously on opposite sides of the room.

At the meeting I will ask the Committee Chairs to make a quick overview of what the committee does in their committee reports, for the benefit of the newly elected senators.

### Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairman Joe Jannazzo wanted to remind everyone that the student Senators have mid-terms tomorrow, (Mar. 6) and try to have as short a discussion as possible.

I wish everybody a happy Spring break, because it will be well needed after this meeting.

### Student Government Association President's Remarks

Senator Saulter wanted to echo the reminder of mid-terms for student Senators, to keep comments brief.

### Administrator's Remarks

**President Strand said:**

- I am pleased to report that the information shared at the last meeting about the \$4 million for the Science Laboratory Building equipment, has now become reality. The \$4 million has been adopted by both houses and approved by the Governor. The building will be open on schedule in August. I want to thank many people for their support.
- Lieutenant Governor, Bob Kustra was on campus Friday, February 28. He toured the Science Laboratory Building and was very impressed with the building. He had a meeting with the vice-presidents and me, during which time he talked about his expectations for the Board of Higher Education, as the new Chair. His vision of higher education was very valuable information. He will be an excellent Chair of the Board of Higher Education. We will host the Board of Higher Education at a meeting on our campus Tuesday, July 1.
- The Lieutenant Governor spoke at the Distance Learning Conference that was held in the Ballroom. We had members of all of the Higher Education Consortia throughout the state, and reached the maximum registration of 300 people. It was very well attended and an excellent conference on Distance Learning.
- I am pleased to report that Governor Edgar, in his Budget message today, endorsed the Board of Higher Education's level of funding for Higher Education in the State of Illinois. This is the fourth consecutive year. It sounds automatic, but it is not, nor is it automatic that the General Assembly will embrace this level of funding. We will work hard to try and get this level of funding passed in the House and the Senate, then signed by the Governor sometime in late May or June.

**Provost Urice said:**

- Last week we signed an employment contract with Clifton Jones, Dean of Libraries at Iowa State. He will be joining us as ISU's Dean of the University Libraries on July 1. This was a long search, taking more than a year. It is the third major search Academic Affairs has included this academic year. The Associate Provost position and the Dean of the College of Business were filled also. The College of Applied Science and Technology is for a Dean, and I have been told they will have recommendations advanced to me by March 6.
- It is important for the student senators to be here tonight because the Academic Senate will debate and take action on the General Education Proposal. This is a culmination of 9 years of very hard work by many faculty, administrators, and other people on this campus who are committed to improving the curriculum of this University. The University is the curriculum and the faculty and students who interact through it. You may, as students, see passion and intensity tonight as we discuss amendments and the basic proposal. I want you as students to :
  1. Understand, if you see this passion and intensity, not to see this as a battle between good and evil. Rather, we are at ultimate stages of an important decision, a critical decision of this University. You will see intelligent, caring professionals working on the proposal for improvements.
  2. I know you have exams, which are very important, but it is vitally important for you to stay with us as long as you can, to cast your vote, however you

choose to cast your vote after hearing the debate, after reading the proposal, and after thinking about the future of this University. Just as other students in the past have committed themselves to doing important things, and have made some sacrifices to make this a better University for you. You have the opportunity tonight to do the same for the future University students.

**Vice President Gurowitz** said I want to echo my colleagues statements, that I hope the students, faculty, and staff enjoy the Spring break. Spring is only two and one-half weeks away.

**Vice President Taylor**, no remarks.

**Committee Reports:**

Academic Affairs: Senator Borg, Chairperson, said they have been discussing a number of issues, several of which will come before you this evening. We have dealt with most of the curricular matters. There are two items in addition to the General Education Proposal this evening that will come up in the next meeting.

Our next meeting will be Thursday, March 6 at 11:00 a.m.

Administrative Affairs: Senator White, Chairperson, said that Administrative Affairs will meet at 6:00 p.m. before the March 19 Senate meeting to make the final decisions on the academic calendars.

Budget: Senator Jones, Chairperson, said that they met Wednesday, February 26. The Budget Committee has been reminded that on March 31, April 1 and 2, in the morning of these 3 days, the Budget presentations of the University's various colleges will be presented in Stevenson Hall, room 401. The missions, goals, and priorities of the various colleges will be related at this time, in preparation for developing the next budget.

We discussed the HPER program revisions that are on tonight's agenda and saw no budgetary reasons why this should not be approved.

Dr. Chapman, the Associate Provost, also presented a report on the outcomes of the AdHoc Committee from last year, to review the summer school. They evaluated 4 issues in the AdHoc Committee:

1. the predictability of summer school sessions
2. the scheduling and calendar of summer school
3. the marketing of summer school
4. the central co-ordination of summer school

Dr. Chapman has addressed 3 of the 4 issues. These are recommendations that should be followed up.

We have had the last of our regularly scheduled Budget Committee meetings until the seating of the new Senators.

Faculty Affairs: Senator Weber, Chairperson, said the Faculty Affairs Committee met at 4:15 p.m. today. We continue to wait for the report from the URC about the ASPT survey. When we receive this report, we will decide on what action needs to be taken. If we receive the ASPT report before the next Senate meeting, then Faculty Affairs will meet before the next meeting.

Rules: Senator Nelsen, Chairperson, said Rules Committee did not meet this evening, but will meet before the next Senate meeting at 6:00 p.m. We will ask Dr. Kern to give us a status report on the Board of Trustees Documents.

We will be also be looking at the College of Education By-laws, from last Spring.

Student Affairs: Senator Brooks had no remarks.

Senator Jones asked if it would be appropriate for Student Affairs to evaluate the request by the Iceberg Team, as to whether they can/cannot use the ISU Logo. Reply - Senator Cook said the Senate has not received the request, and so it has not been referred to Student Affairs.

**Information Items:**

11.20.96.02 *HPER Curriculum Proposal for 130 Hours.* Senator Borg said the revisions are those having to do with the sequence of the program leading to the special K-12 Teaching Certificate, as is required by the State of Illinois. The number of hours exceeds the normal 124 hours of course work and so needs Academic Senate approval. It is this particular sequence that requires our action.

Page 96 of your document, is the sequence leading to the special certificate. In the middle of the page the University Standard for the Proposed Sequence, lists the number of hours as 130. The reason for the number of hours is:

1. The special K-12 Certificate exists only for Music Education & Physical Education. The state requires more hours than for K-9 or 6-12 certificates.
2. The (page 90) Core Requirements for Physical Education have increased the number of credit hours in HPR 280 from 2 to 3, and HPR 240 from 1 to 2 credit hours.

We have Marlene Mawson, HPER Department Chair, present to answer questions. Dr. Mawson said that HPER is asking the Senate to approve this program, because many students are trying to get certification at the elementary school level and the secondary school level. This will allow them to accomplish this with only a few extra hours. Two certifications in other program would take two full programs, rather than just a few extra hours. It is not a matter of increasing hours, but allowing the students to get two different certifications.

*Senator Razaki* asked if the 130 hours include hours required with the General Education Program. Reply - Dr. Mawson said the General Education Program does not bear on this

degree any differently than on any other major program.

**Senator Saulter** asked if the only way for a student to get a K-12 Certification is to get a K-6 Certification. *Reply* - In Illinois K-6 Certification is not offered. They offer 6-12, and the other is K-12. In order to get K-12, you have to have the course work for elementary schools, in additions to the secondary level. **Senator Saulter** asked how many hours are required. *Reply* - 124 hours for 6-12, and 130 hours for K-12. Senator Borg said the 6-12 certificate requires 48 hours in HPER, the K-12 certificate requires 51 hours. Both have a 26 hour core requirement. There is a total of 6 hours difference between the two degrees.

This will be an action item at the March 19 Senate meeting.

**Action Items:**

XXVIII-100

Motion by Senator Brooks (seconded by Nelsen) to remove Athletic Council By-laws (11.08.96.03) from the table. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote with no abstentions.

XXVIII-101

1) Motion by Senator Brooks (seconded by Nelsen) to approve the Athletic Council By-laws (11.08.96.03). Included in the Senate packet are the revisions and the original by-laws of the Athletic Council.

**Questions:**

**Senator Jones** asked to change the words on page 7 from *be aware for*, to *be aware of*. On page 6 of Fiscal Integrity, many of the budgetary issues have been lined out. Is the intent to not have the committee make recommendations on different budgetary issues?

*Reply* - Priscilla Matthews, current chair of the Athletic Council, reviewed the minutes of the '95-'96 year, containing significant debate on the committee that revised this section. They concentrate on general principals in order to make them valid for Athletics at this University. It is not the intention of the current council to change what is reviewed.

The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote with 40 aye, 0 nay, and 4 abstentions.

XXVIII-102

2) Motion by Senator Borg (seconded by Senator Garner) to approve the proposal to delete the Human Biology Sequences from the minor in Biological Sciences. Senator Borg said Biology Chairperson, Carlton Phillips is here to answer questions.

**Questions:**

**Senator Saulter** asked if they are deleting the sequence because a professor no longer teaches the course. *Reply* - No. Professor Phillips said the minor serves a relatively small number of people. The department decided it would be better to put our resources in other areas. The undergraduate course in gross Anatomy is not compatible with a usual undergraduate curriculum in Biological Sciences. It is a very unusual course to have.

**Senator Saulter** asked if the students who take this course are farther ahead when they enter Medical School. *Reply* - Human Anatomy is an important part in the basic curriculum of medical schools. Those programs prefer to teach the Gross Anatomy themselves. The

potential candidates for medicine concentrate more on BioChemistry and Molecular Biology

The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote with 42 aye, 1 nay, 1 abstention.

XXVIII-103

3) Motion by Senator Borg (seconded by Garner) to adopt, as the General Education Program for Illinois State University, the program outlined in the proposal of Feb. 13, 1997, with the addendum from Feb. 27, 1997. (*Refer to appendix A*)

**Debate:**

*Senator White* would like to add two sentences on page 12 at the end of the category as a 'friendly amendment', saying "The courses in this category are writing intensive courses and are not intended as courses in composition. As such courses in this category do not fulfill requirements for second writing courses either in majors or certification." Senator Borg said he would consider only the first sentence as friendly. Senator White said he would change it to, "**The courses in this category are writing intensive courses and are not intended as courses in composition.**" Senator Garner, seconder of the main motion, would not accept the amendment as friendly.

XXVIII-104

Motion by Senator White (seconded by Senator Thomas) to make the 'friendly amendment' a 'formal amendment' saying "**The courses in this category are writing intensive courses and are not intended as courses in composition.**"

**Debate:**

*Senator Nelsen* asked the distinction between a writing intensive and composition course. *Reply* - Senator White said a writing intensive course intends to be a course that is limited in enrollment and requires at least 5 papers. It is not a skills course, it is a content course. A skills course (compositions course) and a humanities course (content course) cannot be offered within the same course, due to their curricular intent. I simply seek to clarify with this amendment the intent of the category.

*Senator Saulter* asked if a course requiring 5 papers is not writing a composition course and don't you plan to bring forth an amendment to add another course? *Reply* - Senator White said he does not plan to bring forth another course. *Senator Saulter* said we are going to add another writing course and take this course away, to specifically use it as a writing course, and there are 5 papers in it? *Reply* - Senator White said yes, that is what goes on in writing intensive courses. Senator Borg said under the criteria on page 12, there are 4 criteria listed. Criteria 1,2 are not considered general characteristics. This is a concern with the English Department, the way the category is now written. Senator White's amendment intends to make explicit in the language that this does not burden the writing composition professors of the English Department. The rest of the category stresses that there should be written projects.

*Senator Brooks* said if we adopt this amendment, we will have only one course in composition, since it is stated that the other course will not be composition. That then

opens the door for an amendment down the road that will add a second composition course, which will add 3 more hours to the program. This is not just a friendly amendment.

**Senator Neuleib** made a statement in a way to describe the courses. It is up to the Senators to decide on this amendment. A *writing composition course* is a course in which students work intensively with:

- writing and rewriting
- doing multiple drafts of papers
- work together in groups on papers
- they respond to one another's papers
- they do extensive research to develop papers

The time in the class is spent emphasizing the writing, and the intensive work on writing.

A *writing intensive course* is:

- a course in which content is covered and then students go away to write papers about the content.
- the time in class is not spent on the content

That is the difference in the two courses. We are defining a composition course as one in which the subject of the course is, *the skills of composition*.

**Senator Kurtz** drew attention to the letter from the Chairs in the Humanities Department which was at the senators' seats tonight. The letter is self-explanatory. There is strong support to alter the description of the category in such a way that it is clear that it is a "writing-intensive" course.

**Senator Jannazzo** asked about criterion #4, which said the course must include specific writing and composing. Is that not composition? Would that also have to be changed?

*Reply* - Senator Borg said the criteria statements between 1 and 2, and 4 are incompatible. Criterion 4 does not constitute enough of a writing component. **Senator White** introduced Dr. Hesse in the Department of English. He said the distinction between writing intensive courses and writing courses is:

- it is necessary for a writing course to be writing intensive
- it is not the case that a writing intensive course is necessarily a writing course
- there is a difference between assigning writing and teaching the processes of writing

The characteristic of a writing course is that it is taught by somebody who is credentialed and familiar with the large body of research and theory in the teaching of writing. In the past 30 years there has been a lot of empirical and theoretical research in the effect of the pedagogy of writing.

This is not to discourage courses that are writing intensive, creating the opportunity for students to write. In a writing course students need to be taught various kinds of intentional characteristics; how to generate ideas, and how to evaluate arguments in a certain situation. They would have a good interaction in various steps in the composing process. In the subject matter of the course, the emphasis would be on production of the



student text, and not on the content of the course.

The motion carried on a ballot vote with 26 aye, 14 nay, 4 abstentions.

*President Strand* made a general statement on the proposal saying that the general education proposal is an initiative with which I have been closely associated and which I strongly support. The effort began when I served as your chief academic officer.

Some background information:

- Our current program is nearly 20 years old
- A 1988 faculty survey revealed strong dissatisfaction with the current program.
- In 1989, while serving as Provost, I appointed a special university committee with four charges:
  1. Review national literature and develop a statement of philosophy for University Studies at Illinois State University.
  2. Define objectives for University Studies at Illinois State University.
  3. Review existing programs at other universities as well as the Illinois State University program to ascertain how well they meet the newly defined campus objectives.
  4. Make appropriate recommendations and develop a plan of implementation for a revised University Studies program.
- During the years since this effort was initiated, we have fulfilled the charge and are now ready to move ahead.

Let me share with you a few of the reasons I believe we should adopt the new program:

- The statements of Philosophy and Objectives have previously been adopted overwhelmingly by the Academic Senate in March 1991, and March 1992.
- The Senate endorsed a three-year pilot program of the 1994 proposal, and the pilot has been completed on time. 250 faculty and several hundred students have been involved in a variety of ways with the pilot program.
- The proposal now before the faculty and the Academic Senate responds very well to the specific concerns raised by faculty members when they were surveyed by the Provost's Office nearly ten years ago.
- The revised proposal also responds to the major criticisms and concerns about the original 1994 proposal.
- From a curricular perspective, the program is very good:
  1. The underlying philosophy, coherence, instructional methods, and faculty development component are all consistent with what is considered the "frontier" of general education and with the "best" instructional practices in undergraduate education.
  2. The program has the major attributes of effective general education programs as laid out by the American Association of Colleges and Universities, a national leader in supporting general education reform. The National Science Foundation

(in their report "Shaping the Future") has just called for significant reform of science education in the United States. The principles of their call for reform are the very same objectives and pedagogies embodied in our proposed general education program.

- The Pilot Program has already attracted the attention of students and educators elsewhere. It has been demonstrated that the new general education program will attract a larger number of academically talented students to the campus and assist in improving retention rates for all students.

In closing, I am hopeful that you will support this program:

- The state is watching to see who assumes the leadership in role in undergraduate education. We are increasingly perceived by the IBHE staff, high schools, etc. as having assumed this role. This program should add significantly to our momentum in becoming a visible leader in the State higher education.
- We have the opportunity tonight to be part of a history-making process in this the 140th year of Illinois State University.

*Let's do just that. Thank you.*

**Senator Brooks** said that originally he had been against the implementation of this proposal, but he hopes others, on the same side as he is, will join him in accepting it now.

XXVIII-105

Motion by Senator Neuleib (seconded by Senator White) to accept the rewritten text, dated Feb. 21, 1997, of her proposed amendment regarding Language and Composition. (*Refer to appendix B*)

The reason for suggesting the 2 semester span is:

- students need further instruction in writing,
- a 2nd semester of writing is required for many of our majors.

**Debate:**

**Senator Saulter** asked who will be teaching these courses. *Reply* - Senator Neuleib said people who will be teaching the courses will be people who have been trained. Currently the introductory composition course is taught by graduate students. **Senator Saulter** asked if they are first semester graduate students? *Reply* - Senator Neuleib said no. There will be no graduate students teaching who have no teaching experience. Senator Borg said that in cooperation with the English Department, resources are being collected to allow the introductory writing courses to be staffed by more experienced students.

**Senator Nelsen** had two major concerns:

- The amendment increases the number of hours in the General Education program, when major programs are working hard to stay within the 120 hour limit.
- Staffing, from the point of view that the current education program requires the splitting of writing into both fall and spring semesters. This would require us to increase the staff.

**Senator Razaki** seconded Senator Nelsen's statement. I am a strong supporter of good writing skills, but for the business majors this is too much.

**Senator Varner** is concerned about the addition of a composition course. In the College of Business, everybody has to take a writing course; therefore, for our majors to get what they need would mean they would have to have at least 9 hours of writing. That would add 3 hours to the General Education program.

**Senator Fisher** asked if anything has gone on lately that would cause such a significant proposal, as well as goals, to be added at this late stage? *Reply* - Senator Neuleib said originally the language and content course was seen by English as the second semester of writing. If the language and humanities course is going to fill that slot, then there is not a place for writing in the sense that is required.

**Senator Borg** yielded to Dr. Dillingham to reply to the discussion of language courses. Dr. Dillingham said that the development of student writing proficiency is one of the most important learning objectives of a baccalaureate degree. The development of these skills is a process that takes more than one course, more than two courses. It requires the right kind of reinforcement, review and repetition, and transfer over the course of the entire undergraduate experience. We as a faculty are collectively responsible for the achievement of this objective, and we as a faculty, here and in many other institutions of higher education, do not have the best track record on the effective achievement of this objective.

I seek for us to do a better job. This General Education Proposal and its inherent commitment to the provision of a sound educational foundation for our students is a start.

- This program as proposed does not reduce the extent of writing expected of students. It increases it.
- This program as proposed provides for development activities that will help all faculty provide more effective and constructive writing opportunities for our students.
- The program proposal and the piloting process have stressed commitment and investment in the improved learning experiences of freshmen, not the simple change of one more course, or one less course required of students.

I am not opposed to a second writing course in concept. I believe we need to provide more writing opportunities, more guidance to our students, and we need to effectively evaluate the development of writing skills that our students experience, in order to do a better job of achieving this objective in the future.

The concerns that I have about the proposed amendment to add a second writing course center on what we know about the writing course offerings of English 101 and/or 145.

1. The discussion among the faculty expressing concern about the writing skills of our students has taken place in the context of our present requirements, English 101, and for many students, English 145, but we have no evidence of the effect of these existing

requirements on the writing proficiencies of our students.

2. The staffing for at least 85-95% English 101 sections is by graduate students. This raises concerns about the qualifications of these instructors relative to those outlined by the English Department, and therefore, the effect of these courses on the writing proficiency of students.

In summary, my concern is the extent to which English course requirements, or other requirements for that matter, have the intended impact upon student learning and the commitment of the faculty and the institution to that objective. We can require a second English writing course, but that is definitely not the same thing as ensuring the improvement of the writing skills development of our students.

**Senator Koehl** expressed concerns over this amendment including:

- time to degree; with an additional 3 hours per student
- reduced student flexibility in scheduling
- writing skills can develop just as thoroughly in other courses
- this is not in the best interest of students

**Senator Wilner** asked how this would affect transfer students, since most Associate Degrees are 120 hours. *Reply* - Senator Borg said the Associates Degree is 60 hours. The courses for transfer that we accept are either an Associates Degree with the General Education requirements substantially completed, or a student who comes in without a completed Associates Degree will have individual articulated course categories for General Education.

**Senator Deutsch** said in the '94 proposal, the original Language in Context category was to be a second writing course. *Reply* - Senator Borg read the proposal from the '94 proposal. "In Language in Context, students who already possess basic skills in a language, will build on their language experiences in earlier writing and speech courses, and exercise their formal language abilities in an academic context. Courses in this category will focus on the discussed conventions of groups of similar disciplines or metadisciplines. The courses will be designed to expand the student's ability to use language effectively, within these broad disciplinary groups." The first goal says, "in Language in Context courses students will learn to write and/or speak well according to the conventions governing language use within groups of academic disciplines." It was never assumed that this would be only a second writing course. **Senator Deutsch** said there remained in the Middle Core, a course in the Humanities. Someone asked why the chairs of these departments feel it is necessary to argue with this step. If we want to have a second course, are we faced with the choice of either removing this humanities course in the middle core, returning to the original description; or adding a second writing to the whole program?. *Reply* - Senator Neuleib said they are proposing to add the second writing course, and retain the humanities course. Senator Borg said that is not entirely an either/or situation. It was the intention to have a reduction in the total number of hours required for General Education, because the Inner Core would have fewer opportunities for student choice.

**Senator White** yielded the floor to Dean Schollaert, who said his first purpose is to demonstrate very clearly that the claims of an administrative conspiracy are not true. I will disagree strongly with Dean Dillingham about his conclusions on the support of this course.

- We are not adding 3 hours with this amendment to the undergraduate general education. Gen Ed is currently 48 hours, this new amendment would make the new General Education program 48 hours.
- The new program would still permit students to take 3 hours in their major programs, which they do not currently permit.
- This program should be able to be accommodated under any of the degree programs.
- I share Dr. Dillingham's concerns of how we deliver English 101 and English 145. These are problems that should not drive the intellectual decision of what the correct curriculum for our students ought to be. These are problems that can be fixed. What needs to be put in place is 6 hours of composition instruction. Teaching students how to compose and write is the hallmark of quality education, and that is why I support this amendment.

**Senator El-Zanati** said he accepts adding the course. He asked about the budgetary savings of \$300,000, by decreasing the number of required hours by 3 hours. *Reply* - Senator Jones said the Budget Committee never understood the \$300,000 savings. Dean Schollaert said currently about 3/4 of our undergraduates take English 145.

**Senator Lockwood** said he is against the amendment. He agrees the need for a second writing course. If the amendment that I plan to offer later fails, then the students still have the 3 hours to elect a writing course on their own.

**Senator Thompson's** question involves the concerns of sequence. Does having two composition courses allow them to benefit more from the writing intensive course? *Reply* - Senator Neuleib said basically everywhere in Illinois, except at Illinois State University, there are two writing courses.

XXVIII-105.b Motion by Senator Saulter (seconded by Senator Nelsen) to stop debate. Approved by voice vote, 32 aye, 10 nay, 2 abstentions.

XXVIII-105 The amendment was defeated on a roll call vote, 7 aye, 35 nay, 2 abstentions.

XXVIII-106 Motion by Senator Lockwood (seconded by Senator K. Strand) that the description of the course categories Language in the Humanities, page 12 be replaced by the course category description Language in Context, listed below, and that related modifications to the General Education Proposal, also listed below, be made. (*Refer to appendix C*)

**Debate:**

**Senator Lockwood** said he recognizes that the faculty are divided on this proposal. I see my amendment as a compromise between the previous Language in Context and the current

Language in Humanities. It does allow the students to have a second writing course, which is not true under Language in Humanities. Faculty for the last 20 years, have had a concern that we are a university that does not require a second writing course. A second writing course would be extremely helpful to students, and would in general, approve the academic climate in the university.

*Senator Nelsen* said he is in support of the motion. This is not saying that the Humanities should not exist, but there are other important aspects of an undergraduate degree that can be addressed. The students should have the ability to choose the options they feel will best meet their needs and requirements.

*Senator Blum* said it is clear that the Language in the Humanities course is the only segment of the Middle Core that supports very important developments in general literacy. We are talking about the literacy of sound, behavior, and vision, which make up the primary needs by which this culture delivers information. I would like to argue against this amendment.

*Senator Kurtz* redirected the attention to the letter to the Senators from the combined chairs of all departments of the Humanities. It is a strong belief that if the presence in the Middle Core of Humanities is diluted or wholly submerged, the whole concept of General Education at Illinois State University would be submerged. I support the maintenance of Humanities in the Middle Core and argue against the substitution proposed by Senator Lockwood.

*Senator Borg* said on page 21 of the proposal is a summary of the General Education outcomes by course category. Those include objective 10, which is addressed under other course categories. However, Objective 6, to develop a critical appreciation of a wide range of aesthetic experiences, is not found elsewhere in the Inner or Middle Core. If this course category is changed, those people who need this, would only get it as a primary influence in the Outer Core Fine Arts category.

*Provost Urice* said he is confident that the intent of the amendment is positive, but passage of this amendment would be a terrible thing to the role of Humanities for our students. I will not support this amendment.

*Senator White* said the nature of the Middle Core has changed. The arguments for the categories in the Middle Core now have more to do with disciplines. In this context PIC decided that Middle Core needed a category for the Humanities. Humanities were not clearly welcomed anywhere else in the Middle Core. As was said to me by an administrator, "if you think the courses in the Humanities are going to fit in the other categories, you are whistling past the graveyard." If you scratch a Gen-Ed Program, what do you find? Shakespeare.

*Senator Varner* requested clarification of the amendment. When you say Language in Context, do you refer to the context as it was in the original 1994 proposal? *Reply -*

Senator Lockwood said he uses the language in the original proposal. How we present Humanities in some of the courses that are there. It should be systematically included in the program. What most folks have wanted for several years is a second writing course for our students.

*Senator Deutsch* said we need to take into account the concerns of the Humanities chairs at this University. Their concern is very clear. I have been involved in the Pilot, and my judgment tonight is that their program is an excellent program. There has been a change from the 1994 version to the present version, where there is now an important place in the Middle Core for these courses. I cannot support this proposal.

*Senator Newgren* said our students would go 4 years with no Humanities. I am against the proposal.

*Senator Nelsen* said he supports the General Education teaching.

*Senator Koehl* asked if this amendment were to be approved, where else in the General Education Proposal would there be reference to learning in the Humanities? *Reply* - Senator Borg said in the Outer Core.

The motion failed on a roll call vote, 7 aye, 33 nay, 4 abstentions.

XXVIII-107

Motion by Senator Pereira (seconded by Senator Brooks) I move that the General Education Proposal be amended to delete the terms "Western" and "Non-Western" wherever they appear. As far as the term "Non-Western", we have come up with an acronym, "A.M.A.L.I." It stands for Asia, The Middle-East, Africa, Latin America, Indigenous Peoples of the World. That will include all the people and the cultures that were included by the term "Non-Western". (*Refer to appendix D*)

**Debate:**

*Senator Razaki* said he very strongly supports this motion.

*Senator Wilner* said he supports this motion, and if this amendment does not pass, the whole General Education proposal is out of order.

*Senator Myers* asked if the term A.M.A.L.I. is new for this program. *Reply* - Senator Pereira said yes, it is not a term, it is an acronym. It was suggested by Senator Brooks and his colleagues in the Political Science Department

*Provost Urice* congratulated Senator Pereira on his work. This is a marvelous addition, and I am totally in support.

*Senator Riley* said he supports the change. Between the suggested amendment distributed Feb 24th and the amendment dated March 4th, the definition of countries changed. *Reply* - I included Australia, because I wanted to make sure that the aboriginal cultures were

included.

**Senator El-Zanati** said he supports the amendment, but does not want to be called an A.M.A.L.I. *Reply* - Senator Pereira said it is important to know this is an acronym, not a name.

**Senator Walters** suggested a friendly amendment to keep the language which refers to the United States traditions. On page 12 to say "within broader traditions". *Reply* - Senator Pereira said had no objections to the phrase. Senator MacDonald said the History Department would be delighted with this revision.

**Senator Garner** said she supports the amendment. Would the acronym A.M.A.L.I. have a meaning in another language which could be a problem. *Reply* - Senator Pereira said I don't think so.

**Senator Borg** I am very pleased with the acronym A.M.A.L.I. I still have resistance in getting rid of the word "Western" completely in the statement of student outcomes and objectives (on document approved 3/25/92) that is a supporting document to the proposal of the objectives. It says "as a result, students will be able to identify and critically reflect upon the major institutions movements, ideas and values, which characterize the past and present of culture in Western cultures."

Also, do you take part in teaching THE 151? *Reply* - Senator Pereira said no. **Senator Borg** asked if you have dealt with any part of the curricular process? Can you tell me the title of THE 151? *Reply* - Senator Pereira, I don't know. **Senator Borg** said History of the Theatre in Western Culture.

Motion approved on roll call vote with 44 aye, 0 nay, 0 abstain.

XXVIII-108

Motion by Senator MacDonald (seconded by Senator Weber) that the wording on page 16, under the heading Disciplinary Knowledge in Cultural Contents, and the sub-heading "Contents" be deleted and replaced with the original wording of the same section as proposed by the PIC Committee in January 1997. The current wording would tend to allow many courses that have been used in our Iniversity Studio Program to enter this Gen-Ed Program. The original PIC wording would fit the new program better.

**Debate:**

**Senator Borg** said you do not have a comparable wording page by page. In the document of February 13 is the wording that was forwarded by the Academic Affairs Committee. The PIC document of 12/18/96 is the other wording.

**Senator Koehl** yielded to Dr. Dillingham. Dr. Dillingham strongly supports Senator MacDonald's amendment. The Outer Core category is intended as a transition from the Middle Core component, and the focus of the Outer Core is disciplinary knowledge. In the original proposal in 1994 there were 3 categories in the Outer Core. The Pilot Committee recommended in 1996 a combination. It combined discliplinary knowledge and the dynamics of culture. The point of which is the study of the impact of cultural contact on



discipline, with disciplinary knowledge and the quality of life. The original of the 1996 version of the proposal is very clear about the purpose of this category and the two different directions of impact that are to be addressed, by the discipline courses in this category.

*Senator Lockwood* spoke against the amendment. The intent of the re-wording was to make the two categories parallel and to clarify the quality of life and the combination of the quality of life and the cultural context.

*Senator Walters* spoke in favor of the amendment. The original wording stressed discipline inquiry, which is a better choice of wording.

Passed on a roll call vote of 34 aye, 5 nay, 5 abstentions.

XXVIII-109

Motion by Senator Riley (seconded by Senator Garner) In “Disciplinary Knowledge in Cultural Contexts, Content”, 4th sentence, it is moved that additional wording be inserted after the phrase “quality of” as follows:

“... life issues, defined as the study of physical, mental-emotional, social and spiritual dimensions of human existence will be examined ...”

I would like a definition of the quality of life included in the content.

**Debate:**

*Senator Riley* yielded to Professor Thomas to speak on the quality of life amendment.

Professor Thomas said I am here this evening to speak in favor of this amendment. I would first like to speak to what the amendment will not do:

- This amendment will not alter the emphasis or spirit of the General Education Proposal. It does not diminish the importance of science, technology, communication, or mathematics.
- This amendment will not open the floodgates to “non-academic” courses. All courses that are proposed must go through the General Education course evaluation process before being implemented.

What the amendment will do is:

- Provide balance to the general education of our students. If the university values the teaching of “balance” in life, (meaning mind, body, spirit) then the definition of quality of life needs to reflect that. The inner, middle, and outer core have done a great job of incorporating traditionally valued knowledge and skills such as reading, writing, arithmetic, and spoken communication through different subject matter, all of which are seen to create value through jobs, productivity, etc. But, there is little in the Gen. Ed. proposal that places value or importance on the self (healthy lifestyles, lifetime leisure skills.) The amendment promotes inclusiveness in consideration of the education of the whole person.

This amendment should be supported because:

It allows for courses that deal with preventing the leading causes of death in our society. I support this amendment because it makes economic sense to educate our students about

these issues. Research clearly indicates that the economic impact in the United States of unhealthy lifestyles costs hundreds of billions of dollars (AHA). The truly amazing fact is that virtually all of the conditions and problems are avoidable. These trends are directly linked to a lack of knowledge about, and practice of healthy lifestyles. This amendment sends the appropriate educational message. It will allow for courses that teach students the knowledge and skills necessary to live longer and lead a higher quality of life. It demonstrates to students that this university places value on those factors that directly impact their quality of life and longevity.

You may wonder why it is important to provide an opportunity for these lessons in the Gen Ed program. Take a good look at your students. It is during early adulthood that trends toward the diseases that afflict our population develop. Our students are away from home for the first time. They are not eating well. They are keeping irregular hours. Many are practicing risky lifestyle behaviors. This is the best time to send the message that what you do now will play a major role in determining the quality and longevity of your life.

This amendment allows for curricular content that is central to the mission of the university. This amendment speaks to the definition of a truly general educated individual, one whose intellectual, physical, social, and emotional potential is maximized. I speak for this amendment because I care for our students. This amendment makes sense from a humanitarian standpoint, from an economic standpoint, and from an educational standpoint.

**Debate:**

Senator Koehl yielded to Dr. Dillingham who is against this proposal.

Motion by Senator Saulter (seconded by Blum) to cut off debate on this amendment.  
Passed on a voice vote with 36 aye, 8 nay, 0 abstain

**XXVIII-109** The amendment failed by a roll call vote with 7 aye, 29 nay, 8 abstentions.

**XXVIII-103** The main motion passed on a roll call vote with 41 aye, 3 nay, 0 abstain.

**Communications:**

No communications

**Adjournment:**

**XXVIII-110** Motion to adjourn at 10:30 p.m. by Senator Saulter (seconded by Senator Razaki). The motion carried unanimously on a standing vote with no abstentions.

## REFERENCE TO ATTACHED APPENDIX

Appendix A	Motion XXVIII-103	From Paul Borg (Academic Affairs Committee) dated Feb. 27, 1997
Appendix B	Motion XXVIII-105	From Jan Neuleib, dated Feb. 21, 1997
Appendix C	Motion XXVIII-106	From Wayne Lockwood, dated Feb. 27, 1997
Appendix D	Motion XXVIII-107	From Kim Pereira, dated March 4, 1997

ILLINOIS STATE  
UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS  
Department of Music



Centennial Building  
Campus Box 5660  
Normal, IL 61790-5660  
Telephone: (309) 438-7631

TO: Jan Cook, Chair, Academic Senate  
FROM: Paul Borg, Chair, Academic Affairs Committee  
SUBJECT: Emendations to the Proposal for a new General Education Program  
DATE: February 27, 1997

The Academic Affairs Committee has adopted the following changes to the proposal for a new program of General Education at Illinois State University it forwarded for information at the February 19 Senate meeting. These changes are responses to questions asked at that meeting and are intended to clarify the issues raised.

1. Faculty Development, p. 19. Wording for the beginning of the firsts paragraph of the section titled *Faculty Development* should read:

“The University will provide an on-going program of faculty development for those faculty teaching in the general education program, since ~~it is expected that~~ most faculty will teach in the program at sometime . . .”

Rationale: It is not the intent of the document to suggest that faculty are “expected” to teach in General Education.

2. General Education Program Policies, p. 18

a. Program Policy No. 3 should read:

“3. Students may count no more that three semester hours of General Education **Middle and** Outer core course work from their major discipline.”

Rationale: The statement is taken from the 1994 document in which there is no mention of a “middle core;” the statement is intended to apply to courses both in the Middle Core and in the Outer Core.

b. Program Policy No. 4 should read:

“4. The general education program consists of a set of course areas essential to the broad education of all undergraduates; within these categories, students should be given the maximum opportunity to exercise individual choice. Major programs may stipulate specific general education courses as a part of the major requirements only if such courses serve as prerequisites for other courses required by the major.”

Rationale: The statement is intended to emphasize the idea of student choice in General Education without preventing departments from demonstrating that specific courses that happen to be in General Education are legitimately prerequisite to courses in the major program.

February 21, 1997

To: Academic Senate  
 From: Jan Neuleib  
 re: Additional Clarification of My Proposed Amendment to the General Education Program, regarding Language and Composition

Ca. 29.7 / 02  
 P... 3/5

Some Senators noted that part D, calling for "other necessary revisions shall be made in the proposal to reflect the changes described in A, B, and C, above," did not make sufficiently explicit the "other necessary revisions." For the purpose of precision and clarity, I am providing additional editorial revisions here. With the exception of a clarifying addition to Part A, everything up to Part D, below, is identical to the amendment distributed February 19.

I move that the General Education Proposal be amended as follows:

A. The description of Category 2 on page 4 shall read:

2. Language and Composition I and II<sup>1</sup> Required Co or Pre: 1 6 (2 x 3) sem hours

B. The following additions shall be made to the "Content" description of Language and Composition on page 7:

In the two-semester sequence for Language and Composition, students develop their writing abilities, focusing on processes through which writers create effective texts for themselves and for others. . . . Students learn to appreciate critically different perspectives on various issues of importance to their growing understanding of themselves and of the world in which they live. In the second semester of this sequence, students apply skills developed in the first semester to increasingly complex writing tasks, as well as developing new analytic and editorial skills. The course stresses peer and instructor critiques. . . .

C. The following shall be added to the list of Goals on page 7:

- 8. apply strategies for critical inquiry to increasingly complex writing tasks;
- 9. develop an extensive repertory of idea-generating and organizing strategies;
- 10. build on their abilities to read critically, including analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating multiple sources;
- 11. learn to incorporate ideas, information, and strategies from somewhat more specialized (in addition to popular) sources into their own writings;

D. Other necessary revisions shall be made in the proposal to reflect the changes described in A, B, and C, above. Specifically:

Page 2:

The ~~15~~ 16 course (~~45~~ 48 semester hour) program consists of the following:

—An Inner Core of ~~six~~ seven courses, ~~three~~ four required courses taken by all students.

...

Page 3:

B. . . . Students are expected to take Language and Composition I and/or Language and Communication the first semester of their freshman year. . . .

Page 4:

2. Language and Composition I and II Required Co or Pre: 1 ~~3~~ 6 (2 x 3) sem hours

<sup>1</sup>While the courses share names with those currently in the *Catalog*, it is understood that Language and Composition I and II are new courses developed for the general education program. Language and Composition I is the course developed by Committee in 1994. Language and Composition II, radically different from the current course taught under that title, will be developed to match the proposed goals.

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Jan Cook, Chair of the Academic Senate  
and Members of the Academic Senate  
FROM: Wayne Lockwood  
RE: An Amendment to the General Education Proposal  
DATE: February 27, 1997

I move that the description of the course category **Language in the Humanities**, page 12, be replaced by the course category description **Language in Context**, listed below, and that related modifications to the General Education Proposal, also listed below, be made.

**Course Category Description:****Language in Context**

**Prerequisites:** Foundations of Inquiry  
Language and Composition  
**Corequisite:** Language and Communication

**Content:** In *Language in Context*, students will build on their language experiences in earlier writing and speech courses to exercise their formal language abilities in an academic context. Courses in this category will focus on the conventions governing language use within groups of similar disciplines or meta-disciplines, such as the humanities, sciences and social sciences. Courses will be designed to expand the student's ability to use language effectively within broad disciplinary groups.

**Goals:** In *Language in Context*, students will

1. write and speak well according to the conventions governing language use within broad disciplinary groups;
2. understand the relationship between the context in which language is used and the development of conventions governing its use in the disciplinary group; and
3. build on their ability to use language flexibly for different audiences and different purposes within and beyond the academy.

**Criteria:** In developing a course in *Language in Context*, faculty will attend to the following criteria:

1. there must be a strong emphasis on the use of language, especially writing, within the context of a disciplinary group;
2. the course must focus on developing a command of language structure and discursive practices within the disciplinary group upon which the course is based;
3. the special conventions governing language use must build on rather than simply replicate students' earlier experiences with language; and
4. the course must be directed toward language use, but may include substantive content drawn from the disciplinary group as a basis for language development.

To: Jan Cook, Academic Senate  
From: Kim Pereira  
Re: Amendments to The General Education Proposal  
4th March, 1997

I move that the General Education Proposal be amended to delete the terms "Western" and "Non-Western" wherever they appear. Specific changes are as follows:

Page 3: The last sentence in the Outer Core course definitions should be amended to read: **And finally, at least one of the four courses chosen must deal with the cultures of AMALI (Asia, The Middle-East, Africa, Latin America, Indigenous Peoples of the World).**

Page 4: 3rd footnote should be amended to read:  
**Students must take at least one course in the outer core that deals with the cultures of Asia, The Middle-East, Africa, Latin America, Indigenous Peoples.**

Page 12: Under "United States Traditions," sub-paragraph 'Content,' the phrase "**within the broader western tradition**" should be deleted.

Page 13: The second line on the page "**and the Western world in general**" should be deleted.

Under "Goals," Item 4, the phrase "**and Western**" should be deleted.

Page 17: The definitions and descriptions under OUTER CORE should be amended to read as follows:

### ***OUTER CORE***

#### ***The Cultures and Traditions of "AMALI" \****

Students must take at least one course from the Outer Core in this section. Courses may qualify if

- a. the course focuses primarily upon facets of specific cultures from these regions or these cultures in general. A minimum of 75% of the course content must deal directly with the culture(s) from these regions.
- b. exploration of the culture(s) is developed in a comparative perspective which helps the student understand and appreciate differences between the culture(s) under consideration and American culture.
- c. the course includes exposure to primary writings and artifacts from the culture(s).

\* Asia, The Middle-East, Africa, Latin America, Indigenous Peoples of the World

### **RATIONALE**

The terms "western" and "non-western" are archaic and date back to an age of cultural imperialism. At the very least they are confusing and at their worst they are exclusionary and racist. Why should we describe some of the oldest and richest cultures in the world by what they are not ("non-Western")? Surely if we are serious about changing

our curriculum for the better, if the interdisciplinary nature of the new proposal seeks to embrace multiculturalism in the best sense of the term, if we care about building bridges into the 21st century, then we should expunge racist concepts and take the first step towards erasing the attitudes concomitant with them.

There should be no weight attached to the argument that these terms have become common parlance. They are wrong, and as an Indian I am insulted to hear my native culture described as “non-Western;” and I am sure thousands of people from Africa, Asia, the Middle-East, and Latin America feel the same way. It has also led to the misconception that there is such a thing as a “non-Western” culture (indeed, many Americans already make broad generalizations about foreigners--all “Orientals” are the same, all “Hispanics” are the same, etc.). I suppose “Western” means Eurocentric, yet several histories of “western civilization” omit references to Spain, Portugal, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, Scandinavia, and almost all the countries of Eastern Europe, restricting their focus to the political powerhouses of England, France, Germany, Italy, and North America. If this is not cultural imperialism, then I am much mistaken!

At the suggestion that the alterations are cumbersome, I would argue that my recommended changes clarify rather than obfuscate the text of the proposal. We have a tremendous opportunity at this incipient stage of the new curriculum. For three years PIC has been telling us that we should not be fearful of change. Let me turn that around and say that if we are to break new ground this is one of the areas in which future generations will bless us for our leadership. All I can say is “if not now, when?”

“The impression has been created that everything “Western” is civilized, and that everything civilized is Western. By extension, or simply by default, anything vaguely Eastern or “Oriental” stands to be considered backward or inferior, and hence worthy of neglect. . . . Generally speaking, Western civilization is not taken to extend to the whole of Europe (although it may be applied to distant parts of the globe far beyond Europe).

Historians most given to thinking of themselves as from ‘the West’--notably from England, France, Germany, and North America--rarely see any necessity to describe Europe’s past in its entirety. They see no more reason to consider the countries of Eastern Europe than to dwell on the more westerly parts of Western Europe. . . . Whatever Western civilization is, therefore, it does not involve an honest attempt to summarize European history. Whatever ‘the West’ is, it is not just a synonym for Western Europe. This is a very strange phenomenon. It seems to assume that the historians of Europe can conduct themselves like the cheese-makers of Gruyere, whose product contains as many holes as cheese.”

(Davies, Norman. *Europe, A History*. Oxford, 1996. p.19-20)



March 5, 1997

Date: 3/5/97	Vol XXVIII	No. 12													
Name	Attend	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion	Motion
		#99	#100	#101	#102	#103	#104	#105.b	#105	#106	#107	#108	#109.b	#109	#110
		all yes	all yes	all yes											all
Blum		no abst	no abst	no abst	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	no abst
Borg					yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	
Brand	7:10	no vote			yes	yes	no	yes	no	abstain	yes	abstain	yes	no	
Brooks					yes	yes	no	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	
Cook					yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	no	yes	abstain	
Corl	absent														
Deutsch					yes	yes	abstain	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	
Diggs					yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	abstain	yes	abstain	
El-Zanati					yes	yes	abstain	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	
Fisher					yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	
Garner					yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	no	no	yes	
Gilbert					yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	
Gurowitz					yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	
Hall					yes	yes	no	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	
Jagodzinski					yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	no	abstain	
Jannazzo					yes	yes	no	yes	no	abstain	yes	yes	yes	no	
Jones	7:10	no vote			yes	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	no	
Koehl					yes	yes	no	no	no	abstain	yes	yes	yes	no	
Kurtz					yes	yes	yes	yes	abstain	no	yes	yes	yes	no	
Layman					yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Lockwood	7:10	no vote			yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	no	no	yes	
MacDonald					yes	yes	no	yes	no	no	yes	yes	no	no	
Mullen					yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	
Myers					yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Nelsen					yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	no	no	yes	
Neuleib					yes	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	no	
Newgren					yes	yes	abstain	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	
Pereira					yes	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	abstain	
Razaki	7:10	no vote			yes	yes	yes	no	abstain	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Reeder					yes	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	abstain	
Riley	7:10	no vote			yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	no	no	yes	
Robertson	absent														
Ruyle					yes	no	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	abstain	yes	no	
Saulter					abstain	yes	no	yes	no	abstain	yes	abstain	yes	no	
Schmaltz	excused														
Sterling	absent														
Strand, D				abstain	yes	yes	yes	abstain	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	
Strand, K					yes	yes	no	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	
Taylor				abstain	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	
Thomas					yes	no	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	abstain	yes	no	
Thompson					yes	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	no	abstain	
Urice				abstain	yes	yes	yes	abstain	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	
Vargas					yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	abstain	
Varner					yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	abstain	
Walters					yes	yes	no	yes	no	no	yes	yes	no	no	
Weber					yes	yes	abstain	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	
White					yes	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	no	
Wilner				abstain	no	no	no	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	