

# ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

Wednesday, April 7, 2004

(Approved)

Volume XXXV, No. 12

## Call to Order

Chairperson Lane Crothers called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

## Roll Call

Chairperson Crothers called the roll and declared a quorum.

## ATTENDANCE

## Approval of Minutes of March 24, 2004

**Motion XXXV-83:** By Senator Rinker, seconded by Senator Koutsky, to approve the Academic Senate minutes of March 24, 2004. The minutes were unanimously approved.

## Chairperson's Remarks:

**Senator Crothers:** The Council of Illinois University Senates (CIUS), a body composed of Senate Chairpersons/Presidents of Illinois public universities, met at ISU on Monday March 29, 2004, from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. Senator Crothers thanked Vice President Bragg for his introductory remarks. This body exists to share our concerns across campuses. There will be some items coming from this group to the Senate, as has happened in the past. The CIUS Agenda was as follows:

## I. Issues Pending from Prior CIUS Meetings:

### A. Discussion of Status of Ratification of CIUS Resolutions/Motions by Illinois Public University Senates

1. **Employee Health Insurance Benefits Resolution/Motion**
  - a. **CIUS Drafted Resolution October 2002; CIUS Approved Motion on 3/21/03**
  - b. **Domestic Partner Benefits - CIUS Discussed 9/19/03**
2. **Voting Representation on IBHE by Faculty Advisory Council Representative**  
**CIUS Approved Motion on 3/21/03**
3. **State Control of Tuition Monies - CIUS Approved Motion on 3/21/03**
4. **"Comprehensive Statement on the Impact of State Monies to Private Institutions and the Impact of Budget Cuts" - CIUS Resolution Drafted Spring 2002**
5. **Interpretation of Truth in Tuition Law for Upper Division/Lower Division Students**  
**SIU-C Representative Requested Interpretation 9/19/03**

### B. CIUS Organizational Concerns

1. **Drafting of CIUS Bylaws - CIUS Discussed 3/21/03**
2. **CIUS Fundraising for Advertisement and Lobbying Costs - CIUS Approved Motion on 3/21/03**

### C. Status of Faculty Attendance at "IBHE Big Picture Meetings" - CIUS Discussed 9/19/03

## II. State Board Governing Tenure – Proposed Legislation

## III. Faculty Productivity Report Drafted by IBHE-FAC December 2003: "Illinois Board of Higher Education Faculty Advisory Council's Response to The Board's Request for Input Regarding Faculty

***Productivity Issues”***

***IV. USA Patriot Act – Resolution Drafted/Approved by Cal State University-Monterey Bay Senate***

***V. College Voter Registration Act – Bill 4141 - Endorsed by ISU Academic Senate 3/3/04***

***VI. State University Retirement System – Changes in Funding Requirements***

***VII. Western Illinois University Senate Resolution Re: Title 10 - Reserve Officer Training Corps Policy (“Don’t Ask-Don’t Tell Policy”)***

***Student Government Association President/Student Body President’s Remarks:***

**Senator Rinker:** There are still underrepresented student senator positions available on SGA. We are looking for underrepresented positions of minority status, as well as by college. The College of Nursing and the College of Fine Arts do not have student representatives on the Senate at this time. I ask that faculty encourage their students to apply for these positions at SGA. We hope to have those positions filled, three undergraduate and two graduate positions, by the end of the semester.

**Senator Pereira:** Students in Theatre find it very difficult to serve on the Senate due to rehearsal times. They feel that the SGA is not willing to accommodate them. I would urge you, if any student from the School of Theatre applies to be on the Senate, to take into consideration that the rehearsals for the plays in which they are involved are not extra-curricular, but are a part of the curriculum.

***President’s Remarks:***

**President Bowman:** We had a community partners meeting this morning, which is a group of business leaders from the community and surrounding areas, who we invite to campus to provide a brief update on what is going on on campus. It is a friendship development/fundraising opportunity for us. Approximately 75-100 people were in attendance. Last night, the University hosted a Distinguished Professor Lecture by Dr. Steven Juliano of Biological Sciences. Dr. Juliano represents the best of ISU and the kind of professor who really helps make the reputation of ISU what it is. The Admissions Office is hosting a number of events for groups of counselors from our major “feeder” high schools around the state providing them with information about the University and developing closer ties. One of the stories that they shared with me is the changing reputation of ISU among high school students. Our academic reputation has moved up considerably and we are perceived as an excellent educational institution and an institution to which admission is difficult to obtain. The Washington agenda continues to move forward and I want to publicly commend Gary McGinnis, Associate Vice President of Graduate Studies, for his important work in Washington. We hope to secure additional funds for the Chicago pipeline. On the Springfield agenda, there have been many discussions by the state legislature about universities raising fees substantially to generate additional revenue. There has also been some discussion about expanding gaming within existing casinos. The fundraising campaign is still hitting its targets. We are just under \$80 million. The Athletic Department has raised 90% of the funds to build the Strength and Conditioning Center. We continue to have concerns about the age and condition of our residence halls and we are working very hard to develop a long-range housing plan.

**Senator Wylie:** What are the major high school feeder schools?

**President Bowman:** A number of them are in the Chicago, Springfield, Danville, Champaign/Urbana and East St. Louis areas.

**Senator Fowles:** Since the budget is not as dire as expected, what is the projection for faculty/staff salary increases next year?

**President Bowman:** It looks good; we may do better than we did this year. In fact, we have to do better to retain and recruit good faculty members or we are just not as good of an institution as we could be. That said, it will take us awhile to recover from the budget cuts.

**Senator Crothers:** I would like to note that Senators Fowles and Waterstraat are responsible for acquiring \$200,000 of the donations to the Capital Campaign.

***Provost's Remarks:***

**Provost Presley:** This week, Gary McGinnis and I wound up a round of discussions about research with faculty in all of the academic units. I see that the distribution of the vitae for candidates for the Panel of Ten is on the Senate Agenda. I want to underscore the importance of the Panel of Ten and express my gratitude for the good work of members of the panel.

***Vice President of Student Affairs' Remarks:***

**Senator Mamarchev:** Congratulations to the newly-elected SGA officers and student senator representatives. Commencement ceremonies will begin one month from today. Friday, as is our tradition, is our Teacher Education Career Fair. We have school districts coming from all over the U.S., as well as from schools abroad and in Canada.

***Vice President of Finance and Planning's Remarks:***

**Senator Bragg:** Last year, we were battling two legislative bills that would control tuition for public universities. The Truth in Tuition Act did pass; however, we have seen no legislation introduced this year to control the income fund or on tuition caps; but I have to remind you that many things do not happen in the General Assembly until May. This afternoon, the University held a ceremony to recognize civil service and A/P employees for their contribution and long service to the University. For the official record of the Senate, I would like to extend the University's appreciation to those employees whose work really does keep this University running.

**Senator Wang:** Will the freeze of the Foundation funds continue into next year; if so, is it necessary to freeze all funds? Is it possible for departments to use a certain percentage of the monies?

**Senator Bragg:** I am not involved in the decisions on the allocation of funds made by the Foundation Board.

**Senator Armstrong:** That is still being looked at, but the outlays are based on an average 12-quarter earning. While the last three quarters have been very good, they are averaged in with nine quarters that were really bad. Therefore, the average earnings are still quite low, so there may be no funds to disperse.

**Senator Wang:** How are these decisions made? We have very limited funds within our department and this freeze has made things very difficult.

**Senator Armstrong:** Recommendations are decided by committee and those recommendations are submitted to Vice President Kern.

**President Bowman:** There is a lot of sentiment this year in making an exception so that there is a distribution in 05. Some of the members of the Foundation Board want to do that. There is concern that it sends a bad

message to the campus to ask people to raise money and then go another year without a distribution of funds.

**Senator Armstrong:** We are also discussing whether some units could actually establish their own kind of rules for disbursement, which in some cases could involve a certain degree of erosion of the principal, for things like scholarships.

***Committee Reports:***

***Academic Affairs Committee***

**Senator Armstrong:** The committee has completed its report on the review of the General Education Program; it is on the agenda this evening as an information item.

***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee***

**Senator Riegle:** The committee continues its examination of two items on previous Senate Agendas, the Solicitation Policy and the Administrator Selection (Search Committee) Policy, but have made little headway. We will continue to work on those at our next meeting. If any of you have any comments you wish to forward to our committee for consideration, please do so.

***Faculty Affairs Committee***

**Senator Wylie:** The Faculty Affairs Committee is deciding on the formats for the presentation of information to the Senate on several items. We have reached a decision on another issue and we will be sending something to the Executive Committee for the next Senate meeting.

***Planning and Finance Committee***

**Senator Crothers:** The Planning and Finance Committee discussed with Senator Bragg graduate and undergraduate tuition in relation to the Truth in Tuition Act.

***Rules Committee***

**Senator Coliz:** The Rules Committee did not meet tonight.

***Information Items:***

***04.01.04.01 General Education Review Report (Academic Affairs Committee)***

**Senator Armstrong:** The Academic Affairs Committee's review of the General Education Program began over a year ago. Many people have contributed to this overall effort. In particular, I would like to thank current and past members of the Academic Affairs Committees for their contributions. In addition, Jonathan Rosenthal and Lou Perez of the Council on General Education deserve a great deal of credit in their efforts to assist our committee. I think that ISU can be commended for how much its student, faculty and staff care about the quality of General Education. The recommendations in our report were kept quite brief. We present six general findings and make six recommendations. Our general findings are amply supported by a small mountain of documentation. These findings and recommendations came from assessment studies and a wide range of feedback from faculty, staff and students. Our committee believes that these six recommendations will serve to improve General Education within the current realities, which ISU faces.

**Senator Mohammadi:** The first statement in your report is that 'Overall, the General Education Program has been successful.' What kind of information was used to make that statement?

**Senator Armstrong:** There is, of course, a major assessment document on the General Education Program and this has provided much of the assessment data and many other things. The General Education Program is a very large construct. The predecessor program had a number of problems and we think a lot of the problems

besetting the previous General Education Program were solved by this program. There were very few difficulties and we only make a few recommendations for modifications to the middle and outer core. In general, that all worked very, very well. So, that would be the basis of our saying that the program was successful.

**Senator Mohammadi:** I still don't understand what yardstick was used to measure success?

**Senator Armstrong:** I refer you to the documentation materials, which were on reserve at Milner Library and also available in the Senate Office for the last six months.

**Dr. Rosenthal, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences:** To give a very general answer to your question, General Education was set up by this body with 12 general learning outcomes, each of which has multiple sub-outcomes. The approach that was taken in the evaluation was to take those learning outcomes to try to find out if we were meeting those goals. There are two massive binders with documentation, which have been available in the Senate Office and at Milner Library.

**Senator Adams:** I did not get a chance to look at a lot of documentation, but when you say that there is an emphasis on small class size and involvement of tenure-track faculty, was there a breakdown between the total number of courses taught in General Ed by non-tenure track versus tenure-track faculty?

**Senator Armstrong:** No, it would have to be accumulated.

**Dr. Rosenthal:** I can tell you that middle and outer cores are quite massively tenure-line faculty. Inner core is a mix. Frequently, there is a lecture section mode of delivery where we have a tenure-line faculty delivering the lecture with non-tenure track, and sometimes graduate assistant, support in sections. FOI (Foundations of Inquiry) has been a mix of NTT and TT faculty.

**Senator Plantholt:** In General Findings, #1, you state that the General Education program was used successfully in recruitment and improving perceptions of ISU. Was there a discussion on the committee of how the changes that you suggest, such as for FOI, might cause the University to lose that progress?

**Senator Armstrong:** No, because FOI does not figure into that as a specific. It is the whole General Education Program that is the selling point and not one particular course.

**Dr. Rosenthal:** FOI is only 1/15 of the General Education Program and 1/6 of the inner core. We have tried very hard to deliver an appropriate freshman curriculum. I think that we have something that is quite different as a freshman year experience and I think that is to what parents and students have responded.

**Senator Garrison:** In recommendation 6B, you talk about how you are going to set up a committee to examine the deficiencies and propose a new structure for carrying out the goals of the General Education curriculum. Your report also says that we will need an outside expert for this. How do we plan on funding this and what are the specifics of the actual composition of the committee?

**Senator Armstrong:** I have discussed with Provost Presley various ideas about putting the committee together and the idea of bringing in someone from the outside to offer a new perspective. Whether it can be done or not, in a fiscal sense, I can't say.

**Senator Crothers:** Is it the case, Provost Presley, that ISU participates in a number of organizations that

might provide some useful insight?

**Provost Presley:** We are currently involved in a process that can bring us, at a very low cost or even actually free, consulting services from the National Center for the First Experience. They are the national experts on the issues involved here and, to some degree, on the assessment. The same project involves the Penn State Center for the Study of Higher Education, so we can easily access national experts. In fact, we are doing that, not for Gen Ed, but for our first year experience at this very moment. We could very easily redirect the focus.

**Senator Crothers:** Was it the committee's sense that we expend an enormous amount of energy on the first year experience?

**Senator Armstrong:** Yes, there is a great deal of effort and resources expended on the first year experience and then we, as a University, really fail to carry that through the rest of General Education in a coherent manner. I believe that represents the major failing of the General Education Program, this lack of integration, but this is a difficult thing to achieve. Even within a departmental curriculum, getting vertical integration of courses is difficult. When you spread it across colleges and departments, it becomes a major effort, but we think that that is something on which some effort needs to be expended.

**Senator Crothers:** Did the committee discuss the relationship of the General Education Program to the rest of the curriculum? Is there is a sense of disconnection between General Education and the academic majors?

**Senator Armstrong:** Yes, it is the same criticism again where the major themes of General Education were not integrated into the major academic curricula. It left General Education as more of a stand-alone item and therefore you end up in a situation where it does not seem that valuable.

**Senator Fowles:** The major concern was the development of critical thinking abilities and FOI was the sole introducer of developing those abilities, but it did not translate well to the middle and outer core and through to the major curriculum. FOI doing it by itself did not work. 6A, item 2, addresses that. So, we are looking at having Gen Ed integrate into the majors and not just relying on one course, FOI, to teach students critical thinking.

**Senator Crothers:** Can you provide a general summary of the strengths and weakness of FOI as it currently exists and why replacing it, as outlined in your report, might be perceived as a better path to an integrated program?

**Senator Armstrong:** We touched on the general deficiencies. There was some excellent FOI instruction, but there were many who did not teach it the way it was supposed to be taught or, generally, were not as affective. We mentioned that student concerns centered on uneven content, workload and evaluation. One of the goals is to redefine the content.

**Senator Crothers:** In recommendation 6B, "This recommendation is predicated upon the assumption that significant change is best accomplished by new construction than mere tinkering." That leads to one of the conversations that I have had that FOI could be adjusted rather than eliminated. What reaction did the committee have to those kinds of arguments?

**Senator Armstrong:** I think the philosophy to seek overall improvement is to take the things we know we did well and figure out the best construction for FOI. We were quite certain, based on our discussions, as well as feedback from a number of different sources, that the best way to do this is to take a fresh approach.

I can't predict how similar or how dissimilar the program will be. This committee had been wrestling with the 120 hour limit and did not reach a resolution because there did not seem to be a good solution to that particular problem for many programs. When you discover that our General Education Program is the largest, in terms of credit hours required, in the state, somehow reducing those requirements would greatly alleviate the problems for any number of programs.

**Senator Rice:** The way that FOI is structured right now is very inconsistent. There is no common thread that I or the other students on the committee found in our FOI experiences. We feel that with possibly integrating those goals into other classes, we can achieve them. If they are only in the English Department and the Communication Department, there could be more consistency.

**Senator Ghrist:** 6C addresses some of the things covered in the General Education Program that could or should possibly be covered outside of the program. Can you address the specifics of what those may be?

**Senator Armstrong:** The general feeling is that the transition activities, that is, bridging students between high school and into college life was best accomplished by a better coordination of resources, such as the Advisement Center, Passages and Preview, outside of General Education, but in coordination with it. We felt that General Education should concentrate on the academic aspect and let other programs deal with the transition.

**Senator Ghrist:** So specifically, are you speaking of transition activities that were found in FOI?

**Senator Armstrong:** Yes, certainly some of those were found in FOI.

**Senator Ghrist:** In restructuring General Education and leaving those out, are we just hoping that someone else will pick up that transition?

**Senator Armstrong:** It would not be done just by hope, but through active coordination.

**Senator Swindler:** Did the committee find that all of the first year experience or all of the inner course experience failed to vertically integrate or was it just FOI?

**Senator Armstrong:** It was very clear that students perceived FOI as a stand-alone course, but you don't have a failure of vertical integration with just one course. You fail to have vertical integration when courses seem to have disparate elements.

**Senator Swindler:** But they also perceived it being redundant with a couple of other courses. I am at a loss to explain the redundancy and the isolation.

**Dr. Rosenthal:** I think that there has been a problem with consistency of the delivery of critical thinking across 105 FOI sections taught by faculty, which is perhaps not surprising. The recommendation the committee endorses is a more developmental approach to get a common vocabulary introduced across a yearlong sequence in English and Communication.

**Senator Koutsky:** Is there any accountability if the themes for a class or not the actual focus of a class?

**Senator Armstrong:** You have touched on the consistency problem that exists. A great deal of this is an

effort to bring more consistency and ‘truth in advertising’ to the first year experience.

**Senator Pryor:** Did your committee have a sense that there has been harm to the majors because of the enormous resources allocated to General Education?

**Senator Armstrong:** It is hard to document harm. There is no question that there is a strong feeling that it has taken resources from disciplinary majors.

**Senator Genta:** I had a very positive experience in FOI because it required us to become involved or find out more about certain organizations. Involving Passages and Preview to deliver part of the FOI curriculum might not be the right path. In those programs, you learn about what is available and they encourage you to get involved, but they don’t require you to actually do something. Educational involvement in some of the activities at ISU is just as important as some of the academics. I wonder if that aspect would be addressed if FOI is eliminated and meshed with English 101 or the Communication classes?

**Dr. Rosenthal:** One of the things that is on the table for this yearlong sequence of English and Communication is an engagement plan. It is a plan that would be developed in the first two or three weeks about how a student intends to become engaged in the life of the campus. This is sort of a natural thing to write about or talk about in a first semester.

**Senator Garrison:** Is there away to document that these teachers are going to actually do these things? When we formed FOI, we had these goals, but those goals were not met. How are we going to make sure that the goals are actually accomplished?

**Dr. Rosenthal:** These are courses that come from individual departments. They are heavily structured and work from a common syllabus. The faculty and graduate assistants who teach these courses are highly advised throughout the semester. I think that this will be a much more consistent mode of delivery as faculty have taught them over and over again.

**Senator Crothers:** It is important to point out that you are trying to coordinate within two departments instead of 36. That alone simplifies the task.

**Senator Swindler:** Is this comparison with other state campuses really quite fair? We are trying to be distinctive and the language in which that distinctiveness is posed is in terms of the public ivy. It seems to me that it is not unfair to think of the public ivy as simply having this kind of cost, being characterized by small classes and contact between the students and the regular faculty.

**Senator Armstrong:** We are not proposing to increase class size. We are actually proposing that we reduce the number of required classes. I don’t see anything particularly distinctive in an awful lot of requirements.

**Senator Swindler:** I would disagree that the number of Gen Ed requirements is not characteristic of the public ivy. It is characteristic of a liberal arts education in general.

**Senator Armstrong:** 45 hours is an enormous requirement.

**Senator Pereira:** My question is for Dr. Rosenthal. You say that faculty in English and Communication have been teaching these courses over and over again. However, won’t these courses be a major reconstruction of what they have been teaching?



**Dr. Rosenthal:** I didn't mean to suggest that faculty have taught a course that has yet to be fully designed.

**Senator Adams:** Who is going to set up the guidelines for restructuring? Are they going to use the current Gen Ed guidelines?

**Dr. Rosenthal:** One of the strengths of the Gen Ed Program, as it currently exists, is that the 12 learning outcomes with all of the subpoints are fully integrated in theory across the outer, middle and inner cores. I think where we have not been attentive is in making sure that integration and a common vocabulary is actually happening, because we have really turned our discussions so much towards the inner core and FOI, in particular. So, the goals of the program will remain the same. The changes to the inner core will be evaluated according to those goals with the addition that we be more attentive to those goals and how they work through the system.

**03.25.04.03    *Blue Book Revisions: Academic Planning Committee Functions (Rules Committee)***

**Senator Coliz:** The Rules Committee made two additions to the functions of the Academic Planning Committee at the Academic Planning Committee's request. Those recommendations entail the formation of a subcommittee to review program resources and advise the Academic Planning Committee about how the program fits within the University's strategic plan and that the Academic Planning Committee will review and, if necessary, revise the program review process every two years. We modified the recommendation in that the subcommittee's report will go directly to the Academic Planning Committee first rather than directly to the department chair, dean and Provost. The Academic Planning Committee would then distribute the report.

**Motion XXXV-84:** By Senator Coliz, seconded by Senator Rinker, to move the revision of the functions of the Academic Planning Committee to action. The motion was unanimously approved.

**Motion XXXV-85:** By Senator Coliz to approve the revised functions of the Academic Planning Committee. The revisions were unanimously approved.

**03.25.04.04    *Blue Book Revisions: Request for Additional SCERB Members (Rules Committee)***

**Senator Coliz:** The Rules Committee received a request from SCERB (Student Code Enforcement Review Board) to increase the number of members on the Board by two faculty and two student members. Given that we are unable to fill all vacancies on the external committees of the Senate, the Rules Committee proposed the addition of one additional faculty and one additional student member.

**Senator Plantholt:** I note that you actually recommend the addition of one faculty alternate.

**Senator Coliz:** The way the committee is set up now, it is a three-panel board. When the three primary members can't schedule a common time to meet, then the alternate member serves. This would give them the availability of one more alternate.

**Senator Ghrist:** Did they also request additional student members?

**Senator Coliz:** Yes, we added one additional student alternate as well.

**Senator Ghrist:** Would the appointment of that student be the responsibility of the Vice President of SGA?

**Senator Rinker:** Yes, it would be through approval by me.

**Motion XXXV-86:** By Senator Coliz, seconded by Senator Carper, to move the proposal to action. The motion was unanimously approved.

**Motion XXXV-87:** By Senator Coliz to approve the revisions to the SCERB membership. The revisions were unanimously approved.

**03.25.04.05    *Blue Book Revisions: Request for CTE Appointments During the Fall Semester (Rules Committee)***

**Senator Coliz:** The Council for Teacher Education has requested that all of the members of their council be confirmed/elected by the Senate in the fall rather in the spring, which is the usual practice. Part of it was that if they were falling short of finding students, there might be more students willing to volunteer in the fall, so we agreed to their request.

**Senator Rinker:** Are the student members appointed by the SGA?

**Senator Coliz:** I think that CTE does a lot of the recruiting and then refers them to you.

**Senator Riegler:** From conversations with the Dean of the College of Education, I believe that she is charged with making recommendations to the SGA and she is the one who needs the extra time.

**Motion XXXV-88:** By Senator Coliz, seconded by Senator Rice, to move the proposal to action. The motion was unanimously approved.

**Motion XXXV-89:** By Senator Coliz to approve the revision of the timeframe for the confirmation and election of CTE representatives. CTE faculty representatives are appointed by the Provost in consultation with the deans and confirmed by the Senate. One Senate member, who is elected from the faculty membership of the Senate, also serves on the Council for Teacher Education. The Rules Committee proposed that confirmation and election of CTE representatives be conducted at the first Senate meeting after August 20<sup>th</sup> of each year. This will not affect the length of service of members of the council. The revision was unanimously approved.

**03.25.04.06    *Blue Book Revisions: Honors Council Student Membership Composition (Rules Committee)***

**Senator Coliz:** The Honors Council has requested that the council's student membership be restricted to students admitted to the Honors Program. There was some discussion about this issue on the Rules Committee—whether the Honors Council is best guided by honor students or by all students. In our general resolution, all but one member thought that the council's request was reasonable.

**Senator Ghirst:** What is the council's function?

**Senator Coliz:** I believe that it is an advisory body to the Honors Program.

**Senator Rinker:** I disagree with this proposal. By eliminating all non-honor students from this council, did anyone on the committee feel that it could present a problem in that the students on the council might be manipulated as they are going to be with their peers, the faculty members? There is no one from the outside

looking in to give a different opinion.

**Senator Coliz:** Yes, those were the sorts of issues we talked about. This generated a tremendous amount of discussion. It was not so much that the students would be manipulated, but that it would become sort of an inbred association and wouldn't it better to have outside exposure. I think the final conclusion came down to, if the Honors Program wanted it and there were no strong arguments against it, then the committee felt that we should go along with it.

**Senator Rinker:** I think that you have restated the point I was trying to make appropriately.

**Senator Fowles:** Does it have to be an all-or-none situation?

**Senator Coliz:** We did not discuss that directly and I don't think that we are going to go back and revisit it.

**Senator Crothers:** We are not going to move this to an action item tonight because I am uncomfortable voting on this when no one around this table knows what the Honors Council does. That is something that we will need to have rectified by next time. The question is, if during debate, if someone were to make such a proposal and offer it as a friendly amendment, would the committee be likely to accept it? This is something that could be discussed by the committee by e-mail within the next two weeks.

**Senator Ghrist:** Was part of the reason for this that the Honors Program recruits these students to serve on this council? By being all honor students, does it make it easier for them to recruit?

**Senator Coliz:** I don't know who does the recruiting for the students. It was not one of the arguments given to us in this request. It was more a sense that honor students know what honor students need.

**Senator Crothers:** The Senate secretary informs me that the SGA recruits for the Honors Council.

**Senator Garrison:** Could we possibly receive a clarification from the Honors Program as to why they want this done?

This issue will come before the Senate as an action item at the meeting of April 21, 2004.

### ***Communications:***

#### ***03.17.04.03 Leadership Recognition Ceremony – Call for Nominations***

The Office of Student Life is seeking nominations to recognize the commitment of the many outstanding individuals and organizations who have made significant contributions during the past academic year to student life on campus. The deadline for the submission of nominations is Friday, April 9, 2004. The Leadership Recognition Ceremony will be held on Sunday, April 25, 2004, from 11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. in the Prairie Room of the Bone Student Center.

### ***Adjournment***

### **ATTENDANCE AND MOTIONS**