Note: There will be no meeting of the Senate on April 1. The next Senate meeting will be April 8. An agenda will go out the week of March 30.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
March 4, 1998

OVERVIEW:

Major topics presented/discussed: Criteria concerning extension of Senate Bill 140 privileges to ninth and tenth graders. Proposed amendments to the GER model/report/draft summary.

Actions:
1. A motion to extend existing criteria for Senate Bill 140 students to newly eligible students carried (p. 2 of these minutes).
2. The following all-encompassing GER motion carried: a motion to send the original GER main motion, all of its amendments, and the working draft back to the Academic Standards Committee (after the March 4 meeting) for the purpose of writing a single document incorporating all changes that have been made and defining the model proposed by the ASC (see p. 2 of these minutes).
3. The following GER amendments proposed by the Academic Standards Committee carried: 5.1 (incorporating critical thinking in Writing I, Writing II, and oral communication, p. 4 of these minutes); 5.2 (incorporating writing, oral communication, and reasoning critically in the capstone, p. 6 of these minutes).
4. The following GER amendments proposed by the ASC failed: Substitute Proposed Amendment 7 (4-hour natural science lab courses, p. 3 of these minutes); Proposed Amendment 5.3 (what constitutes critical thinking, p. 6 of these minutes).
5. The following amendment proposed by entities other than the ASC passed: the Philosophy Department's amendment concerning critical thinking, p. 8 of these minutes.
6. The following amendment proposed by an entity other than the ASC was tabled: Wood/ Krygowski Proposed Amendment 4 from page 6 of the February 25 Senate agenda (proposal to limit the total GER requirements, p. 11 in these Senate minutes).
7. The meeting adjourned in the midst of discussion concerning A. Hunter's proposed Amendment 3, regarding speech-intensive courses, from page 7 of the February 25 Senate agenda (p. 13 of these Senate minutes).

CALL TO ORDER:

Jim Morrison, chair of the Academic Senate, called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

Minutes of the special 25 February 1998 meeting were distributed at the March 4 meeting; they will also be distributed by mail. We will call for approval of those minutes at the April Senate meeting, which will take place April 8 (because of spring break and the start of spring quarter).

CHARTER & BYLAWS COMMITTEE: No report.

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: Jim Morrison attended the meeting with Chancellor Chu on March 3 to discuss how the new Chancellor can relate to faculty. The emerging consensus was to form a group consisting of two representatives from each of the four-year campuses, each to be elected in some manner. One of the two representatives would probably be the chair of the faculty or Senate; the other would probably be elected by the faculty/S [illegible]

ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE:

Senate Bill 140 criteria:

Before resuming discussion of the GER model, amendments, and draft summary, ASC Chair Charles Singler noted that he had included on page 2 of the March 4 Senate agenda a motion regarding eligibility of high school students to take courses at YSU under provisions of Senate Bill 140. The privileges accorded by the bill have recently been extended to include ninth and tenth graders (not just high school juniors and seniors as before). YSU must define [illegible]

A motion to change the order of the agenda was seconded and carried.

On behalf of the ASC, Singler moved

(1) that the University extend the criteria now in place for high school juniors and seniors (rank in upper 20% of class; minimum 3.0 GPA; successful achievement on the Composition and Reading Placement Test given at YSU; counselor recommendation; parental consent) to students newly eligible under the action of the Ohio legislature;
(2) that the criteria take effect immediately; and
(3) that the ASC review in fall 1998 both the criteria and their implementation. Seniors will continue to be allowed to take up to three classes per quarter. Juniors and sophomores will be allowed to take one course per quarter.

The motion carried.

General Education Requirements Discussion/Action:

1. Motion to send all materials to the ASC, which would then create a single document incorporating all changes:

Singler returned to the discussion concerning general education requirements: The main motion was presented February 4. The Academic Standards Committee then prepared a clarifying document or draft "summary," which it presented at the February 25 meeting (see minutes of February 25 meeting). A number of amendments to the model have been made and acted on. I would like to call for a motion to send the original main motion, all of its amendm [illegible]

George McCloud made the motion. The motion was seconded, and discussion followed.

(Allen Hunter raised a point of information: A number of additional amendments have been submitted and more will likely be proposed. How would the motion affect the status of these?

Singler replied that the purpose is to have a single document we can look at. If amendments are to be made, they can be made at that April meeting. Hunter asked if any amendments that haven't yet been addressed would have to be resubmitted. Morrison ruled that they would have to be resubmitted.)

Bill Wood: Is the proposal on the floor meant to take effect now and preempt discussion at today's meeting?

McCloud: No. Whatever comes out of today's meeting will be taken into account by the ASC and incorporated in the single document.

A vote was taken, and the motion carried.

******

2. ASC's motion concerning category B, Natural Science lab courses:

Singler referred to the ASC's "Continuing Report to the Senate" (see Appendix A). He noted that he would like to discuss two previously proposed amendments: one about the Natural Science category and one about critical thinking.

Substituting the following proposed amendment for the original proposed Amendment #7 concerning category B, Natural Science, Singler moved that "Natural Science courses designed to include a laboratory component shall be at least 4 credit hours (semester hours)."

The motion was seconded, and discussion followed.

Allen Hunter: Your proposal is qualitatively similar to Proposal 4 on page 7 of the February 25 agenda. Thus, the departments that designed Proposal 4 will support your proposal and withdraw theirs. The 4 hours give these departments more scheduling flexibility and reflect the historical reality that lab courses typically have one more hour credit than nonlaboratory courses.

Tom Maraffa: The GER Task Force was very aware of people's wishes not to increase the number of hours mandated in the GER program. The proposed amendment does increase the hours a bit. I don't argue with the belief that we need a scientifically literate population, but this literacy can be accomplished with a 3-hour lab course as well as a 4-hour one. I don't agree with mandating a 4-hour lab course. Departments should have the option of offering [illegible]

Singler: This isn't intended to create 4-hour labs. It will enable courses that include a lab component to incorporate both lecture and lab in the courses.

Maraffa and Anne McMahon: It still affects the total number of GER hours. McMahon: I think that inadvertently such a requirement might discourage students from taking two lab courses. Requiring that all lab courses be 4 hours reduces flexibility for students and departments. As a requirement, rather than an option, it's not smart.

Hunter: If you look at catalogs here and elsewhere, you'll see that most natural science labs are 4 hours.

Maraffa: If that's what comes out of the ordinary submission of courses, so be it. But the 4 hours should not be mandatory.

Hunter: Over the summer, an A&S committee with representatives from Geography as well as Chemistry, Biology, Physics, Geology, and Environmental Studies submitted a grant based on a hypothetical GER lab course. This was the model we followed, and it's the model of courses we intend to propose.

A vote was taken, and the motion concerning 4-hour natural science lab courses failed.
Barbara Brothers asked for a hand count; the count verified that the motion failed.

******

3. ASC's motion about critical thinking (Proposed Amendment 5.1):

Singler: See section 2 of the ASC's "Continuing Report to the Senate" (Appendix A). Singler moved Proposed Amendment 5.1, that we insert the following two sentences between "A. Essential Skills" and "1) Writing":

It is expected that all GER courses will attempt to integrate goals 1, 2, and 3 wherever possible. Writing I, Writing II, and the oral-communication course must incorporate all three.

That portion of the draft summary attached to the February 25 Senate minutes (p. 15) would then read:

I. Baccalaureate Degrees
A. Essential Skills

It is expected that all GER courses will attempt to integrate goals 1, 2, and 3 wherever possible. Writing I, Writing II, and the oral-communication course must incorporate all three.

1) Writing

Students must show satisfactory proficiency in the use of written English. This requirement is normally met by taking Writing I and Writing II. . . .

The motion was seconded, and discussion followed.

(Brendan Minogue raised a point of information: Does this mean that a certain percentage of every GER course must integrate writing, oral, and critical thinking skills? And if so, what is the percentage? I'm not very skilled at educating people on communication. I'm not sure what that would require.)

Singler: The original GER Task Force report had the statements "It is expected that all GER courses will attempt to integrate goals 1, 2, and 3 wherever possible. Writing I, Writing II, and the capstone course must incorporate all three." The first part of our statement does not say that GER courses must incorporate all three. Rather, it says that they will attempt to integrate them. The second sentence, which says "must," refers to only 3 courses: Writing I, [illegible]

Bill Jenkins: The Task Force wanted to encourage rather than to mandate inclusion of all three goals throughout the GER. We didn't want to specify a particular amount of each. Our statement was a way of encouraging inclusion of the three goals without requiring a particular amount of any one goal.

Minogue: But these are general education requirements.

Jenkins: We're attempting to get writing, speaking, and critical thinking into all GER courses. We're encouraging but not mandating it. And we can't stipulate or measure exact percentages of each. The Task Force believes there should be efforts to incorporate them into GER courses.

(Jeff Carroll raised a point of information: This proposed amendment introduces another reference to "the oral-communication course." Another amendment referring to it is tabled at this point, and others have been proposed. What is the status of this proposed amendment in relation to those amendments? Singler replied that the motion from the ASC was to include an oral-communication course of some form. The amendment addressing whether that c [illegible]

Minogue: My department, Philosophy and Religious Studies, has raised the point that although the essential skill called "critical thinking" is a goal of GER, the GER model as originally presented has not offered any means by which to achieve that goal. Our department sees this omission as a major problem. The amendment just proposed at least seems to suggest that goal 3 should be included in Writing I, Writing II, and the oral-communication course. T [illegible]

Singler: No, page 5 of the original GER Task Force report distributed in November had a sentence referring to critical thinking, but it said "capstone course" rather than oral-communication course.

Minogue: My concern is this: The proposed amendment seems to suggest that execution of the critical thinking goal will be accomplished in these three courses and that no other course could be used to satisfy that essential skill. Am I misinterpreting the proposed amendment?

Jenkins: The proposed amendment does not preclude incorporating critical thinking in other courses. The first sentence in both the original document and the proposed amendment encourages incorporating critical thinking in all GER courses.

McMahon: My understanding as a member of the GER Task Force was that critical thinking was to be infused throughout all 4 years: required in the first year, required in the senior capstone, and integrated in between in GER courses at least. The idea was that individual majors would include some critical thinking other than in the capstone. We are encouraging inclusion of critical thinking throughout all 4 years. I'm concerned about removing the capst [illegible]

Mustansir Mir: If it's not possible to put a percentage on how much critical thinking will be part of these courses, how does one determine whether a course has in fact satisfied that requirement?

A vote was taken, and proposed Amendment 5.1 carried.

******

4. ASC's motion about the capstone (Proposed Amendment 5.2):

Singler moved Proposed Amendment 5.2, that we revise the paragraph under section I. G by adding an additional sentence: "Capstone courses are expected to incorporate writing, oral communication, and reasoning critically as appropriate in each discipline."

That portion of the draft summary attached to the February 25 Senate minutes would then read:

G. Capstone
Students must take one upper-division capstone course in the major or from another area that satisfies general education criteria. Capstone courses are expected to incorporate writing, oral communication, and reasoning critically as appropriate in each discipline."

The motion was seconded, and there was no discussion. A vote was taken, and the motion carried.

******

5. ASC's motion about what constitutes critical thinking (Proposed Amendment 5.3):

Singler moved Proposed Amendment 5.3, that we renumber I. A. 3) Mathematics as I. A. 4) Mathematics and insert:

[I. A.] 3) Critical Thinking
To encourage critical thinking, GER courses should include discussions of the logical means of defining terms, stating assumptions, distinguishing inductive from deductive reasoning, constructing and evaluating arguments, eliminating common fallacies, and organizing coherent theories.

The motion was seconded, and discussion followed.

Tom Shipka: When you say GER courses "should do thus and so," is this a requirement that each and every course that qualifies as meeting a general education requirement must do so?

Singler: No. The word is "should," not "must." Proposed Amendment 5.3 is an encouragement to include critical thinking and discussion of these items, not a requirement.

Shipka: The ASC probably feels that it has moved significantly off of the language of the original Task Force report. But I believe this is very, very weak language. The language related to speaking and writing effectively is much stronger. For meeting the writing goal, we've created requirements for two writing courses and two writing-intensive courses; for the oral-communication goal, we've stipulated a half or a whole speech course; and we've clarifie [illegible]

I suggest that we defeat this proposed amendment. I've circulated language of a stronger proposal that would establish the concept of a critical thinking-intensive course. We would ask that students take at least 2 such courses, which would be offered throughout the University. Following the parallel with writing- and speech-intensive courses, 30% of the grade would be determined by critical thinking assignments decided by faculty in the various depart [illegible]

Hunter: I generally agree with Dr. Shipka, but I question the definition of critical thinking, which seems to me a good definition of formal critical thought, appropriate in the pure logic of the ancient Greeks. But if you apply it to the thinking of a scientist, engineer, nurse, or almost any other discipline, it's an inadequate definition. It doesn't include comparison of the results of your thought process to the external reality, and that's the core of scientific met [illegible]

Shipka: I tend to agree. The amendment that I would offer has a more general and less rigorous definition of critical thinking. There are many dimensions to critical thinking. All disciplines offer some of them. I think it will strengthen the general education requirements if we give the "green light" to those various disciplines to take the particular critical thinking skills that they can inculcate best and isolate one or two sections each term that will emphasiz [illegible]

Jenkins: The Task Force had taken the line of infusion of critical thinking into GER courses and a broad sense of what critical thinking might be. In this proposed amendment, there are some very specific types of critical thinking. It would appear that each teacher must teach these or teach about these, as opposed to teaching about what would be critical thinking within the discipline. I think the GER Task Force would see these definitions as being very res [illegible]

Minogue: I'm concerned with a term that's appeared over and over: "infusion." When we ask what it means, we hear it means to "attempt" to do whatever. The position of the committee seems to be that critical thinking doesn't have to be taught; it simply has to be "infused." How is this done? It's a very undefined term that I don't think any of us understand.

Maraffa: To clarify: In the Task Force, we used "infusion" to distinguish between a dedicated course for a particular goal or goals versus a skill or goal that would be incorporated, or "infused," in a variety of courses.

Clyde Moneyhun: I would also urge defeat (1) because the proposed amendment has no teeth; it doesn't do much more than the original GER model. (2) The definition of critical thinking is very narrow and culture-specific; in my field, rhetoric, we think of critical thinking much more broadly than this.

Singler: The ASC hasn't used the term "infusion" at all. The language came from a memo from the Philosophy Department.

Shipka: The Philosophy Department has urged upon the ASC a great deal of language, very little of which has been welcomed by the ASC. In regard to Tom Maraffa's statement, we aren't asking for a course in critical thinking; we do want it incorporated across the University, but in a measurable way. We would leave it to the disciplines to decide how it applies to their courses.

A vote was taken, and the motion concerning Proposed Amendment 5.3 failed.

******

Consideration of amendments not proposed by the Academic Standards Committee:

7. Philosophy Department's proposed amendment concerning critical thinking:

Shipka: We circulated the following motion to senators by campus mail. The motion—which applies to the GER Task Force report, p. 5, item 3—is a substitute for the proposed amendment we just defeated. I move that we add the following paragraph:

To meet Goal 3, students must take at least two critical thinking-intensive courses. Any course may qualify as critical thinking-intensive, whether it is a GER course or not, as long as it has been certified as critical thinking-intensive. To be certified as critical thinking-intensive, a course should allocate a substantial portion (30%) of the course grade to critical thinking assignments of various kinds. The kinds of critical thinking assignments can and should va [illegible]

The motion was seconded, and discussion followed.

Shipka: We turned to literature on critical thinking at the national level and drew up language we thought was noncontroversial. Each discipline addresses critical thinking skills in its own way, with special emphases. We want to leave the identity of the particular critical thinking skills up to faculty in the various departments. It's essential that we have a parallel concept to writing-intensive and oral communication-intensive courses. 30% of the grade wo [illegible]

Dan O'Neill: The amendment doesn't add an additional course, it strengthens the GER, and, as a member of the GER Task Force, I believe it's in the spirit of the GER Task Force proposal.

Dave Robinson: I think I speak in favor of this motion, if for no other reason than that the last thing the Senate passed is a predicating motion, which starts "It is expected . . ." but doesn't specify by whom or who will enforce it. It says that courses "will attempt" to do it, not that they will do it, and they will attempt to do it only whenever possible, in whose judgment I don't know. If the predicating motion is not flabby enough to let any member of the facu [illegible]

Minogue: Our department thought about this for weeks, trying to develop a definition of critical thinking that would be broad-based across the University and that would allow many different departments to employ critical thinking skills as they see fit. This is not a philosophy requirement. Secondly, I would encourage you to approve this amendment because if North Central arrives here in a few months and sees a skill identified as critical thinking and th [illegible]

Don Rudolph: What is a critical thinking coordinator, and who would appoint such a person?

Shipka: We're simply following the parallel of the writing- and oral communication-intensive courses. Presumably, a coordinating committee and/or GER coordinator will determine what these coordinators are. There is a critical thinking faculty-development committee, which has a variety of members. Perhaps a critical thinking coordinator could be drawn from that group.

Maraffa: Could a course be both critical thinking-intensive and writing-intensive, and could an assignment include both, even though it doesn't constitute 60% of the grade? It seems the processes are very similar.

Shipka: I don't see any contradiction in such a concept if a course develops assignments that address or require both.

Geneva Kornbluth: As a member of the ASC, I wanted to say that we, too, looked at the original Task Force report and felt the material about critical thinking was weak. Those of us on the ASC concur that the critical thinking area needs to be strengthened. The Senate just defeated our own amendment designed to strengthen it. I think most of us on the ASC would concur that this proposed amendment is also a way of strengthening it. There is a gap that [illegible]

Jenkins: The Task Force felt critical thinking is an essential component that must be encouraged in a college education. We didn't want to diminish that but to find a way in which to do it. How can this be incorporated? In our surveys of faculty, we found that most faculty believed they were teaching critical thinking, at least within their disciplines. Whether you would agree with that probably depends on your definition of critical thinking. While there i [illegible]

Minogue: Bill Jenkins's point is well taken. Critical thinking is difficult to define. The Senate rejected one definition a few minutes ago. We offered a broader, more inclusive definition that may be inadequate in some respects, but it tries to capture an approach that allows all departments to contribute, and that's the core of the concern here. Critical thinking isn't specific to one department; it can be taught in multiple disciplines, using different approaches. [illegible]

Shipka: Bill Jenkins expressed the fear that having a critical thinking-intensive concept might create an excuse whereby faculty abandon their traditional protocol in terms of teaching critical thinking. I think that's a faulty argument. I just finished grading 140 essay exams. I tried to make all of the grammar, spelling, and punctuation corrections that I'm able to; however, I still support the concept of Writing I, Writing II, and two writing-intensive courses [illegible]

(Shipka moved the previous question. This motion was seconded, a vote was taken, and the motion closing debate passed.)

A vote on the motion on the floor was taken, and the Philosophy Department's amendment concerning critical thinking passed.

******

8. (Bill Wood/Frank Krygowski's) Proposed Amendment 4 on page 6 of the February 25 Senate agenda:

Bill Wood: Page 6 of the February 25 agenda contained several proposed amendments. I would like to speak to those. I understand that the Task Force had an enormous task. Attempts were made to bring the departments into the deliberations throughout the process. However, we were assured all along that there would be no increase in the number of GER courses or requirements for GER for our programs. By my evaluation, there is an increase in the to [illegible]

This increase is accentuated by conversion to semesters. There will be at least one additional course. It's a little disingenuous that the 14+ semester-hour courses that the GER Task Force seems to identify don't correspond to 15+ quarter-hour courses as noted in the GER report; it's actually 16.3 courses if you do the contact-hour conversion, and that's clearly more than what we require in our program now. Accordingly, I drafted Amendment 1 on page 6 [illegible]

Frank Krygowski moved proposed Amendment 4:

Revise the Table on p. 3 [of the GER Task Force report] to indicate a requirement of 7 courses in Categories B—Natural Science, C—Artistic and Literary Perspectives, and D—Societies and Institutions. Select 2 or 3 courses in each area. Any additional general education requirements may only be added by elimination of an equivalent existing requirement.

The motion was seconded, and discussion followed.

Krygowki: A three semester hour course is not equivalent to a 4-quarter-hour course. The quarter course has 40 class contact hours, while the semester course has 45 class contact hours. Thus, converting a 4-QH course to a 3-SH course causes a 12.5% inflation in class contact hours. [(45-40)/40 x 100% = 12.5%] This must be made up somewhere.

Another way to understand this is to note that a standard 186-QH bachelor's degree and a standard 124-SH bachelor's degree both have 1860 class contact hours. But in the quarter system, the 1860 class contact hours are divided into 46.5 courses of 40 contact hours each. [46.5 x 40 = 1860] In the semester system, the 1860 class contact hours are divided into just 41.3 courses of 45 contact hours each. [41.3 x 45 = 1860]

Thus, in changing from quarters to semesters, the typical program will have five fewer courses in its curriculum. [46.5 - 41.3 = 5.2]

If there is no reduction in the number of courses allocated to the general education requirements, then all of the reduction of five courses must come from the major and minor areas—from those courses that were most important in bringing the students to YSU. As a step toward easing the burden on the major or minor, I propose we reduce the science or humanities section from 8 to 7 courses.

[Note from Krygowski: Although I didn't state it this way in the Senate, the numbers can also come from this simpler calculation:

186 QH / 4 QH per course = 46.5 courses under the quarter system
124 SH / 3 SH per course = 41.3 courses under the semester system

Again, the typical program must somehow make do with 5 fewer courses.]

McCloud: This is interesting information and instructive. I start imagining inflation in majors, as well as in other areas, and this is useful in providing a large context in which we would ultimately take action. But since there's so much substance that we haven't yet treated, I would suggest that we return to this issue after we've discussed all of the substance and the items that have already been tabled.

McCloud moved to table Krygowski's motion. The motion was seconded and is not debatable. A vote was taken, and the motion to table carried.

******

9. Proposed Amendments 2 and 3, concerning certification, from page 6 of the February 25 Senate agenda:

Wood: Amendments 2 and 3 on p. 6 of the February 25 Senate agenda arose from the concept of a general ed coordinator, a writing-intensive coordinator, etc. It seems that having all of these people will require that we petition or ask that our courses be accepted. I find that structure offensive from an academic-integrity point of view. We're supposed to be able to choose what and how to teach within our disciplines. While I support and do require writing [illegible]

(George McCloud raised a point of order: How do Wood's points relate to what we're discussing? Wood: Many of the items on the table indicate that courses will be certified by a general ed coordinator or something to that effect. While certification is fine, it should be done by the department chair or coordinator, not some outside coordinator. Morrison: There is no motion on the floor except the main motion, Recommendation 1 of the Task Force, whic [illegible]

******

10. Allen Hunter's proposed Amendment 3, concerning speech-intensive courses, from page 7 of the February 25 Senate agenda:

Hunter: Several sessions ago, I offered a motion to table discussion of the communications course, based on several factors. We offered an alternate amendment at that time. See the February 25 agenda, page 7, item 3. As we discussed before, many of us feel that having a whole course on communication, while admirable in principle, is totally unaffordable. It looks like it would require the equivalent of about 10 faculty positions or the equivalent mixture [illegible]

Thus, I would like to move proposed Amendment 3 from p. 7 of the February 25 agenda, that the speech requirement be met by having students take one or more speech-intensive courses within their major.

(McCloud raised a point of order: Wouldn't it be more timely to dispose of the motion concerning oral communication that's been tabled before we speak to another one on the same subject? Morrison: The motion on the floor now is on the main motion. Amendments germane to the main motion are appropriate if there's a second. O'Neill: Anyone can move to remove a motion from the table. Morrison: Hunter is introducing a new motion on the same su [illegible]

Hunter: We tabled that amendment so that we could discuss this amendment first.

(Someone raised a point of order: Has a motion been made? I would like to second it.
Hunter then restated the motion. Morrison asked for a ruling by Bill Jenkins, the parliamentarian.
Jenkins said that whoever has the floor has the right to make a motion to remove an item from the table or to offer a new motion. Hunter's motion was offered and seconded. It is an appropriate motion. Hunter would have to agree with McCloud to withdraw the motion.)

Discussion followed.

Floyd Barger: I would like to speak against the motion, against the argument concerning resources. If we decide to have a speech requirement, it's an administrative duty to rearrange resources to meet that requirement. If we had applied similar reasoning in the past, we would probably have an English Department with 11 faculty now, and we wouldn't have an English writing requirement. The argument is specious. We shouldn't be making decisions ba [illegible]

It was moved and seconded that we adjourn. The motion carried.

******
ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. The minutes of the March 4 meeting will probably be distributed at the same time as the agenda for the April 8 meeting.

2. Anne York, chair of the University Curriculum Committee, was unable to attend today's meeting. She asked us to announce that objections were raised to course no. 98-45, Engineering 610 (Energy and the Environment), and that course should be deleted from the list on page 62 of the March 4 Senate agenda.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.