Council of Entomology Department Administrators (CEDA)
Annual Meeting Notes
14 Dec. 2005, 4:30 – 6:00 pm
Fort Lauderdale, Marina Marriott

The meeting was opened by CEDA Chair, Steve Yaninek of Purdue University. CEDA Secretary, Gary Brewer, North Dakota State University, was introduced.

An agenda (previously sent to CEDA members) was passed out.

General Introductions were made and a brief discussion of the CDEA election followed.

> An email call for nominations was made prior to the annual meeting. This was followed by email voting that was also done prior to the annual meeting. CEDA Chair Yaninek tallied and announced the results to the membership. The election procedures call for the Secretary to assume the Chair position at the conclusion of the Entomological Society of America meeting. The new CEDA Secretary for 2006 is Robert Wiedenmann, University of Arkansas.

Chair, Yaninek thanked the CEDA membership for the opportunity to serve and to preside over useful changes in CEDA activity. He noted the duties are light.

CAST report. ZB Mayo, University of Nebraska has represented CEDA to CAST and has agreed to continue in that capacity. He was reimbursed for one trip to a CAST meeting ($588) in the last year.

CoFARM. Rick Meyer reported on CoFARM activities (report dated November 8, 2005 was emailed to members). Rick has been the unofficial spokesperson for CEDA to CoFARM but as a CSREES administrator there are times when he can not represent us. Rick agreed to continue to be a voice for CEDA to CoFARM with our understanding of his constraints. CEDA requested that Rick continue and thanked him for his support.

CSREES Report. Robert Nowierski gave a brief report for CSREES. He recommended that CEDA members read the SARE report "Manage Insects on Your Farm: A Guide to Ecological Strategies" (http://www.sare.org/publications/insect.htm). Monty Johnson passed out some IR-4 handouts.

CSREES funding workshop. Sonny Ramaswamy, Kansas State University, discussed the workshop held earlier in the day. He recommended that CEDA provide CSREES feedback on needed funding initiatives. What do entomologists want in terms of new funding opportunity? He suggested that CEDA compile a short-list of needs and forward them to Bob Nowierski. This should be done quickly.

Entomological Foundation. Brad Vinson presented an overview of the Entomological Foundation.

- Financial strength is improving
- Mission was redefined to emphasize teaching and outreach

- Foundation is distinct from ESA
- There is a need for broader membership (eastern US members predominate) to improve representation nationally
- The Foundation website has a new look and is more informative

ESA Membership. The letter from Floyd Shockley, ESA Membership Committee Chair, was discussed. The ESA Membership Committee wants to interact with CEDA to promote ESA membership.

CEDA budget. A budget was sheet distributed by Jim Harper.

Other business from the floor. None

Discussion Topic

Evolution and Intelligent Design: Entomology's Role and Responsibility in this National Debate. May Berenbaum, University of Illinois, provided us with a statement for consideration (previously sent to members).

Following an open discussion period three motions were made and seconded. All motions were unanimously approved.

Motion 1. The statement with a slight editorial change was endorsed as a CEDA position statement (the edited motion is attached to the end of the minutes).

Motion 2, in two parts. Part 1, the statement is to be forwarded as a resolution for endorsement by the general ESA membership. Part 2, the statement is to be taken to the ESA press room.

> Bob Nowierski agreed to format the position statement as a resolution and presented it to ESA. Susan Fisher, Ohio State University, agreed to serve as CEDA spokesperson for any questions from the press regarding the position statement. Steve Yaninek will forward CEDA members a pdf file of the AAAS resolution regarding evolution and science education.

Motion 3. CEDA will send a copy of the position statement to the National Science Teachers Association.

> Further discussion followed. The question arose of how to best explain the controversy between evolution as a science theory and intelligent design (ID). Although all of us are familiar with the topic and the broad issues, many of us do not have the background and debating skills to counter a skilled ID advocate.
>
> The position statement was to be a topic of discussion when CEDA members met with the ESA governing board (scheduled immediately at the conclusion of the CEDA meeting).

5:45 pm, the meeting was adjourned and the Annual Salary Survey was distributed by Jim Harper, NCSU.

CEDA Position Statement on Intelligent Design

Entomology, the scientific study of insects and their relatives, aims to increase knowledge of the biology of this largest group of animals on Earth and apply that knowledge toward improving human health and well-being. Advances in entomology depend upon rigorous and widely accepted scientific methods that include the development of hypotheses based on observations that are tested and either falsified or incorporated into the body of knowledge that constitutes the discipline. Any hypothesis that cannot be rejected based on evidence is inherently unscientific.

As in all other sciences, the knowledge that accumulates from the testing of various hypotheses can lead to the development of scientific theories, which offer the most comprehensive explanations of natural phenomena and predict the characteristics of as yet unobserved phenomena. Evolution is one of the most robust theories in the biological sciences and has been integral to the conduct of entomological science since it was first articulated some 150 years ago. Indeed, entomologists were among the first North American scientists to incorporate evolutionary theory into their work and have successfully used its explanatory and predictive power to elucidate aspects of the systematics, ecology, physiology, and genetics of insects and their relatives.

No meaningful or significant controversy exists within the biological sciences, entomological science included, about the centrality and legitimacy of evolutionary theory. Ongoing study and refinement of evolutionary theory are reflections of the manner in which all areas of science advance.

In contrast, "intelligent design," with its central tenet of irreducible complexity (i.e., aspects of living systems are too complex to ascribe to biological processes and therefore must have been designed by some intelligent force) is neither predictive nor falsifiable and therefore does not meet the standards of science. Accordingly, intelligent design has no utility in entomological science and, for the same reason, it has no legitimate place in science classrooms at any level of instruction.

For the United States to remain intellectually and economically competitive in the 21st century, its science must be conducted according to time-tested and globally acceptable standards; evolutionary theory meets those standards and provides the foundation on which the biological sciences can most productively continue to advance. We should expect no less in the quality of science education in this country.