



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
164 Food Science and Nutrition  
1334 Eckles Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108  
Telephone (612)373-3226

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
AND  
CONVERSATION WITH THE PRESIDENT

Thursday, May 19, 1983  
12:30 - 3:00  
Regents Room

AGENDA

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

1. Minutes of April 28 SCC and May 3 SCC/SFC meetings (distributed previously and enclosed to those who missed them)
2. Report of the Student Chair.
3. Committee Reports
  - a. Finance
  - b. Others?
4. Business of 5/19 Senate and Assembly meetings.

CONVERSATION WITH THE PRESIDENT

- |      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1:00 | 1. International Education Planning Theme.                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| 2:00 | 2. College planning issues (Vice President Keller).                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 2:50 | 3. Second cycle planning task forces: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Reports from any of the working task forces?</li><li>b. Status of task forces on The Student Experience and on Communication, Computation &amp; Information Technology.</li></ol> |

-----

PLEASE NOTE: NEXT SCC MEETING IS THURSDAY, MAY 26, 12:30-3:00 in  
300 MORRILL HALL.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
164 Food Science and Nutrition  
1334 Eckles Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108  
Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES

APPROVED 6/16/83

SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

May 19, 1983  
12:45 - 1:15  
Regents Room

Members present: V. Fredricks, P. Freier, J. Howe, B. Hogen, A. Hunt, J. Iverson, B. Kronebusch, D. Lenander, M. Mattson, D. Pratt, P. Quie, W. D. Spring, W. B. Sundquist, P. Swan (Chr.), J. Turner, K. Watson.

Guests: Tom Bernhardt, Scott Singer and Paul Schulte (members-elect), Michael Root, Carol Pazandak, Rick Bale, Maureen Smith.

1. Minutes of meetings of April 28 and May 3 were approved with a few editorial changes which the secretary will send to the members.

2. Report of the Student Chair.

Dave Lenander distributed a written report.

1983-84 student members: Scott Singer, Twin Cities, and Tom Bernhardt, UMW, were introduced. Barry Hogen announced the election of Charles Farrell, UMM.

3. Senate Finance Committee Report. Sundquist.

SFC met most recently on May 17. Sundquist told SCC that if the administration were to implement a retrenchment of 4% instead of 6% as planned, the smaller retrenchment would fund the reallocation commitments of which SFC has been informed. The University could come up with some of that percentage from service units so academic units could have a lesser tariff and still have \$4.5 million available for various kinds of reallocation plus faculty salary augmentation. The budget package has shifted because the legislative appropriation included annualization of salary increases which central administration had calculated into the retrenchment need.

Sundquist raised the Finance Committee's question: Do we want to insist on a 4% retrenchment so that we can have reallocation plus salary augmentation? SFC is strongly inclined to support doing so. However, still only 2-3% is obviously available in the next two to three years.

In finding the necessary money, Swan said she anticipates the problem of choosing between programmatic and across-the-board cuts.

Sundquist reported that the Finance Committee favors proceeding with the retrenchments ordered on the bases, even if central administration then has to

loan some money back to the units so they can pay their bills. The University needs to take action on the collegiate bases to prevent across-the-board cutting and to move toward our long-run objective.

Pratt indicated agreement with Sundquist's point but stressed that the cuts taken are going to inflict damage even if they only last one to two years.

Sundquist said SFC favors getting funds to reallocate to high priority programs. If the University doesn't begin reallocation soon, people will start to think it is never going to happen.

Pratt warned that superimposing an across-the-board cut will negate the planning-reallocation process and the efforts of units rationally to reduce their budgets.

Sundquist told SCC that Keller had asked the Finance Committee what stance it advised the administration to take on permitting units to charge higher tuition and keep the increment, as the School of Management is currently permitted to do for its evening program. The Finance Committee does not regard such a move as an acceptable way to take a retrenchment. It runs counter to the program adjustments we are looking at, and it messes up the schedule for making tuition costs a set percentage of the cost of program delivery. Howe seconded the view that raising tuition has no impact on program planning.

Swan recommended central administration be wary of negotiating separate tuition deals with each unit. Sundquist reminded SCC that while such tuition variances are based on demand, demand might be quite different in five years.

4. May 19 Assembly meeting. Motion from the Student Elections Commission.

Turner requested more information on the background and intention of the motion.

Paul Schulte, chair of the elections commission, told SCC that the present cumbersome amendment procedure makes it almost impossible for the commission to change its rules. Yet some of the rules badly need revision and are in fact mutually contradictory. Passing the motion would make reasonable change easier. Since May 20 is the students' last real opportunity this year to hold a referendum, paving the way to introducing rule changes to be effective in 1983-84, students hope the motion will pass today. Carl Nelson and Nick Barbatsis have asked for simplification of the grievance system regarding elections.

Turner said he sympathized on those problems, but added that the student record of running elections is not good and he fears the possibility of malpractices. For example, an election commission could change rules on election eve. Schulte said there is a safeguard against that behavior.

We must maintain the integrity of the election, said Turner. The change would make easier the making of bad rules. Iverson said MSA is developing a proposal to protect the integrity of the process by requiring that proposed changes to the election rules be printed in advance in the Daily and giving people an opportunity to raise problems.

Turner inquired whether the people dealing with the revision have given serious thought to the kinds of problems he has raised. Hunt affirmed that it had been a major point of their discussions.

Lenander filled in some history. Political party control of the Twin Cities Student Assembly in 1976 prohibited their voting on rules changes the election commission believed necessary. The requirement was added that rule changes go to the Assembly Committee on Student Affairs. Later the procedures were revised to require Twin Cities Campus Assembly initiative in any rule changes.

The SCC meeting concluded at 1:15 p.m. SCC's conversation with President Magrath and Vice President Keller followed immediately (recorded separately).

Respectfully submitted,

*Meredith Poppele*

Meredith Poppele, SCC Executive Assistant

## Report of the Student Senate Consultative Committee

The committee has met over twenty times, and will continue to meet during May and June of 1983. Attendance has been particularly good from the Twin Cities, Morris and Waseca campuses, and up until late in Winter Quarter, from the Crookston campus, as well. Both Crookston and Duluth have suffered from vacancies during much of the year. The committee has built upon and improved the practice of regular meetings of the Student Senate Consultative Committee separate from the full Senate Consultative Committee that was identified last year as important. This is particularly so under the present circumstances whereby the Faculty Consultative Committee is newly asserting its role and responsibilities separate from the University Senate and the full SCC. It may well be increasingly important for the SSCC and the Student Senate to act separately for student initiatives in the future.

Particularly for this reason, it is unfortunate that plans discussed last summer and during fall quarter for division of the responsibilities that have fallen to the Student Chair among several SSCC members were not realized this year. Several different proposals from 81-82 Chair Kit Wiseman, and members Rick Linden, Dennis Kronebusch and Dave Lenander came to nothing--essentially because no individual member aside from the Chair was able to take on additional work. It is especially unfortunate that the Twin Cities campus members had so many responsibilities to campus student governance with the Minnesota Student Association that they were unable to devote more time to the SSCC. To some extent, this must be a responsibility of the coordinate campus representatives as well, however. Copies of the various proposals will be forwarded to the new SSCC for their consideration during 83-84, perhaps in conjunction with a review of the Student Senate Constitution and structure.

As in past years, especially during fall quarter, much time and effort went into the selection of Student Representatives to the Board of Regents. The committee was newly convinced that some of this time must be released from this annual commitment for devotion to SSCC specific concerns. Proposals for reorganizing this process, and further defining the role of SSCC in this area under the Regents' Policy on Student Representatives, were developed by both the SSCC and the Student Representatives during winter quarter. It is hoped that before the conclusion of the academic year on June 30 that the Ad Hoc Policy Committee established under the Regents' Policy (composed of the SSCC and the Student Representatives) can finalize and adopt these proposals. These proposals also address some of the problems identified by the SSCC in 80-81, and which were further discussed by the SSCC during 81-82. The SSCC notes in particular the helpful work of Student Representatives Julie Bates and Marty Smith, as well as Alternate Steven Feig in this process.

Besides Student Representatives and Alternates, the SSCC also participated in the selection of student members of various committees both in and out of the Senate structure, such as Senate Committees on Finance, Honors, Business & Rules, and for the first time recommended a student representative for the Administrative Fees Committee.

The SSCC was particularly interested in certain aspects of SCC discussion topics, such as the reports of the all-University Task Force on Human Services Programs, and the November '82 report of a special administrative committee on International Students at the University of Minnesota, and also in particular, the developing plans for the pursuit of certain "planning themes" in all-University planning: International Education, The Student Experience, University-Industry Relationships, Research and Graduate Education, and computer and telecommunications technology. Discussions of the SSCC focused particularly on the Student Experience topic.

The Student Experience, and International Education, continue to be of special interest to the SSCC. In connection with the first, and focusing on the student experience of classroom teaching, members of the Committee met with Asst. Vice President Betty Robinett to discuss the Promotion and Tenure process, and the place of effective teaching, as well as of student evaluation in this process. This will continue to be a topic of discussion this year, and the SSCC may meet with other administrators to discuss other aspects of this planning theme, pursuit of which was temporarily postponed until the new Asst. Vice President for Undergraduate Education and Outreach, Prof. John Wallace, could assume his new position. Members of the SSCC have also met with Assistant to the President Carol Pazandak to discuss the International Students report in connection with the planning theme on International Education. SSCC is also studying the recent report from the Office of International Programs in response to proposals for dismantling or reorganizing that Office.

Proposals to dismantle and reorganize various units of the University as part of programmatic retrenchment were also of concern to the SSCC (as for the SCC, of course). SSCC has been particularly concerned about student options and the availability of programs to students in a number of areas. Besides those mentioned above, the SSCC is currently involved in examination of the new college plans for 83-85, and has been considering implications of various proposals, such as the CLA proposal to terminate ethnic studies programs, and cutbacks in various support services, particularly in the Office of Student Affairs. Last summer the SSCC discussed the elimination of the Library School, which resulted in forwarding several suggestions to the Library School Director.

Other topics of discussion during the year included the Office of Student Affairs Discussion Paper on student pay rates, the University response to Federal law coupling financial aid to draft registration, and campus specific student concerns raised before the Board of Regents by the campus student body presidents.

During spring quarter the SSCC began to review the Constitutions of the Student Senate, and explore the need for restructuring this body. This led to a decision to convene the Student Senate on May nineteenth. Among other topics that need study involve the role of the Student Senate vis-a-vis the five student governments, the other Senates and Assemblies, as well as the committees of these bodies, and such non-Senate bodies as the Student Representatives. The SSCC recommends the establishment of a task force to study these issues, and is proposing action in this regard to the Student Senate.

Other topics discussed by the SSCC include several proposed changes to Senate practices. The full SCC accepted the proposal that SSCC be briefed on FCC closed meetings, and that the Student Chairs of SSCC and Committee on Committees be included in meetings of the Facilitative Committees. Also under discussion are proposals to provide alternates and other developmental support for student members of Senate & Assembly committees, and new approaches to solving the perennial problems of unfilled Student Senate seats for certain colleges. (Of interest, and under discussion by various groups, is a suggestion that a Senate Committee on Student Affairs be established--possibly under the Student Senate, but more likely under the full Senate).

Members of the SSCC have represented students in various contexts outside of the committee, notably in consultations with University President Magrath, Vice President Wilderson and other administrators. Besides the service of the Student Chair on the search committee for a new Academic Affairs Assistant Vice President, the SSCC would like to particularly recognize the contributions of Kathy Watson, who, despite her extensive time commitments to MSA as Speaker, has particularly assisted the SSCC and the Student Chair with interviewing for student committee assignments, letter writing, and general support.

--David Lenander, Chair



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
164 Food Science and Nutrition  
1334 Eckles Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108  
Telephone (612)373-3226

MINUTES

APPROVED 6/16/83

SCC CONVERSATION WITH PRESIDENT MAGRATH AND VICE PRESIDENT KELLER

May 19, 1983  
1:15 - 3:00  
Regents Room

Members present: Fredricks, Freier, Hogen, Howe, Hunt, Iverson, Kronebusch, Lenander, Mattson, Pratt, Quie, Spring, Sundquist, Swan (Chr.), Turner, Watson.

Guests: Jerry Kline, Michael Root, Jim Borgestad, Mary Jane Plunkett, Tom Bernhardt, Scott Singer, Paul Schulte, Carol Pazandak, Rick Bale, Maureen Smith.

The President asked for a few minutes' discussion at the end of the hour on the 1984 Twin Cities calendar.

1. International Education at the University of Minnesota.

President Magrath said he was speaking from the assumption that international education is a mainstream function for this university. He assumes that all the many aspects of what we call international education cannot and should not be encapsulated in any administrative structure. We have a lot of local options and discretion. But we have to talk about international education as a priority for budgeting vis-a-vis other choices.

International education includes formal exchange agreements between the University and foreign colleges and others, and student exchange programs. It includes all the campuses of the University.

International education also includes academic and curricular programs-- area studies, foreign languages, and aspects of several disciplines. Getting a perfect definition is less important than resolving some important definitional questions. It is incumbent on many of us to look at the structures. We offer 13 area studies, 37 foreign languages, and 15 study grants. There is a strong international platform here; nationally we are regarded as very strong in international education. Later in the meeting the President offered as a broad definition of international education, although with qualifications, "the moving of people across national boundaries."

Today budgetary problems make more acute the problem of funding for programs and the organizational structure for our international education programs.

We have to fight at the federal level to keep the funding for programs funded by Congress. We do well at the national level on contract work, which is largely in agriculture. At the state level the best way to support international education is to get a good appropriation for the University as a whole. Specials on international education don't fare well at the Legislature.

International education activities are forced into competition with some other important priorities.

He thinks there are grounds for cautious optimism that we can do better. There are senators and congressmen who believe in the necessity of our being internationally informed as a nation. The governor's interest is a plus at the state level.

At the University level, we are proposing international education to be one of the themes in the second planning cycle. Many faculty members are interested. He thinks we should engage in planning in the next year or two, but not to the exclusion of trying some structural changes. How much organization should there be? We should encourage as much local autonomy as possible. Our objectives should be to enhance international education at the University of Minnesota.

He referred to the recent work of the Senate Committee on International Education, the Pazandak Report on International Students, the report from the Office of International Programs, and the existence of other studies. He said he would value suggestions and discussion and, at some appropriate point in the near future, guidance from the Educational Policy Committee and the SCC. He told SCC Vice President Keller has asked the deans for suggestions on international education in addition to the question of the future of the Office of International Programs.

The President said he observes that local concerns get in the way of his carrying out appointments regarding international education.

The President invited questions.

Turner noted that he has been associated with international education all his career and is thoroughly committed. To promote international education in an area of constraints, he said we should ask:

- (1) What are our University-wide goals regarding international education?
- (2) Given these goals, what are we currently doing toward them? Take an inventory. We would probably be surprised at how much we are doing, particularly in technical assistance in agriculture and political science.
- (3) What do we want to do regarding those goals that we are not meeting, and how?

It does no good to project expansion of international programs without knowing what resources will fund them. We must work out the priorities very carefully with respect to other needs. We should go at the questions systematically and take care to avoid duplication as units go their own way. Area studies are one of the most expensive kinds of education one can provide.

Lenander said that while Turner's points were important to keep in mind, the planning theme need not require new resources. It could mean a reallocation of what we are giving now. He asked people to keep in mind that there is not presently a commitment to the Office of International Programs, but there is a need for coordination of specific programs. It is valuable for us to remember those connections found even in unexpected places (as the bearing of the inter-



national literary tradition upon English literature).

Howe observed that the various parts of the University's international education (e.g., the foreign students here, our technical agreements with other parts of the world, the teaching of area studies here) seem connected to each other only in the most tangential ways. It seems so diffuse and involves so much of what goes on at the University that he finds it hard to understand why international education comes up in its totality as a theme.

V. P. Keller discussed the position of the Director of the Office of International Programs. The argument for keeping the position is that we are underdeveloped regarding our international aspect and so need some organization. But when internationalization becomes as natural to the University as "meeting social needs," we will no longer need a special structure.

Kline sees the strands of international education running off in all directions. He attributed some of this to entrepreneurial actions of some faculty. He asked how planning about international education will affect what we already have and whether anyone has made an inventory of the documents on international education already produced here.

Keller said OIP did a study and analysis of the rhetoric in the planning documents regarding their international content.

Fredricks noted that according to one report (that of the Senate Committee on International Education) faculty should be encouraged to undertake international education projects and would be rewarded in promotion and tenure for doing so. She asked whether those people now doing international research are not being recognized and rewarded for their work?

President Magrath said there are non-tenured Agriculture people doing overseas service work who get disadvantaged in their home promotion and tenure process. The question of criteria is a serious one with a lot of ramifications, observed Swan. The President said he thinks the international service route has a good role model in the agricultural extension agent.

Turner distinguished three goals or categories in which the University can make improvements:

- (1) International awareness and international educational development of students, including foreign students at Minnesota. Perhaps we should have exchange programs for undergraduates. Would need funding.
- (2) The international education role of the faculty--exchanges, research projects, research without going abroad. Would need funding.
- (3) Aid to developing countries (from units such as Agriculture, CBS, Health Sciences). University already does a lot.

Sundquist observed that the topic is much more intense in some areas of the University than in others. Some faculty haven't had the opportunity to develop ways of teaching an international perspective to students. He chairs a committee addressing what the College of Agriculture should be doing in international education. The plan they are assembling is pretty specific to the college, but includes attention to the flow of information around the campus regarding activities related to the international realm.

Domestic students are interested in the international arena, he said. We must enrich our treatment of foreign students, and should probably not admit them if we cannot assist them more than we do domestic students.

Other aspects of the College of Agriculture international perspective have to do with its own people overseas and the relation of the international to extension work.

We have gotten a lot from the activities of the Office of International Programs, he said, and believe it should be continued.

Jerry Kline said he and the Committee on Educational Policy did not challenge the inclusion of international education as an issue in the planning cycle. They suggest, though, that there are practical limits to what we can do. We should "unbundle" the assorted components. We can deal with the future of the OIP. Student activity items are doable. But he advised against telling faculty they should go overseas.

Swan seconded the call to subdivide the international education topic, either by goals or by functions. She said she cannot see international education as a single planning theme. Some parts are much more doable, some much more difficult. Curriculum is largely unique to the colleges and the faculty hold a strong prerogative as to what can go on within their colleges. This is quite a different area from what can be addressed administratively.

The President told SCC he has never meant that central administration should try to control what the faculty do. He said he is inclined to think the planning theme can be broken down into doable components. He added that he thinks we need some overall structure for the theme.

## 2. Twin Cities Calendar, 1984-85.

President Magrath told SCC that the Assembly-approved calendar presents a problem. The starting date is to be Thursday, September 27, which is Rosh Hoshanna. That would not be right.

Swan asked if we could move to begin the "uniform calendar" in 1985 instead of 1984 (and figure out before 1996--the next year for such a conflict with first day of classes--how to avoid the problem then). We could aim for an informal expression of opinion from the Assembly, which approved the calendar.

Vice President Keller informed SCC that the Calendar Committee had known of the conflict, considered it, and rejected it as a reason to change the starting date.

Fredricks favored the Assembly Steering Committee's recommending to the President that he exercise his prerogative of determining the calendar. Sundquist said that the Steering Committee, as the committee to which the Calendar Committee reports and which forwarded their proposed calendar, must have some consideration for that committee.

Howe recommended taking no action today, but rather talking informally with the Calendar committee, informing them it was the Steering Committee's unanimous conclusion that the proposed starting date was a bad decision and that the Steering Committee would like to advise the President to change it.

Quie moved the Assembly Steering Committee recommend the 1984-85 calendar start on Tuesday, September 25. Fredricks seconded the motion. (The reason to move two days earlier was that were classes to begin on Wednesday, Thursday would still be the first meeting day for many classes.)

Pratt proposed as an amendment that the Steering Committee seek the concurrence of the Calendar Committee, incidating to them our disapproval of their recommendation and asking them to join us in requesting the President to change the dates. The amendment was not voted upon.

The Steering Committee voted on this agreed-upon modification of Paul Quie's motion: To recommend a change in the 1984-85 calendar such that classes start on Tuesday (the 25th) instead of Thursday (the 27th) and to so inform the Calendar Committee by letter with a copy to the President.

The motion was carried without dissent.

The President left the meeting at 2:33 p.m.

3. Planning Themes: Task Forces. Vice President Keller read a memorandum from Vice President Hasselmo on the status of the task forces.

(1) Higher Education and the Economy of the State (David Lilly, Chair). Task Force is progressing well on both surveys. Report expected in early June.

(2) Quality of Graduate Education and Research (Robert Holt, Chair). This task force got a later start. Dean Holt has now set up a special task force to deal with graduate education at Duluth; the number of graduate students is small and there is a proposal for a half-time dean. Promotion and tenure standards applied do not always reflect the same attention to scholarship as on the Twin Cities campus. Should UMD's graduate programs be tied to programs here? Vice President Keller agreed it is desirable to address these questions.

(3) The Student Experience. John Wallace will chair this task force and hopes to begin work by the end of spring quarter.

(4) Communication, Computation and Information. Could Vice President Bohen take the lead on this study? Vice Presidents Keller and Bohen have agreed on the need for clearer focus on what that task force should address before establishing the task force. Bohen employed an outside consultant to assess the University in this regard; he has now reported. Keller said he and Bohen think they need one more day with this consultant and with the other people he is to talk with. They also have had a preliminary discussion with Jerry Kline regarding the educational policy aspects of the issue.

Keller said an initial question to resolve is whether to address academic and administrative computing together or separately.

Vice President Keller referred to the motion brought to the Senate by the Senate Committee on Research calling for a national search for the director of the University Computer Center. He noted that the committee had not asked central administration for any information regarding problems the Research Committee had heard about.

4. College Plans: The Morris Campus.

Professor Spring told SCC that the Morris Campus Planning Committee had met the previous day (May 18) to review the planning document the Provost had sent to the Budget Executive. They had not seen the final document before it left the campus, and May 18 was their first chance to comment on it. Spring had put the Planning Committee's response in the form of a letter to Professor Swan with a copy to Vice President Keller. He read his letter to the Consultative Committee, stressing the following points:

Procedural objections. Although the consultative period was February 15 to April 12, no consultation occurred until March 28. Vice President Keller's letter of charge was not given to the faculty for four weeks. The dean made the plan up out of whole cloth. It is tentative but complete and includes seven pages of academic projections. It calls for retrenching six specific positions. The document surprised the Provost. Faculty responses were due April 12 to the dean's plan.

In a number of separate meetings faculty offered the same suggestions and alternatives but they were in no way incorporated into the plan.

In a word, Spring told the SCC, there was no consultation.

Substantive issues. The faculty saw the dean's plan as being at odds with Vice President Keller's directive and with the Morris campus mission. Positions to be dropped are

English	2
History	1
Political Science	1
Physical Education	1 (which Spring called a token).

The result could be that the core English faculty (apart from Freshman composition) would go from 4 FTE's to 2FTE's, while leaving non-central programs untouched and actually upgrading one or more of them.

Swan asked whether Vice President Keller had inquired of Provost Imholte about the planning/consulting process used at Morris. Keller said he had not. He does not object, he said, to the administration's putting a set of suggestions before the faculty. He would expect consultation.

The Morris campus mission is in the liberal arts. Keller told SCC the administration at Morris believes they cannot maintain their enrollments without adding some professional programs. He called the situation to which Spring had referred "clearly a serious situation."

Swan said we believe there has to be good faith consultation which means two-way consultation. SCC wants to see evidence of good faith consultation. In IT consultation with the faculty also began very late. She added that she thinks the willingness of this faculty to work on this planning effort even at short notice is remarkable.

Spring stated there is no evidence that anything but the most trivial of changes were made in the final Morris document as a result of the consulting process. Mattson advised that the SCC look into the consultative process generally.

Keller noted that the Budget Executive has not approved the proposed Health Fitness program in the Morris plan.

Spring added that the Morris Campus Planning Committee did not see the plan for the support services until after it had been submitted.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Meredith Poppele*

Meredith Poppele, SCC Executive Assistant



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
164 Food Science and Nutrition  
1334 Eckles Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108  
Telephone (612)373-3226

May 17, 1983

President C. Peter Magrath  
202 Morrill Hall

Dear Peter:

The Senate Consultative Committee is pleased that you have agreed to talk about International Education at Minnesota on Thursday afternoon, May 19th. We hope you'll be able to join us for that presentation and discussion at 1:00 p.m.

Around 2:00 we'd like to switch the conversation to our continuing examination of college planning. I believe we wish to start with some additional comments about the CLA situation and then move to discuss some concerns at Morris. If we have time we may move to Crookston and CBS.

In addition, we'd like to "tune-in" to the status of our planning themes. Has either task force reported? What is the status of the "student experience" theme? What about "computers"?

As you see, we have scheduled a full agenda and we must all be across the river by 3:15 p.m.-- thus, we anticipate another session in which we'll need to "talk fast."

Sincerely,

Patricia B. Swan, Chair,  
Senate Consultative Committee

PBS:mbp

xc: K. Keller



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

University Senate Consultative Committee  
164 Food Science and Nutrition  
1334 Eckles Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108  
Telephone (612)373-3226

May 10, 1983

President C. Peter Magrath  
202 Morrill Hall

Dear Peter:

Our May 19th meetings are fast approaching. I have yet to do my usual exercise in collecting the potential agenda items, but we do have one request that I want to convey now so as not to "spring" it on you at the last moment.

We would appreciate hearing remarks from you as to your views of International Education at the University, where you think we should be in International Education, and some of the things we might consider doing to get there. I was disappointed that you didn't get a chance to give, and we didn't get a chance to hear, your seminar presentation that had been scheduled for April 21st (although we understand your being at the Legislature then was crucial). Perhaps you could give us a mini-seminar on the subject of International Education at Minnesota at our meeting next week?

I shall write you again about other aspects of our meetings around the end of this week.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Pat".

Patricia B. Swan, Chair,  
Senate Consultative Committee

PBS:mbp