



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University
Senate Consultative Committee
154 Klaeber Court
320 - 16th Avenue Southeast
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Telephone (612) 373-3226

AGENDA (G)

Senate Consultative Committee

Thursday, January 12, 1978, 12:30 p.m.

Room ~~605~~, Campus Club, Coffman Union*

Action Items:

1. Approval of minutes - December 1, 1977
(previously distributed)
2. Student Access Report
(previously distributed)

1:30 - 2:15 p.m.:

3. Educational Development Program

(Professors Kingston, Werntz and Yonas will be meeting with the committee.)

* meal voucher with cashier on the sixth floor

LLC
1/6/78



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

All University
Senate Consultative Committee
154 Klaeber Court
320 - 16th Avenue Southeast
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone (612) 373-3226

MINUTES OF THE SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Meeting of January 12, 1978

The All University Senate Consultative Committee convened its tenth meeting of the 1977-78 academic year on Thursday, January 12, 1978 in Room 625 of the Campus Club.

Members present included Laird Barber, George Blake, Mark Bufkin, Ann DeGroot, Wendell Glick, Robert Holt (ex-officio), Kenneth Keller, Harriet Lewis, Terry Marchiniak, Fred Morrison, Richard Purple, Betty Robinett (chairman), Philip Ryan, Barbara Stuhler, Michael Wagner and Mahmood Zaidi. Visitors to the Meeting were Jane Bednar, Minnesota Daily, and Maureen Smith, Department of University Relations.

The meeting was called to order at 12:30 p.m. by Professor Robinett.

1. Draft Document - Access to Student Records

* Ms. Lewis presented to the committee the draft of a statement on access to student records. Copies will be made and distributed to the full committee.
* Ms. Lewis said this item is before the Regents for information in January and for action in March. She asked that any comments from SCC members be directed to her.

2. Advisory Committee Appointment

* Professor Robinett relayed to the committee the President's request that the SCC appoint one of its faculty members to a committee to advise the President on a possible faculty suspension problem. Professor Robinett reported that the Judicial Committee favored this kind of advising committee. She said that the suspension review would be a "one meeting affair" of an ad hoc committee solely to advise the President. She stated that Professor Keller had indicated his willingness to serve and she also suggested Professor Phyllis Freier as someone who might be asked to serve (or if she is unable to, might know someone who could) since the President's office had asked for one additional name.

* Professor Morrison suggested that this ad hoc committee review Section 13 of the Tenure Code. He felt that this stipulated the membership of such a committee must be appointed by the SCC. He also expressed the concern that if this policy were not adhered to the committee might be placing itself in jeopardy legally. He said he would check this.

3. Minutes of December 1, 1977

A typographical error on page one was noted: "metting" should read "meeting" in the last sentence of 2.a. The minutes were approved without further amendment.

4. Student Access Report

This report had been previously distributed to committee members for review and was now before them for action. Ms. Lewis began with a discussion of the implications for undergraduate study if the per credit tuition proposal is adopted, based upon present experience with per credit tuition at the graduate level. She is concerned that graduate students may elect to take fewer credits than is usual at this time because the increased tuition will make it prohibitive for many to take exploratory types of classes; the emphasis in graduate study planning will be on developing a program with the fewest number of credits required for the degree in order to avoid the expense of a fuller course of study. She also pointed out that it may be that efforts to determine the number of graduate students at the University based on some average number of credits for graduate students will result in a distortion of the number of students actually attending class. Ms. Lewis felt that the number of persons auditing classes without paying an auditor's fee may also increase. Professor Robinett said that these issues were also raised at a recent meeting of the Directors of Graduate Studies. Professor Barber added that UMM students had also expressed opposition to the proposal at a recent meeting because of the probable move away from experimenting with other areas of study, as Ms. Lewis had mentioned earlier.

Professor Zaidi took exception to the sentiment that was expressed at the DGS meeting, telling the SCC that he felt the quality of individual programs was not in doubt because the faculty directing each program determine the quality of the program. He sympathized with Ms. Lewis concerning the extra expense involved for a graduate student who wishes to experiment, but said that he could not agree that this necessarily meant that the quality of any particular program was reduced because of this factor.

Professor Purple quoted Vice President Wilderson, saying that "now is not the time to pick at details, but fundamental ideas...." Professor Purple illustrated this by giving the example that enrollment in physical education classes is likely to decrease if the per credit hour tuition proposal is put into effect, since these courses have often been used as "fillers" to supplement a regular schedule of classes. A decline in enrollments in such optional classes will have an impact on the funding for that department; this example served to highlight the interdependency of the various units of the University.

In a discussion of the problem of students' amassing numbers of Incompletes under the old system of registration in an attempt to save tuition expenses, Ms. Lewis proposed that the same rule apply to graduate students that presently applies to undergraduates, that is, a specific time limit should be set.

Professor Holt brought up the question of who actually pays for whom under the present and proposed system of tuition assessment. Professor Purple directed the committee's attention to pages 119 and 120 of the Task Force's Final Report on Student Access (dated March 28, 1977), where it is made clear that the Task Force was very much aware of the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed tuition plan. Professor Morrison questioned the use of one system for all units of the University. He said that General College and Morris are different from, for example, the College of Liberal Arts or the Law School. Professor Holt responded that the various units of the University are tied together through the budgeting process, but that about 25% of the program costs for each unit should be paid for by the tuition generated from that program. The budgeting process, however, takes into consideration that, for example, the General College program is less costly to administer than the Law

School program. Professor Purple commented that some tuition charges or lack thereof are mandated; Waseca, for example, has free tuition and competes with state vocational schools that also have free tuition.

Professor Zaidi asked that Professor Purple volunteer to study the report further and get back to the SCC on such questions as what is the total impact on the University expected to be? What will the affects be on access in general? For the non-traditional student? What will the affects be on resources? Professor Zaidi stated that it was his belief that the University has provided open access up to this point and hoped that the proposals contained in the report did not imply a change in that stance.

Ms. Lewis quoted from page 19 of the report concerning access to transfer students: "Were we to select only the brightest freshman students, the academic competition might become so keen that transfer students, no longer able to enter the University as freshmen, would face too fast a pace and too competitive a student body." She raised the issue of whether this implies a dilution of the excellence of the University. Professor Purple replied that the Task Force had been split on the wording of this section. He referred the committee to page 16: "The 39 recommendations contained in this report focus on those areas where marginal changes in efforts, policies, and programs will lead to improved access for certain populations of students whose access to the University has been limited in the past. Recommendations call for the University to serve students within the full range of social, economic, and demographic attributes of the state's population; affirmative action policies are proposed to accomplish this." He felt this section of the report more clearly defined the intent of the Task Force's recommendations.

Professor Purple then referred to the graph on page 29 of the report, which shows that the University of Minnesota receives the state's top high school students. Professor Robinett thought that if comparative data were available for other states and for similar institutions that the data would probably be the same. Professor Purple agreed if the institutions were other land-grant schools and part of the "Big Ten" group of universities.

Ms. Lewis said she applauded the recommendations that do not dilute the academic programs but do improve access and retention of students. Professor Purple remarked that if one were only to read the recommendations, they would seem quite negative; however, if the whole report is read, the serious attempt the Task Force made to assess current practices becomes evident. He said there are several areas described in the report which make one proud to be a part of this University. He was concerned, however, about how the recommendations could be translated into programs and what mechanisms would be put into place to monitor the programs. He also asked for clarification on how the recommendations would be prioritized. Professor Zaidi suggested that the SCC request from the Task Force a statement of the dollar costs associated with each of the recommendations and some indication of what the source(s) would be for the funds. For example, would the funds be derived through some reallocation mechanism applied to existing monies or would new money have to be found? Ms. Lewis objected to the idea that the recommendations would have to be funded by cutting money from the budgets of existing programs. Professor Purple predicted that it would be a sizeable task for the administration to provide costs data on the recommendations. Professor Morrison felt that the SCC should not respond to the specifics of the Task Force's report until the dollar costs are known.

Professor Zaidi particularly wanted recommendation #15 costed out (concerns financial aid for international students). Professor Purple relayed some experiences

his department has had in trying to provide financial aid for international students through a source outside of the University, the National Institute of Health (NIH), which had provided grants for teaching assistant positions but will discontinue funding soon because of a cut-back in the support available for training programs such as the one in his own department (Neurophysiology).

The committee shifted to a general discussion of the trend away from the acceptance of attrition which was seen in the '60's and early '70's to the situation today, one of extreme concern over the loss or potential loss of students. Ms. Lewis, Professor Purple and Professor Holt felt that there has traditionally been a difference in the attitudes of smaller, private institutions as contrasted with the larger state schools and colleges. Professor Holt offered Princeton University as an example: Princeton has historically retained nearly as many seniors as freshmen, indicating very little attrition, especially considering that Princeton accepts a very small number of students matriculating during the sophomore, junior or senior years.

Professor Purple raised the issue of the critical need for improved retention for students in general and minority students in particular. Mr. Ryan said that the new director of the Martin Luther King program, Dr. Phillip Carey, has as one of his goals making the "climate more conducive" for minority students. Ms. Lewis felt that support programs such as the HELP Center, which tutors students in such subjects as English composition and mathematics, are necessary to ensure improved retention of marginal students who would otherwise not have access to individual instruction to help them with their studies at the University. Professor Zaidi and Professor Purple discussed the effects of selection criteria and scholastic review committees on the retention of marginal students. It was mentioned that a fundamental change in the attitudes of some faculty toward marginal students would have to take place before a significant improvement in the retention rate would be seen.

MOTION
PASSED

Professor Zaidi made a motion which was passed to commend the Task Force on the report and suggest that the University community be encouraged to read the report fully. The Task Force will also be asked to provide dollar estimates of the cost of the implementation of the recommendations and some indication of the possible sources for such funds. The Task Force will be informed that the SCC has discussed the report at length, but that no specific action was taken on any of the recommendations at this time, the committee reserving the option of commenting specifically on some of the recommendations at some time in the future, especially if some estimate of cost is forthcoming.

Professor Holt made a final comment: He would have preferred to see the data in the report include some evaluation in relation to the pool of potential applicants, rather than those admitted to the University.

5. Educational Development Program

(Professors James Werntz and Albert Yonas joined the meeting at this point.)

Professor Robinett gave a brief background to the placement of this item on the agenda. Professor Glick asked if last year's business had been taken care of, referring to the note in last spring's minutes that a letter should be written in support of the Educational Development Program. Professor Robinett reported that a response had been sent to Professor Gordon Kingston quoting the minutes of two of last year's meetings when the SCC had expressed public concern over the retrenchment of EDP's budget.

Professor Yonas addressed the committee at this time and introduced Professor James Werntz who had accompanied him to the meeting to act as a resource person on EDP budget matters. Professor Werntz handed out brochures to the SCC which are used to publicize EDP. He said that the intended audience is the University faculty and that the contents reflect the wording contained in the enabling legislation almost verbatim. It was his opinion that the faculty has been very supportive of the program over the years.

Ms. Lewis asked about the accountability mechanism for programs that are granted funds through EDP. Professor Yonas said that each recipient is required to submit a report upon completion of the funded project which seeks to determine such things as the overall success of the project. A careful peer review process is used each year when funds are being allocated and care is taken to ensure that programs that received funds before which are again requesting support have not simply repeated their funding proposal from the previous year(s). Professor Werntz added that approximately one-third of the total faculty at the University have received funds through the Educational Development Program. He said that the reports filed by the project directors for EDP-funded programs are on file in his office and are available for public review.

Professor Robinett told the group that the English as a Second Language (ESL) Program has used the funds available from EDP for salaries of research assistants in instances where no other funds were available. Professor Werntz said that 40% of the EDP resources are channeled into salaries for graduate assistants, with a lesser amount going to support salaries of undergraduate assistants. He distributed an exhibit showing the funding history of grant programs supporting educational development at the University, years 1967-68 through 1978-79. This table showed comparative data for each of the academic years represented and broke down the dollar figures according to the Small Grants Program, the Educational Development Program and Media Production, plus a comparison of the totals to the overall University budget.

Professor Holt asked about the operating budget for EDP. Professor Werntz said that it takes about \$120,000 per year to run the program, 20% of which is allocated to management costs, but he pointed out that there is much management effort supplied to the program at no direct cost to EDP by faculty/student committees. Professor Blake questioned whether there were not other costs as well. Professor Werntz said that there is some discretionary faculty time used to support the work of EDP as well as the leadership in the colleges which works with EDP as an integral part of the planning process within the colleges. Professor Yonas emphasized that this contribution by deans and department heads should not be overlooked.

Ms. Lewis asked for the percentage of proposals that were actually funded. Professor Werntz said this data was difficult to isolate because of the application process. The proposals are presented to EDP through the colleges, so some sifting out may occur at that point before EDP receives the proposals for consideration. Once the proposals have been submitted to EDP, they are reviewed by a faculty committee. Professor Morrison asked if the All-University level had been cut from the program. Professor Werntz responded that it had and that the future inclusion or continued exclusion of this level of proposals was still an issue.

Professor Zaidi asked Professors Werntz and Yonas why this particular program should receive a special endorsement from the SCC, since the SCC is responsible for reviewing and commenting on the total budget. Specifically, he asked for reasons

why the Educational Development Program should be continued over the continuance of other programs; what is the importance of the program to the University?

Professor Yonas made two main points in response: Firstly, the EDP staff handles many things that possibly could be deferred temporarily, but the size of the cut in the budget was felt to be inordinately large (36%). Secondly, if the University drops the Educational Development Program it will be giving up something essential to the academic health of the institution; if the University does not concern itself with renewal, it is heading for stagnation, he predicted. Professor Werntz responded that he had never considered the Educational Development Program to be a separate entity; he feels that it is part of the institution as a whole because it is a program of the faculty for the improvement of the teaching at the University. There is involvement of appropriate faculty/student groups at each level where a proposal will impact; the control stays with these groups. He closed by saying that cutting EDP would be eliminating a program in which all faculty and students should be involved.

Professor Morrison asked Professors Werntz and Yonas about their perceptions of the attitude toward EDP that is held by the colleges. He also asked them if they felt that the function performed by EDP could be handled administratively within the departments and colleges if EDP was not continued. Professor Werntz said that he had no immediate answer but that it was hoped the colleges would eventually assume this function. This would be the way to achieve the proper accounting for expenditures for educational development programs. Professor Blake said he had heard the opinion expressed that "if the money is in EDP's budget, it isn't in ours (the colleges)." Professor Yonas did not agree that this sentiment is widespread, simply because the colleges have the final decision-making power over funds that will be used within their colleges. It is within the colleges that the determination is made on what money will be spent on which projects, so the control is still decentralized, not centralized at the EDP office. Professor Blake felt that having the funds initially placed with EDP made it necessary for the colleges to compete for the available funds. Mr. Ryan countered that colleges have always had to compete for funds for new programs, so this was not a new endeavor for them.

Professor Glick made another point about the centralized nature of EDP; he said that if the monies are not dealt with on a centralized basis first, there would be ossification -- that nothing would be done. He then asked Professor Werntz if any other departments at the University duplicate the efforts of EDP. Professor Werntz replied that there would seem to be some duplication of effort since the faculty are responsible for seeking to improve the quality of instruction at the University. He said that the more progressive units within some of the schools are doing this actively, but it is difficult to know at any given time just exactly what and how much is being done. Part of the problem is in evaluating the results of attempts at improving instruction. Assessment of the teaching job done by individual faculty members and/or by separate units is difficult to accomplish because of the decentralization of efforts. Determining where we are and where we want to be, according to Professor Werntz, is the most difficult assessment to make.

Ms. Lewis asked if there was the possibility within the structure of EDP for funding programs related to "disadvantaged" students. Professor Werntz replied that the capacity and latitude is there in EDP; however, EDP relies on the colleges for input on what programs should be considered. If these sources do not propose programs they are not considered. Professor Yonas added that there is a need to publicize more widely the possibilities for funding through EDP that are available on an All-University level.

Professor Purple asked if the '78-'79 budget had been set. Professor Werntz said that it had not been, and that they were hopeful that their estimate of what would be necessary to continue the program would be the amount that is eventually funded. He said that programs always are dealing with a minimum and a maximum figure, hoping to get something in the middle range. However, last year \$25,000 was cut from the minimum requested by EDP. Professor Werntz said that in effect the current operating budget for EDP is at the level of two years ago, the inference being that the viability of the program is in question. He told the committee that if the budget goes below the present level, the program would only be able to process proposals on the college level. If the All-University level has to be eliminated, Professor Werntz felt that the Educational Development Program would no longer be accomplishing what it was originally established to do.

Professor Zaidi said that the colleges want to obtain direct control over funds that they have had to compete for in the past. He also contended that the Educational Development Program has not reached the full University community; that EDP has a focus of long-range improvements while the colleges must often deal with short-range goals and needs; and that, unfortunately, it will take years before the full impact of losing the Educational Development Program will be felt at the University if this should happen. In sum, Professor Zaidi sensed the dominance of attention to short-range needs in the colleges over the longer range and more global necessity for improved excellence in teaching at the University which the Educational Development Program seeks to ensure.

Professor Morrison inquired about the amount of money being allocated to research in the Graduate School. Professor Keller said that comparisons with the Graduate School were not appropriate because that unit receives matching funds from the government, while the Educational Development Program does not. Professor Werntz suggested that the EDP funds be thought of as monies directed toward helping the University "do its job" in general, rather than focusing on any one program in particular. Professor Yonas reminded the committee that EDP is a Senate program which is slowly disappearing, apparently due to budgetary constraints imposed by the administration.

Mr. Ryan said that he recognized a conflict arising over endorsing EDP because there are many programs that are universally recognized that are not being funded, but EDP is less well known and not as visible to many in the overall community, especially students. He applauded the efforts of EDP to fund All-University level programs and experimental courses. Professor Yonas added that EDP makes efforts toward improved instruction that would not be visible to most members of the University community, such as sending a letter to all department heads inquiring about what they have undertaken recently to improve the quality of instruction in their programs.

Professor Purple was concerned that the representatives from EDP had not really spoken to the issue of evaluation of quality; he felt objective indicators of the excellence of the Educational Development Program, such as the number of volunteer hours spent by peer review committees, would help support arguments in favor of the continued existence of EDP.

Professor Keller raised the issue of whether the EDP administrators should consider a shift from the college level proposals to concentrating their efforts on the All-University level. Professor Yonas said that EDP has difficulty in deciding on proposals from the different colleges because there is no way to determine priorities across colleges. At the college level, the colleges themselves have already prioritized the proposals for EDP.

Professor Morrison made the motion which is enumerated below, but before it was passed there was some discussion. Professor Zaidi said his dual role as a member of the SCC and as the chairman of UCBRBR placed him in an awkward position on considering such a motion. He further stated that if the SCC persists in considering program requests for budget endorsement on a piecemeal basis, he would find it very compromising in his role as the chairman of UCBRBR. He asked that the SCC defer action on this request until all other requests had been received. He also asked for a response from the SCC to his letter of December 19. (Reference SCC Minutes - 1/5/78.) Professor Keller suggested that the EDP request be treated as an item of discussion rather than one of action and that the SCC could refer the EDP request to UCBRBR for consideration with a note of commendation for the program. Professors Blake and Glick stressed that they considered the Educational Development Program an essential one at the University. Professor Blake went on to say, however, that there are many programs at the University which deserve support and he questioned the wisdom of the SCC singling out this program for special endorsement. Mr. Wagner agreed with the earlier suggestion made by Professor Keller that this request from EDP should be referred to UCBRBR for action.

Mr. Ryan said he particularly agreed with part five of the motion (see below), making the Senate aware of any decision to drastically cut funds for the program. Professor Zaidi said that he did not have any objections to this section of the motion; he was more concerned about the financial items mentioned (see below). Professor Purple commented that EDP reports to the Senate through SCEP. Professor Zaidi replied that a representative from SCEP is on UCBRBR, which would give a voice to EDP's request at UCBRBR's budget deliberation meetings. Professor Robinett said that the motion could be amended to simply endorse the program and not attempt to deal with the financial issues as outlined in the motion (see below). Mr. Ryan thought that if the matter was referred to SCEP, Professor Yonas would end up going before all the Senate committees with his proposal for endorsement. Professor Zaidi responded that he would encourage Professor Yonas to do precisely that so that the support base for EDP is broadened. Professor Glick expressed the opinion that some programs have "natural constituencies," whereas EDP does not. He was concerned, however, with the SCC taking the step to endorse a particular program. The motion was carried by a voice vote. Professor Zaidi went on record as abstaining. The motion read:

MOTION
PASSED

(This motion

was reconsidered
and modified at
the 2/2/78 SCC
meeting.)

"The All University Senate Consultative Committee hereby:

- 1) expresses its support for the Educational Development Program (EDP) as essential to the improvement of the instructional process in the University;
- 2) requests that consideration be given to providing the full allocation of funds for '78 - '79 for EDP;
- 3) requests that priority be given to increased funds for '79 - '81 for EDP;
- 4) requests that sufficient funds be allocated to operate the Educational Development Program at both the University and collegiate levels in '79 - '81;
- 5) calls for a report to the Senate if funds are inadequate for continued operation of the Educational Development Program."

Professor Robinett ended the discussion with Professors Werntz and Yonas with a recommendation to them that they approach SCEP with their request and that the SCC would be in communication with the EDP office if any further developments occur.

6. Senate-New Business - Professor Bognanno's Letter of January 6, 1978

Professor Robinett read a letter to the committee which she had received from Professor Bognanno, Chairman of the University Committee on Business & Rules concerning a proposal to include an agenda item at future Senate and Assembly meetings that would attempt to encourage comments from the floor. Professor Purple asked if a formal motion was necessary for acknowledging the request, to which Professor Robinett replied that since the SCC serves as the steering committee for the University Senate, a formal motion is needed so the action is on record. There was a brief discussion of the intent of the motion, with the final comment being that it was designed to promote free exchange and the expression of items of general interest to the Senate/Assembly. Items would be referred to the appropriate committee if further study was requested or required. The appropriate committee might then choose to bring the item before the Senate/Assembly for action at some future date.

MOTION
PASSED

A motion was passed to include the following section in future Senate/Assembly dockets:

NEW BUSINESS (15 minutes)

Please feel free to use this agenda item to comment on a topic you feel is of general interest to the Senate (Assembly).

Not to be confused with the University Senate's "Questions to the President," the Senate (Assembly) is reminded that this entry in the agenda may be used to raise specific issues, concerns and/or ideas of general interest. A motion is not required. As much as anything, the Business & Rules Committee wishes to remind the Senate (Assembly) that all ideas presented to the body need not flow from a committee.

* Professor Robinett was directed to send a letter to Professor Bognanno conveying the SCC's action on his request.

7. Admissions & Records - Professor Barber's Letter of January 3, 1978

Consultative Committee members had been mailed a copy of this letter for information. Professor Barber said his intent was to provide the committee with a sense of what actually goes on in the administration of the Admissions & Records Department. He had no proposed action regarding the document; it was to serve as an introduction to the process before the committee has its meeting, sometime in the future, with Dr. James Preus, Coordinator of Student Services, Admissions & Records Department.

8. Adams' Report to the Planning Council - SCC Response

Professor Robinett asked for a status report from the subcommittee that was working on the draft letter responding to the Adams' Report. Professor Keller, Ms. Lewis, and Professor Morrison said that the draft was still being written and would be given to the committee secretary as soon as it was completed. The letter will then be distributed to the other SCC members for approval before it is transmitted to the appropriate administrative officers.

*

9. UCBRBR Request for Priorities - Professor Zaidi's Letter of 12/19/77

Professor Zaidi appealed to the committee for a response to his request of December 19, 1977. He said that if the SCC insists on proceeding in a piecemeal fashion on items related to the budget which come before it, he will be placed in an extremely awkward position as a member of SCC and the chairman for UCBRBR and as his position on UCBRBR relates to the central administration. Professor Zaidi asked for a list of priorities from the SCC, on which he said he hoped to find the EDP, among others. He agreed that programs without "natural constituencies" as had been mentioned earlier in the meeting might appropriately be championed by the SCC. Professor Keller agreed that some kind of priorities needed to be established by the SCC through a review of the needs of the University in toto, instead of reacting to individual requests as they are received.

10. Agenda Items for the Next Meeting with President Magrath

It was decided that the following items would be presented to the President for his comment: reactions of the Regents to the Salary Equalization Study; retrenchment; reassignment of duties in the offices of the vice presidents; the Student Access Report; the review of the Vice President for Health Sciences.

11. SCC Meeting of February 9 on the Morris Campus

Mr. Ryan asked if anything was being done about advertising the meeting to be held on the Morris Campus next month. Professor Robinett said that an advertisement listing all of the committee meetings had been placed in the campus newspapers for the Twin Cities, Duluth and Morris, so it had been announced in this way. Professor Barber and Ms. Klaus are working with the committee secretary on the travel and meeting arrangements. Members were reminded to contact the committee secretary if transportation would be needed to and from the Anoka Airport. An indication of members' intentions to attend or not attend is also needed to ensure appropriate air transportation. Members were asked to contact the committee office by February 1 so final arrangement can be made.

* The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m. The next meeting of the Senate Consultative Committee will be on Thursday, February 2 at 11:00 a.m. in the Regents' Room in Morrill Hall.

Respectfully submitted,
Linda L. Compton
Administrative Fellow
Senate Consultative Committee