MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING MAY 9, 1984

ATTENDANCE: (✓ present) (*) proxy

✓ Paul Abel
✓ Oscar Armas
✓ Keith Baldwin
✓ James Babbin
✓ John Baker
✓ Dorothy Banister
✓ Thomas Bidner
✓ Edward Blonden
✓ David Blondin
✓ Hugh Brozman
✓ Amelia Canaday
✓ Jo Allen Carter
✓ Peggy Chalson
✓ William Clarke
✓ David Cordell
✓ Michael Daugherty
✓ Dan Dennis
✓ James Dorough
✓ Jerry Draeger
✓ Peggy Draugon
✓ Edward Dugan
✓ Harvill Eston
✓ Charles Frying
✓ Terry Gibson
✓ Mary B. Glass
✓ Robert Godke
✓ Boy Goodrich
✓ Tom Groseky
✓ Edward Henderson
✓ Paul Hannus
✓ William Johnson
✓ Art Kapple
✓ Neil Kostmar
✓ Ronald Knaus
✓ Tallie Krieger
✓ Sandra Kungie
✓ Norma Linnartz
✓ Patrick Lipscomb
✓ Lea Magee
✓ Robert Martin
✓ Samuel Meyers
✓ Don Morrison
✓ Timothy Parish
✓ Paul Paskoff
✓ Kenneth Paxton
✓ John Pennybacker
✓ Gene Reagan
✓ Joseph Ricapito
✓ Judith Schiebout
✓ Simon Shane
✓ Steve Silverman
✓ Marion Socolofsky
✓ Arthur Sterling
✓ T. Bonner Stewart
✓ George Wash
✓ Leslie Whitted
✓ Michael Woodson
✓ John Wulma
✓ John Weaver
✓ Charles Whitmer
✓ John Whitaker
✓ Bill Williams
✓ Terry Worthly
✓ Daniel Yarnette
✓ Selma Zebouri

PROXIES:

Senator Cordell for Senator Martin
Senator Kungie for Senator Abel
Senator Henderson for Senator Whitaker
Senator Paxton for Senator Gondry
Senator Blouch for Senator Good
Senator Bidner for Senator Godke
Senator Bidner for Senator Hannus
Senator Lipscomb for Senator Paskoff
Senator Armas for Senator Yarnett

President Rabin called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. and welcomed Ron May and Ralph Bax (Administrative Information Services), Albert Clary (Academic Services), Edmund Glenny (Improvement of Instruction Committee), Dale Hanchey (Student Records & Registration) and press representative Glynn Culpeo.

Parliamentarian for the meeting was Senator Cordell.

1. Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of April 11, 1984:

The Minutes were approved as distributed.

2. President's Report

The Council on International Education did a survey of faculty activities and interest in international endeavors. There were about 800 responses; over 600 faculty indicated experience abroad in research, publications, performances, consulting, etc. This information was gathered to develop a data base and to continue efforts to establish an Office of International Affairs.

I met with the chairman, the chairman-elect, and three former chairmen of the Commencement Exercises Committee. They agreed that much of the committee's routine work can be better handled by an administrative office. The committee probably will present a proposal this fall (1) to transfer some administrative procedures to an administrative office, while retaining appropriate faculty control over the academic aspects of commencement and the structure of the exercises; (2) to restructure the committee, and (3) to modify its charges.

Congratulations are due to Senators who have won awards. Oscar Armas received the LSU Foundation Distinguished Faculty Fellowship, Edward Henderson the LSU Alumni Federation Distinguished Faculty Award, and Selma Zebouri received the Amoco Foundation Undergraduate Teaching Award. Joseph Ricapito was elected to the University Budget Committee for a 2-year term.

House Bill 977 (Irvin & Blau) to appropriate funds for a 10% pay raise to state classified employees and all school teachers.

3. Report on plans for an on-line registration process:

Dale Hanchey (Asst. Director, Student Records & Registration) spoke on the background of the plan developed for an on-line student registration procedure. In 1980 Chancellor Sharpton (then Dean of General College) sponsored a study of records & registration to develop a student data base (now available) and a master class schedule. The envisioned registration plan would have three phases: (1) the student completes a class schedule on a scannable document. This document is scanned in the student's college, and the student is given confirmation and a fee schedule. The student has the opportunity to revise the schedule in the college office. (2) For those students who fail to participate in phase 1 registration, a one-day walk-through registration will be available. (3) After classes have begun, a walk-through registration will be available for late registrants. The recommended policy considerations for the data base process include a reasonable student load, adoption of a phased registration calendar, cost-managed priority queues, modified student hold policies, student self-advisement, and prepayment and prepayment of fees.
Ron Hay (Asst. Vice-Chancellor, Administrative Information Systems) stated that LSU had one of the best student records processes in the south. The reason the system is not now being used is the lack of funds to implement it. Technically the groundwork has all been done. A discussion followed.

4. Second Consideration of the Improvement of Instruction’s recommendation to establish an Office of Faculty Development. A motion to endorse the recommendations of the Improvement of Instruction Committee’s proposed Office of Faculty Development and recommend it to the administration was made by Senator Shane, seconded by Senator Kungla, and passed unanimously.

5. Report of the Faculty Senate Committee on a Core Curriculum President Babin (an ex-officio member to the committee) spoke briefly on the committee’s report to the Senate (attached). A motion to accept the report and to endorse the committee’s effort was made by Senator Linnarts, seconded by Senator R. Babin, and passed.

6. Discussion of Report of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Tenure and Promotion A motion to accept the report and forward it to the administration with attachments was made by Senator Shane and seconded by Senator Kungla. There was a lengthy discussion. The Senators did not think it appropriate merely to attach comments to the report. The motion was withdrawn. ... A substitute motion to have the Tenure & Promotion Committee meet with the Executive Committee and together incorporate suggested additions and changes into the body of the report and send it to the administration was made by Senator Cordell, seconded by Senator Kungla, and passed.

7. Discussion of Report of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Sabbatical Leave There was a discussion on proposed changes to be made in the report. A motion to continue the discussion when the final report is ready was made by Senator Linnarts, seconded by Senator Reagan, and passed.

8. Acceptance of Faculty Senate Committee Reports A motion to accept the Committee Reports was made by Senator Nye, seconded by Senator Kungla, and passed.

Faculty Senate Report 82-9
1 Committee on Review & Long Range Planning
2 Committee on Student Aid & Scholarship
3 Committee on Student Recruitment
4 Committee on Commencement Exercises
5 Committee on International Education

9. Old Business Senators Cuddy, Humas, Johnson, Canaday, Clarke, Dorzoh, Whittaker, Zehoumi, Braymer, Goodrich, Blommer, Denman, Eaton, Maple, Morrison, Knaus, Shane, and Myers will be retired from the Senate after this meeting. They were thanked for their service and cooperation and given their nameplates and holders.

10. New Business There was no new business.

There being no further business, President Babin adjourned the meeting at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by

Kenneth Paxton, Acting Secretary
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RECOMMENDATIONS

As an outgrowth of five months of deliberation and study, the essence of which is set forth in the main text of this report, the Committee on a Core Curriculum (CCC) wishes to make the following recommendations:

1. That the life of the CCC be extended through the 1984-85 academic year;

2. That the Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs meet with the CCC to review the Committee's findings, discuss the role to be played by the administration in the next phase of the Committee's existence, and reevaluate the original "charges" to the CCC in the light of the accompanying report. If at all possible this meeting should take place in May, 1984;

3. That the CCC proceed to consider the issue of a "core" at LSU with the goal of bringing closure to the question no later than May, 1985. The Louisiana State Board of Regents has expressed an intent to investigate the feasibility of requiring more uniformity at the general education level than presently exists among the State's colleges and universities. It is in LSU's interest to come forward with a program uniquely suited to its own mission and needs, a proposal that reflects the best thinking on the issue of "core curricula" and, at the same time, preserves the University's integrity in matters of academic reform;

4. That a copy of this interim report be made available to curriculum revision committees currently at work within LSU's academic units; and

5. That the CCC, among other aspects of the larger question, investigate non-traditional ways and means of realizing the underlying purposes of a "core curriculum," as well as continuing to identify for students those courses and experiences at LSU that have "core" potential already.
Formation of the Committee. The Faculty Senate Committee on a Core Curriculum (CCC) was formed on October 19, 1983. The nucleus of appointees was: Dewey Carpenter (Chemistry); Edward Dunigan (Agronomy); Edmund Glenny (Architecture); Milton Hallman (Music); Edward Henderson (Philosophy); Gladys Hildreth (Home Economics); Dominique Houseman (Biology); William Lane (Finance); Kaylene Long (Speech); Edward McLaughlin (Chem. Engineering); Edward Pramuk (Art); Lawrence Ruhe (Vet. Medicine); and Peter Soderburgh (Education; Chairperson). Ex officio members were: James Babin (English); Huel Perkins (Vice-Chancellor’s office); and Billy Sax (Honors Division).

The CCC was provided with a multi-part document intended to constitute the “charges” to the committee from the Faculty Senate and the Administration. At base, the CCC was asked to: (1) express its view as to “what educational skills and experiences should be required of all students,” specializing in our understanding; (2) assess the feasibility of making substantive changes in the undergraduate program at this time; (4) cite the purposes of a core curriculum; and (5) propose a core curriculum, if appropriate, in the light of (1) through (4) above.

The lifespan of the CCC was left undetermined, although there was common agreement that an interim report should be submitted to the President of the Faculty Senate sometime in May, 1984. Cooperation from the office of the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs and from the Faculty Senate office was promised, should the CCC require documentation not at its disposal, and was, in fact, forthcoming throughout.

The CCC met four times during the current academic year: November 18, 1983; January 20, 1984; February 17, 1984; and April 27, 1984. Committee members were provided with copies of articles and programs related to the “Core Curriculum: General Education” issue as it was manifesting nationally, regionally, and locally, and to identify major, full-length studies useful to the CCC’s pursuits. Materials produced by the Board of Regents, LSU’s administration, committees of the Faculty Senate, and SACs were incorporated and carefully reviewed as well. Folded into the CCC’s growing body of information were the results of personal talks held with the heads of LSU’s academic units, and letters submitted by faculty members who wished to express opinions on the theme at hand.

Areas of Treatment. In the course of this phase of the CCC’s existence, it was determined that arrival at a semi-final synthesis worthy of faculty consideration could be realized only after the CCC had examined five (5) major aspects of the larger question, viz., (1) a working definition of “Core Curriculum”; (2) an analysis of contemporary (1978-1984) reform movements in general education; (3) a unit-by-unit survey of core curriculum practices at LSU; (4) a rendering of what is meant by “the educated person”; and (5) an expression of the “mission” of LSU as it is articulated presently in both internal and external documents. There was consensus that any reasonable, albeit tentative, list of CCC recommendations would have to be predicated upon such findings.

Findings. In severely abridged form, but given below in an order corresponding to the sequencing of the five “areas of treatment” above, the CCC’s findings may be stated accordingly:

(1) “Core Curriculum” and “General Education” may be differentiated thusly: the former is the translation of the latter into specific curricular designs and coursework patterns;

(2) Current surveys reveal that nearly 300 of the nation’s 2,500 major colleges and universities are at some stage of general education reform;

(3) Faculty attitudes toward general education have become increasingly positive since 1978;

(4) Emerging general education components tend to consume up to 50% of a student’s total curriculum;

(5) Emerging general education components show a heavy emphasis on logical thinking, writing, and computational competence;

(6) Disciplinary areas most often included in general education blocks appear to be: English; Mathematics; Arts; Humanities; Social Sciences; Sciences; and—to a minor degree—Foreign Language and Physical Education;

(7) The most common mode of general education manifestation remains the “distribution requirement” pattern;

(8) General education need not be the antithesis of professional specialization;

(9) General education components should be reflective of the special character of a university, not an overlay or a superimposition;

(10) There must be broad agreement on at least two points if general education reform efforts are to be crowned with success: (a) a definition of what it means to be an “educated person,” and (b) a consensus as to the “mission” of the university engaged in the reform endeavor.
and, continuing now with findings particular to LSU, the unit-by-unit analysis conducted by the CCC reveals:

(11) At LSU there appears to be a broad, sincere subscription to the provisions in the statement "Criteria for Reviewing New and Revised Baccalaureate Degree Programs," promulgated by the Faculty Senate's Courses and Curricula Committee in 1982, especially section "3," which projects disciplinary minimums prerequisite to the awarding of an undergraduate degree;

(12) There is evidently a larger measure of homogeneity with regard to a "core" curriculum across academic units than is generally realized. Course titles and credits aside, the concept of "core" exists at LSU, however informal and uncoordinated it may be across campus. The overwhelming majority of academic units have taken the issue under study on their own and are at various stages in the resolution process.

(13) At this point the typical, on-campus expression of "core" includes the areas: English, Mathematics, Sciences, Humanities, Social Sciences, and, to a lesser extent Foreign Language and Physical Education;

(14) Presently the extent of an LSU student's total program that may be defined as a "core" varies from 35% to 45%.

(15) Language literacy, whether "foreign" or "computer," is an aspect of the "core" issue deserving of keener attention than it has received to date; and

(16) Faculty members and administrators at LSU show genuine interest in the "core" question, and evince a willingness to take measured steps toward a reconciliation of the disparities that prevail among academic units. The usual barriers to progress—departmental politics, territorial wars, free-floating obstructionism, inertia, mild paranoia, and displaced hostility, to name a few—do not seem to prevail on campus. The pockets of resistance that do exist are inhabited by reasonable people who raise thoughtful reservations.

and, moving finally to the remaining areas treated in depth by the CCC:

(17) Insufficient attention has been afforded, thus far, to how we at LSU define what an "educated person" is. It is not surprising that we assume that completion of a degree program is de facto testimony that a student has been "educated";

(18) Intensive searches into the question of what it means to be "educated" at LSU should be conducted within the framework of what LSU views as its unique "mission," a subject on which there is no paucity of material;

(19) Over the past decade LSU has attempted to wring from external and internal sources a clear portrait of what she is, and what she aspires to be. In print, at least, efforts to articulate a "mission" have been successful. However, as she approaches her 125th anniversary, LSU appears to have reached an intersection where there is more to do, than to say. One sign of this is the current tendency to re-cycle the content of "mission" statements, almost to a vanishing point. There may be a need to collect and synthesize the messages that such statements transmit—so that the LSU community may achieve some consensus on "mission," and how it is being operationalized at mid-decade. But there would seem to be no call to await further revelations as to what LSU's "mission" is. It might be more rewarding to focus on how she is practicing what she claims to embrace conceptually; and

(20) As a rule, investigations into the realms of general education that hope to be productive are launched from consensuses on two difficult, but not necessarily imponderable, questions: (a) what is the "mission" of our university? and (b) what do we mean when we say that our graduates are "educated" people? Much more thought, to date, has been given to (a) than to (b), an imbalance that should be corrected, and can be.
Observations En Route. Inevitably, any committee that plunges into the heavy weather generated by debates on "core curriculum" will discover, through reading and deliberation, more thought-provoking material than it can use. For purposes of enhancing faculty and administration perspectives on this complex issue, the supplementary comments that follow have been extracted from the whirlpool of ideas and findings entertained by the CCC. They are proffered not as absolutes, but as devices to stimulate additional discussion.

(1) From the Harvard Committee's General Education in a Free Society (1945) we learn that the "search for a sound general education is as various and unending as search for the good society itself... there are many roads to Rome." At LSU the quest for the right "road" is underway. The University is attempting to carve out a path that is particular, appropriate for its students, and uniquely compatible with its "mission." Searches such as this (the experiences of other institutions inform us) consume considerable time and energy, and probably cannot be accomplished in haste. Patience and cooperation, laced with persistence, are the hallmarks of reform efforts that have been favored with adoption at institutions of high repute. It is in LSU's best interests to seek and achieve coherence at the "core" studies level, lest external bodies move to superimpose order upon the "anarchy" they perceive to be characteristic of many undergraduate programs in the State;

(2) Polarization of opinion around a "core" studies question generally induces corrosion and paralyzes on campus. Lubrication through ongoing, open discussion has been an effective antidote elsewhere. There is no need to refer to the "core" issue as a contest between tradition and experimentation, the broad and the narrow, specialization and liberation, uniformity and freedom, for, indeed, it is not that at all. If what we seek is a general education component "capable at once of taking on many different forms and yet of representing in all its forms the common knowledge and the common values on which a free society depends," then recourse to extremes will serve no useful purpose. Intransigence may be viewed by outside parties as an open invitation to mandate a "core curriculum" on our behalf;

(3) To speak of the "core" issue as if its sole nexus was the reaffirmation of the values of a "liberal education" at LSU is both a diversion and an oversimplification. It may be more productive to talk about fashioning a "new working consensus about what is sound, contemporary [core] curriculum" that weaves the finest elements of both "liberal" and "professional" educational forms;

(4) There is common agreement, stretching back to antiquity, that the degree to which a person may be described as "educated" should not be measured in precise increments of time. Distinguished universities do not claim that those who take their Bachelor's degrees are fully "educated" persons by any means. As orators are so fond of saying, graduation ceremonies are the commencement, not the termination, of the socio-intellectual maturation process. To quote Professor Daniel B. Kaiser of Grinnell, "At graduation our former students have surely not completed the process of self-actualization that we have enjoined them to pursue." What, then, have we done? And what bearing does this have on the character of the general education component we espouse? The CCC proposes that we think of "core" studies in terms of "enabling." Whatever form such studies take, they might be evaluated by posing questions such as: Do they enable students to think (or begin to think) effectively; communicate; pass relevant judgments; discriminate; compute; appreciate; perform; choose; and "break the stranglehold of the present upon the mind"? Are students beginning to develop the "broad critical sense by which they may recognize competence in any field"? Are they beginning to feel "the import of those general ideas and aspirations which have been a deep, moving force" in the lives of men and women through the ages? If we can respond "yes" to such questions, then, through "core" studies, we are enabling. LSU may be doing a better job in this regard than it realizes, but a more conscious estimate is clearly advisable, lest we assume too much—or too little; and

(5) The secondary consequences of curricular reform are all too easy to overlook. Movements toward new general education patterns must anticipate likely effects in areas such as cost, past practices, staffing, external constraints, and other sensitive zones.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter A. Soderbergh, Chairperson
Report of the Review and Long-Range Planning Committee

Five meetings of the Committee took place during the academic year. Following a two year period of relative inactivity the Committee met to identify topics of concern to faculty which are considered to be critical to the growth and prestige of the University. The Committee reemphasized the unique position of faculty in administrative and policy decisions which relate to funding, recruitment and the development of new programs.

The Committee met with Vice-Chancellor Hargrave in March. Based on the discussions which ensued it was agreed that the Committee would prepare a commentary on the Master Plan for Higher Education in Louisiana prepared by the Board of Regents.

The Committee will continue to provide counsel to the administration on significant issues which involve the participation and cooperation of faculty. Planning associated with new programs in biotechnology and the allocation of resources in the face of budgetary restraints will be valid concerns of the Committee during the proximal academic year.

Simon M. Ghone, Chairman
James Stebb, ex-officio
Robert Crocker
Edward Henderson
Victor Kitsch
Marlon Sooja
Peter Soderbergh

April 1, 1984
FACULTY SENATE REPORT NO. 83-10

Report of the Committee on Student Aid and Scholarships

Committee activities during the academic year included:

1). Provided the Special Committee on Alumni Scholars with 21 applicants for consideration in the new Alumni Federation's Scholarship Program ($14,400 awarded to five students over a four year period). Criteria for selecting applicants was specified by the Special Committee and included special talents, leadership, extracurricular activities, and scholastic achievement.

2). Selected 161 high school scholars as potential recipients of the LSU Alumni Federation Scholarships. The selection process was based primarily on ACT or SAT scores and high school grades. At the present time, 114 students have accepted Alumni Federation Scholarship offers.

3). Another committee meeting has been scheduled to interview candidates for the summer student internship with Senator Russell Long's office (Greater Washington, D.C. Alumni Scholarship) and to elect a new committee chairman for next year.

Louie B. Vandevender, Chairman
William Badeley
Lourdes Deya
Dennis French
Lai-Him Chan
James Pitts
Marion Reid
Craig Samperton
Leslie R. Lavigne, ex-officio
Archie L. Lejeune, ex-officio
Jennifer Casonova, student
L. J. Holland, student

April 27, 1984

FACULTY SENATE REPORT NO. 83-11

Report of the Committee on Student Recruitment

There is a considerable amount of information on high school students interested in Louisiana State University which is now computerized. This committee is evaluating the potential for an interchange system of computer located within the various schools and colleges to relate a potential student's name and address to the concerned departments. The goal being to contact the candidate by mail, phone, or in person to offer help or further information. This concept also has the potential for involvement of the alumni. The committee is only in the preliminary phase of investigation.

Our new chairman for 1984-85 will be Dr. Thomas Reagan.

A. J. Farr, Chairman
Allan Lee
Thomas Reagan
Buddhadev Sen
Barbara Shanes
Vernon Wright
Beth Lablanc
Harty Tittlebaum
Archie Lejeune, ex-officio
Mark Stipes, student
Kevin Simpson, student

May 2, 1984
Report of the Committee on Commencement Exercises

The responsibilities of this committee are the planning and supervision of the conduct of the commencement exercises and coordination of work of the administrative departments rendering services for commencements. Summer, fall and the forthcoming spring commencements have been planned and supervised with 440 undergraduate and 349 graduate degrees, 1424 undergraduate and 408 graduate degrees, and 1722 undergraduate and 457 graduate or professional degrees awarded or to be awarded at these exercises, respectively.

Several concerns were sent to the committee by campus administrators for our recommendations or opinions. Questions were raised on the awarding of diplomas to all but doctoral candidates en masse and the time and date scheduling of the exercises and also on the wearing of ribbons for designation of honor society membership by candidates during the exercises. Responses were sent to the appropriate administrative personnel that the decisions reached at the proper academic affairs or systems levels would be satisfactory to this committee. Clarification in one memorandum concerning faculty representation at the exercises was made, a schedule of the necessary memoranda to be mailed to the involved departments was established and guidelines for committee member duties during the exercises were developed during this year.

The committee's membership continued to decrease with retirements and resignations of members. A minimum of 32 members is necessary to conduct the committee's activities satisfactorily (15 marshals, 8 seating, 4 ushering, 5 corridor leaders). It is again this year requested that this respected faculty body, which our committee represents, assign termination dates for appointed member terms and fill vacancies in the committee as they arise. The committee will then have status equal to other Faculty Senate Committees and have the sufficient membership necessary to insure proper conduct of all the commencement exercises throughout the year.

At a short meeting on December 21, Clarence E. Hall volunteered to serve as co-chair to assume the chair for next year (1984-85).

Antonio Acacono  Cameron Hackney  Kenneth McMillin, Chair
William Biddle  Clarence Hall  Russell Miller
Rosalind Charlesworth  Robert Jay  Ramu Rao
Richard Corstvet  Julius Langlinais  William Stanley
William Daly  Sue Labriere  James Turner
Hazel Davis  James McNeillie  Paul Wank
Terry Gibson  Lea McGee

May 2, 1984
Report of the Committee on International Education

The following summarizes the activities of the Committee for the 1983-84 academic year.

1. The Committee awarded nine non-resident tuition scholarships to international undergraduate students from an applicant pool of 23, including two new scholarships funded by the United Campus Ministry, and the LSU Alumni Association Chapter in the Republic of Panama.

2. The committee conducted 12 interviews for Fulbright grants for graduate study abroad. Applicants were from the following University departments: Music (6), Fine Arts (1), Art History (1), Spanish (1), Latin American Studies (1), Speech (1), and Geology/Anthropology (1).

3. A new evaluation instrument was developed and tested for future use in the scholarship selection procedure.

4. The Council on International Education, created by the I.E.C. and approved in 1983 by the Senate's Executive Committee on International Education, moved forward toward the ultimate goal of establishing a central coordinating office for University international affairs. The Council consists of 15 members representing University Colleges, and four ex-officio representatives from standing international offices on campus. Five task-force subcommittees were created to correspond with the functions of the proposed coordinating office: research, curriculum, programs, communications, and public service. A detailed proposal for the Office of International Affairs was prepared and presented to the Chancellor's Office, all Vice-Chancellors, Deans and Directors, and the University Budget Committee. The response to the proposal has been positive, but the decision to fund the office is still pending. The Council has recently completed a survey of the LSU faculty as the first step in the development of a comprehensive, computerized data base of the existing resources relating to international affairs on this campus.

5. Committee work in progress includes the following: funding the proposed International Learning Center, a University international education missions statement, a report on foreign student performance in engineering curricula, and admissions standards for transfer students.

6. Professor Seth Johnson was elected chairman of the committee for the 1984-85 academic year.

Charles Grenier, Chairman
Ronald J. Byrd
Silvia Espinosa
Seth J. Johnson
Vernon Jones
Vijay P. Singh
Stephen Cooper, ex-officio
Inge Jordan, ex-officio
Erin Schmidt, ex-officio
Harun Kabadi, student

May 1, 1984