

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY MINUTES

January 24, 1986

Members Present: Michael Root, Thomas Daniels, Brenda Ellingboe, Ian Maitland, Marvin Mattson, Sheila Corcoran, Laurence Goodman, Mary Young, Susan Collison, William Hanson (Chair), Gretchen Kreuter (Ex Officio), Andrew Collins, Patricia Thomas (staff), Van Gooch?

Guests: Karen Murray, Jeanne McLean, Lesley Cafarelli, Russell Hobbie

Minutes: The minutes were approved as circulated.

Pay vs. Credit: UROP

Lesley Cafarelli distributed general information on UROP. She stated that the credit versus pay issue affected other programs besides UROP and hoped that SCEP could help in providing a central policy concerning the problem. Basically, the issue becomes difficult when students apply for both credit and pay. Usually, this indicates that the project is too large for the \$750.00 stipend; then credit can be awarded for a research-oriented project with high academic content.

Professor Hanson said the purpose of the program is to provide important and unique educational experiences for the student. UROP is also an employment program which enables the University to draw on other work sources. However, he believes that students shouldn't receive both pay and credit except under special cases, i.e., when the project is too extensive for the stipend or when one phase of the project involves assisting a faculty member (for pay) and a second phase involves research which is beneficial to the student (for credit). In this case, the student's proposal must be very specific.

Michael Root suggested that credit is not payment but an acknowledgment of academic achievement. He further stated that the question is to determine whether the educational experience is worthy of credit. Laurence Goodman said he saw a problem with some students being paid and not others.

Jeanne McLean noted that there is a need for clarification of student proposals. The student proposal places the learning experience in a broader context. The stipend is basically to free the student from an outside job. Laurence Goodman offered the following proposal: Projects broad enough in scope to earn both pay and credit should be completed in a two-quarter sequence. During the first quarter, students could earn a maximum of 4 UROP credits which would be associated with a term paper over and above the research labor performed. No pay would be given. During the second quarter, the students would receive pay and no credit.

Michael Root reiterated that credit should not be equated with reward or payment. It is an indication of academic achievement. Van Gooch said that

credit and pay are two different things and that UROP could award payment and the academic department could award credit. While SCEP did not solve the problem, Lesley Cafarelli said the discussion helped to clarify issues.

Special Committee on Unifies and Increased Preparation Standards

Andy Collins explained that an open forum before the Senate meeting on February 20th would cover the special committee's report. Action would be taken in April. He requested a statement from SCEP which could be presented to the Senate. After discussion, the following six issues were raised:

1. The words "preparation," "entrance," and "admission" are used interchangeably on the Commitment to Focus documents. In order to avoid confusion, the Committee should define "preparation standards."
2. The Senate should pay specific attention to whether or not in the future these preparation standards will become part of college admission standards. The wording of recommendation 10 implies that preparation standards will be part of the admission criteria. SCEP believes that preparation standards should not be reviewed as part of the admission process, and careful attention should be given to the wording of this recommendation.
3. There should be a mechanism for oversight to college admission and consultation beyond the individual colleges on exceptions to increased entrance standards. It is important that minority, transfer, and older students have access to the different colleges within the University.
4. More specific information on the financial aid situation needs to be provided. How will the required additional preparatory courses affect the number of quarters a student can receive financial aid? How will this affect minority students? SCEP suggests that there should be a mechanism for speeding up the system and responding quickly as federal changes in financial aid laws are implemented.
5. The Senate should consider reviewing the effects of the increased entrance standards. Regular progress reports on the recommendations should be made to the appropriate Senate Committees.
6. A thorough discussion should be conducted of General College's role in providing the remedial courses and additional advising responsibilities necessary to implement the increased entrance standards. A SCEP statement, provided by the staff and Bill Hanson will be printed in the Forum by February 20th.

SCEP Minutes
January 24, 1986
Page 3

A SCEP statement, provided by the staff and Bill Hanson, will be printed in the Forum by February 20.

Library Budget

The Senate Library Committee passed a resolution urging exemption of the University Libraries' acquisition budget from retrenchment. In dispute is \$126,000. Bill Hanson said he would write a letter to Acting Vice President Murthy, stating the SCEP is also concerned and requesting any information which is sent to the Senate Consultative Committee. The issue will be discussed at the next meeting.

Senate Research Committee

Bill Hanson suggested that SCEP receive more information before responding to the issues of REI and Classified Research and Indirect Cost Recovery. He will invite Paul Gassman to attend th next SCEP meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Thomas
Administrative Fellow, SCEP

:crc