

Senate Committee on Educational Policy
-Minutes-
June 4, 1987

Attendance: Lawrence Goodman, Crystal Hanscome, John Clark (acting chair), Robert Myers, Patricia Thomas (staff), Naomi Scheman, Marvin Mattson, Sheila Corcoran, James Moller, Susan Collison, John Wallace (ex officio).

Guests: Dr. Lesley Cafarelli, Director of OEDP, and Dr. Mary Jo Maynes, Chair, Senate Committee on Educational Development.

Minutes: The minutes were approved as written.

EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Dr. Cafarelli explained that there were three categories (funding and awards, workshops and conferences, and publications) which were the basis for future planning by OEDP and listed six areas her organization was concentrating on.

1. Put greater emphasis on workshops and conferences.
2. Have OEDP play a more significant role in supporting individuals, colleges, etc., in getting outside funding.
3. Have central administration clarify the direction the University is taking in educational development and define and describe the responsibilities of OEDP and the Senate Committee on Educational Development.
4. Determine the future of the Senate Committee on Educational Development.
5. Determine what is happening to the Morse-Amoco Awards. The Amoco Company will not be funding the program next year. Should the awards continue simply as a recognition program, or should the recipients become involved in advising the University on teaching or in working with honors programs?
6. Define the Honors Program. The Twin City Assembly Committee on Honors changed to the Senate Committee on Honors. This committee has been meeting since January and will be producing a mission statement on honors and four position papers. Gary Fine is the chair.

Discussion followed. Robert Myers said that it was important to develop a University-wide honors program. John Clark was impressed with the number of programs under the umbrella of OEDP and asked what the constraints were in determining criteria for program selection. Lesley said the choices were determined by staff availability. Her office has a facilitating function; it facilitates the process itself and facilitates cooperation and communication between the different departments. Marvin Mattson agreed that the scope of the workshops should be increased. He attended the writing-

across-the-curriculum workshop and was very favorably impressed with the quality of the workshop.

John Clark questioned the future of the Bush Foundation Program. Lesley said this was a good program, and it was important to retain the program because it is dedicated specifically to undergraduate education and scholarship. The program is currently funded with \$300,000 per year, but this is insufficient to support faculty development at the University. Also, since funding ran out two years ago, the future of the program is uncertain. The University needs to stabilize and expand the program. Lawrence Goodman said there was an educational conceptual issue at stake here. It is necessary to look at the way the University makes a commitment to sustaining and refreshing the faculty who do the instructing here. The University must look at the courses and curriculum to be offered, the cycle they are to be offered in, the faculty resources available, and the faculty development available to refresh the faculty.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mary Jo Maynes, chair, said that a new committee has been established to work on policy having to do with educational development. The committee is trying to work on the governance issue and raised the question of whether it is more appropriate that SCED report to the Senate through SCEP rather than through the Senate Consultative Committee. How exactly does this committee fit into the Senate structure? Naomi Scheman said it was logical that this committee report to SCEP which could serve as a liaison between the Honors Committee and the new Assembly committee on undergraduate education. John Clark said it was important that SCEP stay involved in some way and suggested that SCEP interact with SCC, SCED, and OEDP to work this out.

UNIVERSITY ART MUSEUM

Provost Benjamin and the Consultative Committee have asked SCEP to review the new formal policy on University Art Museum Accession and Deaccession. Lawrence Goodman said the question of selling art, especially gifts, is a most important point. It is open to the danger of adverse public reaction and the University must have unanimous committee support before something can be sold. This policy received strong support from SCEP. It was recommended that number 11 under the section on Procedure be checked. Should the first figure in that paragraph be \$1,000 or \$10,000? It was moved, seconded, and passed that SCEP endorse the new policy.