

7-21-1985

Board of Trustees Educational Policy Commitee July 21, 1985

Ellen N. Doughty

University of Maine - Main, edoughty@maine.edu

University Of Maine System

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/bot-corp-records>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Repository Citation

University Of Maine System. (date).Board of Trustees [Meeting minutes]. Raymond H. Fogler Library Special Collections Department, University of Maine, Orono, Maine.

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UMaine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Corporate Records by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UMaine. For more information, please contact um.library.technical.services@maine.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE
Board of Trustees

Educational Policy Committee

107 Maine Avenue, Bangor
July 21, 1985

PRESENT: Francis Brown, Chairman. Other trustees: Robert Dunfey, Joseph Hakanson, Richard Morin. Faculty Representatives: Carol Ann Hall, Andrew Anderson, Ralph Jans, Cynthia Norton, Harry Kerr, and Ruth Nadelhaft for Earl Booth. Student Representatives: Dina Merrill, Robert Sezak, Lisa Cote, Bradford Payne, Theresa Moore, Kenneth Fredette, Staff: Chancellor McCarthy, George Connick, Frederic Reynolds, Arthur Johnson, Constance Carlson, Richard Spath, Robert Woodbury. Also present from UMO, Richard Bowers and Charles McRoy.

Chairman Brown convened the meeting.

- Ph.D. in Biological Science, UMO. President Johnson presented the recommendation for discussion. He reported that the program could be implemented within the existing resources of the several participating Colleges and Departments. Concerning projected enrollment, Vice President Richard Bowers indicated that there already is a core group of students in the basic biological sciences area who would be interested in the program, and it is expected that students who formerly would have enrolled in Master's level programs would opt for the PhD instead, since the Master's level can be bypassed in this instance. After further discussion, Mr. Brown indicated that the proposal would be referred to the full Board for action.

- Changes in tenure format. Mr. Brown reported that the Committee had been asked by the Board to review the nature and scope of the documents presented to the Trustees when they consider nominations to tenure, to determine whether the volume of these materials could be reduced effectively to more manageable proportions. He pointed out that the tenure process is primarily, and properly, one of peer review, and that most of the debate at Board level is concerned with nominations which are presented as exceptions to policy. Mr. Brown noted that the staff had drafted an alternative format for tenure presentations which provided for the Educational Policy Committee to continue to conduct a thorough review of the nominations supported by a comprehensive package of documentation, but to reduce the background materials presented to the Board as a whole. Specifically, the full Board would continue to receive the Report on Tenure Statistics, plus a one- or two-page summary for each candidate which would include face data (name, rank, department, work experience during tenure probation, and educational background) and the record of actions leading to and including the recommendations for tenure. In addition to these materials, the Educational Policy Committee would also receive a profile, student and peer performance evaluations, and letters

supporting the application for tenure, for each candidate. During discussion, Faculty Representatives endorsed the proposed changes in format, although questions were raised about the impact of the quantitative data on the Board's decisions about tenure. Professor Nadelhaft inquired whether the Trustees considered individual nominations in terms of the percentage of tenured faculty, for instance. Mr. Brown pointed out that data on tenure statistics are provided for each Campus but are not incorporated into the information on individual nominees. He said the statistical profile is intended to give Trustees a sense of the tenure situation throughout the institution. The Board of course is interested in knowing whether departments are becoming highly tenured, but he said the situation has never been critical at the University of Maine. After further discussion, Mr. Brown indicated that the proposed changes would be referred to the public meeting for action.

- University College, UMO. President Johnson presented the recommendation, which was developed by a faculty committee chaired by Professor Ruth Nadelhaft. The proposal was designed to establish a University College by renaming and augmenting the functions of the Bangor Community College. The reconstituted College would include the following units: Bangor Community College; the Continuing Education Division; Conference and Institutes Division; Cooperative Education/Field Experience; Onwards Program; living/learning programs; and programs associated with tutoring, testing, advising, and academic skills development. In brief, the central missions of the proposed College are to serve as the principal access unit for underprepared students, and to provide innovative delivery systems for those not served by other UMO units. Dean McRoy and Professor Nadelhaft elaborated on the specific details of the proposal and responded to questions of interest about the College's programs and missions. During discussion, Mr. Brown said he thought the University College would play a significant role in the education of this student population and he said it is important for the University to serve these students. He noted that one of the frequent charges expressed during the University's legislative hearings is that the institution has no admissions standards. He urged all present to take the time to explain to those who complain that the University maintains both high admissions standards and good access. President Johnson pointed out that the University College systematizes this approach. After further discussion, Mr. Brown said the proposal would be referred to the public meeting for action.

- Developmental/Remedial Education. Discussion of these issues was scheduled in response to a suggestion from Professor Carol Ann Hall at the last meeting, that the Committee address the need she perceives across the system for attention to remedial education. At the request of the Chairman, Professor Hall elaborated on the issues. She indicated that the number of students in need of remedial work is growing and that the problems are not limited to non-traditional students since they appear to be present to some degree in the remainder of the student population as well. She indicated that most faculty are not skilled in remedial teaching, and that the practice of scheduling students for remedial work

along with their regular courses is not an effective approach. She said she would like to see the University mount a well-publicized effort to attract those potential students who will need help and take the leadership in establishing extra-length programs where the needed remedial assistance would be provided to enable these students to realize their potential. She said this approach would benefit qualified students as well since the quality of the University's degrees would be maintained and enhanced. Professor Hall recommended that the Educational Policy Committee convene a meeting where teachers from each Campus could come together to assess the scope of the problems and share whatever efforts have been taken to address them. President Carlson endorsed the idea of a system-wide meeting. She pointed out, however, that the issues are complex ones and other important aspects, such as the implications of academic advising and financial aid requirements, should be included in the discussions. Professor Hall suggested that the focus of the initial meeting should be quite narrow in order to define the nature and scope of the problem. If it is determined that there is a need for a significant remedial effort, then the complicating factors could be dealt with in a subsequent session. Other faculty and student representatives endorsed the suggestion for a system-wide meeting, citing needs for remedial education on their campuses. Mr. Brown said he would have the staff arrange for such a session and would report the Committee's intentions to the Board at the public meeting.

Adjournment.

JoAnne R. Magill
Clerk

